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Abstract

This dissertation is a study of dialect choice and dialect mixture in Hellenistic book epigram. The aims of the project are not only linguistic, but also literary; indeed, what motivates the study is an overarching interest in understanding how specific dialect choices can enrich the meaning of the poem in which they appear. Scholars have only recently started to include dialect in their readings of individual epigrams, but no one has systematically studied the entire corpus. In order to more fully understand Hellenistic book epigram and its flourishing during a period of great social, cultural, and literary change, we must confront the genre’s use of dialect or otherwise miss out on an important component in this self-conscious genre’s production of poetic meaning.

Following an introduction that sets out the interpretive framework for the dissertation and explores issues of dialect transmission in the manuscript tradition, the study falls into two parts, each comprising three chapters. In the first part, I attempt to situate dialect choice and mixture in its poetic and literary-critical contexts. In the first chapter, I investigate dialect usage in pre-Hellenistic Greek poetry, not including inscribed epigram, arguing that dialect mixture for poetic effect existed in Archaic and Classical poetry. Poets used dialect to comment on the relationship of their work to other poetic traditions and to mark regional identity of characters or speakers, both of which are precursors to Hellenistic usage. In the second chapter, I examine the development of the ancient concept of dialect and attempts to reconstruct some of the literary-critical discourses on the aesthetic propriety of dialect use and dialect mixture. In the third chapter, I treat dialect usage in the tradition of inscribed epigram which is overwhelmingly determined by the regional identity of the deceased or dedicator. Since Hellenistic book epigram borrows heavily from inscribed epigram, I pay particular attention to the the injection of authorial identity into the previously linear relationship between the voice of the inscribed epigram and the identity of the dedicator or deceased.

In the second part, I offer analyses of dialect use and dialect mixture as a literary device in Hellenistic book epigram. In the first chapter, I begin with dialect as a marker of identity and place, which has a long history in Archaic and Classical poetry and the tradition of inscribed epigram. I explore the various poetic ends to which Hellenistic book epigrammatists put this strong association between dialect and place. I argue that this association was integral to the use of dialect in Hellenistic book epigram, and so the results of this chapter inform the rest of the analysis in the dissertation. In the second chapter, I treat the erotic epigrams of Asclepiades, one of the earliest and most influential book epigrammatists. I suggest that the unity of these poems’ Ionic dialect serve a dual purpose, both to situate theses epigrams in the tradition of sympotic-erotic poetry dating back to Theognis and to allow an identification between the voice of the anonymous lover and Asclepiades, a native of Ionic-speaking Samos. In the third chapter, I turn to the early reception of dialect in Hellenistic book epigram. Through the examination of imitations by late Hellenistic epigrammatists, such as Antipater of Sidon and Meleager, I demonstrate that these poets inventively used dialect in order to signal their relationship to and reading of model epigrams.

By treating this dialectal variety as a dynamic element of the genre and not necessarily evidence of intractable errors in the manuscript tradition, the results of my research demonstrate that dialect choice and mixture contributed meaningfully to the aesthetics, organization, and reception of Hellenistic epigram.
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Note on dialect conventions

To make my study of dialects in Hellenistic book epigram more inviting to its readership, I have devised a set of conventions for marking dialect forms in the Greek texts. They are as follows:

**Doric** forms appear in bold; **Ionic** forms are underlined; **Aeolic** forms are italicized and underlined; and **koine** forms in those instances where they are juxtaposed with another dialect for are italicized. In those cases where a form is dialectally ambiguous, such as α following ε, ι, or ρ (Doric or Attic) or the contraction of the diphthong εο to ευ (Doric or Ionic), I mark the form in accordance with the surrounding dialect environment.

Introduction

Linguistic variety is at the heart of poetic expression. It is not only the words that a poet chooses, but also the form in which he decides to render these words that contributes to the meaning, sonority, and emotional impact of a verse or entire poem. The mixture of Ionic and Aeolic forms imbue Homeric poetry with an epic ring; the Ionic of Archilochus and Hipponax, Ionians each, provide their invectives a realistic sting; and the Doric of Theocritus’ pastoral Idylls evokes the rustic patois of Sicilian goatherds and shepherds as they sing songs of unrequited love to one another. Dialect, in short, is a constitutive and important component in a Greek poet’s presentation of his composition.

This dissertation sets out to decode the practice underlying dialect choice and dialect mixture in Hellenistic book epigram. The aims of the project are not only linguistic (the collection and description of various dialect forms across the corpora), but rather decidedly literary; indeed, what motivates this study is an overarching interest in understanding how

---

1 van Groningen 1953, 28-29 (196-97), who goes on to add: “Mais il y a un autre motif, qu’on persiste à ne pas faire
2 Palumbo Stracca 1987, 429. See further comments on the dialect variance in Hellenistic epigram in Kock 1910 and Buck 1923.
specific dialect choices can enrich the meaning of the poem in which they appear. I have chosen to focus my attention on Hellenistic book epigram for two reasons in particular. Firstly, Hellenistic book epigram presents the reader with a dialectally rich and varied corpus; epigrammatists often mixed together various dialects in their epigrams to a degree not witnessed in previous poetry. \(^3\) Secondly, the genre flourished during a time of great social, cultural, and literary change. During this time, language, and dialect in particular, were impacted significantly. The spread of Hellenic culture beyond Greece, the formation of a conception of the Greek language and its subsequent standardization, \(^4\) and the development of a bookish literary culture that defined itself, in large, part through its self-conscious reuse and reinvention of the poetic canon, \(^5\) influenced the linguistic choices of Hellenistic epigrammatists.

In the past several decades, Hellenistic book epigram has received renewed critical attention, which has greatly expanded our understanding of its engagement with various literary traditions (most notably Archaic elegy and inscribed epigram) and its role in the development of artfully arranged poetry collections. \(^6\) Despite these important contributions, however, the language of Hellenistic book epigram has been generally ignored. Since the manuscript tradition can obscure the transmission of dialect forms, many editors and scholars have dismissed the dialect mixture present in the manuscripts of the *Greek Anthology*, routinely changing non-

---

\(^3\) For the recognition of the dialectal variety present in Hellenistic book epigram, including the admixture and juxtaposition of dialects within the various epigrammatic corpora as well as individual epigrams, see Baale 1903, 90-119; Kock 1910; Buck 1923; Gow and Page 1965, 1.xlv-xlvi; Geoghegan 1979, 14; Palumbo Stracca 1987; Palumbo Stracca 1993-94; Guichard 2004, 103-109; Sens 2004; Guichard 2005; Sens 2011, lxv-lxxii and Gutzwiller 2014.

\(^4\) On the standardization of Greek and the development of the koine, see Bubenik 1989 and 1993; Brixhe and Hadot 1993; Colvin 2009; Silk 2009; and Horrocks 2010, 73-123 and especially 73-95.

\(^5\) Among the numerous treatments of the bookish aspects of Hellenistic literary culture, see e.g. Giangrande 1967 and Bing 1988a. Of course, one cannot ignore the influence of popular or “low” performative genres (often oral in nature) on Hellenistic literature; on this interaction, see e,g Zanker 1987; Cameron 1995, 44-103; and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 1-41. See also Floridi 2012 on the interface of popular culture and imperial epigram.

standard dialect forms in an epigram to produce uniform usage or discounting them as simply manuscript variants or scribal errors.

In their monumental edition and commentary to the Hellenistic book epigrams of the *Greek Anthology*, Gow and Page offer a traditional assessment of dialect use in the collection. After rightly observing the range and mixture of dialects in the surviving corpus, they then continue on to contend that this mixture of dialects in Hellenistic book epigram is a “tiresome and insoluble problem”\(^7\) of the manuscript tradition, one slightly tempered by the realization that these “vagaries of dialect affect neither the meaning nor, to a modern reader, the poetical value of the poems.”\(^8\) While some dialect forms are undoubtedly the product of scribal error or editorial correction rather than the product of authorial choice, this should not disqualify attempts to understand the broader picture of dialect usage in Hellenistic book epigram. Indeed it is extremely improbable, as we shall find, that dialect mixture *on the whole* is a product of scribal intervention. Underlying Gow and Page’s second point, that dialect mixture has no impact on the meaning or poetics of Hellenistic book epigram, is the assumption that dialect is primarily a function of generic convention, a practice that consequently excludes the artistic mixture of dialects. In this dissertation, I will address and challenge these existing assumptions about dialect transmission in the manuscripts of the *Greek Anthology*, in particular, and dialect usage in ancient Greek literature, more broadly.

Vagaries of dialect—that is, the mixture of dialects within individual epigrams and across poetic corpora—*did* affect the meaning and poetical value of Greek literature for the ancient Greek reader. I explore this phenomenon in Archaic and Classical poetry in chapter one, where, based on a flawed belief that generic conventions alone prescribed dialect usage, dialect mixture

---

7 Gow and Page 1965, 1.xlv.
8 Gow and Page 1965, 1.xlvii.
as a marker of ethnic identity, imagined location, or commentary on other literary traditions has been ignored. For exact Hellenistic parallels, I need only cite the Doric and epic-Ionic *Hymns* and *Iambi* of Callimachus, or the Doric and Aeolic *Idylls* of Theocritus. In the *Hymns*, for example, Callimachus composes a pair of elegiac poems (*H. 5* and *H. 6*) in a Doric patina overlaid on epic diction that contrasts with the meter and epic-Ionic color of his Homeric models. While one scholar has been quick to dismiss the choice of Doric as a mere “cosmetic adaptation” that has “no profound rationale”, internal and external evidence does not bear out such naïve claims; rather it is almost certain that Callimachus had a literary purpose in mind for his dialect choice. The presence of Doric in *H. 5* may emphasize the realism of the Argive occasion of performance internal to the poem, thus locating the speakers of the hymn (attendants to Athena) and the readers within the same linguistic orbit. Alternatively, the Doric of both hymns may be interpreted as evoking the dialect color of public choral lyric with which the hymn shares the framework of a song sung to the accompaniment of a religious festival, or, not to be

---

9 Hopkinson 1984, 44.
10 McKay 1962, 77 and Bulloch 1985, 26 (“The Fifth Hymn uses Doric as part of its ‘mimetic’ apparatus, to recreate as convincingly as possible (within the poetic framework) the occasion of the festival at Doric Argos. Callimachus’ Doric hymns should be seen in their general Alexandrian context: in the same period Theocritus was experimenting with mimetic poems which had ‘realistic’ use of Doric in presenting the conversations of Sicilian or South Italian countrymen or even Syracusan immigrants in Alexandria, and Herodas wrote mimes in a carefully revived Ionic genre dialect.”). Callimachus’ sources for the festival were also at least partially Doric, namely the *Argolika* of Agias and Derkylos (see Bulloch 1985, 16-17), and his dialect usage may have some basis in his process of research (cf. the glancing suggestion to such at Hunter and Fuhrer 2002, 149). Scholars have suggested the setting of *H. 6* was the sanctuary of Demeter in Callimachus’ native Cyrene (Laronde 1987, 365 and Bacchielli 1990, 22-33), whose local Doric may also be recalled in the dialect of the hymn, although, as Hopkinson 1984, 38 rightly observed, “a scrap of real evidence” does not exist for such an identification (Hunter and Fuhrer 2002, 149 n.16, to whom I owe the previous citations, consider a Cyreanean setting “not improbable”). Moreover, there is little to no evidence to support the supposition (Ruijgh 1984) that Callimachus’ literary Doric is based on his native Cyrenaic.
11 Fantuzzi 1993, especially 927-32 (“E la scelta del dorico potrebbe essere…visto che la coloratura dorica restò convenzione della lirica cerimoniale ancora almeno sino alla fine del V sec.”). McKay 1962 argued that Callimachus linked the Doric color of the two hymns through their contrasting engagement with Doric elegiac threnody in *H. 5* (83), on the one hand, and Epicharmian comedy in *H. 6* (117-24), on the other.
discounted, Erinna’s *Distaff*, whose hexametric lament of a mixed Aeolic and Doric color also marries epic form to the representation of an occasion for song.\(^{12}\)

The final poem of Callimachus’ *Iambi* provides the clearest expression of the awareness of dialect’s poetic significance that we have suggested are operative in *H. 5* and *H. 6* (and elsewhere).\(^{13}\) Indeed, *Iambus* 13 is essential to understanding the literary-critical discourse on dialect that informed its usage in Hellenistic book epigram and I provide a fuller discussion in chapter two. In a partially preserved dialogue between the poet and a fictional and anonymous critic, the latter reproaches Callimachus for his failure to emulate properly the iambographic model provided by Hipponax. One part of his criticism is directed at Callimachus’ iambic *lexis* (lines 15-18). Whereas Hipponax composed in a strict Ionic and drew his language from the contemporary vernacular,\(^{14}\) the concatenation of Ionic and Doric in the *Iambi* has little poetic value and is thus entirely unsuitable, in the opinion of the fictional critic, for the type of poetry Callimachus professes to produce. With these words, the aesthetic valuation of the critic in *Iambus* 13 heralds Gow and Page’s description of the dialect use in Hellenistic book epigram.

Dialectal variance is also a notable feature of inscribed epigram from the Archaic through Hellenistic periods, whose structures, motifs, organization, and language had a significant influence on the development of Hellenistic book epigram.\(^{15}\) Whereas inscribed epigram from the Archaic period forward commonly borrowed from a repertoire of imagery, diction, and phraseology indebted to the epic tradition, the dialect of inscribed epigrams were often

---

\(^{12}\) On Erinna, her dialect, and prominence in Hellenistic poetry and book epigram in particular, see the discussion in chapter one (78-83).

\(^{13}\) While some uncertainty surrounds whether *Iambus* 13 was the final poem in the collection, I believe there is significant evidence this is the case (particularly relating correspondences between it and *Iambus* 1), and accordingly I will treat *Iambus* 13 as holding an important programmatic position and function in my discussion of the text throughout the dissertation. Acosta-Hughes 2002, 9-13 concisely summarizes the evidence for and against the poem as the conclusion of the collection.

\(^{14}\) On the language of Hipponax, see Hawkins 2013.

\(^{15}\) On dialectal variance in Archaic and Classical inscribed epigram, see e.g. Buck 1913 and 1923; Mickey 1981; D’Alfonso 1986; and Palumbo Stracca 1987.
determined by the native origins of the deceased (and their family) or the dedicator.\textsuperscript{16} To commemorate a deceased Spartan soldier the epigram would almost certainly be composed in a literary version of the community’s local Laconian; similarly Ephesians would record their dedication at a local temple or sanctuary in Ionic. This practice of linking dialect to the native speech of the deceased or dedicator, as Buck observed, extended to epitaphs and dedications erected abroad.\textsuperscript{17} Dialect, just like deceased and dedicators, traveled. I treat the dialect practices of the inscribed epigram tradition in fuller detail in chapter three. As we shall find, this association between dialect and place or identity, which is most apparent in the tradition of inscribed epigram, provided an essential touchstone for the poetic use of dialect in book epigram.

Nevertheless, despite the ancient theoretical awareness of dialect in Callimachus’ \textit{iambus} 13 and elsewhere and the predominance of dialect variation in inscribed epigram, the view articulated by Gow and Page has remained predominant, as evidenced by the general silence on the topic of dialect in articles and monographs on individual epigrams and epigrammatists as well as more synthetic studies. No mention of dialect (beyond an occasional notice of a dialect form or the passing comment on the dialectal color of an epigram) is made in the influential studies of Giangrande on book epigram’s relationship to the tradition of sympotic literature, Tarán on the “art of variation” in Hellenistic epigrams, Gutzwiller on the artistic organization of author-organized poetry books and multi-authored anthologies, or Bing, Bruss, and Tueller (among others) on book epigram’s engagement with inscriptional conventions.\textsuperscript{18} Discussion of dialect is also absent from several notable synthetic treatments of the genre.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} See Mickey 1981 and my discussion in chapter three (126-43).
\textsuperscript{17} Buck 1913 on “interstate” prose inscriptions and dedicatory epigrams erected at pan-Hellenic sites.
\textsuperscript{18} Giangrande 1968a; Tarán 1979; Gutzwiller 1998; Bing 1995; Bruss 2005; Tueller 2008.
\textsuperscript{19} Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 283-349; Gutzwiller 2007a, 106-20; and Bruss 2010, 117-34. Dialect receives some mention in several chapters in Bing and Bruss 2007; Enrico Magnelli’s contribution on diction (2007: 177-78) is the most enriching and subtle.
Scholars began to pay serious attention to dialect after the discovery and publication of *P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309*, a third-century BCE papyrus containing a collection of thematically arranged epigrams generally regarded to be composed by Posidippus. In comparison to the epigrams of Posidippus transmitted in the manuscript tradition, the epigrams of *P.Mil.Vogl VIII 309* present a wider array of dialect usage and mixture. In particular, the epigrams on the papyrus transmit a greater degree of Ionic and Doric variance within individual epigrams, a practice that plausibly grants further support to the originality of dialect mixture in epigrams of Posidippus transmitted only in the manuscript tradition, such as G-P 1.3-4=AB 123.3-4 (ὦ τε Κλεάνθους | Μοῦσα, μέλοι δ’ Ἡμίν….) and G-P 8.1-3=AB 139.1-3 (ὦ Κύπρον ὥ τε Κόθηρα καὶ ὥ Μύλητον ἐποιχεῖς |…Σωρίς…|…ἲ…). Richard Janko, however, has argued that the dialect variance in *P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309* is itself a product of scribal error, going so far as to assert that the scribe of the papyrus was “bad at dialects,” and he suggests emendation to a uniform usage, especially in epigrams that have several Doric forms. The scribe of the Milan papyrus was certainly not infallible and Janko’s suggestion that Doric forms should be restored in certain contexts is not unfounded; however, we must also resist the urge to return to the flawed practice.

---

20 The one notable exception I know of is Bing 1988b on Theocritus’ epigrams on statues of poets, where he argues that the juxtaposition of the Doric color of an epigram on a statue of Anacreon with the poet’s Ionian origins and the predominant use of Ionic in his surviving poetry is designed to underscore the gap between reality and representation. On the dialect variance between Ionic and Doric in the *Anacreontea*, see Sens 2014.

21 Here and throughout the dissertation I treat the epigrams transmitted in the *P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309* as the work of Posidippus of Pella, although this identification is not universally accepted. Posidippean authorship was assumed since the *editio princeps* of Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001 where it was recognized that several of the epigrams preserved in the papyrus were attributed elsewhere to Posidippus. Many subsequent studies of the language, style, and structure of the poetry book strengthen the argument for a single author for the epigrams. The most vociferous, but ultimately unconvincing, argument against Posidippean authorship is Schröder 2004 (for a response, see Livrea 2007); Lloyd-Jones 2003 and Bravi 2005 both consider the possibility of the poetry book as an anthology consisting of Posidippus and other poets, Asclepiades and Hedylus in the case of Lloyd-Jones, and the more amorphous “school” of Posidippus for Bravi. For discussion of the New Posidippus, see the studies collected in Acosta-Hughes, Baumbach, and Kosmetatou 2004 and Gutzwiller 2005.

22 Surveys and studies of the dialect composition of the Posidippus epigrams transmitted in the Milan papyrus include: Palumbo Stracca 1993-94; Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001, 21-22; Sens 2004; and Guichard 2005.


of earlier scholars, who uncritically corrected all dialect variants to uniform usage. In short, it would be a mistake to reject the overwhelming evidence of dialect mixture in the Milan papyrus on the grounds that some of this admixture could reflect scribal error. To the evidence for dialect mixture in Hellenistic-period papyrus collections of epigrams, we can now add the recently published *P. Vindob. G* 40611 (ca. 230 BCE), a list of two-hundred and twenty-six epigram incipits, likely a selection of poems from a larger collection in four (?) books, all but one of which are not previously attested. Ionic and Doric forms appear the incipits, and in at least one instance together in the same line. Despite the ragged state of preservation of many of these lines and the unfortunate absence of the epigrams in their entirety, *P. Vindob. G* 40611 reinforces our evidence for the variety of dialect usage and the prevalence of dialect mixture in Hellenistic book epigram previously attested in the Milan papyrus, while also offering a tantalizing glimpse of what we have lost of the genre in the intervening centuries.

While the Milan papyrus suffers from textual corruption and is undoubtedly an imperfect witness to authorial dialect choice, nevertheless it transmits Doric forms that are almost certainly correct, but which were regularized at some late point in their transmission. G-P 18=AB 65 is the only epigram that is transmitted in both *P.Mil.Vogl. VIII* 309 and a manuscript of the *Greek Anthology* (Planudes).

> Λύσιππε, πλάστα Σικυώνιε, θρασαλέα χείρ, 
> δάτες τεχνίτα, πῦρ τοι ὁ χαλκὸς ὅρη 
> ὁν κατ’ Ἀλεξάνδρου μορφᾶς ἔθευ· οὖ τι γε μεμπτοῖ 
> Πέρσαν· συγγνώμα βουσὶ λέοντα φυγεῖν. (Posidippus G-P 18=AB 65=AP119)

---

25 Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini 2015, especially 10-17. The one identifiable incipit belongs to Asclepiades G-P 15=A.P. 12.46, which the papyrus preserves through the fourth foot of the hexameter with no difference in the readings.

26 Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini 2015, 13 with representative citations. A more thorough examination of dialect practice in the papyrus is needed.

27 col. i 7: ἵσεν Ἀστερίνης γαρδόσαμαι.

Lysippus, Sikyonian sculptor, bold hand, cunning craftsman, like fire the bronze flashes, which he has poured over the form of Alexander; blameless are the Persians; it is forgivable for cows to flee a lion.

The third-century version of the epigram and the version transmitted in Planudes’ early fourteenth-century manuscript copy of the Greek Anthology agree on several Doric forms (α for [a:] in πλάστα, δάις, and μορφὰς and the contraction of α + ει to η in ὅρη), but the papyrus also transmits Doric θρασαλέα to the later witnesses’ Ionic θρασαλέη/δαιδαλέη and the Doric contract verbal form ἔθευ (ε+ο to ευ) to the epicizing χέες. The Planudean manuscript, as we shall discuss in further detail below, commonly regularizes Doric forms to their Attic or Ionic equivalent, and this likely accounts for the variance between Doric θρασαλέα in the papyrus and the regularized θρασαλέη in Planudes (and the Ionic variant δαιδαλέη in another Byzantine manuscript).29

Spurred by the increased Doric color in G-P 18=AB 65 and the presence of Doricisms in other epigrams in P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, Alex Sens undertook a treatment of this dialectal aspect of Posidippus’ corpus. He recognized that in G-P 18=AB 65 the choice of dialect recalled the native language of Lysippus, the master sculptor from Sicyon, whose θρασαλέα χείρ so faithfully captured the formidable visage of Alexander the Great.30 Three other epigrams from the the Milan papyrus use dialect to engage with notions of place and identity. Also from the artistically organized section on statuary, AB 64, on a life-like bronze statue of the Cretan hero Idomeneus,

29 P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 is not without its own dialectal errors: Palumbo Stracca 2003 noted that in AB 87.3 [πο]λυθρύλατον is a hyperdorism that entered a text as an erroneous correction of the original η ([πο]λυθρύλητον) to an α, since [πο]λυθρόητον is a Doricism in its own right. 30 Sens 2004, 70.
and AB 68, on Chares of Lindus’ monumental bronze statue of Helios commissioned for the Doric-speaking Rhodians, use a literary Doric to recreate the local timbre of their subject’s speech in the case of the former or the place of display for the latter. Similarly, AB 102, an epitaph for a certain Cretan Menoetius in the first-person, contains several Doris severior forms shared by the Cretan dialect. Even the absence of an expected dialect form in these predominantly Doric contexts can be laden with meaning. In the ecphrastic epigram on the statue of Cretan Idomeneus, for example, the papyrus transmits the koine verbal form in the phrase εἴδομεν ἐδ (AB 64.2), where given the other Doric forms we might expect the metrically equivalent εἴδομες ἐδ, which Bastianini and Gallazzi perceptively suggest may have been designed as a play on the subject’s name, particularly in its later spelling (Εἴδομενεύς).

Although Sens is not the first to recognize that dialect was used in Hellenistic poetry as a marker of place, identity, and native speech, his thorough treatment of the Doricisms in Posidippus has drawn attention to the need to examine the dialect of book epigram, a genre that developed out of inscriptional epitaphs and dedications erected in physical landscapes, in terms of its ability to fashion aural soundscapes.

The work was a catalyst for several other studies on dialect in book epigram. In her treatment of the small corpus of Archaic epigrams that survive both on stone and in the manuscripts of the Greek Anthology, Sarah Kaczko addressed the issue of textual transmission’s

---

31 Luppe 2003 unconvincingly attempts to remove all Doric color from the epigram; conversely Janko 2005, 127 adds additional Doric conjectures, correcting the koine verb form εἴδομεν to the Doric εἴδομες.

32 For discussion of the association between dialect choice and identity in these epigrams, see Sens 2004; Guichard 2005, 315-18; and Palumbo Stracca 1993-94, 408-409 (on AB 102). Doric also clusters in Posidippus’ epigrams on equestrian victories by certain members of the Ptolemaic royal house. The original editors of P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, Bastianini and Gallazzi, 2001, 21-22 read the presence of Doric as an allusion to the language of Pindaric epinician. Sens 2004, 73-75 observed that Macedonian elites, among which the Ptolemies were counted, traced their origins to Dorian Argos and suggested that the Doric then might have a political or ideological meaning when read in the context of epigrams celebrating Ptolemaic royal achievements. Neither of these treatments appears to completely make sense of the pattern of dialect usage in these epinician epigrams (where neither the entirety of the section nor every epigram on a member of the Ptolemaic family is in Doric) and I offer my own reading of the epigrams in chapter four (227-37).

33 Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001, 190.
effect on the practice of dialect mixture in epigrams through a similar comparative method as that found in Sens’ analysis of Posidippus’ Doricisms. Besides the expected mistakes that often enter a text during its transmission—including dialect regularization—Kaczko has noted several cases of likely modification of the dialect by later, possibly Hellenistic, editors, which she then argued are manifestations of the broader Hellenistic aesthetic of *variatio* and innovation within the parameters of a well-defined literary tradition.\(^{34}\)

The Classical dedication of a Herm by a certain Leocrates, son of Stroebus, from Athens, exemplifies this process of reception and expansion (*CEG* 312; Athens, ca. 460 BCE):

\[
[\text{Στροίβου παϊ, τόδ’ ἄγαλμα, Λεωκρατες, ἐυτ’ ἀνέθηκας}]
\]
\[
\text{herentia, kalλικómos oúk élathes [Xáritas].}
\]

Son of Stroebus, Leocrates, when you set up this statue to Hermes, you did not escape the notice of the beautiful tressed Graces

As preserved in the *Palatine Anthology*, Leocrates’ dedication is a quatrain and ascribed, like many other anonymously composed inscribed epigrams, to a famous poet of the period, in this instance Anacreon (*A.P. 6. 144=*Anacreon *FGE* 15):

\[
\text{Στροίβου παϊ, τόδ’ ἄγαλμα, Λεωκρατες, ἐυτ’ ἀνέθηκας}
\]
\[
\text{‘Ερμη, καλλικόμους ούκ ἔλαθες Χάριτας}
\]
\[
\text{οὐδ’ Ἀκαδήμειαν πολυγαθέα, τής ἐν ἀγοστῷ}
\]
\[
\text{σὴν εὐφρενεσίην τὸ προσίοντι λέγω. (Anacreon FGE 15=A.P. 6.144)}
\]

Son of Stroebus, Leocrates, when you set up this statue to Hermes, you did not escape the notice of the beautiful tressed Graces

nor delightful Academy, in whose arm I spoke of your kindness to the passerby.

\(^{34}\) Kaczko 2009, 97 and 114.
The discovery of the inscription has provided support for a long held supposition that the second couplet was a later addition. This supposition was based partly on the stark difference in the language between the two couplets. With ἔν ἄγοστῳ, not attested for the meaning “embrace” until the Hellenistic period, as well as the dialectally contrastic πολυγαθέα and εὐεργεσίην, we find an elevated level of poetic expression quite uncommon to inscribed epigram of the period. I would like to focus on the latter pair, whose vocalisms run contrary to what one would expect in an Attic inscribed epigram. πολυγαθέα includes the retention of inherited *ā as a feature of Doric absent from Attic (where we expect πολυγηθέα), while in the following line we have a markedly Ionic εὐεργεσίην. Such coordination of different dialects in an Archaic inscription would be quite rare, which led Kaczko to conclude rightly that this second couplet contains an “instance of intentional dialect mixture” on the part of a Hellenistic editor/poet who sought to enhance the poetic quality of the original, functional dedicatory inscription.

On the whole, Kaczko’s argument for the artistic intervention of a Hellenistic epigrammatist in the expansion and transmission of this inscribed epigram is compelling and her study serves to highlight the engagement of Hellenistic epigrammatists with the tradition of inscribed epigram through the lens of dialect features. That said, Kaczko’s study also falters in regards to the amount of dialect change and mixture she is able to highlight in her limited corpus. While the example cited above contains both Doric and Ionic dialect coloring, these examples are limited to two words. In my study of dialect mixture in Hellenistic book epigrams, the larger corpus will allow me to focus my attention on poems where dialect plays a more significant role and then use these poems to establish a baseline for determining patterns of dialect usage into

35 See Kaczko 2009, 106 n. 47.
36 Kaczko 2009, 108. Kaczko’s argument could be slightly undermined by the variance in the transmission between P¹ and P² on the form of εὐεργεσίας, although from the correction of the Attic (or Doric) for in P² by C, it is more likely that εὐεργεσίαν is a common scribal regularization.
which poems with less overt examples can be more readily appreciated for their possible literary effects.

Most recently, Kathryn Gutzwiller has offered another case-study in dialect as a marker of identity and place in Hellenistic book epigrams, with special attention on the late Hellenistic poet and anthologist Meleager of Gadara. Gutzwiller, noting the marked use of Doric in the opening quatrain to the predominantly Attic-Ionic proem to his *Garland*, convincingly suggests that Meleager chose the Doric as recognition of the dialect of the anthology’s imagined first readers on the Doric-speaking island of Cos where he resided and was granted honorary citizenship later in life.37 Gutzwiller’s observations on the introduction of the proem and the use of dialect as a marker of place elsewhere, such as in the heavily ionicized epitaph for the Ephesian pre-socratic philosopher Heraclitus (G-P 121=A.P. 7.79), reinforces the expressive power of dialect down to end of the Hellenistic period.38

Nevertheless, the analyses of this study, and the work of Sens that influenced it, are ultimately circumscribed by their almost exclusive focus on the relationship between dialect and identity and the restriction of their discussion to examples from the corpus of an individual Hellenistic book epigrammatist. Considering the lack of dedicated treatments of dialect in Hellenistic book epigram, and our increased understanding of the genre’s self-conscious engagement with inscribed epigram and other literary traditions as well as the period’s broader intellectual interest in the Greek language and the shifting frontiers of Hellenic identities, now is an ideal time to conduct a more detailed and critical analysis of the literary purposes to which a group of Hellenistic poets put dialect.

37 Gutzwiller 2014, 83.
38 Gutzwiller 2014, 92-94.
Dialect in the Manuscripts of the *Greek Anthology*

That the manuscripts of the *Greek Anthology*, which transmit the large majority of Hellenistic book epigrams, can be used effectively in a critical analysis of the original dialect color of a given epigram is the foundation of this study’s argument. Still, our understanding of the dialectal composition of Hellenistic book epigram is doubtless compromised by the distortions inherent to manuscript transmission. This is especially the case for poetic corpora that are known to have deliberately mixed dialects. As we have seen from the brief discussion of Posidippus G-P 18=AB 65, agreement between various witnesses does not necessarily inoculate the text of the epigram against the possibility that scribal intervention into its dialect color has not occurred. The reliability of dialect transmission in the manuscript tradition, however compromised, is not the “tiresome and insoluble problem” that Gow and Page considered it to be. While caution and a healthy dose of skepticism are essential in the treatment of the manuscripts, careful and detailed attention to the paradosis of the Hellenistic book epigrams can mitigate some of these distortions and reveal patterns of dialect transmission that can also aid in our evaluation of the dialectal situation when witnesses diverge.

The large majority of epigrams treated in this discussion are transmitted in one or both of the Byzantine epigram anthologies that comprise the *Greek Anthology*. They are the *Palatine Anthology* and the *Planudean Anthology*. Both ultimately derived much of their material from the same source, a more extensive and now lost anthology compiled by the Byzantine scholar Constantine Cephalas in the early tenth century CE.³⁹ Important sources of Cephalas’ anthology included several ancient epigram collections: the sixth-century CE *Cycle* of Agathias, the first-

³⁹ On the history of the *Greek Anthology*, Cameron 1993 remains the essential treatment; see now Maltomini 2008 on some of the sylloges, which derive the majority of their material from Cephalan exemplars independent of the *Palatine* and *Planudean* anthologies.
century CE *Garland* of Philip, and most importantly for this project the first-century BCE
*Garland* of Meleager.\(^{40}\)

The *Palatine Anthology* is transmitted in Palatinus 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384 (hereafter P). The manuscript is now solidly dated on palaeographic grounds to the middle of the tenth century CE (ca. 940 CE), meaning its compilation occurred within a generation of Cephalas’ significant accomplishment of bringing the tradition of Greek epigram together in one collection. At least four scribes compiled the fifteen books of P from copies of Cephalas’ anthology, each taking control of a particular block of text.\(^{41}\) The epigrams through *A.P.* 9.563 (primarily copied by scribe A) were subject to later revision, which principally took the form of erasures and supralinear corrections, but also included the writing of variant readings in the margins (often marked by the abbreviation γρ for γράφεται) and, less commonly, the addition of authorial ascriptions, ethnics, and lemmata.\(^{42}\) The scribe who intervened into the text copied by scribe A is known as the Corrector (hereafter C). Given the notation γρ that accompanied marginal variants, it is clear that the Corrector had access to another manuscript.\(^{43}\) We should not assume, however, that all of the Corrector’s interventions into the text were taken from the other exemplar at his disposal; some were certainly conjectural. Indeed, C is not a scribe in the same sense as A, whose transcriptions he corrects, but rather he was scholar as well, as Cameron rightly observes, and thus in his corrections he retained “the scholar’s penchant for personal as well as critical

\(^{40}\) Other ancient sources include a collection of epigrams attributed to Theocritus and epigrams derived from Diogenes Laertius’ *Lives*, as well as a large number of imperial epigrams composed after Philip, most significantly 100 epigrams of Palladas.

\(^{41}\) For discussion of the scribes of P—their number, what sections they copied, their temporal relationship—see, Cameron 1993, 99-108 with a clear treatment of previous scholarly discussion.

\(^{42}\) The majority of authorial ascriptions and lemmata are likely the work of a scribe known as J, whom Cameron 1993, 108-16 and 300-307 convincingly identifies with the tenth-century CE poet Constantine the Rhodian, and so are contemporary with the copying of the *Palatine Anthology*.

\(^{43}\) Cameron 1993, 111-12 has identified the manuscript against which C corrected the epigrams in P as Michael Chartophylax’s autograph copy of Cephalas on the basis of several notes in C’s hand in books six and seven of P in which he refers to Michael’s copy. On the Corrector and Michael Chartophylax, see Cameron 1993, 111-20.
One notable example of the Corrector’s critical acumen, as regards issues of dialect, appears in C’s marginal note for A.P. 7.431.3=Simonides G-P 5.3; here A has copied ἄπρατον, which C then corrects to ἀ πρατόν (scil. πράτον), the latter word being the Doric version of Attic-Ionic πράτον. Since πράτον was seemingly an unfamiliar dialect feature to A or the scribe’s exemplar, the Corrector flags the word and comments in the margins δωρικῶς ἄντι τ(οῦ) πράτον. In this instance, C likely deemed a simple correction of an offending error not enough for the readership of the anthology.

The Planudean Anthology is transmitted in Marc. gr. 481, the autograph copy of the Byzantine scholar and translator Maximus Planudes’ epigram collection from which the anthology receives its name; the manuscript can be precisely dated to September of 1301 CE. Drawing on two redactions of Cephalas, Planudes’ anthology was smaller than P, and significantly reorganized for ease of consultation. Following the original compilation (Pla), Planudes’ appended an additional block of epigrams (Plb). The content of this appendix was derived from a second exemplar. Although he intended Plb to serve as a supplement to the original anthology, Planudes mistakenly duplicates numerous epigrams already found in the main body of the anthology (Pla). Since Pla and Plb are two witnesses derived from different redactions of Cephalas, this accident of duplication, as we shall find, impacts our understanding of the transmission of dialect variants.

---

44 Cameron 1993, 113.
45 Planudes used the common dating system of the period, which included dating by the induction year and the world year. There is a notable and much discussed variance between the induction year (13th year and thus 1299 CE) and the world year (6810 and thus 1301 CE). The latter appears to have been corrected to 1301 CE. Certain scholars have argued that the corrected, later world year date indicates the year when Planudes revised the anthology, making the original date of compilation September 1299 (e.g. Gallavotti 1959, 30; Cameron 1973, 96 n.1 similarly adopted the earlier date, on the grounds that an error would more likely appear in the world year rather than induction year, while not accepting the argument of revision). Demonstrating that such a practice of redating post-revisions was not at all a common practice in Byzantine manuscripts, Cameron 1993, 76-77 has argued quite convincingly that the correction to the world year rather reflects that this was the year of importance to Planudes, and he simply failed to update the induction year to reflect his correction of the world year.
46 Cameron 1993, 17.
47 See the chart in Lenzinger 1964, 32-34.
Apographs exist for both P and Pl. The apographs of the *Palatine Anthology* are more numerous and represent selections of epigrams present in P but absent from Pl. The sources of most of these apographa were the selections of epigrams made by Salmaise from his collation of the *Palatine Anthology*, which was at the time unavailable to most scholars until Brunck’s joint edition of P and Pl (1772). As handwritten copies of some epigrams from the *Palatine*, the apographa of P are not independent witnesses, and so they are mainly of importance to modern editors for the numerous emendations they contain. Accordingly, they have little to contribute in a discussion of dialect transmission, and I do not as a rule report their readings in my dialect apparatus criticus, except in the rare circumstance where they may help guide the interpretation of the paradosis or offer astute and necessary correction. The case is essentially the same for the apographa of Pl. The one exception is BM Add. 16409 (Q), a manuscript that was copied from Pl before Planudes finalized his autograph version of the anthology, which makes it a witness to early, divergent readings in Pl before correction (indeed it appears Planudes made corrections to Q) and thus of some relevance as regards the constitution of the text.\(^{48}\) Besides Q, I do not report the readings of apographa in my apparatus criticus, except in those few cases where I believe the correction is warranted or the conjecture of value.

In addition to P and Pl there are several smaller collections that contain Hellenistic book epigrams, commonly referred to as the “*syllogae minores.*” Where an understanding of the text of an individual epigram is concerned, those sylloges that derive, independently of P or Pl, from copies of Cephalas’ anthology are the most relevant. They are: *Sylloge Parisina* (S); *Sylloge Laurenziana* (L); *Sylloge Eupheniana* (E); *Appendix Barberino-Vaticana* (ABV); *Sylloge Σπ* (Σ^π); *Sylloge I* (I); and *Sylloge H* (H). These sylloges provide a further, and generally underappreciated, witness to dialect transmission in the *Greek Anthology*. I discuss one example

\(^{48}\) On Q, see Young 1955, 197-214 and Cameron 1993, 345-50.
below, but a full and detailed treatment of dialect variants in the sylloges, however important for shedding light on the editorial history of the *Greek Anthology*, is beyond the scope of this project.\textsuperscript{49}

Although the witnesses to the *Greek Anthology* have received detailed and critical analyses, including studies of their relationship to one another and the Cephalan exemplar, patterns of transmission and the relative reliability of one witness over another when it comes to dialect has not been given a thorough treatment. In the discussion that follows I undertake to establish briefly what we already know about dialect transmission in the witnesses to the *Greek Anthology*, and some new discoveries I have made in the course of my study of the corpus of Hellenistic book epigrams. Since the discussion of manuscripts and the field of textual criticism in general can be quite technical, I have placed the data for my findings in an appendix to which I direct the reader throughout the following.

In the introduction to their edition of *Hellenistic Epigrams*, Gow and Page succinctly summarize the principal problems that confront an editor of epigrams transmitted in the *Greek Anthology* in the face of dialect mixture and suggest possible best practices:\textsuperscript{50}

Epigrams in which the dialects appear to be mixed present an editor with one of two problems. If there are dialect-variants in the tradition he must choose between them. Our choice has been in favour of the forms which best match the rest of the epigram, but this principle, though logical and perhaps only the possible basis for choice, may well have occurred to scribes and correctors in the past and account for some of the variants we have preferred; we have no confidence that it will regularly restore what the author wrote. If on the other hand there are no variants in the tradition and the dialect of the epigram is mixed, an editor must consider whether uniformity should be imposed by emendation. Here our principle has been to make as few changes as possible and almost to restrict them to places where no more than single word is aberrant in form.

\textsuperscript{49} In her collation of the sylloges, Maltomini 2008 represents a recent and important step forward in the critical study of these manuscripts; nevertheless, she has not published editions of the sylloges and so we still lack clarity on the exact readings.

\textsuperscript{50} Gow and Page 1965, 1.xlvi.
Despite their assertion elsewhere that dialect presents an intractable editorial complication, Gow and Page offer measured and generally well-reasoned advice, especially in terms of preserving dialect mixture agreed upon in the witnesses. Intervention into the dialect of an epigram which takes the form of correction that produces uniform usage should generally be avoided, especially given the artificial and composite nature of dialect in Hellenistic book epigram. On those numerous instances where the manuscript witnesses diverge, Gow and Page demure: adoption of the form that produces uniform usage is one possible direction to take, but to do so may well be to replicate the process of scribal intervention that possibly led to the presence of the form in the manuscript witness in the first place. Although they ultimately back the presence of dialectal variance, Gow and Page do so with very little conviction that said variance brings the reader any closer to the original dialectal color of an epigram.

A little more than twenty years after the edition of Gow and Page, Palumbo Stracca revisited the issue of the reach of editorial intervention into the dialect of Hellenistic book epigrams.\textsuperscript{51} She framed her discussion in light of the inscribed epigrammatic tradition, which displays a marked dialectal variance across time and space. On this model, Palumbo Stracca argued that if one can locate an inscriptional parallel for a particular example of dialect mixture in a book epigram, then regularization through emendation is not advisable. Although Palumbo Stracca’s focus on inscriptional antecedents as the litmus test for authentic types of dialect mixture in Hellenistic book epigram does not allow much room for other, literary factors, her contribution is an important one in that it reinforces the need to consider seriously mixture as a purposeful aspect of a poet’s presentation of his text.

Given the demonstrable practice of individual Hellenistic poet’s presenting a wide range of dialectal forms in their works, is there anything that can be done to refine the approach of

\textsuperscript{51} Palumbo Stracca 1987.
Gow and Page and with it clarify our understanding of dialect transmission in the manuscripts? Although absolute certainty on the originality of any particular dialect form is impossible, faithfully printing the paradosis is one means of ensuring the presentation and preservation of dialectal mixture against a tendency (both ancient and modern) to create uniform usage.

Ultimately, however, this approach is too conservative. Some of the variance is still certain to be a product of textual corruption or scribal intervention, and in the case of epigrams preserved in more than one manuscript there is the additional complication of choosing between variants, many of which are equally appropriate on metrical or other grounds. A refined understanding of an epigrammatist’s stylistic preferences may allow one to discern certain patterns of usage, but of course these patterns of usage are intrinsically affected by the manuscript tradition. A better way forward is to marry those types of stylistic studies with textual-critical knowledge. By seeking out patterns in the transmission of certain common dialect forms across the various manuscript witnesses, we can combine this information with our understanding of the language and poetics of Hellenistic book epigram in order to produce a more informed and judicious assessment of the paradosis. Here and throughout the dissertation I have had the opportunity to check all dialect variants reported in the editions of Stadtmüller, Waltz, Beckby, and Gow and Page, through use of Preisendanz’s facsimile of the Palatine Anthology and high-resolution photos of the Planudean Anthology.

The Doric phonemic interchange of \( \alpha \) for Ionic \( \eta \) from original *a* is one of the most common dialect markers in Hellenistic book epigram; it is also one of the most susceptible to change back to \( \eta \), since (among several reasons) the Ionic form will always be a metrical equivalent. It has been observed, for example, that P is the generally more reliable manuscript when it comes to the transmission of Doric \( \alpha \) whereas Pl presents a clear pattern of regularization
of Doric forms to their Ionic equivalent.\textsuperscript{52} Two representative examples of epigrams with a demonstrable Doric color make the disparity clear:

a) \textit{A.P.} 5.180=Meleager G-P 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.180.3</td>
<td>μάτηρ</td>
<td>μήτηρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.4</td>
<td>Ἀφαίστου</td>
<td>Ἦφαστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.4</td>
<td>κοινά</td>
<td>κοινή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.5</td>
<td>ματρός</td>
<td>μητρός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.5</td>
<td>μάτηρ</td>
<td>μήτηρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.6</td>
<td>τραχύ</td>
<td>τρηχύ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.7</td>
<td>ὁργάν</td>
<td>ὁργήν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.8</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ἵσην</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) \textit{A.P.} 6.125=Mnasalces G-P 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.125.4</td>
<td>δεξαµένη\textsuperscript{53}</td>
<td>δεξαµένα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.125.5</td>
<td>πάχυν (circumscript add. C)</td>
<td>πάχυν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.125.6</td>
<td>φαµί</td>
<td>φηµί</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My survey of this vocal interchange supports this general observation (Appendix I Table A). Of the 97 recorded instances of variance between \(\alpha/\eta\) in \(P\) and \(Pl\), \(P\) transmits the Doric form in 74 (76\% of the time). While the Doric forms in \(P\) are not assumed to be “correct”—in terms of original to the epigram—they nevertheless demonstrate the consistency in transmission of Doric in \(P\) observed by previous scholars. To generally assume that a Doric form in \(P\), appearing in a predominant Doric context, is more likely than the Attic-Ionic form in \(Pl\) is to fall victim to this same reasoning that I have criticized above; however the same pattern warrants considering seriously the presence of Doric vocalisms in \(P\) (where \(Pl\) transmits Attic-Ionic) in contexts where the predominant dialect color is not Doric. In such instances the Doric form(s) in \(P\) could

\textsuperscript{52} cf. Waltz 1929, 1.li and Gow and Page 1968, 1.xxxvi-xxxvii (this observation is interestingly absent from the discussion of dialect transmission in Gow and Page 1965, 1.xlv-xlvi).

\textsuperscript{53} The correct order of words is also reversed in \(P\): κάµακας δεξαµένη; this error is noted, whether by \(A\) or \(C\) is unclear, with a beta written superscript above κάµακας and an alpha similarly above δεξαµένη.
represent an original mixture of dialects or, in certain instances, suggest that the entirety of the
epigram was originally Doric. Collectively, then, these findings justify that future research into
the dialect use of Hellenistic book epigrams give some weight to the originality of a Doric form
in a mixed context if the form is transmitted in P and, conversely, continue to approach the
regularization of Doricisms in Pl in a more skeptical manner.

In the dialectally ambiguous context of the reflex of *ā following an ε, ι, or ρ, where
Doric and Attic have an α and Ionic an η, there is a similar variation in patterns of transmission
between P and Pl. Out of the twenty-four instances in my survey, fifteen of the variances are
from Doric/Attic in P to the Ionic equivalent in Pl, while nine cases are of the opposite type with
the Ionic form in P transmitted as a Doric/Attic form in Pl (Appendix I Table B). The rate of
variance here, then, is in line (within a 10% range of deviance) to the Doric/Attic-Ionic α/η
interchange (63% Doric/Attic to Ionic variance between P and Pl). Consequently, one could
interpret this pattern of variance as further evidence for understanding P as the more reliable
source for dialect usage, but we must be especially cautious in drawing any conclusions since the
α vocalisms in P can also be interpreted as Atticisms and thus equally a marker of possible later
scribal intervention.

The α/η interchange is by a great margin the most common example of dialectal variance
between P and Pl. I have found a comparatively small number of other types of dialectal
variances between the two manuscripts (Appendix I Table C). While these examples are not of
any statistical significance, P quite possibly transmits the original dialect form to Pl’s ionicized
form in several epigrams. In each of these instances the form is Doric in P and Attic-Ionic in Pl
and the epigram displays a predominant Doric color and/or has subject matter that would explain
the use of Doric. They are: A.P. 6.118.6=Antipater of Sidon G-P 49.6 (πρῶτα P [πρῶτα C]:
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πρότα Pl) a dedication of hunting items to Apollo in Doric; A.P. 7.413.7=Antipater of Sidon G-P 67.7 (κάρρων P: κρέσσων Pl) on Hipparchia the Thracian wife of the Cynic Diogenes in Doric; 54 and A.P. 7.431.3=Simonides G-P 5.3 (πρῶτον P: πρότων Pl) on the Spartan dead at Thyrea.

While it is clear that P is the more reliable source of certain common dialect usages, Pl is not to be completely disregarded as a witness for the authorial origin of dialect forms. 55 I will examine one particular instance where Pl supersedes the readings of P in relation to dialect in the following section, but first I will discuss a more wide-scale pattern of dialect transmission in Pl that has a bearing on our understanding of the manuscript’s reliability. An unavoidable product of anthologization from a number of sources is the creation of duplicates. In Pl, Planudes’ decision to include more epigrams in the form of an addendum (Plb) led to the unintended duplication of epigrams already present in his main anthology (Pla). 56 In his very selective study of epigrams transmitted in P and duplicated in Pla and Plb, Alan Cameron observed that Pla “reveals a clear tendency to normalize, while Plb retains Doricisms almost as consistently as AP

54 It should be noted that this epigram has an especially complex dialect transmission: At line two the ἐλόμην of PPl is corrected by C to its Attic-Ionic ἐλόμην and at line 8 P and Pl disagree on the dialect color of σοφίη (P: ἰα Pl) and ὀρειάρης (P: ἰας Pl) where P consistently transmits the Ionic to the Doric/Attic in Pl. Given the dialect variance throughout the epigrams, it is difficult to evaluate the likely authenticity of P over Pl in this context, especially since the readings of Pl could be interpreted as Doric as well as attiticization. Line seven in which the dialect variance cited above appears has its own issues: Korsch offered φαὶ δὲ Μανιλάς κάρρων ἐμεὶν Ἀταλάντας (which Page adopted in his OCT), while P has ὁμὶ δὲ Μανιλάς κάρρων ἰμὲν Ἀταλάντας and Pl has ἰμὶ δὲ Μανιλάς κρέσσως ἰμὲν Ἀταλάντας. Gow and Page print the reading of Pl, except the incorporate the Doric κάρρων from P in place of Pl’s likely regularization to the Attic-Ionic κρέσσων (perhaps also influenced by the κρέσσον in the following line). Korsch’s Doric infinitive ἐμεὶν for the very likely corrupt ἰμὲν is a bold conjecture, since it is very rare in literary Doric.
55 Seelbach 1964, however, did just that in his editions of Mnasalces and Theodoridas, where he privileged the readings of P to the complete exclusions of any variants in Pl.
56 P also contains duplicate copies of epigrams, some of which contain variant dialect readings, most notably A.P. 7.170=A.P. 7.481 (Posidippus G-P 21). The process of duplication is often likely a result of Cephalas’ editorial practice. In the creation of thematically arranged books, Cephalas often had to move an epigram from the context in which he found the text. After moving the epigram, Cephalas later failed to excise the poem when he copied the sequence from which the epigram originally was taken in full. In this case, the dialect variances entered into one of the duplicates either during Cephalas’ process of copying the epigram or later during the copying of P. Since our understanding of dialect variants in duplicates of P likely will likely have an impact on how we understand the internal workings of P rather than its relatively reliability to Pl and other manuscript witnesses, I intend to collect and analyze the dialect variants in a later study.
To Cameron’s select examples I add a full accounting of all α/η interchange variants cross-checked with Lenzinger’s collation of P against all epigrams transmitted in both Pl⁰ and Plᵇ.⁵⁸

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl⁰</th>
<th>Plᵇ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.256.6</td>
<td>πυγμάν</td>
<td>πυγμάν</td>
<td>πυγμήν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.2</td>
<td>θηλειάν</td>
<td>θηλειάν</td>
<td>θηλειών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15.2</td>
<td>Μαιονίδας</td>
<td>Μαιονίδας</td>
<td>Μαιονίδης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.76.4</td>
<td>ὀλίγην</td>
<td>ὀλίγην</td>
<td>ὀλίγαν (ὀλίγην Pl⁰)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.388.3</td>
<td>Δίκα</td>
<td>Δίκη</td>
<td>Δίκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.388.5</td>
<td>αἰδομένα</td>
<td>αἰδομένη</td>
<td>αἰδομένα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.388.6</td>
<td>γά</td>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>γά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.388.6</td>
<td>ἕας (as. corr. C)</td>
<td>ἐής</td>
<td>ἕας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.154.2</td>
<td>ἄ τλάμον</td>
<td>ἦ τλήμον</td>
<td>ἄ τλάμον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.154.6</td>
<td>τάς πατράς</td>
<td>τής πατρῆς</td>
<td>τάς πατράς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.333.3</td>
<td>ἦς</td>
<td>ἦς</td>
<td>ἦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.375.6</td>
<td>αὔξαμέναν</td>
<td>αὔξαμένην</td>
<td>αὔξαμέναν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.375.6</td>
<td>εὐφροσύναν</td>
<td>εὐφροσύνην</td>
<td>εὐφροσύναν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.549.2</td>
<td>ἡελίου</td>
<td>ἡέλιου</td>
<td>ἡελίου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed, Plᵇ appears to transmit Doricisms in more instances than P, as evidenced by A.P. 9.333.3 (ὦς P: ἄς Plᵇ) and A.P. 9.549.2 (ἡελίου P: ἡελίου Plᵇ). In these limited cases Plᵇ presents itself as a valuable source for dialect usage since it reinforces the general reliability of P. Definitive conclusions for the increased preservation of Doric in Plᵇ in comparison to Pl⁰ are not forthcoming, but it likely derives from a combination of the differences between the two exemplars and Planudes’ diminished intervention into the text. Indeed, this possibly explains why Planudes never agrees with himself but always agrees with P in one of the two instances.

Since Cameron’s findings were based on limited evidence, I have investigated whether this pattern of dialect usage extends to all the epigrams in Pl⁰ and Plᵇ. In other words, do the

---

⁵⁷ Cameron 1993, 364.
⁵⁸ Lenzinger 1964, 32-34. Lenzinger overlooked A.P. 6.256.6. Additional epigrams are transmitted in twice in Pl, but are absent from P, including (with any dialect variants in parentheses): API 12.1 (ἐγρήγορο P⁰; ἐγρήγορο Pᵇ); API 12.1 (ἄ P⁰: ἄ Pᵇ); and API 12.2 (κεκλιμένα P⁰: κεκλιμένη Pᵇ).
epigrams transmitted in \( \text{Pl}^b \) transmit Doric vocalism at a higher rate than those transmitted in \( \text{Pl}^a \)? In the comparison of \( P \) and \( \text{Pl}^a \) (data drawn from Appendix Table A), \( \text{Pl}^a \) transmits the Attic-Ionic form to the Doric of \( P \) in 51 out of a total of 67 instances (76%). In the comparison of \( P \) and \( \text{Pl}^b \) (data drawn from Appendix Table A), \( \text{Pl}^b \) transmits the Attic-Ionic to the Doric of \( P \) at a slightly higher rate on a smaller number of examples, 24 times out of a total of 30 instances (80%). Our sample suggests that there is no marked difference between \( \text{Pl}^a \) and \( \text{Pl}^b \) in the transmission rate of Doric or Attic-Ionic vocalisms.

As briefly mentioned above, the Corrector examined the portion of \( P \) up to \( A.P. \, 9.563 \) (copied by A) and made numerous corrections to the text, wrote variant readings in the margins, and supplemented lacunae. This range of editorial activity suggests, as has been long recognized, that C had at his disposal another exemplar of Cephalas. C’s most common correction of dialect forms is the Doric/Attic-Ionic \( \alpha/\eta \) interchange. C had at least two possible sources for his correction: first the exemplar of Michael Chartophylax which he was collating against \( P \); and second his own conjectures.

The consonance between C’s corrections and the text of a given line in \( \text{Pl} \) suggests that the source of these corrections has a relatively close relationship to one of the two manuscripts of Cephalas from which Planudes created his anthology. In my survey of \( \alpha/\eta \) interchanges C agrees with \( \text{Pl} \) in roughly half of the instances (15 out of 34 total examples), a rate that confirms the

---

59 It should be noted that a single example of a Doric/Attic-Ionic variance between \( P \) and \( \text{Pl}^a \) is the result of correction in \( \text{Pl} \): \( A.P. \, 7.182.3 \) (\( \acute{\alpha} \chi 

50 \) P: \( \acute{\alpha} \chi \), \( \eta \chi \) P\( \text{PL}^c \)). Exclusion of the example has a negligible effect on the rate of transmission.

60 This number includes two instances in which the Doric form in \( \text{Pl}^b \) was consequently changed to its Attic-Ionic equivalent; both appear at \( A.P. \, 6.134.1 \): \( \acute{\eta} \) επι: \( \acute{\eta} \) δε \( \text{Pl}^c \), \( \eta \chi \) \( \text{Pl}^c \) and \( \alpha \theta \gamma \) \( \text{P} \): \( \alpha \theta \gamma \) \( \text{Pl}^c \), \( \alpha \theta \gamma \) \( \text{Pl}^c \).

61 The corrections take the form of writing the substituted vowel superscript or in the erasure of the original form written by A. As regards the latter, it is especially difficult to see what letter was present under the erasure from Preisedanz’s facsimile (1911). It is also very difficult to differentiate in some instances between what is a correction by the scribe himself and a correction by C, since the distinguishing factor is often a matter of differences in the ink that are almost impossible to perceive in the facsimile. In these cases I must rely on the report of Stadtmüller in his Teubner edition of the Greek Anthology, but I remain ever mindful that Stadtmüller may have imagined himself to be able to see more than was actually present.

62 Of course we cannot rule out other copies of Cephalas unknown to us.
observations of previous scholars that C and Pl shared similar manuscript witnesses (Appendix I Table D). Of these fifteen examples, C corrects to a Doric form in nine and to Attic-Ionic in six. The corrections of C are also variably consonant and divergent from the predominant dialect of the epigrams in which they appear. The corrections of C that agree with Pl are not predominantly regularizations to Attic-Ionic, and warrant a cautious recognition that the dialect readings of Pl are not irretrievably compromised by Planudes’ editorial interventionism.

My survey also includes nineteen instances where C corrects a dialect reading in P that is shared with Pl (Appendix I Table E). In twelve of those instances, C replaces the Attic-Ionic in P and Pl with Doric, while in five of those instances C replaces Doric in P and Pl with Attic-Ionic. A further two instances preserve the correction from and to an ambiguous Doric/Attic form. Overall it is impossible to tell if C’s corrections derive from an exemplar that diverges with the one he shared with Pl or are the product of his own judgment. In at least seven instances where the dialect of the epigram can be considered to be predominantly Doric, C’s correction matches the dialect color of the whole epigram. This pattern plausibly suggests that C, who we have seen had knowledge of and an academic interest in dialects, is independently correcting the admixture of Attic-Ionic forms to a uniform usage. That said, other explanations, such as C’s exemplar being an even more reliable witness to dialect usage as is perhaps also suggested by the number of Doric corrections shared with Pl, are equally possible.63

In the thirty-eight total instances in the surveyed material where C corrected the α/η vocalism of a word in P (including those epigrams transmitted in Pl as well), in 60% (23/38) of

---

63 In my survey I noted eight instances where C intervenes in the text of P when it is the only witness to the epigram. The corrections are evenly divided between Doric to Attic-Ionic and Attic-Ionic to Doric and included variable dialect corrections within a single line of a single poem (A.P. 5.195.3: ἄ μὲν P: ή μὲν C; 5.195.3: μορφῆς P: μορφᾶς C). Although this is likely a product of the small sample size, seven of the eight epigrams are composed in a predominantly Doric color. If this pattern turns out to be replicable on a larger scale in P, it may possibly speak to an increasing unfamiliarity with Doric among Byzantine scribes and editors.
the corrections C changed an Attic-Ionic form to its Doric equivalent. Among this set of corrections, seventeen (74%) appeared in epigrams that were either predominantly Doric or featured some degree of Doric admixture agreed upon by a second witness such as Pl. This pattern could support the above articulated proposition that C was more observant of Doric in his exemplar or was actively inserting Doric conjectures to make the dialect usage more uniform. Conversely, however, in those examples where C corrected a Doric form to its Attic-Ionic equivalent (15), the overwhelming number of those corrections occurred within predominantly Doric environments (12). C similarly regularizes other dialect forms which were likely original to the epigrams, notably the Ionic contraction of \( \varepsilon + \omicron \) to \( \varepsilon \upsilon \) in the present feminine participle \( \varepsilon \upsilon \sigma \alpha \) at 7.163.1 (\( \varepsilon \upsilon \sigma \alpha \) P: \( \omicron \sigma \alpha \) C)\(^{65}\) or the Doric genitive in the name of a certain deceased Cretan Echemmas (\( \text{Ἐχέμμας} \) P: \( \text{Ἐχέμμου} \) C) at A.P. 6.121.1=Callimachus G-P 61.1. From my survey of the evidence, then, no one clear or single pattern of dialect emendation arises for C. The most that we can say with certainty is that as a scholar as well as scribe C took some interest in the dialectal color of the epigrams he collated against his own exemplar, although his knowledge of Doric, it appears from the evidence, might have been very limited, perhaps just to the \( \alpha/\eta \) interchange.

Regarding the dialect transmission in those sylloges that derive from redactions or copies of Cephalas and are independent of P and Pl, I can only offer a circumscribed discussion, since most of these sylloges do not have modern editions, which can make it difficult to collect dialectal variants in a reliable manner. I limit my discussion here to the Appendix Barberino-Vaticana, a collection of fifty-four erotic epigrams quite likely compiled as a supplement to Pl, that contains several Hellenistic book epigrams by Asclepiades, Posidippus, and Meleager and

\(^{64}\) I include in this number 7.491.2 (\( \text{ἄλκιάν} \) P: \( \text{ἡλικίαν} \) C), where C’s correction produced either an erroneous hybrid form or the Attic form depending on one’s interpretation.

\(^{65}\) On the manuscripts readings of this dialect form, see my discussion at n. 459.
for which we do have a modern edition (Sternbach’s 1896 edition, which admittedly has its own flaws including not reporting the third witness to the sylloge [Par. suppl. gr. 1199]). In a number of instances where the manuscripts to ABV depart from the text of P (only seven of the fifty-four epigrams are also found in Pl, an argument for the collection’s design as a supplement or appendix to the erotic epigrams in Planudes, and of these seven only one in Pl contains a dialect variant from the text in ABV), the dialect form found in ABV is most likely a regularization (Appendix Table F). In A.P. 12.86.2=Meleager G-P 18.2, for example, the manuscripts of the ABV\textsuperscript{MVP} transmit ἠνιοχεῖ for the Doric ἄνιοχεῖ in P at line two, and similarly diverge at line three over Doric καῦταν (P), with two of the manuscripts reporting Attic-Ionic καυτήν (ABV\textsuperscript{VP}: κα♀άτον ABV\textsuperscript{M}), and ματέρα (P: μητέρα ABV\textsuperscript{MVP}). As transmitted in P, Meleager’s poem is predominately Doric, and elsewhere ABV mirrors the Doric color (cf. l.1: ἀ Κύρις; l.3: ποτὶ and φαµὶ; l.4: νικᾶ). So while we cannot discount the possibility that the Attic-Ionic forms capture a purposeful program of dialect admixture, it is more likely that a somewhat haphazard process of regularization has taken place at some point in the transmission of the epigram.

At the same time, ABV transmits in a smaller number of instances dialectal forms that could be interpreted as either \textit{lectiones difficiliores} or as possibly pointing to the loss of dialect admixture in P. Notable on this account is A.P. 5.285=ABV 26 (Agathias), where at line six ABV\textsuperscript{MV} transmits Doric ποππίσδων (an ioticized version of ποππύσδων) for P’s ποππύζων. This

---

\textsuperscript{66} The ABV as an appendix to Pl, formulated primarily on the recognition that forty-six of the epigram are absent from the sanitized erotic epigrams collected by Planudes, is the scholarly \textit{communis opinio}, recently confirmed by Maltomini 2008, 123-32. For a dissenting, but ultimately unconvincing view, based on the argument that the ABV was an independently produced collection of erotic epigrams, see Gallavotti 1983.

\textsuperscript{67} Here and in Table F of the Appendix I report the readings in the three manuscript witnesses to ABV. Recently, Maltomini 122-23 has argued that ABV\textsuperscript{M} (=Vat. Barb. gr. 123), which was sloppily copied and contains numerous inaccuracies (see Meschini 1975), is dependent on ABV\textsuperscript{P} (=Par. suppl. gr. 1199), and thus should not be considered, \textit{pace} Cameron 1993, 165-67, an independent witness. Maltomini’s evidence, based on a reexamination of the manuscripts, is sound and I agree with her reconstruction of the stemma to ABV; however for the sake of fullness I have chosen still to print the readings of ABV\textsuperscript{M} in my dialect apparatus criticus and Appendix.
form is rare, attested elsewhere only once at Theocritus *Id.* 5.7, where the goatherd Comatas uses the verb to describe the playing of a rustic pipe. In Agathias’ epigram the speaker, lamenting his inability to kiss his beloved Rhodanthe, likens himself to an ὀχετηγός (P; note another possible Doricism; ὀχεταγός ABV\(^V\), ὀχετασγός ABV\(^M\)), a Homeric *unicum* used to describe a farmer versed in irrigation techniques, who can drag the kiss planted by Rhodanthe on her girdle across the fabric to his own lips (ll.5-6: περὶ ζωστῆρα δὲ κούρης | μάστακι ποπψόδων, τηλόθεν ἀντεφίλουν). In addition to its agricultural usage, which might accord well with a Theocritean reminiscence, an anonymous epigrammatist uses the term metaphorically for a flute (A.P. 9.505.6: Ἑυτέρπη δονάκεσσι πολυτρήτοισι λιγάινει | πνεῦμα σοφῆς ὀχετηγὸν ἐπισπείρουσα μελέσσης). If the late-antique Agathias had knowledge of this epigram in particular, or the association between ὀγετηγός and piping in general, it might even better explain his possible borrowing of a rare Doric verbal form from a context also related to the playing of a wind instrument. The evidence provided by ABV suggests that some of the sylloges are likely a further source for information on the dialect transmission in the *Greek Anthology*, which only makes the need for editions all the more urgent.

Patterns of dialect transmission in different manuscripts can helpfully guide editors and scholars in deciding between dialect variants (and I will return to my own findings throughout the study to justify reading one variant over another), and a more detailed and critical examination of the manuscripts, which falls beyond the scope of this study, is an important and badly needed step towards gaining a more secure understanding of dialect in the *Greek Anthology*. Still, scholars must consider these patterns of transmission in tandem with an epigram’s particular textual and literary contexts. It is a foundational aim of this dissertation to subject the language of Hellenistic book epigram to a more transparent textual-critical
accounting and fuller literary treatment; to demonstrate, in other words, that dialect is less an “insoluble problem” for readers to begrudgingly accept than a key to unlocking poetic meaning. Firstly, this means stripping away any modern editorial interventions and engaging directly and critically with the paradosis. This means admitting dialectal variance, while also accepting that it might not be in any one instance more authoritative than modern attempts to impose uniform usage. Secondly, this means that where there is a plausible literary explanation for the presence of dialect mixture, the possibility of editorial intervention or scribal error should not automatically preclude a substantive discussion of the feature. Not all readings may be similarly convincing, but by collecting and explicating a range of possible literary affects for dialect in Hellenistic book epigram, I venture to advance the scholarly conversation surrounding dialect as a literary device in Hellenistic poetry and Greek literature more broadly.

**A.P. 7.440=Leonidas G-P 11: A Case-Study in Dialect and Meaning**

Before concluding my discussion of the manuscripts, I first want to provide a case-study that crystalizes my approach to the transmission of dialect. To reiterate, our best chance at assessing the purpose of dialect choice in Hellenistic book epigrams is to read the paradosis critically (each time) in consultation with patterns of transmission and to attend to the expressive qualities of dialect. In other words, one must find a natural balance between textual critical conservatism and an openness to the literary potentiality of dialect use.

The text of Leonidas G-P 11=A.P. 7.440, an epitaph for a certain Aristocrates, exemplifies my methodology.

‘Ἡρίον, οἶνον νυκτὶ καταφθιμένοι καλύπτεις
Tomb, what bones of a dead man do you hide in the night,
what head, earth, have you gapingly engulfed,
that of Aristocrates very much pleasing to the yellow-haired Graces,
and very much pleasing to all through memory (of him).
Aristocrates knew how to speak splendidly in public,
an aristocrat never breaking out into a tortured grimace.
He also knew how among Bacchic craters
to calmly lead common table-talk.
He knew how to offer kindnesses to both strangers and citizens,
such a deceased, beloved earth, do you hold.

In line two Pl transmits the Doric vocative γά. P appears to have originally written γὰρ,
completely unwelcome in the context, which C remedied by correcting to the general poeticism
γαί. P’s reading should be recognized as a rather crude attempt to remedy hiatus by adding a
rho to γὰ that was likely in the scribes’ exemplar as it was in the exemplar for Pl. In line 10 Pl
transmits the Doric vocative γά this time paired with the Doric vocative adjective ἐρατά. P
transmits γαί ἐρατῆ, a syntactically inappropriate dative phrase, which P has perhaps once more

68 Gow and Page print γαῖ following C.
69 I print the reading in P and Pl (C: πολλών) that Scaliger corrected to πολλοῦ, requiring the mental addition of ὄντος, which the majority of editors have accepted. I agree with Gow and Page 1965, 2.321-22 that there is no grammatical reason for precluding πολλοῦ since one can easily reapply ἀριστοκράτευς from the preceding line.
70 The reading of Planudes and adopted by Waltz and Gow-Page; Jacobs, followed by Meineke, Dübner, Paton, and Beckby, print κείνην.
71 Gow and Page print γαῖ ἐρατῆ following C.
72 Stadtmüller reports the original reading of γὰρ in P. Autoscopy of Preisendanz’s facsimile supports the probability of the reading. Although no erasure is visible, the ascender of the τ in γαῖ has a similar form to the ρ in ἡρίον in the preceding line. In addition, the circumflex differs from the usual form of the accent in the hand of A and appears to be constructed out of the grave that would have been present with γὰρ.
devised to avoid hiatus through the simple addition of iotas (and then the likely regularization of a final alpha in ἐρατῆ). Again C remedies the erroneous intervention of P by adding an apostrophe, thus turning the dative γαῖ into an elided vocative γα᾽, and erasing the iota and circumflex in ἐρατῆ to create ἐρατή. 73

In line two, it is unlikely P confused an iota with a rho. This means that the correction of C was not based on a comparison with the scribe’s exemplar. The correction to P in line ten should be considered from a similar perspective. It requires minimal intervention in the text of P and so could represent a quick fix. So while it is possible that C obtained γαῖ (in lines 2 and 10 and ἐρατή in line 10) from Michael Chartophylax’s exemplar of Cephalas’ autograph, I think it is rather more probable that his reading is an example of his own textual intervention. If C did know of the readings transmitted in Pl from one of his sources, he chose to regularize them and so we end up with the same situation. While rhythmically harsh due to hiatus, we have every reason, then, to consider Planudes’ Doric γᾶ in line two and γᾶ ἐρατά in line ten as the original readings in Leonidas and the exemplars to P and Pl. 74 No other solution can account for the consistent doricization we find in Pl. 75

73 The apostrophe in γαῖ is almost certainly in the hand of C and the erasure of the ι from ἐρατῆ is visible in the facsimile.

74 This epigram appears in a long Meleagrean sequence and it is at least worth noting that the following epigram, A.P. 7.441=Archilochus FGE 3, an epitaph for Megatimos and Aristophon, likewise has an address to earth (ὦ µεγάλη γᾶ) preserved with partial Doric color in P (caret Pl), but emended in modern editions, following Jacobs, to γαῖ, as was the same case with C in A.P. 7.440. Given the organizational proximity of the two epigrams, it is possible that Meleager paired verses in part on their evocation of earth in Doric. If this is the case, Meleager’s editorial technique may be added evidence for the originality of the Doric readings of Pl in A.P. 7.440.

75 Pl transmits one other form that could be diagnostically evaluated as Doric, the adjective οἵαν in line two (P: οἴη). The form can equally be interpreted as Attic. Given the dialect context of the epigram and the tendency of regularization to result in Attic-Ionic and not strictly Attic forms, it is unlikely the form was originally designed to be interpreted as Attic or regularized through scribal intervention to an Attic form. In this context we need to decide if οἵαν is a Doricism original to the text, perhaps pointing to further lost Doric coloring, or an intervention on the part of Planudes under the influence of the immediately following Doric γᾶ. I tentatively endorse the latter. The Attic-Ionic color of κεφαλῆν, where we might expect a matching Doric form, bolsters this interpretation. I know of no example in the surviving corpus of Leonidas where the poet does not match the Doric color of adjective and noun (or article and noun) when the possibility presents itself. Of course, κεφαλῆν may be a regularization, but we have no textual evidence on which to base such speculation.
to dialect, reinforcing the need to balance observed patterns of dialect transmission with a thoughtful engagement with the paradosis. Most significantly, however, this renewed look at the text of Leonidas G-P 11=A.P. 7.440 underscores the stultifying effects that the guiding editorial presumption that dialect mixture is invariably the product of scribal error—we would rather privilege regularizing corrections of C over the consistent dialect variance of Pl—has had on our appreciation of the linguistic composition of Hellenistic book epigram.

The pattern of Doric usage, limited to bookend vocative addresses to the earth, naturally invites us to investigate the dialect mixture for possible literary effects. Firstly, Doric exhortations of earth are most commonly attested in choral passages from Attic tragedy, and it possible that the use here is meant to establish a literary affiliation with tragedy, fashioning the loosely conceived epitaph into a miniature tragic lament for our sociable Aristocrates.76 While a tragic reading of the dialect admixture is a strong possibility, there is another layer of poetic meaning that the admixture of Doric forms associated with the image of earth may generate. As has been previously noted, dialect is commonly associated with place and identity in Greek literature and epigram (both inscribed and literary) in particular. In a pair of epitaphs for a certain Cretan Pratalidas, which were certainly designed to be read in tandem within an epigram collection,77 Leonidas evokes the deceased’s native language through the incorporation of Doric features:

Πραταλίδα τὸ μνῆμα Λυκαστίω, ἄκρον ἑρώτων εἰδότος, ἄκρα μάχας, ἄκρα λυνστασίς, ἄκρα χόροιτπτῆς, χθόνιοι < >78 τούτον Κρηταίες 79 Κρήτα παροκίσατε. (Leonidas G-P 12=A.P. 7.448)

76 Doric addresses to earth in tragedy are manifold, see e.g., Aeschylus Suppl. 890 and Choe. 399; Euripides Medea 148 and Phoe. 686.
77 On these so-called “companion pieces” in epigram, see Kirstein 2002, 113-35.
78 P left the remainder of the line blank. For discussion, see Gow and Page 1965, 1.323 and the supplements collected by Stadtmüller in the apparatus criticus to his edition of The Greek Anthology.
This is the tombs of Pratalidas from Lykastios, known for his consummate skill in love, battle, net-hunting, and choral dancing. Cretans from the earth below.... settle this Cretan among yourselves.

Πραταλίδα παιδίον Ἐρως πόθον, Ἀρτέμις ἁγραν, Μοῦσα χοροῦ, Ἀρης ἐγγυάλεξε μάχαν.
πῶς οὐκ εὐαίων ὁ Λυκάστιος, δός καὶ έρωτι ἄρχε καὶ ἐν μολπᾶ καὶ δορί καὶ στάλικι; (Leonidas G-P 13=A.P. 7.449)

To Pratalidas Eros granted love for boys, Artemis the chase, the Muse dances, and Ares war. How is the Lykastian not fortunate, who found success in love, dance, the spear, and the net?

We should read, I believe, the use of Doric in the epitaph for Aristocrates in a similar context. Under the influence of epigraphic conventions, the Doric apostrophes to earth may well suggest some type of contrast between the ethnic identity of the deceased, which is commemorated in a general Ionic patina, and his place of burial. Leonidas does not, however, supply an ethnic for Aristocrates, and nothing internal to the epigram suggests that the deceased perished abroad. That said, the striking Doric address to the earth may have been enough to suggest a disjunction between the identity of Aristocrates and his place of burial.

The contrast between the Ionic of the rest of the epigram and the Doric address to the burial ground could also possibly point to a different sort of division of identity than that between regional origins and place of interment. The same Aristocrates appears in another of

\[ P \]

\[ \text{1 Λυκαστίω Salmius: Λυκαστω, Λυκαστωι C} \]

79 P wrote κρήτην εἰς, which C corrected to Κρήτας.
Leonidas’ surviving epigrams, which here provides a report of his wordly envoi (G-P 10 = A.P. 7.648).  

\[ \text{Ἐσθλὸς Ἀριστοκράτης, ὅτε ἀπέπλεεν εἰς Ἀχέροντα,} \\
\text{ἐπὶ ὀλυνοχρόνης ἀψάμενος κεφαλῆς;} \\
\text{„Παιδὸν τις μνήσατο καὶ ἐνδόσατο γυναῖκα,} \\
\text{εἰ καὶ μὴν δάκνοι δυσβίτος πενίης;} \\
\text{ζωὴν στροφώσατο· κακὸς δὲ ᾠστολος ἑδέσθαι} \\
\text{οἶκος. δὲ αὐ τῇ ὁμήρῳ ἕνεκορ𝜌 ἐσχαρεῖν} \\
\text{εὐκίον φαύνοιτο καὶ ἐν πολυκαῖο ὑκῳ} \\
\text{全资子 ἀγάζων ἄλλα γυναικῶν,} \\
\text{ἄνθρωπον, ἥχθαιρεν τὴν ἀλιτοφροσύνην.} \]

Noble Aristocrates, when he sailed to Acheron,  

let every man be mindful of children and marry a woman,  
even if life-destroying poverty should bite him.  
Give one’s life pillars of support; a pillarless house  
is an evil thing to see. Moreover, what is best (?)...of the hearth  
may appear beautifully pillared and in much burning dignity  
….the firebrand on the hearth.”  
Aristocrates knew the good; but the wicked mind  
of women, o man, he hated.

In a base Ionic color (underlined forms) similar to A.P. 7.440), we learn that Aristocrates, due to misogynistic leanings, had no wife or family, a situation that he counsels even the poorest men to avoid. Those anonymous speakers in our poem, who are imagined to have commissioned the epitaph, cannot be identified with any family. Whatever the exact identity of the speakers,  
Aristocrates is presented as a man apart. A rich man, as his name suggests, he rejects the normal socio-cultural values of his class for an ascetic and independent lifestyle that might take

80 See Gow and Page 1965, 1.321 and Gutzwiller 1998, 98 pace the claim of Geffcken 1896, 79 that we are dealing with two different men who happened to share the same name. There is no evidence that the two epigrams stood together in Leonidas’ collection, but the inscriptional tradition of pairing epitaphs, Gutzwiller 1998, 98 n.126 recognizes, may have influenced such a grouping.

81 Gow and Page 1965, 2.320: “The sentence has been variously and violently corrected, and it is not plain what meaning ought to be extracted from it.” Since my primary focus is on the dialect of the epigram, rather than the details of phraseology, I have printed text of this sentence as transmitted in the manuscripts.
inspiration from Cynic ethics.\textsuperscript{82} While the primary use of Ionic may suggest to a reader an origin in an Ionic-speaking region, the injection of Doric for the place of burial may, then, hint at a divide in his identity. Just as Leonidas signals his sense of displacement with Ionic, so we may interpret this dialect in a similar fashion here: Aristocrates is a foreigner even in his (Doric-speaking?) homeland.

In either instance, the purpose of this discussion was to outline and demonstrate some of the approaches and methods that I will use throughout the course of this study as I explore the varied and rich aesthetics of dialect choice in Hellenistic book epigram.

\textsuperscript{82} On the Cynic leanings of Aristocrates see Gutzwiller 1998, 98. The influence of Cynic thought on Leonidas was first recognized by Geffcken 1896, 138 and again in Geffcken 1909, 4-18. Gigante 1971, 44-55, who also detected Pythagorean principles, and Gutzwiller 1998, 103-108 are important recent contributions to the question.
Part 1: Contextualization
Chapter 1: Dialect Usage in pre-Hellenistic Greek Poetry

The Problem: Genre-Conditioned Dialect Choice

A traditional assumption that underpins the scholarly history of Greek literary language is that generic considerations were the major influence on dialect choice for authors in the Archaic and Classical periods.\(^{83}\) Since antiquity scholars have observed an association between poetic type and dialect. On this model, choral lyric was composed in Doric; elegiac, iambic, and monodic lyric in Ionic; and tragedy and comedy in Attic. In her recent survey of Greek literary dialects, Olga Tribulato described the practice as “one of the most steadfast rules in the whole of Greek literature.”\(^{84}\) Beginning in the nineteenth century, scholarship on Greek literature sought to historicize the origins of this association between poetic type and dialect through the regional origins of a particular poetic founder. The Doric color of choral lyric, for example, has been associated with a “school” of Peloponnesian poets and citharodists. Xenodamus of Kythira, Sacadas of Argos, and Eumelus of Corinth, whose ethnics are Peloponnesian in origin, are among the possible early influences on the genre (cf. ps. Plut. *De mus.* 1134b.8-9). Today, however, we do not need to seek the origins of a dialect practice in a specific historical founder; instead we recognize that poetic types developed organically over time out of particular regions of the Greek-speaking world. Choral lyric likely originated from various Peloponnesian contexts,

\(^{83}\) A version of this statement is present in a number of the standard treatments of Greek literary language beginning with Meillet 1913 and Schwyzter 1939-71 and continuing into modern handbooks such as Adrados 2005 and Tribulato 2010. Horrocks 1997, 193 provides an elegant summary of this standard view: “Each genre employs a form of language which exhibits certain distinctive ‘markers’ of the dialect group to which the spoken and official varieties of its supposed region of origin belonged, but which conventionally eliminates narrow linguistic parochialism in favor of a more stylised diction…Wherever poetry of a particular kind came to be composed outside of its ‘traditional’ region…the associated ‘literary’ dialect was then routinely adopted as a genre-specific standard by all practitioners, regardless of their native speech.”

\(^{84}\) Tribulato 2010, 389.
just as epic flourished on the Ionian coast of Asia Minor, and tragedy on the stages of Athens. And yet, the language of these various genres was not constrained by their region of origin. While the dialects of the various poetic types belong to the language spoken in their putative place of origin, they are not reproductions of the local linguistic reality. In Archaic and Classical Greek song, then, we do not encounter a mere mimicry of the poet’s local dialect or the dialect of the song’s initial place of performance, but rather literary dialects whose mannered and formalized language excludes linguistic features that have a provincial texture.  

In short, all Greek poetic language is artificial; no author composed verses in a pure version of the literary dialect associated with the genre in which they worked. Archaic and Classical poets are not ventriloquists of the epichoric, oral (and later textual records of) local soundscapes; rather they are wordsmiths at work in the foundry of poetic language. When we speak, then, of the dialect color of Pindar as ‘Doric’ or Tyrtaeus as ‘Ionic’, this type of classification fails to acknowledge properly the dialectal variance that appears in the surviving text of these and other authors. Befitting their artificiality, the poetic languages of Archaic and Classical Greek poetry were quite open in regards to the admittance of non-standard dialect features. The traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic authorized all later poets to use a composite poetic language made up of various dialects. As the first literary dialect, Homeric language comprised of a mixture of Ionic, Aeolic, and archaisms formed through successive phases of (re)performance. The influence of dialect mixture in Homeric poetic language is everywhere in Archaic and Classical poetry. In Sappho, for example, we find the free admixture of epic and Ionic features with the predominate Lesbian color of her lyrics. Similarly non-epic

---

85 Horrocks 1997, 193.  
86 Specialist scholarship on the development of the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic is vast. Horrocks 1997 remains a fundamental introduction to the question.  
87 On the language of Sappho and Alcaeus, see Bowie 1981.
Aeolicisms based on the compensatory lengthening of Vns > Vis, e.g. the sequence of *-onsa > –οισα in the feminine present participle –οισα, *-ansa > –αισα in the feminine aorist participle, *-ans > -ας in accusative plural, and the word Μοίσα, become features of literary Doric beginning from the lyrics of Alcman and continuing with increasing regularity in Pindar; the dialogue and choral section of Attic tragedy show Doric alpha in contexts where inherited *e should produce an eta in Attic.

Even if we expand the traditional model of genre-conditioned dialect usage to include the presence of dialect admixture as long as the predominant dialect remains relatively unchanged, important exceptions remain. Corinna, who, depending on arguments of dating, was either a contemporary or later rival to Pindar, composed lyrics in her native Boeotian. And Erinna, to whom will we return at the end of the chapter, composed an innovative hexametric lament in Doric with the admittance of limited Aeolic features, a mixture which drew the interest of ancient scholars and editors. Consequently, the standardization of dialect usage at the heart of

---

88 Earlier treatments of the reflex of *-onsa in the feminine present participle and Μοίσα, especially their appearance in Alcman, led scholars such as Page (1951a, 134) to argue for their origins in “Old Doric, particularly Old Laconian, dialect.” This cannot be the case since we would expect an outcome of -οισα in a severe Doric dialect like Laconian following second compensatory lengthening after of the loss of ν in –ονσα. That –οισα does appear in the inscriptive language of Cyrene led Risch 1954 to argue that these forms are later editions by Alexandrian editors; arguments against Risch are convincingly mustered in Cassio 1993a (see also Cassio 2007). Aorist accusative participles in –αις are an innovation in the language of Pindar; see Verdier 1972, 65-103. The communis opinio is that these forms are originally East Aeolic, since they are well attested in the Aeolic Lesbian of Alcaeus and Sappho. See Cassio 2004 and Triublato 2008 for a complete discussion of the issue and an updated bibliography. On the origins of these forms in Doric based lyric see the discussion below.

89 Björck 1951 remains the standard treatment of the alpha impurum in Attic tragedy.

90 The dating of Corinna remains an unsettled question. Arguments for an early dating of Corinna to the fifth century BCE are based on ancient testimonia that she competed against and defeated Pindar in musical contest (Pausanias 9.22.3 and Aelian VH 13.25.1-2) and there is also her reproach of another female poet, Myrtis, for imitating Pindar’s style (PMG 664a). The earlier dating of Corinna is endorsed by Bowra 1931; Davison 1968; Gerber 1970; Palumbo Stracca 1993; and Collins 2006. Linguistic evidence is central to the arguments for a late date in the Hellenistic period (end of third century BCE). The Boeotian of the papyrus represents the spelling of what we know of the dialect from that period (ca. 200 BCE), but it is quite possible that the papyrus reflects the respelling from the original text since Boeotian underwent serious orthographic changes between the fifth and fourth centuries BCE (see Page 1953, 75). The late dating of Corinna is endorsed by Page 1953; Guillon 1958; West 1970 and 1990; Clayman 1993; and Berman 2010. Vergados 2012, 112-14 provides a recent and full review of the scholarship on Corinna’s dates.
traditional treatments, both within and across poetic types, is only justifiable on a superficial level.

**Addressing and Interpreting Dialect Mixture**

Scholars have conducted linguistic studies on dialect variance in a number of Archaic and Classical authors, collecting and categorizing the phonological, morphological, and syntactic evidence; however relatively little attention has been paid to its possible literary implications. Uncertainty over the reliability of the manuscript witnesses and the possibility of ancient editorial intervention is a significant factor for this critical silence. What I argued in the introduction, specifically in regard to the dialect transmission of the *Greek Anthology*, is equally applicable to the texts of Archaic and Classical poetry. Invariably damage has been wrought to the language of these poems and we have no definitive way of proving a dialectal oddity is the product of scribal error, but this does not preclude analyzing the transmitted dialectal variance, especially when a plausible literary accounting is available.

Besides complications of textual transmission, the more entrenched resistance to assigning poetic meaning to dialect variance stems from a traditional reconstruction of the creation of Greek poetic language. On this view, the linguistic composition of various poetic types results from an early process of borrowings across genres in the pre-literate period. The artificiality of poetic language, including the admixture of features from other dialects, is then established well before the texts under study were composed. In other words, dialect variance is a linguistic fossil.

From this interpretive position, a range of dialect admixture in the language of Archaic and Classical poetry is unmarked, in the sense used by the Prague school, since it comprises a
part of the basic linguistic environment of the poetic language.\(^{91}\) This is indeed the case for a number of dialect features that appear in linguistic situations where they are technically out of place, but are correctly regarded as general poeticisms, such as the common admixtures of dialect features I described in the previous section. Rather, marked dialect variance requires a degree of aberrance; for a dialect form to be marked it should appear with such a degree of irregularity so that it would not be considered a basic feature of the poem’s linguistic environment. Further criteria that can guide the judgement of the markedness of a dialect form are: a) the form is not a metrical necessity, but rather it is an alternative to an unmarked form, and b) there is a plausible literary explanation for the form. The latter criteria, as we shall see, can outweigh the former in certain cases. Ultimately a designation of aberrance is contextually contingent, a marked dialect form can vary on a case by case basis both within a particular poetic type and the corpus of an individual poet. It is this contingency that has made many scholars reticent to apply poetic meaning to dialect forms that are marked by any other metric. Three examples will elucidate the boundaries of markedness I apply to dialect variance. I first treat the hybrid poetic language of Stesichorus’ *Geryoneis*, then the use of Doric alpha vocalism in select Aristophanic choruses, and finally non-epic Aeolicisms and athematic infinitives in –ναι in Pindar.

The defining distinction between unmarked and marked language is the frequency or ordinariness of the word/form within its linguistic environment. The frequent admixture of Doric alpha vocalism (α for inherited *e*) in Attic tragedy, both within choral passages and the trimeter,

\[^{91}\text{The concept of markedness was originally developed by the linguist Nikolai Trubetzkoy (1931 and 1939) to describe phonological oppositions (e.g. voice} t \text{is marked in comparison to its unvoiced counterpart} d \text{in German) and was later extended by Roman Jakobson (1932 and 1939) to lexical grammatical features. Greenberg 1966 extended markedness even further to encompass the broader level of frequency, i.e. unmarked and marked linguistic categories were distinguished by the degree of frequency with which they appeared in the subject linguistic environment. On the varying senses of the term “markedness,” and the arguments that this has led to a dilution of the term’s usefulness in linguistic discourse, see the arguments in Haspelmath 2006.}\]
makes this variance unremarkable, a standard component in the linguistic fabric of tragedy. The language of Stesichorus draws extensively on the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic, but reworks this inherited idiom in a dialect that primarily combines Doric and Ionic features. Since both Doric and epic-Ionic features are significant components of Stesichorus’ poetic language, it is difficult to describe either as marked in relation to the other. At the same time, Stesichorus’ poetic project in his Geryoneis, the treatment of the myths of epic in a lyric meter and choral performance context, is original and innovative. Considered within the wider landscape of poetic tradition in the seventh century BCE (as known from the surviving evidence), Stesichorus’ poetic language is marked on the whole.

The hybridity of the Geryoneis’ poetic language has implications for our literary and cultural understanding of the work. The following passage from a fragment of the Geryoneis is

---

\[92\] Like Stesichorus’ own dialect, scholarly opinions on its composition have been equally mixed. Russo 1999, 340 describes language of Stesichorus as “universally agreed to be a Doricized epic literary dialect” (see also Silk 2010, 426), while Colvin 2007, 55 and Willi 2008, 74-76 privilege the Doric aspects over the presence of epicisms. Most recently, Davies and Finglass 2014, 44, after summarizing the various stances on dialect, reach a more agnostic position on the predominance of Doric over Ionic/epic: “faced as we are with so many forms from both Doric and epic-Ionic (not to speak of Aeolic), it seems futile to attempt to decide which element is predominant: both are fundamental to Stesichorus’ literary language.” The fullest descriptions of Stesichorus’ phonology and morphology are Nöthiger 1971; Willi 2008, 57-75; and Davies and Finglass 2014, 40-46.

\[93\] We cannot forget that some of the Doricisms present in the text of Stesichorus could be the result of later editorial intervention. As Finglass and Davies 2014, 42 observe, the increased association of Sicily with Doric from the fifth century BCE could have led to the insertion of more Doric forms, either as a result of Sicilian editions made by Doric-speaking scribes or Alexandrian editors working under the assumption that Stesichorus, as a Sicilian, must have composed in Doric. Excluding contract futures, for which there is some evidence of their presence through later interventions (see Finglass and Davies 2014, 41 with bibliography), we should still assume the Doric features we find in the surviving text of Stesichorus are genuine.

\[94\] Stesichorus’ name itself, “he who sets up the chorus”, suggests a working relationship to choral performance (Furley and Bremer 2001, 1.9-10) and the term Stesichorus uses to refer to his own compositions, μολαζη (frr. 193 PMGF and 250 PMGF), has contemporary associations with choral singing (LfgrE s.v. and Cingano 1993, 349-53). Stesichorus as a composer of choral lyrics remains the scholarly consensus. That said, the strict modern divisions between choral and monodic genres did not exist in antiquity (although there were different levels of associated prestige) and there remains the possibility that Stesichorus composed monodic songs to be accompanied by a lyre (see Davies 1988 on the “tyranny of the handbook” in generic divisions of lyric and West 1971; Pavese 1972, 243; and Russo 1999 for case of monodic performance). In support of this view scholars have noted possible analogies to the performance of Demodocus in Od. 8 (first noted by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913, 239 n.3). Based on the length of the Geryoneis (ca. 1300 lines), Barrett 2007, 22-3 has vigorously argued that Stesichorus was a solo citharodist at all times, although he has not been able to muster secure evidence, as Davies and Finglass 2014, 32 observe, that a choral ode could not be coordinated for performance at such a length.

\[95\] Rossi 1983 described the Geryoneis as an “epica alternativa”. On Stesichorus’ adoption and reworking of epic conventions see the treatment of PMGF S15 in Maingon 1980.
...the pain of the speckled necked Hydra, the destroyer of men; secretly he, with guile, thrust it into its brow and with divine dispensation pierced its flesh and bones; and the arrow went straight into the crown of its head, and stained his armor and gory limbs with purple blood.

The language Stesichorus employs in the bloody death scene between Heracles and Geryon is thoroughly epicizing. Accordingly, the Doric features are a simplified veneer restricted to α for η (σιγά; ἐπικοπάδαν; αἵσι; ἀκροτάταν; κορυφάν). The rest of the passage is a mixture of features from Homeric epic. In terms of morphology we find the long dative plural in –αισι (δῶναις) and the uncontracted vowel cluster εα (ὁ[στ]έα and likely μέλεα at l. 13). Epic phraseology and common lexemes include: σάρκα [καὶ] ὁ[στ]έα (cf. Od. 9.293 and 11.219: σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα), and the singular form of blood (αἵματι). Regarding usage, the compound

---

96 Text is from the new edition of Davies and Finglass 2014 and the translation (with adaptations) is from Curtis 2011.


98 Other Doric features present in the remains of Stesichorus include: secondary long ο as ω (although examples of the diphthong ου, which can be interpreted as doris mitior as well as Ionic is more prevalent); short α in the accusative plural of α-stem nouns; athematic infinitives in –μεν and –μεν; third-person plural in –οντι; various particles (γα), prepositions (τοι; ποτα), conjunctions (ὅκα and πόκα), and pronouns (τιν; νιν; ἄμν). For the citations to these examples, see Willi 2008 or Davies and Finglass 2014, 41 who cites directly from Willi 2008.
adjective άιολοδή[τ]ου appears first here, but adjectives of this type are common in the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic.99

Beyond generalized epicisms, Stesichorus also borrows specific Homeric usage. In the image of Heracles’ arrow in flight at line 10 the poet recalls scenes such as that at Il. 5.99-100: ὄδα ὀ ἐπατο πικρός ὄστός | ἀντικρῦ δὲ διέσχε.100 However, Stesichorus makes the Homeric phrase his own through the use of anastrophe, placing the adverb ἀντικρῦ after the preposition ὄδα and thus creating a tmesis that makes the deadly strike of the hero’s arrow all the more vivid.

The primary sense of κορυφή, “top of the head”, in the next line recalls Il. 8.82-83, where the bard uses the term for the head of Nestor’s horse, which was similarly smitten by an arrow.101 Still, “mountain caps”, the common Iliadic meaning of the noun, is also operative in the passage, likely as an acknowledgment by Stesichorus of his monster’s colossal physique.102

The linguistic hybridity in this passage and elsewhere in the Geryoneis contributes meaningfully to Stesichorus’ portrayal of Geryon. It has been observed that Geryon is not a typical monster,103 and indeed while Geryon cuts a monstrous figure, he takes on characteristics and values more commonly associated with Greek heroes.104 Geryon, for example, shows concern for his own kleos and the reputation of his kin. Noussia-Fantuzzi has claimed that “Stesichorus makes Geryon a new Hector” when he has the monster receive the supplication of a male and female figure before he goes off to battle Heracles.105 The same sequence of events,

99 Maingon 1980, 102 n.10: “there are precedents for the individual elements of the compound epithet, although Stesichorus’ compound as such has no precedent in epic.”
100 Maingon 1980, 102 and Curtis 2011, 139-45.
101 Maingon 1980, 103. Zeus’ head is also referred to as a κορυφή at H.Apoll. 308-9 in the context of the cranial birth of Athena; perhaps coincidently this example appears several lines after a brief narration of Apollo’s defeat of the monstrous serpent Python.
102 Maingon 1980, 103; Curtis 2011, 144-45; and Noussia-Fantuzzi 2013, 247.
104 Gentili 1977, 300 and 305
105 Noussia-Fantuzzi 2013, 250.
with Priam and Hecuba doing the imploring, occurs in the lead up to Hector’s showdown with Achilles (II. 22.28-76 and 82-89).\textsuperscript{106} The points of contact between the two scenes ennobles Geryon’s preordained defeat; even in death at the hands of Heracles, Geryon is presented to the reader in a heroicized and pathetic light. In the lines immediately following the passage quoted above, Stesichorus likens Geryon’s lifeless body to a drooping poppy.\textsuperscript{107} Stesichorus adopts his simile from II. 8.306-308, where Teucer, aiming for Hector, misses his target and hits the Trojan’s brother Gorgythion, whom the narrator describes as “blameless” (ἀμύνωμα);\textsuperscript{108} this is the only instance in the \textit{Iliad} where the poet compares the death of a Greek fighter to a flower. In both the Homeric model and Stesichorus’ adaptation, the jarring juxtaposition of the ugly and destructive force of violence with the gentle grace of the natural world poignantly memorializes a savage death in the havoc of a battlefield.\textsuperscript{109} But these death scenes capture, significantly, the passing of a dangerous outsider; through these similies both poets, then, ask the audience to sympathize with a fallen opponent, a foreign warrior in the \textit{Iliad} and an uncivilized monster in the \textit{Geryoneis}.\textsuperscript{110}

Despite this softening of his monstrous characterization, Stesichorus never allows Geryon to become a fully heroic or sympathetic character; rather he remains an enemy of Greek civilization. On this point, Rozokoki has argued that Stesichorus’s reworking of the poppy simile

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{106} Gentili 1977, 300 and Noussia-Fantuzzi 2013, 250.
\item\textsuperscript{107} \textit{PMGF} S15.14-16=Finglass 19.45-47:
\begin{itemize}
\item ώς ὁκα μ[ά]κοτ
\item ἀπε κατασχόνοι κ[ά]πη λον [δέμας]
\item ἀρν ὁκο φύλλα βαλοσγ ντ
\end{itemize}
(“like a poppy, which shaming its tender stalk, swiftly dropping its leaves…”)
\item\textsuperscript{108} μὴκον δ’ ὡς ἔτρωσε κάρη βάλεν, ἢ τ’ ἐνι κήθῃ,
\begin{itemize}
\item καρπῳ βριθομένη νοτήσε τε εἰάρνησιν,
\item ὡς ἔτρωσ’ ἠμυς κάρῃ πήληκη βαρυνθέν.
\end{itemize}
(“He bowed his head to one side, like a poppy which in a garden is laden with fruits and spring rain; so he bowed to one side his head weighted down with a helmet.”)
\item\textsuperscript{109} On this pattern of similes in Homer that juxtapose violence with beauty and their implications for Homeric valuation of war, see Porter 1972.
\item\textsuperscript{110} Segal 1985, 190 similarly read the deployment of the Homeric simile as an attempt to make Geryon’s death sympathetic.
\end{itemize}
actually casts Geryon in an unfavorable light. By describing the flower as “befouling” itself by shedding its petals, Stesichorus ventures to shame Geryon for his swift defeat at the hands of Heracles, the great civilizing hero, and turn his audience against the monster who has done no wrong in attempting to protect his flock. While I am not ultimately convinced by this reading, Stesichorus’ version of the Homeric simile does offer, as Segal has observed, “a potentially grotesque point of comparison” that likely complicates the poignancy of Geryon’s death but does not ultimately undermine the audience’s compassion. More recognizably, Geryon’s monstrous otherness is reinforced, in part, by notable points of contact with the imagery and language associated with Polyphemus. In the passage quoted above, for example, the verb used to describe the piercing action of Heracles’ arrow (ἐνέρεισε) occurs once in Homer in the blinding scene of the Cyclops (Od. 9.382-83). Such points of contact remind the reader that Geryon, despite the blameless role he plays in his own destruction, is still a monster, like Homer’s Polyphemus, living at edges of civilization.

Geryon, then, is a hybrid in terms of his characterization, a tragic hero drawn from the monstrous non-Greek edges of the world. Thus it is fitting that he is presented within a poetic hybrid, a “song that combines Greek mythology and Homeric convention,” as Franzen observed, “from an entirely new perspective, that of the ‘other’, the monster Geryon.” This hybridity also extends to its linguistic composition. Through dialect mixture Stesichorus may have sought out a linguistic expression of the themes of belonging and difference, hero and monster juxtaposed and negotiated in the song. In likening Geryon’s death to a poppy, Stesichorus introduces the simile with the conventional epic collocation of ὡς and the temporal adverb (ὦτε),

---

111 Rozokoki 2009, 5-7.
112 Segal 1985, 190.
113 For other parallels between the language used to describe both monsters, see Lobel 1967, 6; Maingon 1980, 103; and Noussia-Fantuzzi 2013, 247-48.
114 Franzen 2009, 59.
except that he substitutes Doric ὣκα for Attic-Ionic ὅτε. While a previous commentator to the line dismissed the use of ὣκα as simply an equivalent alternative to the standard epic ὅτε, I suggest that we can observe in the use of the metrically equivalent Doric form the odd fit of likening the grotesque slumped body of a defeated monster, through the use of a unique Homeric simile, to a Greek warrior.

Beyond the level of characterization, we should consider the mixture of epicizing and Doric features within the broader literary and cultural context of the poem’s production at Sicily and perhaps Himera in particular. Stesichorus came of age in a unique linguistic environment at the edges of Greek geography and culture. The westernmost colony of Sicily, Himera was a secondary foundation inhabited by Syracuseans, Chalcidians and non-Greek natives where they spoke in a mixed Ionic-Doric dialect. In considering the Western Mediterranean subject matter and hybrid poetic language, we can observe the poet’s attempt to further develop a colonial literary heritage that would compete with that which was disseminated from the East. The epicizing Doric lyrics of Stesichorus, then, bring the periphery to the center (here the center

---

115 Maingon 1980, 105: Stesichorus “follows the conventional epic introduction to a simile with the words ὡς ὣκα, where the Wester [i.e. Doric] dialect form ὣκα is equivalent to epic ὅτε.”

116 The fragments of Stesichorus do not preserve an example of ὅτε, the presence of which would strengthen this type of reading. The corpus of Alcman preserves both forms (ὅτε PMG 13a.7; ὣκα PMG 20.1.3 and 56.1.1), although none appear in the exact same phrase, and later Pindar only uses ὅτε, e.g. N. 9.16 (ὡς ὅτε). Given, however, the close engagement with epic language in this passage, the presence of ὣκα (if original to Stesichorus) in place of ὅτε has a plausible literary purpose in underscoring the reapplication of the metaphor to a monster.

117 Thucydides 6.5.1: καὶ Ἰμέρα ἀπό Ζάγκλης ἔκτη ὑπὸ Εὐκλείδου καὶ Σίμου καὶ Σάκωνος, καὶ Χαλκιδῆς μὲν οἱ πλείστοι ἤλθον ἐς τὴν ἄπουκαν, ἔμποροι δὲ αὐτοί καὶ ἐκ Συρακουσίων φιλάδες στάσει νικηθέντες, οἱ Μυλητίδαι καλούμενοι καὶ φωνὴ μὲν μεταξὺ τῆς τε Χαλκιδέων καὶ Δωρίδος ἔκραθη, νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Χαλκιδικὰ ἐκράθησαν. (“Himera was founded from Zancle by Euclides, Simos, and Sakon, and the majority who came into colony were Chalcidian; but fugitives from Syracuse, who were defeated in the civil conflict and were called Myletidae, joined them in the foundation. Their language (φωνῆ) was a mixture between Chalcidian and Doric, but Chalcidian institutions (νόμιμα) prevailed.”)

118 On Stesichorus as a “kolonialer Dichter”, see Willi 2008, 82-90. Morgan 2012, 42 reaches similar conclusions when she considers Stesichorus’ dialect mixture as “an expression of a Sicilian cultural koine.”
being Homeric epic) and the center to the periphery, and in the process aid in the creation of a distinct poetic language for Sicilian lyric.\(^{119}\)

At Athens, the center of Greek literary culture, we find Aristophanes who was equally innovative in his use of language and dialect. Aristophanes is best known for his use of dialect in the speech of foreigners, and I will address this unique aspect of the dramatist’s poetics later in the chapter. Aristophanes did not, however, only use dialect to inject his comedies with the aural realism of Athens’ neighbors and enemies. Here I want to focus on the dialect variance present in some of his choral songs. I contend that this dialect variance is a meaningful component in Aristophanes’ sophisticated comic engagement with contemporary generic conventions.

Aristophanes’ choral lyrics generally lack Doric coloring or components from the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic;\(^{120}\) rather the language is primarily Attic coupled with a pastiche of elevated and idiomatic diction and phraseology.\(^{121}\) The realism of the comic stage, of course, plays its part in the Attic coloring of Aristophanes’ choral lyrics. Yet we should not view this linguistic choice purely within the confines of dramaturgical motivations. Literary critical discourses were also influential; Aristophanes avidly engaged in contemporary debates related to the aesthetic value of genres and individual authors, in particular Comedy and Tragedy.

Consequently, the antagonistic discourse Aristophanes establishes between his comedy and the

---

\(^{119}\) Adopting a sociolinguistic perspective, Willi 2008, 75-76 describes this process as a type of creolization that (75) “wenn die Sprecher aufgrund soziopolitischer Umstände mit einer neuen Prestige-Sprache konfrontiert werden.” Pace Hutchinson 2001, 115, who believes that Stesichorus’ “poetry certainly does not present either a quasi-Himeraean mixture of Ionic and Doric,” which leads him to conclude that “place is not, as in the Lesbian poems, proclaimed by his very language.” Davies and Finglass 2014, 46, cogently raise the possibility that “a Himeran audience…may have perceived in Stesichorus’ poetic language something arranged on not entirely dissimilar principles from those underlying the linguistic mix of their own city.” While Davies and Finglass’ suggestion that Stesichorus composed his lyric epics in a dialect designed, in part, to recall his native linguistic environment is debatable (note the lack of demonstrable Euboean forms), the combination of the two dialects, as with the two generic influences, does highlight a process of literary hybridization that is common, as Willi 2008 demonstrates, to Sicilian literature as a whole.

\(^{120}\) Silk 2010, 428; see also Willi 2003, 233-34 on the various contexts in which *ā* appear in Aristophanes.

\(^{121}\) In his study of Aristophanes’ choral language Silk (1980, 125-51) has coined the term “low level plus” for this particular mixture of dialectal and dictional usage.
sister genre of tragedy manifests itself in the linguistic decisions the comic poet makes in his lyric passages. Instances of language more commonly associated with choral lyric—Doric coloring, epic phraseology, an overabundance of compound adjectives—stand out from the rest. Often examples of register-switching find their expression in parodic contexts. A clear example of this process is in the chorus of frogs in Frogs, whose hymnic croaking most modern critics regard as satirizing the voice of contemporary poets, perhaps those associated with the New Music (209-218):122

In an elevated Doric paired with a *hapax* compound adjective (ἐὔγηρν ἐμὰν ἀοιδάν), the over-puffed frogs describe their croaks (βοάν) as “euphonious songs.” To produce a mock-serious lyric tone, Aristophanes similarly deploys Doric in the strophe to the parodos of the cloud chorus in Clouds (276-290):123

---


Clouds everlasting, let us arise, revealing our dewy bright form, from deep roaring father Ocean onto high mountain peaks with tresses of trees, whence to behold heights of distant vantage, and holy earth whose crops we water, and divine rivers’ rushing, and the sea crashing with deep thunder. For heaven’s sake tireless eye is ablaze with gleaming rays. So let us shake off the rainy haze from our deathless shape and survey the land, with telescopic eye.

The strophe includes Doric coloring (albeit limited, it is still enhanced by its appearance in the elevated compound epithet βαρυαχέος) and a pile-up of epithets to the point of poetic turgidity so that the passage has the feel of a burlesque. At a minimum, the elevated lyricism of the strophe contrasts, as does Socrates’ equally lyric invocation, with its wider comic context. As Spatz recognized, Aristophanes reinforces the mock-seriousness of this opening lyric through the “extreme formality,” in terms of parallelism and meter, between the strophe and its antistrophe. In the antistrophe (298-313), the chorus describes their approach to Athens with a focus on the mysteries and the festival of Dionysus with the same array of lyric components as that found in the strophe. Based on its content, some scholars understand the antistrophe as serious and thus treat the presence of Doric features as designed to harness the lyric’s laudatory

---

125 Fisher 1984, 91: “for the serious passages are funny precisely because they are ‘serious’ passages in a comic context; by being serious they become ridiculous”; and 95: “certainly there is no parody, but…the lyricism is itself ironical and the lyric alphas add to the mock-heroic ethos [of the entire parados].”
mode for solemn effect. A contrast between strophe and antistrophe that share so many formal features is dubious. In the case of antistrophe the lyric color of the song appropriately borrows from a stylistic register appropriate to religious solemnity, to only then redeploy, as Fisher recognized, this language within the context of Socrates’ bogus mystery initiation. The stately doricizing lyrics of the Cloud chorus, new and ephemeral deities (who have not yet even materialized), only make sense when read as a send-up of a serious lyric song.

Thus far we have examined two authors whose use of dialect variance has qualified, based on the definition from which we began this discussion, as marked. I would like to conclude with a brief discussion of what does not qualify as marked and therefore meaningful dialect variance. Our example is Pindar, whose complex lyric language is still in need of a fundamental treatment; generally considered representative of the composite language of Doric lyric, Pindar has his own interesting peculiarities. Non-epic Aeolicisms, such as feminine present participles in –οίσα, are a feature of Doric lyric language beginning with Alcman. Their usage rate in Pindar, however, is greatly elevated, and his lyrics also include innovative features built on the same phonological processes, such as aorist accusative plural participles in –αίς (*-ans). Previous treatments of this phenomenon argue that the prestige of Sappho and Alcaeus led to the increased use of forms native to their poetry in the the fifth century. While such an influence cannot be ruled out, we must also recognize that this series of non-epic Aeolicisms entered the

---

127 Adkins 1979, 14-15; Silk 1981, 109-10; and Parker 1997, 188.
128 Spatz 1968, 90 describes the lyrics as having a “liturgical quality.”
129 Fisher 1984, 101-102; pace the serious tone assigned to the antistrophe in contrast to the views of Socrates by Adkins 1979, 14-15 and Parker 1997, 188.
130 On the language of Pindar, see Forssman 1966 and Verdier 1972.
131 On these features in Alcman, see Hinge 2006, 39-43. Nöthiger 1971, 89-95 and Verdier 1972 treats the relative rate of occurrence the choral lyric authors.
132 The tables in Verdier 1972 are the best source for this. Feminine participles in –οίσα, for example, appear 48 times in Pindar’s epinicians, a total that greatly outnumbers the participles in –ούσα in the same body of material and the usage rate in other authors. Verdier 1972, 99-103 surveys the possible instances of aorist accusative plural participle in –αίς in other Doric lyric authors and reaches the conclusion that the evidence does not demonstrate a strong case for originality in any of the examples.
133 e.g., Verdier 1972.
composite language of Doric lyric quite early on in its history, and Pindar’s utilization of these features needs to be considered within that tradition as well. Perhaps these forms were felt to be modernizing, and thus Pindar’s use reflects the demands of contemporary tastes or his desire to distinguish himself from his predecessors. Michael Silk has traced the outline of a modernizing movement in the language of his later contemporary Bacchylides; however these modern features are often not dialectal but rather lexical in nature, for example the substitution of terms common to fifth-century usage for their epic equivalents. The compositional or literary influences behind Pindar’s increased usage of these dialect features remain unclear; in this instance, however, their creation is likely due to a combination of factors including associations with other poetic types as well as an engagement with the generic conventions of lyric language. Whatever the case, the frequency of this form in Pindar does not qualify it as marked in way to make the reading of any one appearance have a plausible literary explanation.

A thematic infinitives in –ναι, a form common to Attic-Ionic but also found in Arcadian, are rarer still than the use of non-epic Aeolicisms. Pindar uses the infinitive form four times in his surviving poetry. In one instance, at O. 6.87-90, the form appears in relation to Arcadia,

---

134 As regards dialect, Bacchylides is notable for the increased presence of Ionic η as a reflex of *ā in place of Doric α. Over a century ago Kenyon (1896, xlvi) offered stylistic motivation for the increased use of η for α in that Bacchylides sought to avoid α in successive syllables and in such cases chose to retain η in the initial syllable. Tucker 1962, 498-9 has questioned, however, this interpretation of the data and has argued instead that the substitution is (499) “an automatic sound-change in the speech of Attica and Ceos: when η < ã [æ:] occurred in two syllables of the same word (or even closely associated words), the first became [e:] by dissimilation.” On the whole, Tucker’s treatment is convincing and so suggests that the majority of η for α examples in Bacchylides—recognizing all the while the likely influence of later scribal intervention—are the reflex of Bacchylides’ native Cean. On the phenomenon of the “Attische Rückverwandlung” more generally, see Szemerény 1968.

135 Silk 2010, 429-30 takes as a representative example the opening lines of Ode 5, wherein he notes the use of the “more modern στραταγέ (not epic, and not distinctively poetic)” for the address to the “commander” of Syracuse, Hieron, and then the string of fifth century usage (τῶν γε νῶν; ὀρθὸς; and αἳ τις an intensifying phrase found first in Ibycus (SLG 221), but with a similar effect in Attic drama, see Soph. Trach.8, Eur. Andr. 6, and Ar. Pl. 655; Maehler 2004, 111) that contrasts with the preceding elevated epithet-noun pair γλυκύδωρον ἄγαλµα. He comments (429): “None of these modernisms are abrasively modern…but collectively they serve to inform the celebration of a man of the poet’s own time with more contemporary resonance.”

136 On athematic infinitives in –ναι as a feature of Arcadian, see Buck 1955, §154.1. O. 6.89 (γνῶναι); P. 4.35 (δοῦναι); Pae. 16.4 (φανῆναι); fr. 42.5 (δεικνύναι).
and raises the question of whether the use of such a rare form is related to dialect’s ability to recall ethnic and linguistic realities. *Olympian* 6 celebrates the victory of Hagesias, a citizen of Stymphalos in Arcadia and a co-founder of Syracuse, in a mule-drawn chariot race. At lines 87-90 the singing voice, here quite likely to be associated with the poet himself, entrusts to a certain Aeneas, possibly a local Stymphalean choral trainer and whom the poetic voice praises as an ὄγγελος ὀρθὸς (“true messenger”), the performance itinerary whose first stop will be at Hagesias’ native Stymphalos, and orders him to give a rousing performance at the sanctuary of Hera Parthenos and then report back (γνῶναι) on the reception. The orders given to Aeneas activates, in part, the departure to Arcadian Stymphalos. Whether or not the song was performed at Stymphalos (and Syracuse, or only later at Syracuse), these lines and a passage less than ten lines later (98-105), where the chorus and victor are described setting off from Arcadia to Syracuse (cf. esp. 99: οἶκοθεν οἶκαδε “from one home to another”), invite the listener (and later readers) to mentally reconstruct the travel to and performance at Stymphalos. Just as Pindar asks Aeneas to report back (γνῶναι) across space and time, so in the dialectal form of the infinitive a listener (or later reader) may well have heard an echo of the linguistic soundscape of the song’s first performance context, especially if we identify Aeneas as a native Stymphalean.

While there is, to my mind, a suggestive contextual connection between Arcadia and a form that is attested in the dialect spoken at that region, ultimately I consider it is rather unlikely

138 The identification of Aeneas as the choral trainer is reported in the scholia to Pindar (148a and 149a), although scholars have challenged this reconstruction and offered alternative identities such as a soloist (Heath 1988, 191) or argued that the choice of name had less to do with any real chorus trainer of Pindar but rather more to do with its etymological link to ὀἶνος (Too 1991). I do not believe, however, that we must reject the identification of the scholia. On this Aeneas as a native Stymphalean charged with bringing the ode from Thebes to his home city, see Hutchinson 2001, 414.

139 Disagreement remains on the identification between the song Aeneas is commanded to perform at Stymphalos and *Olympian* 6, see Heath 1988, 191; Letkowitz 1991, 182; Bonifazi 2001, 133-38; Hutchinson 2001, 413; and Too 1991.

140 For a recent treatment of this thorny interpretive issue, see Stamatopoulou 2014, who argues that the poem suggests a first performance at Stymphalos as well as projecting the idea of a future reperformance at Syracuse, with bibliography.
that γνῶναι was designed by Pindar to activate such associations. Attested at Od. 2.159 (γνῶναι), the form is part of poetic language from the earliest periods, and the other three instances in Pindar do appear in contexts with any Arcadia associations. Additionally, Pindar’s corpus does not contain any examples of an alternative infinitive form in –μεν(α), which further problematizes arguments for markedness. It is likely best, despite the possibility of a literary resonance, to read γνῶναι, like the other examples, as an unmarked and metrically useful piece of Pindar’s poetic language. Consequently, this example demonstrates that not every literary explanation of a dialect form, which is objectively marked by its relative rarity, is equally plausible.

Dialect Admixture as Poetic Commentary

There is some limited evidence that poets prior to and outside of the comic world of Aristophanes employed dialect mixture as a type of commentary on the works of other individual poets or different poetic types. One example is the language of Hesiod, whose cosmological and didactic hexameters are traditionally compared with and set in opposition to Homeric epic. The non-Homeric features present in Hesiod are some of the earliest and most controversial examples of dialect admixture. Scholars disagree over the type of dialect admixture present, for example the short accusative plural in –ας in first declension nouns as a Doric feature, and the source of

---

141 See the conclusion reached by Braswell 1988, 112, commenting on the use of the infinitive at P. 4. 35.
142 Treatments of non-Homeric language in Hesiod include Troxler 1964; West 1966; Edwards 1971; and Cassio 2009.
143 For discussion of the dialect and possible origins of short accusative plurals in –ας, see Morpurgo Davies 1964; Wyatt 1966; Edwards 1971, 141-65; and Cassio 2009. I treat this question more fully in my discussion of the feature in Tyrtaeus below.
initial influence (spoken vernaculars or literary traditions). Treatment of both of these issues depends on one’s understanding of the composition of the Hesiodic corpus, whether as the work of an individual mind or a tradition in the vein of Homer. If the latter, non-Homeric features are valuable in that they provide evidence for the linguistic and literary forces at play in the shaping of the final Hesiodic text. Boeotian forms and the presence of non-epic Aeolicisms, for example, may well be indicators of the influence of mainland performance contexts or a different, possibly East Aeolic, poetic tradition.

If one considers the Hesiodic corpus is, at its core, the product of an individual poet, these same non-Homeric forms can take on more poetic and critical coloring. Hesiod’s choice to include forms absent from Homer may be a statement on his part of his poetic independence in hexametric poetry and a marker of the thematic and structural differences between his didactic and the military heroism of epic. The phonology of λαμπράν in the phrase λαμπράν τε σελήνην (Th. 19 and 371) is an instructive case in point. The substitution of α for η could be construed as another Boeotism, but its appearance as a modifier of the Attic-Ionic σελήνην, here and elsewhere, suggest the form be understood as an Atticism. Scholars have posited λαμπράν τε σελήνην as a borrowing from an Attic hexametric poem. Selene’s Attic roots stem from the tradition in which her daughter, Pandie, was wed to Antiochos the epynonymous founder of an

144 Cassio 2009 with bibliography offers a succinct but thorough survey of the history of scholarship on Hesiodic dialect.
145 The former approach to Hesiod as an individual author has a long-standing tradition; however more recently scholars have begun to question the strict veracity of the autobiographical comments found within Hesiod’s works, see e.g. Griffith 1983, Rosen 1990, and Martin 1992. Nagy 1990, 36-82 has argued that ‘Hesiod’ is not a historical individual but rather represents a legendary identity in an oral poetic tradition that performers could assume.
146 Linguistically verifiable examples of Boeotianisms are, in actuality, quite limited: a) the form of Sphinx as Φικ' at Th. 326 (see scholiast on the form: Φίκα δ' ειαυτήν οι Βοιωτοί ἔλεγον) and the compound adjective θεόσδοτα at WD 320 (an artificial form on analogy with common Boeotian names such as Θεόστος as recognized by Cassio 2009, 194). On a broader scale scholars have noted an increased percentage of forms from the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic that are shared with Boeotian (e.g. thematic infinitive in –έμεν and dative plural in –οις), although whether such variability can be related to the compositional context of the Hesiodic text is debatable.
147 As Cassio 2009, 199 notes, the appearance of Attic λαμπράν in both instances of the phrase and elsewhere in non-Attic hexameters where the Ionic form would be expected strongly support this dialect feature as original to the context.
Attic tribe. Likewise the string of non-epic Aeolicisms at \textit{WD} 618-694, a passage on sailing, may derive, as Richard Janko suggests, from an Aeolic poetic tradition that dealt with similar subject matter. Since, however, both of these poetic traditions to which Hesiod may (or may not) be alluding are only conjectures, and could just as easily be used as evidence for the composite tradition in creating the corpus, the impact of any allusion created through dialect admixture must remain surrounded by a good deal of uncertainty.

Outside of allusions to Homer, Hesiod, and the epic tradition more broadly, the Archaic elegists, Sappho, Alcaeus, Alcman, and Stesichorus do not use dialect admixture to comment on their poetic practice in relation to other literary conventions. One example, however, stands out and deserves detailed consideration. The poet of a Doric lyric fragment from Oxyrhynchus, whose authorship a majority of scholars attribute to Ibycus (\textit{PMG} 282), utilizes a non-epic Aeolicism to comment on the distance between his lyrics and the tradition of divinely inspired poetry famously articulated in Homer and Hesiod. The fragment opens with a summary recounting of the rape of Helen by Paris, whose actions provided tinder that sparked the Trojan War. The poet, however, responds that he will not rehearse the deeds of Paris, the capture of Troy, nor the catalogue of Achaean ships. On this final point he states (23-26): \footnote{151}

\begin{verbatim}
καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄνει Ὁμίσαι σεθονθα[σεῖ]έναι
ἐν Ἡλικονθό[ες] ἐμβαλέν ἀλογὸ
θναι[ε]ϊς † ἃστρον ἀνήρ
διερ[ομεν]...[τὰ ἐκαστα ἐποι
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{148} Apollodorus \textit{FGHist} 244f 162; Casso 2009, 199 also points out that \textit{Homeric Hymn} 32 (Selene) was likely composed for performance before an Athenian audience; on this see West 2003, 19.

\footnote{149} Janko 1982, 168; see also West 1978b, 30. Steiner 2005, 348 considers the increased presence of Aeolic features in this passage to evoke the speech of his father, who hailed from Aeolian Cumae and whose own sailing travails Hesiod mentions in passing (see further below), while Martin 1992, 27 argues that the use of non-epic features in his diction is a conscious attempt by Hesiod to establish his status and poetry in opposition to Homer.

\footnote{150} Stylistic features suggest a number of possible archaic or classical lyricists; however the mention of a Polycrates, who shares a name with the patron of Ibycus, makes the identification quite certain. See also Page 1951b, 166-68; Bowra 1961, 230; and Barron 1969, 132-33.

\footnote{151} Text and translation from Wilkinson 2013.
On these events might the skilled Heliconian Muses embark...; but no quick [mortal] man could say each one...

As has been long recognized these lines recall *Il.* 2.484-93 in which Homer famously contrasts the omniscient position of the Muses on Olympus with the limits of mortal knowledge that relies on rumor.\(^{152}\) Homer then declares that he could not recount all the Greeks who came to the shores of Troy unless he had ten tongues and mouths; rather he requires the divine aid of the Muses. Ibycus comments, in contrast and without qualification, that a mortal does not have the ability to narrate these events. A corruption in these lines have led some scholars to offer emendation by which Ibycus does qualify his statement;\(^{153}\) however corrections of this variety are at odds with the poet’s decision not to recount epic material, which he then does in praeteritio, in favor of praise for the contemporary accomplishments of Polycrates.\(^{154}\)

Ibycus further engages with the epic conception of poetic inspiration when he describes the Muses as Ἑλικονίδες, clearly evoking Hesiod’s famous encounter with the Muses at the opening of the *Theogony*. Within this meditation on the nature of his lyrics, it is of note that Ibycus chooses to use non-epic Aeolic Μοίσαι. While forms of Μοῖσα and feminine participles in –οίσα are a part of the literary dialect of Doric lyric, this is the only instance of the former in Ibycus and no instances of the latter are extant.\(^{155}\) Steiner considers Aeolic Μοίσαι, together with other language drawn from Hesiod’s discussion of sea-faring from *WD*, to underscore the

\(^{152}\) Barron 1969, 133-34.  
\(^{153}\) West 1966b, 152-53 proposes to emend θνατ[ό]ς to αὐτός which would render the lines as “no man himself could say...” and raise the possibility that he could sing on these topics with divine aid. Barron 1969, 128 proposes a rearrangement of the lines following the excision of θνατ[ό]ς and suggests a reconstruction of οὐκ ἀδάς δέ κ’άνηρ | δειρός τά ἐκαστα εἶπεν which conveys the same meaning as West’s conjecture.  
\(^{154}\) Wilkinson 2013, 72. Hutchinson 2001, 243-44 reads a considerably more pointed and specific attack on Homer in these lines: through the difference in Ibycus’ account of the events, the poet suggests that Homer’s account is uninformed and, as a result, Homer could not have been inspired by the faultless Muses.  
\(^{155}\) Nöthiger 1971, 91 and 93.
allusion to Hesiod’s Heliconian Muses through his father’s connection to Aeolian Cumae. The connection of Μοίσαι to this cluster of Hesiodic allusions would have more support, if we found this phonological feature in Hesiod, which, however, we do not. In the same line, Ibycus employs the participle σεσοφισµένος to describe poetic skill of these Heliconian Muses. In addition to nicely summarizing Il. 2.485 (ἡµεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἔστε τε πάντα) in one word, σοφίζω, which also appears at WD 649, the same sea-faring passage from which Ibycus draws other language, is used, as Wilkinson notes, in relation to human skills and so “by applying it to the Muses, Ibycus subtly devalues their talents to a human level.” Similarly, Ibycus, by choosing a (metrically equivalent) linguistic form completely absent from Homer and Hesiod, distances his lyric encomium from epic treatments of mythic events, while simultaneously activating these famous poetic tropes in the minds of his listeners.

The Sicilian comic tradition also employs dialect in the service of parody. I will consider one example in which philosophical discourse is the comic target. In Diogenes Laertius 3.9-17, the doxographer quotes at length from the fourth-century Sicilian local historian Alcimus’ Πρὸς Ἀµύταν (FGrHist 560). Alcimus tells the reader his aim is to demonstrate that Plato borrowed important philosophical ideas from Epicharmus. To prove his accusations, Alcimus quotes fragments of Epicharmus that support the comic’s priority in the formulation of certain philosophical positions. Unlike other Pseudoepicharmea these lines are in a dramatic format and,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Steiner 2005, 348.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Wilkinson 2013, 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>In a recent article Nikolaev 2014 has argued that Archilochus employs the Aeolic infinitive νηφέµεν in 4W for a mock epic effect. The thematic infinitive ending is best known from epic, while the verb νηφέω is absent from epic diction and likely has a colloquial flavor. Not merely an epic reminiscence, νηφέµεν is rather a striking Archilochean coinage. In the context of a poetic invitation to get drunk while on night watch, the combination of epic and colloquial linguistic features combine for a comic effect. Nikolaev further argues for the coinage of this form acts as an allusion to Hesiod’s ἀθόσα πνέµεν οἶνον (WD 592) from the conclusion of a description of an idyllic midsummer festival—a place and time where drinking is socially acceptable in humorous contrast to the supposedly sober night watch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>On FGrH 560, Alcimus’ use of Epicharmus, and his approach to Plato see, Jacoby’s commentary; Gigante 1953 and Cassio 1985.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
while the authenticity of these passages has been questioned, there is little compelling evidence
to doubt their genuineness, which Alcimus took for granted in his arguments.\textsuperscript{160} Even if they are
not original to Epicharmus, they are securely products of the late Classical period by virtue of
their quotation in Alcimus.

[Epich.] fr. 275 K.-A., the first example of Platonic plagiarism offered by Alcimus in
Diogenes Laertius, is a dialogue between two unknown speakers on the distinction between the
immutable character of the divine and the ever changing existence of men. The quotation of the
exchange opens with a philosophical declaration (1-2):\textsuperscript{161}

\begin{quote}
\begin{quote}
\textit{ἀλλ᾽ ἂεὶ τοι θεἱ παρῆσαν χυπέλιπον οὐ πόσκα,}
\textit{τάδε δ᾽ ἂεὶ πάρεσθ᾽ ὀμοία διὰ τε τῶν αὐτῶν ἂεὶ.}
\end{quote}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
1 οὐ πόσκα τάδε edd., οὐπο οκα τάδε PF, οὐπα ποτε κατὰ δε B
\end{quote}

Always are the gods present and they have not yet ceased to be,
these things are always the same thing for all time.

Plato’s reliance on Epicharmus aside, the opening statement \textit{ἀλλ᾽ ἂεὶ τοι θεἱ παρῆσαν} recalls
metaphysical arguments redolent of Presocratic Ionian philosophy.\textsuperscript{162} The koine of philosophical
discourse was an artificial version of eastern Ionic, and so the presence of \textit{παρῆσαν}, the only
instance of the Ionic third-person plural form of \textit{εἰμί} in Epicharmus,\textsuperscript{163} is quite certainly marked.
That an Ionicism is present in the mouth of a character espousing the discourse of a natural
philosopher is more than a nod to generic (and ethnic?) realism on the part of th poet; it is also,
as Cassio recognized, played for humor: for while the philosophy under discussion is not in itself

\textsuperscript{160} For the authenticity of the passages cited by Alcimus, see Gigante 1953, 166-72; Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 247-
55; Cassio 2002, 57; and Álvarez Salas 2007.
\textsuperscript{161} Text and apparatus criticus from Dorandi’s (2013) edition of Diogenes Laertius.
\textsuperscript{162} Willi 2008, 164-6 argues that this fragment be read as a response to Xenophanes and his theory of everlasting
nature of the gods. Statements in Aristotle (\textit{Met.} 1010a5-7) and Alexander of Aphrodisias (\textit{CAG} I, p. 308.10-14
Hayduck) testify to an antagonistic stance on the part of Epicharmus towards Xenophanes and his philosophy.
\textsuperscript{163} Recent treatments of the dialect of Sicilian comedy include Cassio 2002 and Willi 2008, 125-60.
humorous through infelicities in content or argument, we must consider the comic frame in which this exchange originally functioned.\textsuperscript{164} We know nothing of the speakers, but we could imagine the speaker of these lines as amusingly putting on airs when adopting this philosophical stance among other possibilities.\textsuperscript{165}

I have not encountered similar examples in fifth-century contemporary lyric, elegiac, or hexametric poetry. In these genres Homeric references are prevalent and the differences in the quality of dialect admixture, for example in Pindar, raise questions about the author’s relationship to the poetic type in which he composes. The latter phenomenon is inward looking, in that it presents evidence for intra-generic treatments of dialect admixture, but provides much less evidence for the use of dialect mixture as a means of engagement with other poetic types at a critical level. The aims of this study dictate that my treatment cannot be exhaustive, so the possibility remains that more examples of the sort presented in my readings of Ibycus, Aristophanes, and Epicharmus exist. From the evidence mustered above, however, the implication is that despite the sensitivity of poets to the linguistic composition of the literary language in which they composed, Archaic and Classical poets did not use dialect admixture to any great degree in order to comment on the relationship of their work to other poetic traditions.\textsuperscript{166} This is not to suggest, however, that dialect was lacking in expressive power; rather dialect was becoming a significant building block in the generation of poetic meaning even from this early period. This developing literary potential of dialect choice is better understood by

\textsuperscript{164} Cassio 2002, 57.
\textsuperscript{165} An instructive parallel may be present in Menander’s use of Doric in the speech of a character pretending to be a doctor in his Aspis (e.g. 439-64), which likely relies for its humor on the association between doctors and their training centers on Sicily and Cos; for a collection of sources linking doctors (reputable or bogus) with Doric-speaking regions, see Gomme and Sandbach 1973, 93 (on the forms themselves 99), and Holford-Strevens 2009, 625-26 updates the citations. Conversely (or possibly simultaneously) the use of Doric can be interpreted as an attempt at linguistic realism along the lines of Aristophanes’ deft recreation of Laconian, Megarian, and Boeotian dialects (see discussion below).
\textsuperscript{166} This discussion does illustrate, however, that comedy appears to be the literary product on which further research could be most fruitfully directed.
examining the presence of marked forms in conjunction with the articulation of regional and ethnic identities.

**Dialect Admixture as Marker of Ethnic Associations**

Dialects function as linguistic features within the physical landscape. Any Greeks in the pre-Hellenistic period who traveled between *poleis* would have encountered not only phonological and morphological differences between their speech and that of others, whether aurally or through inscriptions, and also, especially in the Archaic period, differences in the graphic rendering of the alphabet.\(^{167}\) Indeed, the regional linguistic diversity of Greece in the Archaic and Classical periods is one of its defining socio-cultural aspects.

While Morpurgo Davies has demonstrated that Greeks did not have a concept of “Greek” as a standardized language until the Hellenistic period, they did have an idea of “Greek” as a single language; there is evidence that Greeks of the Archaic and Classical period were aware of different varieties of “Greek” and that to certain varieties different cultural associations were attached, including levels of prestige.\(^{168}\) In terms of the recognition of different regional and linguistic varieties of the language, we can cite Herodotus (1.142), who discusses the different dialects spoken in his native Ionia and at 7.197 glosses the Achaean word for πρυτανήιον (λήίτον), or Thucydides (3.112), who describes the Messenians as speaking the Doric language (Δωρίδα...γλῶσσαν ἱέντας). Plato and Xenophon both use dialect expressions, often exclamations, to mark the origin of a non-Attic speaker (although the rest of the dialogue is

---

\(^{167}\) Differences in local alphabets have traditionally been considered accidental in origin. Luraghi 2010 convincingly demonstrates that local alphabets were consciously fashioned to mark ethnic boundaries and so function in a similar fashion to dialects.

\(^{168}\) Morpurgo Davies 2002.
produced in undifferentiated Attic prose). Examples such as these likely reflect a fifth-century glossographic tradition engaged in the collection of dialect features. Some evidence for the prestige value of particular dialects also survives from this period, albeit from an Athenocentric viewpoint. The Old Oligarch (Ath. Pol. 2.7) complains about the dilution of pure Attic speech through contact with other linguistic communities as a result of Athenian commerce. An Athenian ostrakon and a fragment of Aristophanes reveal the stratification of Attic sociolects. The former suggests that lower social level dialects within Attic were marked by forms shared with Boeotian; in the latter (PCG 706) an nameless speaker observes the different social registers of Attic that exist between city-dwellers, elites, and rustics.

While a recognition of and developing interest in the variety of spoken dialects is attested in Classical Greek culture, evidence for a similar treatment of literary dialects is slight. Indeed, questions remain surrounding the existence of a conceptualization of literary dialects. Cassio has argued that literary dialectology was not a separate concept in the minds of ancient grammarians, but rather they assumed the linguistic features taken from poetry reflected the origins or realities of local dialects. There is some evidence, for example, that such considerations partially

---

169 Plato Phaedo 62a, where the introduction of the speech of Boeotian Cebes is marked by a dialect exclamation (Ἴττω Ζεύς, τῇ αὐτοῦ φωνῇ εἶπον). In Hellenica 4.4.10 the Laconian Pasimachus also opens his speech, the entire first sentence of which is rendered in Laconian, with the exclamation Ἀλλὰ ναὶ τὸ σῶ; see the same expression, followed in this case by Attic, at Anabasis 6.6.34. Bonner 1909 collects further examples of dialect features in Classical prose works.

170 On the glossographic tradition see Latte 1925 and Dyck 1987. Plato’s use of dialect features in etymologizing in his Cratylus led Latte 1925, 158-60 to suggest that the philosopher had at his disposal a work, possibly by the Ionian Heraclitus, which collected corresponding features between dialects.

171 Thucydides (7.63.3) represents the other side of the coin: Nicias encourages his sailors who are resident aliens to battle resolutely for Athens since their knowledge of Attic has offered them the prestige of Athenian citizen which they in fact lack.

172 Colvin 2004. The Athenian distaste for Boeotian, with which it shared the phonological isogloss of ττ for σσ, is attested in Pindar O. 6.90, where the poet comments on the disparaging image of his fellow Boeotians as pigs, and Strattis PCG 49 in which the speaker ridicules Thebans for the name they used (ὀπιτθοτίλαν) for cuttlefish (σηπίαν).

173 διάλεκτον ἔχοντα μέσην πόλεως οὐ’ ἀστείαν ὑποθηλυτέραν οὐ’ ἄνελεθόρον ὑπαγριφωτέραν (“he has the standard language of the city, not the effeminate urban speech, nor the clownish servile speech.”)

motivated Hellenistic and Roman-era works on Homeric dialectology. These works sought to connect the epic bard to specific regions or cities for purposes of prestige through dialectal features shared across Homer and the local dialect of the city in question. The possibility of Alexandrian editorial intervention into the text of Alcman, through the incorporation of more Laconian color into his literary language, may attest to the conceptual overlap between literary and regional dialects.

Marked differences, however, between literary and epichoric dialects would suggest that a difference was recognized. Classical period studies of Homeric language, such as Democritus’ Περὶ ὸμήρου ἡ ὀρθοεπείης καὶ γλωσσάων, whose title suggests an investigation into Homeric forms considered difficult or foreign, perhaps included discussion of dialect features.175 Yet it must be admitted that beyond possible glossographic treatments of literary language, no contemporary discussions of literary dialects are known. By the third century BCE, however, the development of broad dialect categories (Doric, Ionic, Attic, Aeolic),176 statements about proper dialect usage in literature such as that in Callimachus Iambi 13 (influenced by Aristotle’s discussion of lexis in the Poetics; see discussion in chapter 2), and later in the Hellenistic period Tauriscus’s inclusion of dialect in one of his three branches (τὸ τριβικόν) of literary criticism (Sextus Empiricus Adv. math. 1.248-249)177 demonstrate a growing recognition of the difference between epichoric and literary dialects, which may have its roots in the late Classical period.

Although treatment of non-Greek language in Archaic and Classical poetry is well documented from Hipponax, Timotheus, and Aristophanes, references to the linguistic diversity

175 B20a D-K. Also intriguing is Antisthenes’ Περὶ διάλεκτου to which no fragments can be securely assigned. Nevertheless, despite his interest language, it is unlikely that Antisthenes wrote a treatment of literary dialects, since διάλεκτος does not appear as a technical term for the linguistic diversity of Greek until the third century BCE (at the earliest); see Morpurgo Davies 2002.
176 See Morpurgo Davies 2002 and further discussion in chapter two.
177 See discussion of passage at Asmis 1992, 140.
of Greek speakers in non-dramatic poetry are quite rare.\textsuperscript{178} In the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo}, the narrator of the hymn describes how the maidens at Delos know how to imitate the voices and the rattling chatter (?) of all peoples (πάντων δ’ ἀνθρώπων φωνάς καὶ κρεμβαλλαστῶν | μιμεῖσθ’ ἵσασιν).\textsuperscript{179} The imitation of different φωναί on the part of the Delian maidens may refer to their ability to sing songs in a number of dialects,\textsuperscript{180} although the use of φωνή could equally refer to different languages.\textsuperscript{181} Solon (36.8-12 W), in a similar vein as the Old Oligarch, comments that those Athenians, who were forced into exile on account of debts, returned to the city with a diminished capacity to speak in Attic.\textsuperscript{182} Despite the recognition of dialect variety, it does not translate to the linguistic choices of the texts themselves. The author of the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} retains the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic, leaving the possible dialect mixture of the Delian maidens’ songs to the imagination; nor does Solon incorporate dialect features foreign to the Ionic of Archaic elegy, or more importantly change Ionic to regular Attic forms, as markers of the compromised language of the exiled Athenians.

\textsuperscript{178} Hipponax incorporates vocabulary from Lydian sources; see Hawkins 2013. In his \textit{Persians} (150-61) Timotheus renders the direct speech of a Phrygian in pidgin Greek; for discussion of the linguistic features, see Colvin 1999, 56 for a succinct discussion of the linguistic features. On foreigner speech in Aristophanes, see Brixhe 1988 and Willi 2003, 198-225 with bibliography.

\textsuperscript{179} The text is that of Allen 1912; there remains editorial disagreement on the form of the second object of μιμεῖσθ’ with some several scholars, including the 2003 edition of the \textit{Homeric Hymns} by West, preferring the variant βαμβαλλαστῶν (ET: κρεμβαλλαστῶν Λ’ΠΔ), understanding the \textit{hapax}, likely derived from βαμβαλύζω, to be an onomatopoeic term related to the Delian maid’s ability to mimic foreign speech; however the meaning of both variants—κρεμβαλλαστῶν and βαμβαλλαστῶν—are unclear. For an exhaustive and incisive discussion of the textual problem, see Peponi 2009, 41-51.

\textsuperscript{180} On this interpretation of φωνή, see Colvin 1999, 46 and Halliwell 2002, 18 and n. 43.

\textsuperscript{181} The view of Schwabl 1962, 17 and others.

\textsuperscript{182} πολλοὶς δ’ Ἀθήνας πατρίδ’ ἐς θεόκτιτον ἀνήγαγον πραθέντας, ἄλλον ἐκδίκος, ἄλλον δικαίος, τοὺς δ’ ἀναγκαῖς ὑπὸ χρεούς φυγόντας, γλῶσσαν οὐκέτ’ Ἀττικὴν ἤντας, ὡς δὴ πολλάκητ’ πλανωμένους

(“And I guided back to their established fatherland many Athenians having been sold into slavery, one illegally and another rightfully so, and others who fled on account of the force of necessity, no longer speaking the Attic language (γλῶσσαν), like those who travel to many places.”)

It is unlikely the fact that this statement is rendered in Ionic is significant.
What, then, of the employment of dialect when a character or subject speaks or a reference is made to a location whose regional dialect traits are at odds with the base dialect of the poem in which it is situated? Epic, the poetic type with the highest percentage of reported speech, is completely lacking in the use of dialect to mark the regional language variety of the Greek force. All Greek characters speak in the same artificial literary dialect as the framing narrative.¹⁸³ Foreigner speech is also undifferentiated: the Trojans and Greeks speak in the same language. Homeric epic’s influence on later conceptions of what defined good poetry likely had a significant effect on the use of dialect markers in reported speech, since there appears to be no surviving instances of this practice outside of Aristophanic comedy. The voice of lyric and elegiac poetry is often the “I” of the poet and dialect choice here is governed, as we have already seen, to a significant degree by literary convention. As discussed above, Pindar is very careful to avoid the inclusion of features from his native Boeotia, even when he composes odes for Boeotian patrons or features myths associated with the Boeotian landscape.¹⁸⁴

Although Pindar avoids Boeotianisms, several other Archaic and Classical poets—Tyrtaeus and Aristophanes—do employ dialect as linguistic markers of regional associations. In each of these examples the admixture of regionally significant dialect features enriches the meaning or rhetoric of the passage or larger work in which the poet purposefully incorporated them. The following discussion is organized chronologically, beginning with Tyrtaeus and dialect as a marker of Archaic Spartan identity and then turning more briefly to dialect and foreigner speech on the Athenian comic stage in Aristophanes. I conclude with an examination

¹⁸³ In a discussion of the absence of dialect use as a marker of regional differences among the Greeks at Troy, Colvin 1999, 41-42 comments on a passage that possibly alludes to a recognition of the dialect diversity of Greek speaking people. At Od. 19.172-7 Odysseus comments on the variety of populations on Crete, which results in a mixture of languages (γλώσσα μεμιμένη).

¹⁸⁴ An anonymous Doric lyric fragment, considered by some to be Pindaric, contains the Doris severior genitive singular ending in –ω (fr. 333a. 6 and 8 Maehler: Πυθαγγέλω and Ὅρχομενό) that is foreign to the literary Doric of Pindar (see Nöthiger 1971, 78), but, as Cassio 2002, 62 observes, “very appropriate for a Boeotian laudandus and a Boeotian place-name.”
of an early reception of the practice of dialect as a meaningful marker of regional associations in Plato’s famous reading of Simonides’ “Ode to Pittacus” in his Protagoras. This passage provides evidence, I argue, for the possibility of such readings I have advanced for Tyrtaeus and Aristophanes in (at the latest) the Classical period.

Apart from a general Ionic color similar to the poetic language of works attributed to contemporary elegists such as Callinus, the verses of the Archaic elegist Tyrtaeus of Sparta include some Doric features. Archaic elegy was a type of song, an oral-poetic tradition that spread from Ionia to the mainland along with symposium culture, which was likely the primary site for its original performance occasion. As a product of oral performance the language of Archaic elegy was subject to modification up to and during the process of its commitment to papyrus, which likely first occurred in the fifth century BCE. As these works were collected and studied in the Hellenistic period they would have received further editorial treatment. Under such editorial pressures it is common to find linguistic features considered non-standard removed through regularization and, conversely, features considered exemplative stressed. Since the poetic tradition associated Archaic elegy with Ionic, there is a possibility that the verses attributed to the historical figure of Tyrtaeus originally included more Doric color than was found acceptable by later performers and editors as the generic conventions of dialect ossified. All the surviving Doric forms are metrically guaranteed, ensuring their originality and thus making them resistant to later correction. Even if the songs of Tyrtaeus admitted more Doric features than attested in the textual records of the Spartan and the other contemporary elegists,

185 For the conception of poetry, and more specifically Archaic elegy, as song, see Nagy 1985, Nagy 1996, 1-4; and Bowie 1986, 14-15.
186 Bowie 1986. Based on evidence internal to the elegies, West 1971, 10-13 proposed a series of performance contexts. One cannot discount such occasions as locations for reperformance.
187 For the latter, see Cassio 1993c (Callimachus) and Palumbo Stracca 2003 (Posidippus) on hyperdorisms, likely inserted into texts in the Hellenistic period, and Cassio 2009 on the anachronistic Doricisms present in the text of Alcman.
the linguistic environment of his elegies was undoubtedly an unmarked Ionic.\footnote{For the linguistic composition of Archaic elegy, see West 1971.} So while we may not be able to judge the degree of marked Doric forms in Tyrtaeus, the Doric forms that do survive are used in a discernable pattern that justifies a literary treatment. Tyrtaeus, I argue, incorporated Doric in those poetic moments when Spartan superiority—military and civic—was at issue.

The speaker of a fragmentary exhortatory elegy (19W) that survives in a third-century BCE papyrus marshals a group of Spartan soldiers for battle. The fragment opens with mention of βροτολογὸς Ἀρης, a collocation also found in Homeric epic.\footnote{e.g. \textit{Il.} 5.31; 5.455; 12.130; \textit{Od.} 8.115.} Here Tyrtaeus likely used Ares’ wrath and rampage in battle as a model for the Spartan soldiers. The Spartan origin of the soldiers is not assumed from Tyrtaean authorship alone: at line 8 the poet names Spartan tribes—the Pampyli and Hylleis—\footnote{The presence of ἕδε at the break in the papyrus suggests that a third tribe follows, and most editions print Δυμάνες.}—from which the soldiers are drawn. These soldiers, along with the speaker, are the subject of the future first person plural verbs in lines 11 and 12.

\begin{verbatim}
[...]

στρεμ. ἡμεῖς πεισόμεθ᾽ ἡγεμόνι
c. ἄλλ᾽ εὐθὺς σύμπαντες ἀλοιπόσεο[μεν] 

…………we will obey the general
but immediately as a group we will crush (them)
\end{verbatim}

Having envisioned the complete loyalty of the soldiers to the cause (l. 11: πεισόμεθ᾽ ἡγεμόνι), in line 12 the speaker turns to the battle before them and stresses that as a group (σύμπαντες) they will crush (ἀλοιπόσεο[μεν] the enemy. There follows a description of the battlefield melee.

\[\text{ἀλοιπόσεο[μεν] line 12 is a so-called Doric future and is metrically guaranteed by its position in the hexameter—synizesis of the form produces a long syllable where the Ionic ending}\]
cannot.\textsuperscript{191} Although the sigmatic future in –se– does appear in certain groups of Attic verbs (those with the sequence –ϝυ),\textsuperscript{192} it is a general characteristic of West Greek dialects and should be treated as one in this context. Metrical convenience remains a possible explanation for the presence of the form and the absence of the future form in the preceding line (πεισόµεθα) may add further support; however, this is the only instance of the Doric future in Tyrtæus, and if metrical necessity were the sole motivating factor in its introduction we might expect to find the practice repeated elsewhere.

Consideration of the feature beyond its metrical sedes reveals a literary effect quite welcome in an exhortatory context. The imagined battlefield of the symposium in which exhortatory elegiac compositions may have been performed provided a space for elite male self-fashioning as Homeric heroes set to fight for their fatherland.\textsuperscript{193} It is within this environment of “epic role-playing”, to use the language of Elizabeth Irwin, characteristic of exhortatory elegy that the use of ἀλοιησέοµεν creates meaning. Although the papyrus does not preserve the beginning or conclusion of the elegy, the Doric ἀλοιησέοµεν, nonetheless, seems to appear at a significant turning point in the movement of the imagined battlefield speech: our speaker, having cited Ares’ martial prowess as heroic precedent, directs his words to the collective body of Spartan soldiers and conjures an image of them as a united force entering the fray. It is quite possible that this description of battlefield prowess was the climax of the exhortation. Would it not then be rhetorically effective and, perhaps, emotionally engaging for the speaker to use a Doric form (one not foreign to Laconian)? When stressing the need for collective accountability

\textsuperscript{191} The papyrus witness shows ἀλοιησέοµεν. Since the resolution of the diphthong εο to ευ is not attested until the fourth century BCE, the contraction is certainly a later editorial intervention. This contraction is ambiguously Ionic or Doric (koine influence would have resulted in ου), so one cannot ascertain whether the editor incorporated the diphthong in order to ionicize the form, in fitting with the predominating dialect, or to underscore the Doric origins of the sigmatic future in –se–.

\textsuperscript{192} See Walker 1894.

\textsuperscript{193} See Irwin 2005, 15-64.
and action Tyrtaeus creates a linguistic link between the imagined landscape of the Spartan battle line, filled with Doric-tinged shouts of encouragement, and the symposium of elite Spartan males who envision themselves in that exact heroic position.

A second feature associated with Doric literary dialect found in the text of Tyrtaeus is the short scansion of the accusative plural in α-stem nouns.\(^\text{194}\) The short –άς accusative appears three times in Tyrtaeus (4.5W; 7.1W; and 20.14W) and each precedes a vowel so that it is metrically guaranteed. With one possible exception, long –άς accusative before a vowel is not attested.\(^\text{195}\) The feature has metrical utility, which we cannot discount while trying to understand this dialectal anomaly, but when other patterns emerge that can possibly have a literary explanation it is prudent to provide an accounting. As regards short –άς, two of the three terms in which the feature appears—δεσπότης and δηµότης—are absent in Homer and Hesiod and otherwise do not fit the hexameter except in the vocative singular. Un-Homeric, then, in both diction and linguistic composition, the presence of these forms in a poetic type that draws heavily on epic language, style, and themes suggests that their usage is possibly poetic in purpose. These two terms—ruler (δεσπότης) and citizen (δηµότης)—are part of the political vocabulary of the polis. In Spartan society, in particular, the position of ruler and citizen was both valued and contentious given the status of the Messenian helots. The Doric coloring of δεσπότης and δηµότης appears in words used of Spartan rulers and citizens. In 4W, an important source for the Spartan rhetra,

\(^{194}\) Short accusative plurals in -άς appear in Alcman (PMG 10b.15), Steischorus (PMG 222b.247), an inscriptional epigram ascribed in manuscripts to Simonides (CEG 131 [480 BCE]=Simonides 11 G-P), a Rhodian chelidonismos (PMG 848), and throughout Epicharmus. Cassio 2009, 200-201 notes that in the papyri of archaic lyric poets and Epicharmus the scribes consistently mark all accusative plurals in –άς as long even if they are followed by a consonant. The short accusative appears in variation with the long (regular) accusative plural in Hesiod. The Doric origins of the Hesiodic examples are contested. Morpugo Davies 1964 argues that these forms are the survival of archaism from an early stage of the Greek language in the oral poetry of the Hesiodic tradition. In a response to Morpugo Davies, Wyatt 1966 concludes that the origin of the feature is most likely to be found in literary traditions from Boeotia or Northwest Greece; Cassio 2009, 200-201 suggest the influence of Doric poetic traditions, likely lyric, on the form’s presence in Hesiod.

\(^{195}\) The poorly preserved sequence μαντείασαν at 2.4W.
Tyrtaeus recounts how the Pythian oracle divined the constitutional process at Sparta in which the citizens (5: δηµότας ἄνδρας) are to provide just counsel to the king and his elders. 7W describes the proscribed act of mourning all Messenians must offer for their deceased Spartan masters (1: δεσπότας). Consequently, Tyrtaeus’ inclusion of terminology that is foreign to epic and unwelcome (in their non-Doric form) to the metrical shape of elegiacs may have to do with the political resonances this language had in elite Spartan society. 196

The force of these readings are attenuated by the notion that if Tyrtaeus harnessed the local dialect of his audience in order to make his martial elegy more emotionally engaging or rhetorically effective, one would expect to find more examples of the practice. In response I note that the lack of notable Doric features, such as α for η, could be a function of scribal regularization. The substitution of η for α is a metrical equivalency, and the same goes for other markers of Doric such as first-person plural active ending in –µεν (compared to –µες) or third person plural active ending in –οντι (compared to –ουσι). While the examples discussed above are metrically guaranteed, nevertheless, it cannot be proven that these dialect forms are not the result of errors or interventions in the transmission. When, however, plausible literary interpretations can be applied to a non-standard dialect form, especially in patterns of dialect usage, as we have found in with the short accusative in –ᾱς, we are justified in offering a literary accounting of the usage. Because their polymorphism is in neither instance marked and the Doric features recall the original performance context of the songs, I have chosen to approach the usage of these forms from the position that their appearance has motivations beyond the purely

196 Admittedly the third example of the short accusative in -ᾱς (χαίτας ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς) is not so easily intelligible in the reading of the forms I advance above. 20W is quite fragmentary, but from what does survive it appears to be an exhortation to success in a pitched battle. It has been posited that the “hair above the head” may reference the mane of a cavalry horse, based on the mention of a chariot in line 12, or the plume of a battle helmet. Without a clear understanding of the context it is difficult to say what literary effect might be garnered from the use of the Doric short accusative in χαίτας, and it is possible that it could be a metrical convenience or a general epicism. That does not, however, detract from the reading of δηµότας or δεσπότας, whose content and context unite the two terms to an extent not found with χαίτας.
metrical. That said, with any phenomenon present in a poorly attested author, our understanding of these features and their poetic effects must remain preliminary.

The comedies of Aristophanes are populated by a number of foreign characters, non-Attic Greeks and non-Greeks alike. It has long been recognized that Aristophanes regularly marks the speech of these non-Attic characters, and his use of dialect has received the most sustained and theoretically informed treatments of all Classical poets. Accordingly, I the discussion of Aristophanes’ artistic use of dialect will be brief, centering on two important recent contributions to the topic. The extended passages of epichoric dialect in the direct speech of characters from Sparta, Megara, and Boeotia is unprecedented in extant literature, dramatic and non-dramatic, prior to Aristophanes. Incorporation of dialect imitation is in part for comic effect. Aristophanes often draws on Athenian cultural associations of other poleis—Boeotians are gluttonous and dimwitted and Spartan women are objects of sexual desire—for easy laughs and the close association in the classical Greek mind between language and ethnic identity can then be exploited to similar effect. That said, Aristophanic comedy does not bear out Kaibel’s assertion that “den Athenern erschienen ja alle anderen Dialekt (ausser dem ionischen) als lächerlich und halb barbarisch klingend.” Aside from some punning of dialect lexemes, Aristophanes never exploits dialect on its own for comic effects. In other words, there are no scenes, as Colvin has recognized, where an Athenian cannot understand the speech of a non-Athenian or the statement

---

197 The opposite is the case in tragedy. The great majority of characters are from non-Attic speaking regions of the Greek world and yet character speech is not differentiated by dialect usage. There are some examples wherein a character announces s/he will speak in another dialect, for example Orestes in the Choephoroi comments that he will speak in Phocian upon entering the palace in disguise; however Aeschylus’ text does not follow through on the claim, although it is possible that in performance an actor may effected an accent. Nevertheless, it appears that for tragic conventions stating that one spoke in a different dialect sufficed. The fragmentary remains of Sicilian comedy greatly hinder our knowledge of the relationship between language use and character. Bits of Ionic colored lines survive among the fragments (here I am only counting those that are not clearly borrowing from the traditional poetic idiom of Homeric epic), as for example Epicharmus fr. 115 K-Α (πολλοὶ στατῆρες, ἀποδοτῆρες οὐδὲ ἄνει), which suggest that Epicharmus may have reproduced the speech of non-Doric speakers in his comedies in a similar fashion to Aristophanes; see Cassio 2002, 57.

198 Important studies include Colvin 1999; Willi 2002; and Willi 2003.

199 Kaibel 1896, 991.
of a non-Athenian in their native dialect precipitates confusion. Thus, while the Boeotian accent may have contributed to the more generalized humor derived from Athenian stereotypes of Boeotians, the Boeotian dialect is not itself intrinsically comic in the same way as the pidgin Greek of the Scythian archer in the *Thesmophoriazusae* or the “Persian” of the ambassador in the *Acharnians*, which is played for outright laughs.

In fact, Aristophanic reproductions of non-Attic dialects are close imitations of Laconian, Megarian, and Boeotian based on what we know from contemporary inscriptive evidence. Such attention to linguistic detail would appear to bear little fruit in terms of comic effect. Dramatic realism, a notable component of the comic stage, is likely a significant influence on the verisimilitude of Aristophanic dialect imitation. Linguistic realism has the capacity to effect a range of emotions beyond amusement. Andreas Willi has considered the possible impact certain negative emotional responses to non-Attic dialect could create. The three dialects that receive the most extensive treatment in Aristophanes—Laconian, Boeotian, and Megarian—belong to the avowed enemies of Athens. Laconian, in particular, likely provoked negative emotional responses in an Athenian audience, considering Spartan aggression at the heart of the Peloponnesian war and the aforementioned link between dialect and ethnic identity. And yet the *Lysistrata*, in which Laconian speech is most prominent, is a peace play that imagines the reconciliation of Athens and Sparta. Reading this dialect choice within the dramatic discourse of political rapprochement, Willi comments on how Aristophanes transforms the use of Laconian from over the course of the play. When the sex strike is first conceived, a conspiracy against patriarchal *polis* society, Laconian is present in the strident voice of the Spartan Lampito, a

---

200 Colvin 1999, 303. On the mutual intelligibility of dialects in the fifth and fourth centuries, see Bonner 1909.
prominent advocate of the protest. Laconian, then, is presented at the outset as the language of transgressive thought and actions. By the play’s conclusion, however, when the strike has worked and produced a peace agreement between Athens and Sparta, the dialect now appears in the celebratory song of the Laconian women (an actual chorus of Athenian males). Initially polarizing in its ethnic associations, Doric has evolved a linguistic choice that articulates a unexpected and newfound unity.\(^{204}\) Dialect imitation in Aristophanes is, then, not only for laughs. During periods of intense conflict, such as the Peloponnesian War, the cultural impact of language takes on a heightened role. The language one chooses to speak can make a person an ally or an enemy. In this environment, as Willi has suggestively demonstrated, Aristophanes also uses dialect in an effort to invite his Athenian audience members, when confronted with an argument for future peace, to reconsider the negative emotions they associate with Laconian and its Spartan speakers.

Plato’s *Protagoras* offers a fascinating glimpse of the reception of dialect mixture in pre-Hellenistic Greece. Through the quotation and discussion of the language and style of Simonides’ “Ode for Scopas”, Socrates and the sophist Protagoras debate concerning the meaning and intellectual value of the song, which engages with the thought of the Mytilenean sage Pittacus. The exegesis of the Simonides’ text begins with Protagoras who asserts that the “most important part of a man’s education is being clever concerning verse.” What Protagoras means by this is the ability to distinguish what a poet says well from what he says poorly and to provide evidence when challenged. Next Protagoras demonstrates critical acuity in relation to poetry (\(\piερι\ \dot{\epsilon}πων\ \deltaεινόν\)) when he quotes a section of Simonides’ lyric in which the poet claims

\(^{204}\) Willi 2002, 141: “While the plot of *Lysistrata* invites rational reflection about the integration of the enemy as a friend, Aristophanes’ use of the enemy’s dialect is a linguistic trick to support this integration on an emotional level.”
that to become truly good is hard. Protagoras argues that later in this same poem Simonides
contradicts himself when he states (339c-4):

οὐδὲ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον νέμεται, καίτοι σοφὸ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰρημένον·
χαλεπὸν φάτ’ ἐσθλὸν ἐμμεναι.

The saying of Pittacus is not fitly thought through in my view, even
though spoken by a sage man; he said that it was hard to be good.

In response Socrates first attempts to reconcile the two statements through recourse to linguistic
distinctions between “becoming” (Simonides) and “being” (Pittacus): to become good, in the
words of Simonides, is quite difficult, however being good, in the words of Pittacus, is less
arduous. Leaving aside points of linguistic contention (Protagoras in the meanwhile has accepted
Socrates’ differentiation of “becoming” and “being”), Socrates enters upon fuller treatment of
the song, in which he attempts to locate a purpose that directs and unifies the statements
contained within the poem. The poet’s purpose, according to Socrates, is to contradict the saying
of the sage Pittacus and in doing so gain intellectual fame for himself (343c).

It is in the process of refutation that Socrates quotes three lines of Simonides’ poem,
which are of particular interest for our discussion (345d-5):

πάντας δ’ ἐπαίνημι καὶ φιλέω
ἐκὼν ὅστις ἐρδη
μηδὲν αἰσχρόν· ἀνάγκη δ’ οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.

But I praise and love everyone
who willingly commits
no baseness; for the gods do not make war against necessity.

Modern scholars question some of Socrates’ interpretive claims in his discussion of this passage,
such as the assertion that Simonides meant for ἐκὼν to be read in hyperbaton with ἐπαίνημι so as

205 Text from the OCT of Burnet.
to avoid the idea that man would do wrong willingly—a notion that is in contravention of Socratic thought on human virtue.\footnote{For Socrates’ argument on reading ἐκών in hyperbaton with ἐπαίνημι and φιλέω see 345d6-46b5. Scholars have long noted the strained aspects of this argument—Taylor 1976, 146 calls it a “blatant perversion of the plain sense of the poem”—and have then understood this passage as yet another parody of sophistic close reading on the part of Socrates as he undertakes, conversely, the more serious attempt to redeem Simonides by aligning his thought on human nature to his own. See Ledbetter 2003, 108: “The particularly Socratic views that Socrates claims to discover in Simonides’ poem are the provisional products of Socratic inquiry, subject to revision and modification. For the dialectical, and the comic purposes of this interpretation, however, Socrates allows himself to appear to hold them dogmatically and to aim solely to establish consonance between his own views and those of a traditionally respected poet. This is Socrates at his ironic best...”}

This example, among others, has lead to a conventional understanding of Socrates’ close reading as a critique of sophistic poetic criticism.\footnote{See Ledbetter 2003, 100 n.2 for a bibliographic survey of this opinion.} Whether this is the case or not—and recently scholars have begun to argue that Socrates’ interpretation is serious\footnote{Ledbetter 2003, 98-118 argues that through Socrates’ often overreaching sophistic argumentation Plato indirectly (101) “draws the outlines of what a truly Socratic interpretation would look like.” On this point, see also Ford 2011.}—the arguments Socrates offers provide a glimpse into the types of interpretive approaches to poetry fashionable in the second half of the fifth century. At the conclusion of his interpretation, in which he summarizes the thrust of Simonides’ criticism of Pittacus’ understanding of human virtue, Socrates pauses to consider briefly the presence of the Aeolic verb ἐπαίνημι in the passage quoted above (346d3-347a1).\footnote{Translation adapted from Taylor 1976.}

καὶ οὐ ἐξίτω, ἔφη, πανάμωμον ἄνθρωπον, εὕρειδοὺς ὅσοι καρπὸν αἰνύμεθα χθονὸς, ἐπὶ θ’ ὑμῖν εὐρὼν ἀπαγγέλεω· ὡςτε τοῦτον γ’ ἐνέκα οὐδένα ἐπαινέσομαι, ἀλλὰ μοι ἔξαρκεί ἂν ἡ μέσος καὶ μηδὲν κακὸν ποιή, ὡς ἐγὼ πάντας φιλέω καὶ ἐπαίνημι—καὶ τῇ φωνῇ ἐνταῦθα κέχρηται τῇ τῶν Μυτιληναίων, ὡς πρὸς Πιττακὸν λέγου τὸ πάντας δὲ ἐπαίνημι καὶ φιλέω ἐκὼν—ἐνταῦθα δὲι ἐν τῷ ἐκὼν διαλαβεῖν λέγοντα—ὁστὶς ἔρδη μηδὲν αἰσχρόν, ἄκον δ’ ἔστιν οὐς ἐγὼ ἐπαίνημι καὶ φιλέω. σὲ οὖν, καὶ εἰ μέσως ἔλεγες ἐπιεικῆ καὶ ἠληθῆ, ὥς Πιττακὲ, οὐκ ἂν ποτε ἐψεγον·

“I do not seek”, he says, “an utterly blameless man, among all those who reap the fruit of broad earth, and when I find him I shall tell you. “So for this reason at least I won’t praise anyone; it is enough for me if he is in between and does no evil, for I praise and love all”—and here he uses the Mytilenean dialect, since it is against Pittacus that he says, “I praise and love all willingly”—it’s there, at “willingly”, that one must divide the phrase—“who do nothing shameful, but there are some whom I praise and love against my
will. So if you Pittacus, said what was even partly right and true, I would never find fault with you.”

Simonides chose to use this form, a feature of the Mytilenean dialect, because his censure of Pittacus continues to the end of the poem: I, Simonides, praise (ἐπαινημένοι) men who do nothing shameful; however, Pittacus, since you claim to speak the truth about virtue when you are in fact falsifying, you are worthy only of blame. Simonides the praise poet adopts the language of Pittacus the sage only to underscore the distance between those worthy of praise and blame-deserving Pittacus.

The effectiveness of Socrates’ reading to the modern view is open to debate; nevertheless, the passage has great value as a testimonium about possible contemporary interpretations of dialect usage, polemics against sophistry aside.210 Although certainty is impossible, examination of the context of dialect mixture strongly suggests that the poets of the second half of the fifth century and fourth century BCE, who were by no means isolated from the intellectual movements of the period, had begun to develop their own poetic of dialect usage. In short, the value of Simonides’ “Ode to Scopas” to the study of dialect mixture in pre-Hellenistic poetry is as a hermeneutics of dialect in Classical Greece. It provides a tantalizing glimpse of the developing technical approach to poetic criticism, one that included a sensitivity to the potential of dialect choice and mixture in the generation of poetic meaning.

210 Taylor 1976, 147 rejects the reading: “Since words in this dialect [Aeolic] occur frequently in lyric, the use of an Aeolic word here gives no reason to suppose that Simonides intends any reference to Pittacus at this point in the poem.” Poltera 1997, 513 recognizes, unlike Taylor, the rarity of the form in Simonides’ literary language, but seeks an explication of the form through recourse to intertextuality with Hesiod.
Erinna: a Hellenistic Precedent

Poetics and poetic criticism brings us to our final example for the developing literary significance of dialect choice and mixture in the Archaic and Classical periods. Much admired for its slender size (300 hexameter lines), refined style, and linguistic and generic experimentation, Erinna’s *Distaff* (mid-to-late fourth century BCE) exerted a significant influence on the style and poetics of the early Hellenistic period. In the combination of hexametric poetry and Homeric diction with language that creates the occasion of maidenly folksongs, funereal lament, and wedding song, scholars have found inspiration for the *Hymns* of Callimachus and certain of Theocritus’ hexametric *Idylls*, particularly *Id.* 28 (“Distaff”). Erinna’s dialect choice may have partially inspired the Doric of Callimachus *Hymn* 5 (to Athena), to which some scholars attribute a mimetic effect meant to evoke the imagined Argive performance context, the Doric hexameter songs of Theocritus, and the Aeolicisms in *Id.* 28.

Given the apparent influence of Erinna’s dialect choice on Hellenistic poets, it is important to examine its roots and possible function in the *Distaff* itself. The Suda, our earliest...

---

211 Only fifty-four, often partial hexameters of the *Distaff* survive (*PSI* 1090 = SH 401); testimony to its overall length comes from an anonymous and undatable, but likely late Hellenistic or early imperial, epigram (*A.P.* 9.190) and 300 lines has becomes the accepted standard.

212 Erinna’s exact dating is difficult to pinpoint, but the scholarly consensus is that she was active sometime in the mid-fourth century BCE as reported by Eusebius. Asclepiades’ epigram (G-P 28 = *A.P.* 7.11) on Erinna provides a *terminus ante quem*. For discussion, see Levin 1962, 193-94; Scholz 1973; and Neri 2003, 42-46.

213 On the relationship between the Doric and the mimetic quality of the hymn, see Bulloch 1985, 26 (Hopkinson 1984, 44 notes the coincidence but does not consider it a major factor in the dialect choice of either Doric hymn). Parsons 2011, 144 also adopts this view. *Hymn* 6 (to Demeter), the other Doricized poem, does not mention a specific performance context from which we can successfully extrapolate a sense of place to the dialect choice; however that does not mean would should reject such an effect. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1907, 16 viewed the dialect as a reflection of Callimachus’ native Cyrenaic, an idea that was pursued further by Ruijgh 1984 for Callimachus and Theocritus, but has been rightly met with a skeptical response (see Molinos Tejada 1990 and Abbenes 1995). Clayman 2014, 80 has suggested that the use of Doric in these *Hymns* has the effect, in part, of “keep[ing] Berenike [II] in mind as the poems go forward,” since the Queen was, like Callimachus, a native Cyrene. The problem with this line of interpretation is that neither poem is addressed directly to Berenike II, so unlike an epigram in Doric on the beauty of queen, which may indeed find its motivation in her native origins, here I cannot follow Clayman’s reading.

214 See Bowra 1933, 183; Hunter 1996, 15-17.
comment on the dialect of the *Distaff*, noted the use of Doric and Aeolic forms (*ποίημα δὲ ἔστιν Ἀιοκικῆ καὶ Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ*). From the papyrological evidence, Doric is the predominant dialect color of the *Distaff*. The majority of Doric forms are common to the artificial literary Doric known from earlier choral lyric poetry. They include: α for the reflect of inherited *ā*; the contract of α + ε to η; the genitive plural of α-stem nouns in -άν; first person plural personal active ending in –μες; thematic infinites in –ήν; the second person pronoun τύ; ποτί for πρός; and τόκα for τότε. Two other Doric forms are more restricted in their epigraphic attestations, the compensatory lengthening following the loss of a postconsonantal digamma (l. 3: κῶρα) and τῆνος for (ἐ)κένος (e.g. l. 24), but are not in literary Doric. The Aeolic features attested in the surviving verses are much more limited: geminate νν from intervocalic σν (e.g. χελύννα [ll. 5,7, 16]; σελάννα [l. 6]); athematic conjugation of contract verbs (l.18: γόη μι); and the diphthongization of the vowel preceding secondary –ns in the feminine participles in –οισα and –εισα (e.g. l.31: κατακλαίοισι; l. 18: στονάχεισα). All three forms are attested in Lesbian and given the associations Erinna draws between her own poetry and Sappho’s, to which we will return, these forms have been interpreted as such. By the time Erinna was composing verse in the fourth century, however, the feminine participle in –οισα (as well as other forms in –οισα), and to a lesser degree in –εισα, had entered into the literary Doric of choral lyric under the influence of Pindar. Given the suitability of this form to both Doric and Aeolic literary dialects, I do not believe this form should be construed as a marked Aeolicism, as previous scholars have interpreted it, within the larger dialect context of the *Distaff*.

---

215 Neri 2003, 521-58 is the most complete discussion of Erinna’s dialect usage; see also Latte 1953 and Donando 1972.

216 Verdier 1972.
The dialect of Erinna’s Distaff has been a topic of scholarly discussion since the publication of PSI 1090.\textsuperscript{217} Based on the biographical sketch of Erinna as a nineteen year old maiden from the small Doric-speaking east Aegean island of Telos, which is the most often cited place of origin for the poet,\textsuperscript{218} some scholars have naively assumed that Erinna, given her age and sex, could only have composed verses in her native dialect, despite its seeming clash with the traditional use of Ionic in hexametric poetry. In his controversial edition of PSI 1090, West attempted to locate a literary purpose in the association between her dialect and identity, observing that “the Doric element is meant to convey that she is an ordinary person, a homely little Telian maid, not a Μουσάων θεράπαιν᾽ ὀτρηρή.”\textsuperscript{219} I do not agree with West that the use of an artificial version of one’s likely native dialect lent a sense of ordinariness to the poem; he injects value judgments where none are needed. Rather the use of a dialect that recalls the poet’s native speech works in concert with Erinna’s creation of a sense of occasion, in the maidenly “tortoise” game and her lament, to inject a sense of realism to the hexametric song (and here would should locate possibly the influence of Erinna on the use of Doric in Callimachus Hymns 5 and 6), and this realism undoubtedly aided in the production of pathos for the poet’s grief. The Doric also has literary resonance, especially as it relates to the tradition of laments composed by the likes of Pindar and Simonides.\textsuperscript{220} By placing her localized female lyric voice, marked out by

\textsuperscript{217} Important studies include Cervelli 1952; Latte 1953; Levin 1962; Donado 1972; Scholtz 1973; West 1977; Neri 2003; and Levaniouk 2008.

\textsuperscript{218} Other island locations include Tenos (Ionic), Rhodes (Doric), and Lesbos (Aeolic), the latter given the presence of Aeolic features associated with Lesbian poetry. For discussion, see Neri 2003, 38-42.

\textsuperscript{219} West 1977, 117.

\textsuperscript{220} On the similarity between the composition of Erinna’s Doric coloring and the language of Archaic and Classical choral lyric, see Cervelli 1952, 206-209; Hunter 1996, 16; Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 29; and Neri 2003, 525-26.
its Doric color, into a hexametric structure used to celebrate male heroes, Erinna draws attention to and possibly valorizes the grief she feels for her friend Baucis.\textsuperscript{221}

Conventionally, the Aeolicisms have been treated as a studied evocation of Sappho,\textsuperscript{222} and indeed scholars have demonstrated Erinna’s knowledge of and close engagement with the Lesbian’s poetry.\textsuperscript{223} Recently, Olga Levaniouk, within a wider discussion of the generic blending of lament and wedding song in the \textit{Distaff}, has argued that use of Doric with the admixture of Aeolic forms has its antecedent in the poorly attested, but early hexametric poetry “of small occasional genres, especially prayers, processional songs, hymenaia, and threnoi.”\textsuperscript{224} Levaniouk casts a wide net in order to create a tradition of Doric-Aeolic hexameters and, ultimately, I do not think the evidence supports the claims. Her strongest argument for an antecedent to the dialect combination we find in Erinna comes from Sappho’s hexametric fragments. These verses were used for wedding songs, and are transmitted in a “toned-down Lesbian,” which would share many, but not all, qualities with literary Doric.\textsuperscript{225} Levaniouk is not, however, the first scholar to recognize the relationship between the hexametric structure, wedding motifs, and dialect color of the \textit{Distaff} and the fragments of Sappho’s wedding songs.\textsuperscript{226}

It is not surprising that Erinna, as a female poet, would wish to incorporate Sappho into the \textit{Distaff}, and in doing so concomitantly incorporate herself into the Sapphic poetic tradition, where she would ultimately rank as a rival to the Lesbian poet in hexameters. And indeed while

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{221} While not commenting on the dialect of the \textit{Distaff}, Gutzwiller 2007a, 37 correctly observed that Erinna “in writing a woman’s lament for the death of another woman, had shown how the hexameter line and even Homeric diction could be used differently, to express emotions traditionally confined to subliterary songs by grieving women.” Gutzwiller’s stress on the subliterary should reinforce the connection between dialect choice and local speech, since it is likely such songs would be sung in the local dialect.
\item \textsuperscript{222} Wilamowitz 1924, 2.109 n.2 was the first to comment on the connection between the Aeolicisms and Sappho, ultimately asserting that the reliance was unconscious (West 1977, 116 n.37 rejects the latter claim); see also Latte 1953, 82; West 1977, 117; Arthur 1980, 65; Cavallini 1991, 129; Hunter 1996, 16; and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 29. Neri 2003, 524 n. 18 provides a complete list of treatments.
\item \textsuperscript{223} e.g., Rauk 1989.
\item \textsuperscript{224} Levaniouk 2008, 224.
\item \textsuperscript{225} Levaniouk 2008, 221.
\item \textsuperscript{226} e.g., Arthur 1980, 65 and Hunter 1996, 16; and Fantuzzi in Hunter and Fantuzzi 2004, 29.
\end{itemize}
the Aeolicisms evoke Sappho, we must not discount the role the large Doric color of the poem plays in this process. Starting with Sappho and continuing with Corinna and Erinna we find an association between a female poet’s dialect usage and her native speech. In choosing Doric, then, Erinna may well be further establishing herself in the Sapphic tradition, and such a scenario appears to play out, as we shall find, in the dialect choice of the epigrammatist Nossis.

Because of the fragmentary state of the Distaff, it is difficult to say anything conclusively about the admixture of Aeolicisms beyond a general appeal to the association with Sappho. As such, the dialect variance is akin to the more pointed poetic commentary found in Ibycus and Aristophanes. Recognizing the limitations present in the text, of which only a fragmentary sixth survives, I would likely to briefly consider the distribution of the marked Aeolic forms (not counting feminine participles in –οισα and –εισα), which interestingly cluster in the report of the maidenly game of “tortoise.” Bowra was the first to recognize that the first eighteen lines of the papyri, which contain some of the most fragmentary sections, likely had something to do with the “tortoise” game. One girl, taking on the part of the “tortoise,” would sit at the center of a group of girls who would chant a three verse call-and-respond song, upon the completing of which the “tortoise” would jump up and try to chase down a girl to take her spot. A version of the song is quoted in Pollux (9.113), which has marked similarities of diction with this part of the Distaff. As quoted the song includes several Doric forms (λευκᾶν and ἅλατο, both of which appear in a line ascribed to the girl playing the tortoise).

On the strained assumption that the mimetic quality of the children’s song must extend to the dialect use to represent that song, Cervelli incorrectly reasoned that the presence of

---

227 Bowra 1933, 180-85 and accepted since by most commentators. Michelazzo Magrini 1975, adopting an interpretation first suggested by Edmonds 1938, has argued that the reference to a χελόννα is an allusion to the lyre, the instrument to which laments and weddings song were played.
Aeolicisms meant that Erinna was Lesbian not Telian, as favored by most scholars. West hinted at a similar explanation for the Aeolic forms when he proposed the supplement of the unattested Aeolic name Πελαννα, one of Erinna’s playmates, for ἄννα in line 12 which is more likely σελαννα a repetition of the Aeolic form from line 6 that accords nicely with the use of anaphora throughout the poem. That we find these Aeolicisms within the context of a seemingly standardized and well-known folksong might suggest that a prior literary treatment, perhaps by Sappho, stands behind the dialect variance, but such an assumption is unprovable. What is rather more clear, however, is the thematic cohesion between the song of the tortoise game, which Hutchinson notes “involved a play with bereavement,” and the lens of Baucis’ death through which Erinna recounts the game. As a “replica in miniature of the poem itself,” it is apposite that this childish folksong should share in the same type of dialect composition that defined the entire poetic project in its mixture of linguistic features that marry local realism with poetic erudition. Just as with the Hellenistic poets she inspired, in Erinna’s able hands the dialect combination resonates on multiple levels, injecting the occasions portrayed in the poem with a realism all while laying bare her refined crossing of genres in the interweaving of choral lyric, hexametric wedding songs, folksongs, and epic.

Conclusions

The composite nature of the literary languages of pre-Hellenistic poetry has a long and varied history. The origins of early practitioners, audience expectations, reperformance abroad,
and contact with other literary traditions have all helped shape the literary dialects we encounter in authors such as Hesiod, Stesichorus, Tyrtaeus, Pindar, and Aristophanes. Literary conventions established, to a certain degree, expectations of dialect usage in the poetic types of this period. That said, authors experimented within the bounds of these literary conventions in order to carve out their own space in relation to the tradition. As I have shown, in the case of lyric poetry, Stesichorus’ epicizing lyrics suggest a self-conscious response to Sicily’s location on the linguistic and cultural periphery of the Greek world, and the greatly increased usage of non-epic Aeolicisms in Pindar may reflect, among other possibilities, a modernizing turn. Consideration of Aristophanes’ tendency to modulate the dialect coloring (and tone) of his choral lyrics between Attic and Attic with an admixture of Doric and epic features, more consistent with the composite language of choral song, in passages that often have a parodic function raised the question of whether pre-Hellenistic authors utilized dialect admixture to comment on their own work’s relationship to other poetic traditions. Ibycus’ use of Aeolic Μοίσαι in his densely allusive rejection of the epic tradition of divine poetic inspiration is a clear indicator that dialect choice had the potential for metapoetic commentary, and dialect admixture in the parody of other more “serious” genres does appear, from examples in Aristophanes and Sicilian comedy, to be part of the comic repertoire of fifth century BCE.

Dialect choice and usage invariably has sociolinguistic implications, and this is especially the case in the ancient Greek world where dialect and ethnicity were linked. While literary convention dictated dialect mixture to a great degree, authors did harness the cultural associations between dialect and ethnic/regional identity for poetic effect. Tyrtaeus incorporates Doric features into the Ionic base of his elegies at moments in his poetry where notions of Spartan cultural identity come to the fore, as, for example, in imagined battle line speeches
rousing soldiers for the defense of the fatherland or in narratives of Spartan civic hegemony. Aristophanes never fails to reproduce the native dialect of his non-Attic speakers. Humor is, of course, part of the intended effect—laughter at the speech of the Other—but the emotional potency of language in times of ethnic and regional conflict transcends simple amusement. In the case *Lysistrata*, Aristophanes’ use of the Laconian dialect in the speech of the politically dangerous Lampito and in the graceful song of reconciliation at the work’s conclusion problematizes for an Athenian audience their conception of Sparta as state enemy *par excellence*. Finally, Socrates’ treatment of Aeolic ἐπαίνημι in Simonides’ “Ode to Scopas” demonstrates that by the fifth century critical evaluation of the linguistic composition of a poem included consideration of non-standard dialect features as signifiers of poetic meaning. Simonides’ decision to render the verb for “praise” in Aeolic, a form foreign to the literary language of his Doric lyrics, was read as a rebuke of Mytilenean Pittacus, whom Simonides does not include among those he offers praise (ἐπαίνημι καὶ φιλέω) because he willingly makes false statements concerning the nature of goodness.

There is evidence, then, for a developing sensitivity to the poetic effects available to a poet through the admixture of dialect features beginning in the archaic period. From the fifth century the strength of evidence increases; the *testimonial* of Socrates’ treatment of Simonides’ “Ode to Scopas” in the *Protagoras* demonstrates that dialect choice was becoming part of a technical approach to poetic criticism. Finally, Erinna’s *Distaff* used Doric with an admixture of Aeolic features to vivify the imagined local occasion of lament on Doric Telos as well as to acknowledge the synthesis of lyric and other occasional poetry inside her hexameters, a practice they had a significant influence on Hellenistic aesthetics. The focus of my dissertation allows only a survey of the material, but even these results suggest that our understanding of dialect
choice in the pre-Hellenistic period as solely conditioned by literary conventions demands reappraisal.
Chapter 2: Literary-Critical Discourses on Dialect

Whether Plato constructed Socrates’ comment on Simonides’ dialect choice in the *Protagoras* as a parody of sophistic approaches to literature is unclear, but the presence of the discourse suggests that dialect was a subject of literary analysis in the fourth century, thus raising larger questions concerning the literary-critical evaluations of dialect mixture as a poetic practice. Indeed, the late Classical and Hellenistic periods witnessed the development of professionalized literary criticism of the sort whose function and limits Plato interrogated in his dialogue. Scholar-critics edited texts, established canons, and directed researches into the Greek language. These activities had an important impact on contemporary views on the literary past. While other concerns such as genre took center-stage, the conceptualization of the boundaries of poetic languages, including dialects, also had a place in literary-critical discourse. To gain a proper understanding of the practices of dialect mixture present in Hellenistic book epigram, it is essential first to evaluate what we know of ancient critical discourses on poetic language. That several of the epigrammatists whose poems we shall discuss in the second half of this study were also actively engaged in the articulation of these critical discourses underscores the necessity for such an investigation.

In what follows, I present the evidence for literary-critical treatments of dialect as a productive component of poetic language, which results in the identification of three strands of thought on dialect, ranging from the endorsement of dialect mixture and juxtaposition to the complete avoidance of the practice. I will treat the following as major representatives of these three strands: a) Aristotle, Philitas and Callimachus; b) the nameless, fictional critic of *Iambus* 13 and the Platonic poetics that lie behind this figure; and c) the euphonists. These literary-critical
treatments of dialect admixture are, I show, intrinsically linked to conceptions of genre. Callimachus bases his dialect admixture on the practice of earlier poets; every poetic type, as we have seen, admits a degree of mixture. In contrast, other critics, likely influenced by a contemporary scholarly compulsion to organize and categorize earlier Greek literature on the basis of formal attributes, engaged in rule making that equated each literary genre with a “pure” dialect based on the dialect associated with the putative founder of the poetic type or the region from which the poetic type was thought to have originated. Euphonists apparently ignored the influence of dialect, along with other formalist trappings as criteria for good poetry in favor of word choice, order of words and phrases, and the sound quality produced from these. Since dialect has no stylistic effect on the organization of lines of verse, dialect mixture did not detract from a poem, but at the same time it did not add to the judgment of its poetic value either.

The Terminology for Dialect

Before I turn to an examination of the three strands of literary-critical responses to dialect mixture, it is imperative to discuss the ancient Greek terminology for “dialect.” A fully realized conception of the major dialect groups did not exist before the third century BCE (at the earliest); nor did a specialized terminology to refer to dialect in particular. The absence of technical language, however, does not suggest a concomitant absence of conceptualizations of language difference. Prior to the this time, authors used semantically expansive words or phrases, such as γλώσσα (“tongue” or “language”) and ξενικόν ὄνομα (“foreign/strange word or name”), when making apparent references to language difference among Greeks. Drawing on such language,

---

232 Essential literature on the development of the Greek conception of dialect include: Münz 1921; Ax 1978; Consani 1991a; Cassio 1993b; and Morpurgo Davies 2002.
Herodotus and Thucydides both comment on the linguistic variety of the Greek language. In the context of a discussion of the failed peace treaty between the Ionians and the Persian king Cyrus, Herodotus (1.142) digress on the climactic and linguistic nature of Ionia, noting that the Ionians speak four different types (τρόπους) of Greek (γλώσσα), which is differentiated across cities.233 While recounting the harrowing Athenian rout of the Ambraciot forces, Thucydides narrates (3.112) the treacherous maneuver of the Athenian commander Demosthenes to capture an Ambraciot position by filling the vanguard of his troops with Messenians who shared the same Dorian language (Δωρίδα...γλώσσαν) with the enemy target.234 In these two passages we can see the seeds of the notion of dialect, while still recognizing that the differentiation in speech between various Ionians or between Athenians and Messenians is couched in ethnic terms, unsurprising considering the close link in the Greek mind between language and ethnicity, rather than regional/geographic terms associated with the modern (i.e. from the Hellenistic period onwards) notion of dialect. The historians’ use of γλώσσα, the common term for “speech” or “language”, demonstrates we are in a period that predates the formation of technical language for linguistic difference.

γλώσσα, while still used to refer to “speech” or “language” in general, takes on a more...

233 Hist. 1.142: Γλώσσαν δε ου την αυτην ουτοι νενομικασα, άλλα τρόπους τέσσερας παραγωγέων. Μίλητος μεν αυτον πρότη κειται πόλει πρός μεσαμβρινη, μετα δε Μυος τε και Πριηνη- αυτη μεν ον τη Καρη κατοικηναι κατα ταυτα διαλεγομεναι σφηται. Αιδε δε ον τη Λυδιη. "Εφεσος, Κολοφων, Λέβεδος, Τεως, Καλζομεναι, Φοκαι- αυτη δε αι πόλεις θε θρετον λεγεσθητη ομολογηουσι κατα γλωσσαν ουδεν, σφησι δε ομοφωνοντοσι. "Ετι δε τρεις υπόλουοι Ιάδες πόλεις, τον αι δυο μεν νήσους οικηται, Σάμιον τε και Χιων, ή δε μία ον τη ηπειρω ιδρυται, Ερυθραι- Χιοι μεν νον και Ερυθραιοι κατα τωνα διαλεγονται, Σάμιοι δε έπι έσωτον μουνοι. Ουτοι χαρακτηρες γλωσσης τέσσερες γίνονται. ("They do not all make use of the same speech, but four different dialects. Miletus lies farthest south among them, and next to it come Myus and Priene; these are the settlements in Caria, and they use a common language; Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedos, Teos, Klastomene, Phocia, all of them being located in Lydia, have a language in common, which is wholly different from the speech of the three aforementioned cities. Yet there are three Ionian cities, two of them situate on the islands of Samos and Chios, and one, Erythrae, on the mainland; The Chians and Erythreans speak alike, but the Samians have a language which is there own and none other’s. Theses are the four types of speech."") Adapted from the Loeb translation of A.D. Godley.)

234 και γαρ τοις Μεσσηνιους πρωτους επιτηδες ο Δημοσθενης προβατει και προσαγερειν εκελευν, Δωρίδα τε γλωσαν έναντα και τοις προφυλαξει πατιν παρεχομενους... ("For Demosthenes had purposefully arrayed the Messenians at the front and ordered them to call out, using their Doric speech and offering trust to the advance guard...")
technical meaning in Aristotle’s Poetics. Driven by a desire for classification, Aristotle applies this perspective to poetic language. Among the components of poetic language Aristotle includes γλώσσα, which he defines in the Poetics and Rhetoric as an umbrella term for rare or difficult words in need of explication. The philosopher includes under this heading terms that should be clearly recognized as dialect lexemes. The term διάλεκτος, which will later become the terminus technicus for dialect, usually refers broadly to speech or language in the fourth century BCE, but one usage in Aristotle interestingly presages its later reference to regional linguistic variety. In a discussion of the φωνή (“voice”) of different animals (which unlike humans animals do not have διάλεκτος (“language”); Hist. Anim. 536b1-14), Aristotle observes that “articulate sound” (ἡ [sc. φωνή] δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄρθροις), which could be considered a διάλεκτος (ὡν ἄν τις ὀσπέρ διάλεκτον ἐπιέειν), can differ within the same species due to the effects of their differing physical locations: some partridges, in Aristotles’ example, cackle (κακκαβίζουσιν) while others twitter (τρίζουσιν). So while Aristotle does not have a specific term for dialect words, nevertheless he recognizes the presence of regional linguistic difference, and his definition of γλώσσα includes within it a conception of dialect.

235 Rh. 1410b12: οἱ μὲν οὖν γλώσσαι ἄγνωτες, τὰ δὲ κόρα ήσμεν (“Some words are obscure, but we known the proper ones.”) At Po. 1457b5-6 Aristotle defines γλώσσα by using the example of a dialect lexeme, σύγγον which is Cypriot word for spear; in his definition of γλώσσα in the Rh. 1406a7 none of the example terms listed are specifically dialect words. The definition of γλώσσα in this capacity pre-dates Aristotle; cf. the fragment from Aristophanes’ Daitales (PCG 233) in which one character demands that another consult the Ὄμηρου γλώσσας in order to research the usage of rare or obsolete terms. The philosopher Democritus’ work (DK 68B 20a1) entitled Περὶ Ὄμηρου ᾗ ὀρθοσετής καὶ γλώσσασιν (Siebenborn 1976, 17 argues for the deletion of ἤ) was likely similar to the work referred to in Aristophanes; see Pfeiffer 1968, 42 and Classen 1976, 243-46. Since nothing survives of this work we do not know if Democritus treated dialect lexemes in his discussion of Homeric γλώσσαι. A definition of γλώσσαι as obsolete or antiquated words is attested only in a statement of Galen (19.66 Kühn): ἡ γλώσσα παλαιῶν ἐστὶν ὄνομα τῆς συνεπτής ἐκπέπτωκός (“the glossa is an ancient word having fallen out of custom.”); see Lebek 1969, 57-58 n.3 and 64-65.

236 On terms for language, including διάλεκτος, in Aristotle, see Ax 1978 and Melazzo 2004.

237 HA 536b9-14: Διαφέρουσι δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους καὶ αἱ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ διάλεκτοι. Ἡ μὲν οὖν φωνὴ δεξύτητι καὶ βαρύτητι μᾶλλον ἐπιδήλως, τὸ δ’ εἶδος οὐδὲν διαφέρει τῶν αὐτῶν γενόν· ἡ δ’ ἐν τοῖς ἄρθροις, ἦν ἄν τις ὀσπέρ διάλεκτον ἐπέειν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζῶν διαφέρει καὶ τῶν ἐν ταύτῳ γένει ζῶν κατὰ τοὺς τόπους, ὅπως τῶν περίδικον οἱ μὲν κακκαβίζουσιν οἱ δὲ τρίζουσιν. (“Voices and speech differ according to location. The voice is very much distinguished by sharpness and pitch, and its nature does not differ among the selfsame race. But articulate sound, which someone might speak of as a type of language, differs among different animals and also within the same race of animals according to location, so that some of the partridges cackle and others make a shrill noise.”)
Philosophy of language also contributed to the development of a notion of dialect. In the *Cratylus*, a dialogue on the form of nouns and nature of language, Plato introduces a new term for dialect that more explicitly points to the regional orientation of this linguistic phenomenon. In the course of employing non-Attic dialect forms to complete certain etymological arguments, which comprise the primary object of discourse, Socrates and his interlocutors refer to these dialect lexmes as ξενικά ὄνόματα, since they are “foreign” to the speakers’ native Attic dialect. ὄνομα is itself a technical term in Platonic discourse, referring to names or nouns in contrast to ρῆμα (“expressions”), and so we find Plato here attempting to develop a technical vocabulary for the recognized phenomenon of regional linguistic diversity. Plato’s Athenocentric understanding of linguistic variety as a collection of “foreign” words is not altogether remarkable. It is equally unsurprising, then, that we observe the use of a term like ξενικός for linguistic diversity replaced by more neutral terminology in the more cosmopolitan and open Hellenistic world.

διάλεκτος, the Greek *technicus terminus* for linguistic variety, is first defined as such in a quotation ascribed to the Stoic philosopher Diogenes of Babylon (fl. early second century BCE) by Diogenes Laertius in his life of Zenon (7.56=SVF III. 213.10-12):

διάλεκτος δὲ ἔστι λέξις κεχαραγμένη ἑθνικῶς τε καὶ Ἑλληνικῶς, ἢ λέξις ποιητή, τούτους ποιὰ κατὰ διάλεκτον, οἷον κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἀττιδα θάλαττα, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰάδα ήμέρη.

Dialect is a form of speech marked ethnically and hellenically, or a form from a certain place, that is to say such a sort according to a dialect, for example θάλαττα (“sea”) in accordance with the Attic dialect and ήμέρη (“day”) in accordance with the Ionic dialect.

---

238 e.g. *Cra.* 401b-c on the etymology of the name of the goddess Hestia, wherein Socrates wishes to demonstrate that the goddess’ name is associated with “being”; he notes that in one dialect οὐσία is rendered as ἐσσία, whose form is rather close to Hestia.

239 Diogenes is traditionally dated from 240-150 BCE. Cicero (*De Sen.* 7.23) notes that Diogenes made a visit to Rome in 155 BCE. Lucian *Macr.* 20 states he lived well into old age and died in his 88th year. Dorandi 1991, 29-34, after Obbink and Vander Waerdt 1991, 356 n. 8, has argued for a down dating of Diogenes’ death to the late 140’s BCE based on the chronologies of his students Panaetius, Mnesarchus, and Dardanus.
While the exact meaning of the first part of the definition in relation to the use of διάλεκτος to designate non-Greek languages has elicited a number of interpretations, the second half of the definition almost certainly demonstrates that Diogenes of Babylon used διάλεκτος to refer to the concept of regional linguistic variations within a language.\(^{240}\)

This definition of διάλεκτος likely did not originate with Diogenes of Babylon. As evidence for an early Hellenistic precursor to Diogenes’ conception of διάλεκτος, Morpurgo Davies cites a fragment from the third-century BCE historian Heracleides Criticus. Commenting on the associations between ethnicity and language, Criticus discusses the differences between Athenians, Dorians, and Aeolians, adopting the mythical ethnic divisions first articulated in a fragment of Hesiod (9 M-W).\(^{241}\)

"Ελληνες μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν τῶι γένει καὶ ταῖς φωναῖς ἐλληνίζουσιν ἀρ’ Ἕλληνος· Ἀθηναιοὶ δὲ οἱ τῆν Ἀττικὴν κατοικοῦντες Ἀττικὸι μὲν εἰσιν τῶι γένει, ταῖς δὲ διαλέκτοις ἀττικίζουσιν, ὡσπερ Δωρικὸς μὲν οἱ ἀπὸ Δώρου τῆς φωνῆς δωρίζουσιν, Αἰολίζουσι δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ Αἰόλου, Ιάζουσι δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰονος τοῦ Ξουθου φύντες. (BNJ 369A F3)

Hellens are those in race descended from and speaking the Hellenic language from Hellen; Athenians, inhabiting Attica, are Attic in race and speak Attic with respect to their speech (ταῖς διαλέκτοις), just as the Dorians speak in Doric from the language of Doros, and those descended from Aiolos speak Aeolic, and those from Ion, son of Xouthos, speak Ionic.

---

\(^{240}\) On the various interpretations of this passage, see Consani 1991b with bibliography. Later uses of διάλεκτος to refer to dialect as regional varieties of a language are found in Strabo 8.2.1(Münz 1921), and in the titles of e.g., Dionysius Iambus (Περὶ διαλέκτων), Crates of Athens (Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου), and Demetrius Ixion (Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείων διαλέκτου), all taken from the list in Tosi 1994, 209; see also Latte 1925, 166 n.58 and Cassio 1993b, 85-6.

\(^{241}\) Morpurgo Davies 2002, 161-3. Ax (1986, 100 n. 126 and 201) considers the passage from Diogenes Laertius as the first to reflect a notion of dialect that comes close to our modern definitions of the term. For her part, Morpurgo Davies (2002, 162-3) acknowledges that “dialect may not be the right rendering” in this context and that the classification in this passage of Heracleides “is largely done on ethnic rather than on linguistic bases.”
The D Scholia on the *Iliad* may offer further evidence for διάλεκτος as terminology for language variety in the third century. The significant portion of the D Scholia that consists of lexicographical glosses of uncommon words or phrases represents its oldest segments.242 These entries mirror the marginal glosses found in first-century CE papyrus texts of the *Iliad* and the earlier Alexandrian glossographic tradition. Scholars consider the Worterklärungen sections of the D Scholia to have originally derived from a pre-Alexandrian interpretive tradition.243 Among the lexicographical material in the D Scholia are glosses of word forms considered by the scholiast (sometimes incorrectly) to derive from particular dialects. In a number of instances, the scholiast glosses the dialect form with the term διάλεκτος.244 Although the origins of the D Scholia are diverse and the scholia do not, as a rule, preserve the terminology of their earlier sources, the relative consistency of this terminology and the connection of the lexicographic portions of the scholia to a long-standing tradition again plausibly suggest, at the minimum, that διάλεκτος contained the meaning of “dialect” in the early Hellenistic period.

For most, if not all, of the Hellenistic period there existed a conception of dialect in the sense of a variety of language defined by regional or ethnic differences; the term that referred to this linguistic phenomenon was διάλεκτος. Prior to this period, recognition of linguistic variety, while not yet systematized or exposed to detailed study, existed; however the language for this linguistic phenomenon lacked a technical sophistication. It was not until the Hellenistic age, when the confluence of an increased interest in the linguistic diversity of the Greek world and the
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242  van Thiel 2000, 5-6.
243  On the pre-Hellenistic origins of these Worterklärungen, see Henrichs 1971, 99-100 and van Thiel 2000, 2.
244  cf. e.g. 1.176 (Βασίλεων: Βασιλέων ἱὰς ἡ διάλεκτος); 5.331 (θεάων: θεόν θηλυκῶς, ἡ διάλεκτος Βοιωτῶν). One also finds the phrase κατὰ διάλεκτον employed for glosses of apparent peculiarities of Homeric diction, e.g. 1.10 (λαοί: ὄχλοι, λάκως κατὰ διάλεκτον οἱ λίθοι λέγονται). It is not clear if we should consider this usage to represent a conception of a Homeric “dialect”; it is safest to render διάλεκτος here as “speech” or “diction” and thus not partaking, like the other examples, in the sense of regional differentiation.
development of scholarly apparatus provided the intellectual environment for sustained investigations into the Greek language.

**Plato and Aristotle on Poetic Language**

Much of pre-Hellenistic literary criticism concerns itself with topics that do not directly touch upon poetic language. Critics judged poetry based on, *inter alia*, plot structure and characterization, and they engaged in discourse on the proper conception of poetic teleology. Leaving aside Socrates’ treatment of ἔπαινημι in the *Protagoras*, dialect does not receive any mention in literary-critical discourses before Aristotle. Even in the *Protagoras*, Socrates does not explicitly comment on the propriety of such a specific example of dialect mixture; rather Plato’s major criterion in the evaluation of poetry is the ability of the work to transmit effectively concepts and mental images that are a moral benefit for the listener and the wider community. All components of a poetic work, including diction and dialect, should ideally contribute to this moral utility. And yet mixture, in particular, appears to be anathema to Plato’s vision of poetic utility. In the *Laws* and *Republic*, for example, Plato condemns the mixture of rhythms, sounds, and voices in musical genres, for their aesthetic incongruities may well inspire moral deviance. Consequently, we are likely correct in assuming that Plato would equally critique dialect mixture since such a practice would also disrupt the social benefit provided by a specific genre.

In the realm of the nascent philosophy of language Plato does comment, as we have seen, on the different varieties of the Greek language and this recognition—and the quasi-technical language (ξενικὸν ὄνομα) with which he describes these non-Attic dialect lexemes—is an

245 In particular *Leg.* 669c-e and 700a-1b and *Rep.* 349b-98b.
important milestone in the ancient Greek conceptualization of dialect. When Plato, for example, employs dialect lexemes in the process of etymologization, he does not express any value judgment for a particular dialect in the course of his discussion. While a study of Plato’s use of dialect terms in the *Cratylus* would be fruitful addition to our understanding of the early history of dialectology, equally important is Plato’s decision to cite dialect glosses in the first place. The act of citation suggests that by the fourth century BCE dialect terms had begun to be collected for study.\(^{246}\) The scholarly motivations for such collections must remain obscure since we lack direct evidence of their composition or format. If, however, we suppose that the primary sources for these collections were likely literary texts (which is not at all implausible), this raises the possibility that the dialect composition of poetry was a topic of interest; what this interest entailed, however, is an open question.

The fascination with and collection of dialect lexemes brings us to Aristotle. Aristotle’s treatment of *lexis* in the *Poetics* is the first systematic discussion of the properties of poetic language. The first two chapters (20-21) on *lexis* treat the grammatical categories of Greek, and need not detain us here. At chapter 23 Aristotle turns to stylistics. He begins his discussion with the statement that excellent poetic diction is defined by a balance between clarity and an avoidance of banality (1458a18: λέξεως δὲ ἀρετῆ σαφῆ καὶ μὴ ταπεινῆν εἴναι). To accomplish the latter requirement, Aristotle advocates the incorporation of “exotic” (ξενικόν) figures (1458a2-23): loan/rare words (γλῶσσαι), metaphor (μεταφορά), lengthenings (ἐπέκτασις), and “everything that diverges from the standard” (πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸ κύριον). The first category of ξενικόν, γλῶσσαι, interests us in particular.

\(^{246}\) See Latte 1925, 159-161, especially 160 and footnote 47 where he suggests Plato had available to him earlier correspondence between dialects and posits specifically an (160) “ionische Vorgänger unter den Herakliteern.”
Traditionally translated as “loan or rare words”, γλῶσσαι was an umbrella term under which Aristotle included dialect lexemes whose rarity was due to the fact they were known from only one dialect, e.g. the example of the Cypriot dialect term for “shield” (σίγυνον). Dialect lexemes, as a piece of the larger group of rare words, are, for Aristotle, part of the fabric of effective poetic style. As with the other ornamental components of poetic lexis, Aristotle prescribes that the usage rate of γλῶσσαι should not be so great that their presence detracts from clarity (σαφῆ), which is the basis of proper poetic style.247 When Aristotle uses the term σαφῆ he refers to a style that exemplifies hellenismos, a clarity of design and literary technique, which for Attic tragedy would include the use of an elevated register of Attic.

Because the Poetics is aimed at an esoteric audience, Aristotle does not provide a clear and full definition of what he would view as “standard” poetic language. But one can assume, based on the requirement of σαφῆ, that it includes the notion that the base linguistic situation would be appropriate to the specified genre. And, since an overabundance of γλῶσσαι would corrupt the poem, Aristotle appears to describe the linguistic situation we find in Archaic and Classical poetry, where a base-dialect is enriched, to varying degrees, with linguistic features borrowed from other dialects or poetic types. Taken altogether, then, it is plausible that Aristotle does endorse, at least in the abstract, the mixing of dialects as a welcome component of proper poetic style.

247 Po. 1458a31-35: δεῖ ἄρα κεκράσθαι πως τούτοις· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὴ ἰδιωτικόν ποιήσει μηδὲ ταπεινόν, οἷον ἡ γλῶσσα καὶ ἡ μεταφορὰ καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ τάλλα τὰ εἰρημένα εἶδος, τὸ δὲ κύριον τὴν σαφήνειαν. (“It is necessary then to blend these components somehow: the one—loan words, metaphor, decoration, and the other classes enumerated—will result in something not ordinary nor banal, but the fitting terms will result in clarity.”)
The Glossographic Tradition

For much of the last half-century it has been common practice to situate a significant break in the history of ancient literary criticism between the death of Aristotle and the rise of the Alexandrian scholar-poet. On this view, prior to the third century BCE one cannot locate a product of scholarship that anticipates the critical works of Aristarchus and his kind. While it is true that there is no evidence of Aristotle editing a text, the intellectual dividing line scholars such as Garrod and Pfeiffer have envisioned between Aristotle and third-century BCE scholarship has recently undergone a reappraisal. The development of a glossographic tradition, various collections of rare words and dialect lexemes that make up the raw material of a portion of Aristotle’s definition of correct poetic language, is one area of Hellenistic scholarship that most readily displays Aristotelian influence.

The origins of the glossographic tradition in the Hellenistic period are linked to the intellectual world of the scholar-poet through the figure of Philitas of Cos. In addition to poetry which survives only in fragments but was greatly influential on Callimachus (among
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248 Most notable and influential are the statements of Pfeiffer 1968, 87 (“In the stupendous work of Aristotle the τέλος of the classical age was reached…) and 88 (“The relation of the new generation [Hellenistic scholar-poets] to the past was entirely different from that of Aristotle, the whole perspective of literary criticism was changed.”).
249 For example, Garrod 1946, 16: “Homer is not a scholar, nor yet Plato, nor even Aristotle…The contrast here with the Alexandrians, with whom, if there are any beginnings, scholarship begins, is real. The line which separates the ‘scholarship’ of Aristotle from that of Aristarchus is at once broader and deeper that that which divides Aristarchus and Bentley.”
250 Pfeiffer 1968, 71.
251 See Richardson 1994, in which the previous quotations of Garrod 1946 and Pfeiffer 1968 receive treatment, and a number of other articles from the same entretiens (Tosi 1994 on the lexicographic tradition is especially relevant to the current discussion) that provide evidence for a closer link between Aristotelian thought and Hellenistic scholarship than previously considered.
252 See Latte 1925; Dyck 1987; and Tosi 1994.
253 Glossographic collections or resources are mentioned in passages from Classical works or titles attributed to Classical authors; see n.1 on Aristophanes PCG 233 and Democritus’ glossographic research into Homer (68B 20a1 DK). Add to these the Γλῶτται of Clearchus, a student of the Peripatetic school, fr. 111 SA (=Schol. A. Homer. Ψ 81), although the authenticity of this attribution has been questioned. For discussion of the early history of this scholarly practice, see Latte 1925, 147-57 and Dyck 1987. On Philitas as scholar see the discussions in Pfeiffer 1968, 89-91; Tosi 1994, 144-49; Spanoudakis 2002, 384-95; and Bing 2003.
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others), Philitas, famously dubbed par excellence, composed a collection of miscellaneous rare words with accompanying erudite discussion.

Entitled Ἀτακτοὶ γλῶσσαι, the collection included a range of dialect lexemes. The meaning of ἄτακτοι in this context is obscure and so the form and organization the collection took remains uncertain. To the latter, alphabetical organization is unlikely in this period and we might entertain an organization in sections by authors or other topic headings. In terms of content, Philitas dedicated a good deal of space, based on the surviving fragments, to the discussion of obscure Homeric vocabulary. The playwrite Strato harnesses the collection’s emphasis on Homeric lexical exegesis for comic fodder, when in fragment of one of his comedies he has a master exclaim that he must consult τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα...βυβλία in order to understand the Homeric language in which his cook speaks (PCG 1.40-6).

Another area of scholarly interest to Philitas, and for the purposes of this discussion of the most importance, was dialect lexemes. Philitas glosses a wide-array of dialects in the

---

254 The appellation likely pre-dates Strabo; Kuchenmüller 1928 36 n.5 suggests that Strabo borrowed it from Demetrius of Scæpsis (ca. 200-150 BCE), a source of Strabo’s elsewhere, and who was described by Diogenes Laërtius (5.84) as a φιλόλογος ἄκρως in his own right.

255 Citations of fragments of the Ἀτακτοὶ γλῶσσαι and Philitas’ poetic works are based on the numbering in the edition and commentary of Spanoudakis 2002; see also Dettori 2000.

256 The title of Philitas’ glossographic collection is transmitted in the Scholia to Apollonius Rhodes (4.989i), and Athenaeus refers to the work several times as ἐν Ἀτάκτοις (fr. 31, 39, and 42 Spanoudakis). Von Blumenthal 1938, 2169 suggested that ἄτακτοι was chosen by Philitas to describe terms “die sich nicht einordnen lassen,” i.e. words whose definition varied across dialects. This interpretation is based on the use of ἄτακτος in this sense from Proclus In Euc. 220-21. Some dialect glosses do deal with the multiple meanings of a word across dialect; pace Von Blumenthal, Spanoudakis (2002, 385) notes that such a definition is not fitting for the majority of Homeric glosses and argues instead that ἄτακτοι is used to signal the miscellaneous content of the collection which sets it apart from the “near-contemporary Γλῶσσαι-collections confining themselves in one region or one author or literary genre.”

257 On the unlikeliness of alphabetical organization, see Wilson 1969, 368; however the next generation of glossographic texts, such as that by Zenodotus, the pupil of Philitas, employed alphabeticalization; Nikau 1972, 40-1. e.g., fr. 30 (ἀὐτόν, Od. 22.10); 33 (πέλλα, Il. 16.642); 37 (κρήϊον, Il. 5.99); 41 (ἰσθµιον, Od. 18.300).

Glossographic and lexicographic studies have their basis in Homeric exegesis; cf. the discussion of Aristophon fragment and Democritus title above. On the so-called “glossographoi”, see Lehrs 1882, who traces their origins to Classical Athenian classroom instruction, and Latte 1925, 148 n. 26 who is more vague on the chronology stating, in his opinion, that such glossographic practices recall “das voralexandrinische Anfangsstadium der Grammatik” and continued post-Aristarchus as well; pace Pfeiffer 1968, 79 who dates the practice not “before the later third century.” Dyck 1987 collects the fragments of the Hellenistic “glossographoi” and Tosi 1994, 143-78 offers a thorough survey of the evidence.
surviving fragments. Glosses are provided from Cyrenean, Syracusean, Megarian, Boeotian, Aeolian, Argive, Sicyonian, Lesbian, and possibly Laconian. The surviving dialect glosses were drawn from both literary and sub-literary sources. A few dialect glosses are related to the explication of rare Homeric terms, a practice which has its roots in Aristotle and his school. Since a number of the dialect glosses derive from regions with little or no history of poetic production, some scholars have proposed an interest in epichoric speech underlying Philitas’ dialect collection and, accordingly, have understood the Coan’s dialect sources to be primarily oral. While Philitas could have consulted acquaintances from different linguistic regions, the literature of the Classical period, especially monodic lyric, iambic, and Attic comedy, was a rich source of dialect terms. We should not underestimate the influence of dialect usage in literature on Philitas.

This brings us, next, to the motivation(s) behind Philitas’ decision to create such a collection and, more significantly, to dedicate ample space to dialect glosses. Homeric exegesis, as already mentioned, is one of the primary motivations behind the entirety of the glossographic and wider lexicographical traditions, and we have seen dialect factor into this hermeneutic practice. Still, Philitas also collected dialect glosses unrelated to Homeric language. This research possibly has its roots in contemporary factors such as the spread of the koine and the Peripatetic practice of scientific classification of natural phenomena along geographical lines.

Nevertheless, the Aristotelian interest in γλώσσαι as components of poetic language must have

259 fr. 31 (Megarian); 32 (Cyrenaic); 33 (Boeotian); 35 (Aeolian); 37 (Argive); 38 (Syracusean); 40 (Sicyonian); 42 (Lesbian).
261 For example, Aristotle Po. 1461a9-14 and Praxiphanes frs. 14, 21, and 23 SA; Spanoudakis 2002, 387. Later scholarship, exemplified by the Homeric scholia and glossographers, also employed dialects in the advancement of new or contrary definitions of poetic words; Latte 1925, 147-57 and Dyck 1987, 125-6.
262 Wilson 1969, 369; Lebek 1969, 64 n.4; and Tosi 1994, 205-8.
264 Influences of this variety were recognized as early as Latte 1925, 160-2. Wilson 1969, 369 observes that such investigations were an important step forward in the development of Greek dialectology.
loomed large in the mind of the Coan poet. It is quite reasonable to suspect, then, that the Ἄτακτοι γλώσσαι was conceived as a resource for contemporary poets in the composition of erudite poetry. Unfortunately, we cannot tell from the surviving composition of the collection, in what contexts Philitas would have approved of the use of particular dialect glosses (if he had any such opinion).

Dialect glosses, however, do appear in Philitas’ poetic fragments. The majority of these surviving dialect glosses derive from Doric dialects. One example is the Cyrenean gloss (Ὀκης) for ἔρυθρινος, a type of fish.265 There is no indication that the use of these glosses were restricted to Doric-based poetry; on the contrary, the surviving fragments indicate that Philitas composed primarily in an epicizing Ionic. Of course, we wish that we knew more about Philitas’ own poetic practices and the content and organization of the Ἄτακτοι γλώσσαι. The innovation hinted at in his poetic fragments, coupled with his interest in the rich variety of the Greek language, are at least consonant with an approach that allowed for admixture of dialect glosses. To the purpose of dialect mixture and the use of dialect glosses—whether to evoke a certain linguistic atmosphere or direct the reader to an allusion—we are unfortunately still in the dark.

The collection of dialect glosses continued throughout the third century BCE. We know of studies of this type given titles Ἐθνικαὶ γλώσσαι or Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις, whether as separate works or sections of large lexicographical researches, ascribed to important Alexandrian scholars such as Zenodotus, Callimachus, and Aristophanes of Byzantium.266 The surviving fragments of these works represent a developed interest in the documentation of local and spoken varieties of Greek. As was often the case in the Hellenistic period, where scholarly and artistic pursuits were

---

265 18 Spanoudakis: οὖν ὄκης ἱγθεὶς ἐσχάτος ἐξέφυγεν. (“the deep-sea hyces did not flee.”)
266 On Zenodotus, see Nickau 1972, 40-3 and Tosi 1994, 151-5; Callimachus cf. Wendel 1939, 508 and Pfeiffer 1968, 135; on Aristophanes of Byzantium, see Pfeiffer 1968, 202 and Tosi 1994, 166-7. We should also record the Περὶ ἀπαλάκτων of Aristophanes’ teacher Dionysius Iambus (Pfeiffer 1968, 171), and the Laconian glosses of Sosibius Laco (Weber 1887, 55-64).
closely intertwined, glossographic research left traces in the contemporary literature. Comments on the differences between various languages and dialect glosses appear in Hellenistic poetry, particularly in the context of local stories drawn from throughout the Greek world. Callimachus’ Aetia contains a number of dialect glosses, and some may remind the reader of the local context of the aetiological narrative, e.g. the use of ζάγκλον, the Sicilian word for sickle, in the telling of the foundation of Zancle whose name was supposedly derived from the term (fr. 43.71 Pfeiffer). The Cretan form of the name Ariadne (Ἀριήδης) in the Acontius and Cydippe narrative (fr. 67.13 Pfeiffer) recalls the origins of the deserted maiden, who in certain versions of the myth was left sleeping on Naxos, the native island of Cydippe.

Assessment of this interest in dialect glosses must take sociological and political factors into account. Investigations into linguistic variety and historical and poetic interest in local history originate in the same concern about the continuity and disruption of Greek identity in the wake of the expansion of the Greek world in this period. The geography of Callimachus’ Aetia engages with this process of expansion giving space to stories from the Eastern and Western bounds of Greek colonization as well as the mainland, thus uniting the present (since a number of the prominent locations are Ptolemaic holdings) with the past. In a similar fashion, these collections of dialect glosses, drawn from both colonies and famous foundations of Greek culture, brought together the language of the Greek world in one place. Beyond offering contextualization for the interest in local stories in Hellenistic poetry, these works are not,
however, a source for literary critical views on dialect usage and mixture; \textsuperscript{271} rather they represent a significant milestone in the history of Hellenistic dialectology, whose focus on the collection of epichoric dialect features extended into the first century BCE. \textsuperscript{272}

Collectively, discussions of and references to dialect in Plato, Aristotle, and Philitas, strongly suggest that dialect emerged as a topic of critical evaluation for poetic style during this period. Plato’s recourse to dialect forms in certain etymological arguments in the *Cratylus* and, later, Philitas’ incorporation of dialect lexemes in his Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι indicate a growing fascination with the linguistic variety of earlier and contemporary literature which was likely the source for the majority of these dialect forms. Aristotle, in the context of a wider discussion of poetic λέξις, offers an evaluation of the linguistic variety from which Plato and Philitas draw their individual dialect forms. Dialect forms, like other rare words, are an essential part of proper poetic language, provided that their deployment does not ultimately overwhelm the clarity of expression. Interest in rare and recherché language and the advocacy of a poetic language that admits linguistic ornamentation, including dialect mixture, foreshadows what we find in third-century poetry.

\textsuperscript{271} In a recent study of the dialect glosses from the Homeric scholia, Montanari 2012 suggests that the glossographic practice is part of a discourse on Aristarchus’ argument that Homer’s origins lie in Attica. The *scholia exegetica* attribute a vast array of dialects to Homeric diction, which Montanari (2012, 137) considers “si aggiunge all’idea generale non aristarchea di Omero origine,” while the glossographic testimony of the VMK generally supports the Aristarchean view of Homeric language as (137) “una forma arcaica di ionico dell’Attica, arricchita occasionalmente di elementi dialettali variegati e riconosciuti come glosse.”

\textsuperscript{272} See e.g., Neoptolemus of Parium’s Φρύγιαι Φωναί (*Ach. Tat. Isag.* 36.15 Maass); Crates of Athens’ Περὶ τῆς Ἄττικῆς διαλέκτου; Demetrius of Ixion’s Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείων διαλέκτου; and Demetrius Pyktes’ Περὶ διαλέκτων. See also Latte 1925, 164-5 with notes.
Callimachus *Iambus* 13: Two Opposing Strands of Critical Thought on Dialect Mixture

While collections of dialect glosses offer an instructive window into the early history of dialectology and the interface of this research with contemporary literary praxis, exceedingly valuable for our purposes are passages from ancient authors that comment explicitly on the conditions of language use and in particular the linguistic or poetic environments in which a certain dialect should be used. This type of discourse is known in modern linguistics as metapragmatics.\(^{273}\) Aristotle’s prescriptions on the proper components of poetic λέξις are metapragmatic in their own right, but only indirectly relate to notions of dialect usage.

The most significant metapragmatic statement on the literary use of dialect comes from one of the most influential literary minds of the third century. As previously mentioned in the introduction, in his thirteenth *Iambus*, Callimachus confronts criticisms directed at his iambic poetics, including the use of a variety of dialects in his collection of iambic poetry. *Iambus* 13 likely closed Callimachus’ inventive collection of iambic poetry, and consequently its content—on what it means to write iambic poetry and the poet’s fidelity to the poetic tradition—serves a clear programmatic function.\(^{274}\) Like the opening poem of the collection, *Iambus* 13 also centers upon an exchange between the poet and critics.\(^{275}\) That Callimachus chose to embed this

\(^{273}\) On the concept of metapragmatics see the discussion in Bublitz and Hübler 2007.

\(^{274}\) On the concluding position of *Iambus* 13 there has been much debate. The text of the *Diegesis* transmits four poems (frr. 226-9 Pfeiffer) between *Iambus* 13 and the beginning of the *Hecale* (Pfeiffer 1934). Horace’s *Epodes*, for which the *Iambi* was a model, are seventeen poems in number, which has led some scholars to suggest the same organizational scheme for the *Iambi*. My discussion does not require *Iambus* 13 to be understood as the concluding poem of the collection as much as the recognition that it and *Iambus* 1, in similarities of meter, dialect, speaker, and theme, create the sense response and closure when read together. On *Iambus* 13 as “essentially a summary of ideas and images which are developed in the preceding 12 poems” (7), see Clayman 1980, 11-47. For further discussion of the evidence, see also Dawson 1950 132-3; Ardizzoni 1963, 258-60; Clayman 1980, 52-54; Cameron 1995, 164-7; D’Alessio 1996, 45; Hunter 1997, 41; and Acosta-Hughes 2002, 10-13.

\(^{275}\) On the thematic relationship, united by the image of Hipponax, between *Iambus* 1 and *Iambus* 13, see the discussions in Clayman 1980, 44-47; Hunter 1997; and Acosta-Hughes 2002, 89-91.
metapragmatic discourse within his poetry necessarily complicates its reception as evidence for literary-critical treatments of dialect usage. The criticism leveled at Callimachus’ use of dialect is voiced by a critic of the poet’s own making. Thus a statement such as this can tell us a good deal about Callimachus’ view on dialect. It also can tell us something, I suggest, about other, oppositional discourses surrounding dialect. While recognizing that critic and criticism in *Iambus* 13 are fictionalized and serve a clear rhetorical purpose in Callimachus’ articulation of his own poetics, I also treat the views expressed by the critic as accurately reflecting a type of position held by contemporary critics. The critic does not likely represent any one historical individual, but it is equally unlikely, I think, that Callimachus would construct a straw-man, whose criticism have no relation to contemporary aesthetic discourse, as his combatant in an exchange of invective.

The opening ten lines of the poem are badly damaged, and when the text becomes clearer we encounter the voice of the nameless critic (203.11-22 Pfeiffer):

```
ἐκ χάρ ......[ . οὗτ'] "Ιωσὶ συμμεῖξας
οὗτ' ἑφεσον ἐλθὼν, Ἦτις ἔστι αὐτόμ.[
"Εφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες
tὰ χολὰ τίκτειν μη ἄμαθός ἐναύονται:
ἀλλ’ εἰ τι θυμόν ἤ πι γαστέρα πνεύμ.
```

---

276 Acosta-Hughes 2002, 76: “Callimachus’ aesthetic opponents, real or imagined, are here, as in the *Aetia* prologue, an artistic means for the poet to define himself...The critical voice is rather a means for the poet to play with the positions of invective.”
277 One tradition posits Herodas. As in the *Scholia Florentina* we find the Τελχίνες identified by Asclepiades, Posidippus, and Praxiphanes; see Clayman 1980, 47.
278 pace Hunter 1997, 43 who too eagerly dismisses the complaints of the critic; the critic’s “outburst has few roots in reality” and if his complaints over τὸ σύμμυκτον refer to the admixture of Aeolic features into the Doric of *Iambus* 7, which I do not accept, “then the ignorance of the utterance condemns itself.” Of course Callimachus shapes the reproaches of his critic (as they currently exist) in such a way to make the criticisms, and by extension the critic, founder under the weight of their own interpretation (cf. the perceptive readings of Acosta-Hughes 2002, 77-80). But making arguments look rhetorically foolish does not make their existence as features of an aesthetic discourse any less possible.
279 The *Diegesis* preserves the first line (Μοῦσαι καλὰ κάπολλον, ὦς ἐγὼ σπένδω) an invocation of the Muses that recalls *Iambus* 12. The presence of a first-person verbs here and in line 5 (διέπλευσα), repeated again in the latter portion of the poem that contains the poet’s self-defense, suggest that the poet is the speaker of the first ten lines; see Acosta-Hughes 2002, 70-74.
The critic reproaches the poet for his failure to properly use and imitate the model of Hipponactean choliambics in the composition of the *Iambi*. The first criticism leveled at the poet (lines 11-14) is that he has not traveled to Ephesus, the home city of Hipponax; this charge suggests the notion, on the part of the critic, that proper iambic poetry was context specific and “could not simply be moved wholesale to modern Alexandria.” The second criticism is aimed at the poet’s iambic *lexis* (lines 15-18). Hipponax composed in a strict Ionic and drew his language from the contemporary vernacular. Lines 16 and 17 are fragmentary. The mention of ἄρχαῖον in line 16 likely relates to the use of archaic or obsolescent diction. The juxtaposition

---

280 Translations of *Iambus* 13 adapted from Acosta-Hughes 2002.
281 Hunter 1997, 42.
282 On the language of Hipponax, see Hawkins 2013.
283 The reconstructions of ἀπαρηθεῖν (Pfeiffer 1949); ἀνάρηθεν (Platt 1910, 113); ἁμαρτηριῶν (Gallavotti 1946). Kerkheker 1999, 256-57 tentatively reads a π before the lacuna but does not offer a further reconstruction beyond the translation “rustic?” What Kerkheker considers to represent “rustic” language is obscure. He speaks of the influence of “Old Comedy,” but if this is the case, I do not see how the use of such language would be considered out of place by the critic; indeed iambic, which drew its diction from lower social registers, had a large influence on the language of Old Comedy (Rosen 1988).
of terminology for elevated (ἐµπέπλεκται) and low (λαλεύσει) poetic language in line 17 suggests 
a criticism directed at the variation of tonal registers. The critic concludes, at line 18, by 
commenting on the variety in the poet’s use of dialect that includes Ionic, Doric, and τὸ 
σύµµεικτον (“the mixed type”). Callimachus includes within the Iambi Ionic (1-5, 8, 10, 12, 
and 13) and Doric (6, 7, 9, 11) poems. The use of Doric as the base dialect of four poems is a 
notable innovation within the tradition of iambic poetry. Such practice would be especially 
egregious in the mind of the nameless critic, whose approbation requires an iambicist to closely 
imitate the Ephesian and, thus, compose in pure Ionic.

The meaning of the third dialect category, τὸ σύµµεικτον, which is of especial interest for 
this study, requires a more detailed discussion. Is τὸ σύµµεικτον meant to be understood as a 
technical term for a dialect type that is considered to be a combination of two other dialect 

---

284 The image of weaving (ἐµπλέκω) as a metaphor for poetic production has a long history in Greek aesthetic 
thought (see, e.g. Od. 5.59-62 and 10.220-3; Pind. O. 6.87 and N. 4.94), and here it likley refers to syntactical 
complexity, which can be an element of elevated style. Callimachus uses λαλέω and nouns derived from the verb 
elsewhere in Iambi to characterize the products of unskilled poets (I. 1.11 and 2.14); see Clayman 1980, 45 and 
Acosta-Hughes 2002, 80. Clayman (1980, 45 n.74) notes that the metaphor becomes negative in Plato’s poetic 
discourse (Leg. 669c-d) where poets are censured for their failure to properly imitate their models, which often 
results in the mixture (Leg. 669d4: ἐµπλέκοντες) of incongruous components. The critic echoes these complaints 
and so we should consider the use of εµπλέκω not only in juxtaposition to λαλέω but also in connection to Platonic 
poetics; cf. n.245 for further instances of Plato’s condemnation of mixture.

285 The references to Ionic (Ἰαστί) and Doric (Δωριστί), rather than a reliance on epichoric terminology such as 
Ephesian or Laconian, demonstrate that a full recognition of the major dialect groups was already in existence by the 
first half of the third century BCE. See also the metalinguistic statement at Theocritus Id. 15 in which two 
Syracusean women, in response to complaints about their speech, declare that they speak “Peloponnesian.” Beyond 
allowing the Syracusean women to authenticate their colonial culture through a connection with mainland Greece 
(Willi 2012), this comment implicitly recognizes that Syracusean shared basic linguistic attributes with the 
languages of the Dorian cultures in the Peloponnese. On a third-century BCE dating for the classification of the 
Greek language into broad categories, see Morpurgo Davies 2002, esp. 161-3 and the passage from Heracleides 
Criticus discussed above.

286 Contemporary uses of the term are of little aid when it comes to the sense of σύµµεικτος in relation to linguistic 
phenomena. A fragmentary epigram book dating to the mid third century BCE (P.Petrie II 49a) preserves the title 
σύµµεικτα ἐπηρήματα on its verso. After a space the name of the epigrammatist Posidippus in the genitive can be 
read (Ποσειδίππος), who was possibly the sole author of the collection; on the likely presence of multiple names, 
see Lasserre 1959 and Lloyd-Jones and Parsons 1983, 495. However, a representative selection of the epigram 
book’s contents does not survive, allowing us to better appreciate what the author or editor of the collection meant 
by his use of σύµµεικτος. If one accepts the reconstruction of P.Petrie II 49a as a single authored collection of 
Posidippus, the term possibly describes the miscellaneous thematic contents of the collection; σύµµεικτος would be 
aesthetic term akin to ποικιλία, but there is no evidence to suggest that the term refers to a variety of dialect use. 
Otherwise σύµµεικτος can plausibly be understood to refer to the collection of more than one author.
categories, or is it a reference to the mixture of dialects within an individual poem, collection, or across an author’s corpus? Although the term appears in a sequence whose first two components are dialect categories, the former meaning is rather unlikely. *Iambus* 7 is predominantly Doric with a smattering of Aeolic forms. On account of this light dialect variance, Dawson argued, incorrectly in my view, that *Iambus* 7 was composed in Callimachus’ native Cyrenaic, 287 a Doric dialect that shares certain features in common with Aeolic, and that this dialect was to be identified with the linguistic category of τὸ σύμμικτον. 288 The admixture of a limited number of Aeolic forms makes the dialect color of the poem only superficially similar to Cyrenaic, and the context of the verses do not justify reading the dialect as exclusively Cyrenaic over a predominant Doric mixed with common literary Aeolicisms. 289 Furthermore, would it be appropriate to label a local dialect like Cyrenaic with the broad title of τὸ σύμμικτον. While what does or not define “mixture” is subjective, the syntactical structure of the line suggests rather strongly that τὸ σύμμικτον is unlikely to be a third linguistic category similar to Doric and Ionic. Whereas Ionic and Doric, as linguistic categories, are united by their appearance in the dative singular (‘Ἰαστί καὶ Δωριστί), Callimachus differentiates τὸ σύμμικτον by a switch to the accusative case. This switch in case suggests that τὸ σύμμικτον stands in relation to Ἰαστί and Δωριστί as a stylistic category to its constituent parts. The “mixed” style, then, is one in which more than one dialect appears.

---

287 Dawson 1950, 81, who was not the first to suggest *Iambus* 7 was composed in Cyrenaic; see Pfeiffer 1934, 25. The poem shares some features in common with aspects of Cyrenaic that fall outside of the general parameters of Doric, e.g. νο from λθ (46: ἐνθ[ης and 48: ἦνθε) and genitive singular in –ο by contraction (42: πυρδάνω...λεπ[τῳ). These forms are also a common feature of Aeolic. On the dialect of Cyrene, see Buck 1946.

288 Dawson 1950, 132.

289 I agree with the assessment of Hunter (1997, 312 n.3), who, rejecting Dawson’s linguistic findings, accurately states that “the ‘Aeolic’ tinges in this poem hardly qualify it as ‘mixed’.” D’Alessio 1996, 2.627 n.113 also considers the forms to be Aeolic and has proposed their presence has a literary purpose in that they refer to the setting of the poem in Ainos.
If this is the case, then it brings us to the second half of the question with which we began this discussion: what level of composition—poem, collection, corpus—receives condemnation for the presence of this “mixed” style? Is it meant to be applied to all? The answer to this question is contextually contingent. The unnamed critic in *Iambus* 13 directs his reproach at the poet qua iambicist. The iambic collection, whose conclusion the reader has reached with *Iambus* 13, lacks (in the critic’s view) authenticity since the poet failed to “go back” to the genre’s origins in Ionia, a salient feature of which is the strict use of Ionic; rather the poet, as we have noted, composed in both Ionic and Doric and so, when taken together, his collection of *Iambi* are τὸ σύμμεικτον.

In light of the poet’s self-defense in the latter portion of the poem, the critic’s charge of σύμμεικτον can also be extended to the entirety of Callimachus’ corpus. The poem inventively inverts the position of the poet from dispenser of invective to the target of criticism over the course of the dialogue. The poem likely opened in the voice of the poet, and following the critic’s charges the poet supplies his response. At lines 30-33 the poet directs to the critic a rhetorical question which challenges the notion that an author should limit his poetic activity to one genre:

> τίς εἶπεν αὐτ[...]λε...ρ.[...].
> σὺ πεντάμετρα συντίθεια, σὺ δ’ ἦ[ρῶο]ν,
> σὺ δὲ τραγῳδε[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκληρώσω; ὅ
> δοκέω μὲν συδεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ το.δ..κεψαι

Who said… you compose pentameters, you the [heroic], it is your lot from the gods to compose tragedy?

---

290 This question is, of course, related to the broader issue of πολυείδεια in regard to which the same type of questions have been asked about its applicability; see Clayman 1980, 48-51; Scodel 1987, 208; and Acosta-Hughes 2002, 82-89. The discussion that follows naturally touches upon the πολυείδεια v. one poet-one genre debate.
291 Rosen 2007a, 189 notes that the dialogue was “a common device in ancient satirical genres”; what is inventive here is that the iambic poet becomes the object of invective through the course of the dialogue.
I consider no one, but [consider] also [this]...

The *Diegesis* to *Iambus* 13 states that Callimachus adduced the image of the poet as carpenter, a craftsman who produces a number of different objects from a variety of materials, and Ion of Chios, a prolific author of tragedies, lyric poetry, and prose works, as precedents for the composition in many genres by one poet. The rhetoric of Callimachus’ self-defense exploits the critic’s reproach of dialect σόμικτος in order to launch into a broader appeal for mixture (what the author of the *Diegesis* labels as πολυείδεια although the term does not survive in the text itself)—of dialects, themes, and genres—as a defining aspect of his poetics.

As I noted at the beginning of this discussion, the nameless critic of *Iambus* 13 is a rhetorical cypher in response to whom Callimachus fashions a space for articulating his poetics of engagement with and reinvention of the literary past. Part of this poetic program includes the use and mixture of multiple dialects. Despite the rhetorical position of the critic, this does not mean his charges are an inaccurate portrayal of contemporary discourses on poetics. The search for poetic authenticity lies at the core of the critic’s poetics. An important aspect of this authenticity is the successful reproduction of the formal elements which define a particular genre.

Formalist definitions of genre pre-date the third century BCE, but it was during this time that scholars created further taxonomies and classifications only, in the opinion of Rossi, in order

---

292 Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς καταμεμφασένους αὔτον ἐπὶ τῇ πολυείδεια ὧν γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντών φησιν ὅτε Ἰονά μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν· ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονα τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ σκεῦη τεκτανόμουν. (“In this poem in response to those who criticized him for the variety of the poetry which he composes, (Callimachus) responds that he imitates Ion the tragedian; additionally someone does not criticize the carpenter when he crafts implements of different varieties.”)

On the variegated poetic career of Ion of Chios see the essays in Jennings and Katsaros 2007.

293 Acosta-Hughes 2002, 76: “the critic of *Iambus* 13 is rather a foil, a voice to whom the poet may respond in outlining his own compositional ideals.”
for these rules to be broken.\textsuperscript{294} A significant result of this rule breaking is the so-called *Kreuzung der Gattungen*.\textsuperscript{295} The critic of *Iambus* 13 is not, however, among the group of scholars who devised formalist rules of genre only to advocate their violation; rather he represents a strand of poetic criticism reminiscent of the Platonic aversion to all mixing or corruption of genres and generic boundaries.\textsuperscript{296} In the view of the critic, Callimachus fails in his endeavor to be an iambic poet because he does not, among other things, reproduce the language of Hipponax. Since Callimachus positions himself as a second Hipponax, who would be grouped as an Ionic poet, he should compose poems only in Ionic. Purity of dialect in relation to the chosen genre is an inviolable component of “good” poetry.

The controversy about dialect mixture is a microcosm of a larger debate about the literary past, as it relates both to its conception and use by later poets. The critic’s statements about dialect usage articulate a conception of the literary past as a ‘Museum’ piece, so to speak, a collection of artifacts to be studied, classified, and imitated. This view of the literary past is, ironically, inauthentic. In the previous chapter we have seen how fluid the use of dialect (to take one example) is within the works of individual authors and across genres.\textsuperscript{297} As regards the

\textsuperscript{294} Rossi 1971, 83: “Questa terza epoca scrive le legge, si, ma per violarle. Sembra quasi che l’analisi accurata dei generi classici venga fatta apposta per violarne meglio le leggi.”

\textsuperscript{295} For the formulation of the term, see Kroll 1924; also Rossi 1971; Fantuzzi 1980; Schwing 1981.

\textsuperscript{296} Callimachus subtly responds to Plato’s stance on generic propriety in lines 30-33 (quoted above). The language and rhetorical structure of the lines has long been recognized to evoke a passage in the *Ion* (534b7-c7) where Socrates argues with his interlocutor, the rhapsode Ion of Ephesus, that he is only skilled in the performance of epic because his artistic ability is a product of divine inspiration; he should not try his hand at other genres such as dithyrambs or iambics. Callimachus turns Plato’s words (and the critic’s literary critical stance) against him in his promotion of the composition in multiple genres by one author. For discussion of Callimachus’ interaction with this passage, see Depew 1992, 325-30 and Acosta-Hughes 2002, 85-89. On Callimachus and Plato more broadly, see Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012 and Stephens 2013.

\textsuperscript{297} A title of the late Hellenistic grammarian Tryphon (ca. 60-10 BCE) Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ὀμήρῳ διαλέκτων καὶ Σιμονίδη καὶ Παισίδρω καὶ Ἀλκάντη καὶ τῶν ἀλλων λυρικῶν (Suda Τ 1115) possibly displays recognition of the mixed nature of Homeric and lyric literary dialects. Tryphon is known to have had an interest in local dialects, and if we retain the reading of διαλέκτων (contra the correction to διαλέκτου proposed in Wendel REVII A, 739-40 and adopted in Lobel on *P.Oxy.* 24.2396 who both connect these poets with composition in one dialect) the plural form works in concert with the grammarian’s broader dialectological research; see Cassio 1993b, 73-4 and especially 78-79: “Ma un plurale è esattamente quello che ci aspettiamo: Trifone aveva scritto un trattato sui dialetti, cioè sulle varietà parlate dai greci, in Omero, nei lirici ecc., cioè in pratica aveva scritto uno o più trattati sulle varietà locali.
iambographic tradition in particular, the language of Archilochus and Hipponax both admit forms from other Greek dialects as well as foreign lexemes. More importantly, the entire concept of composing poetry Ἰαστί or Δωριστί is a product of the Hellenistic conceptualization of the broad dialect categories of Ionic, Attic, Doric, and Aeolic. “Hipponax’s dialect has itself been established,” Richard Hunter observes, “by the scholarly activity of the Museum not by a ‘going to Ephesus.’” The rules that Callimachus breaks do not reflect the reality of the poetry he has read and researched; rather the literary past was a messy thing and not easily subjected to formalist rules of classification. Callimachus’ response, then, against the notion of a one-to-one relationship between dialect and genre advocates, conversely, for the artistic authenticity that the critic decries as absent from his poetry.

The use to which Callimachus puts dialect in his *Iambi* and elsewhere is not, in fact, that far removed from the practice displayed in pre-Hellenistic poetry. First, the *Iambi*. The poems that feature choliambics, including *Iambus* 13 in which he defends his usage of dialect, are composed in the Ionic dialect expected from the tradition. The long-standing association between dialect and place influences the use of Doric in some of Callimachus’ iambics. *Iambus* 6 on the statue of Zeus at Olympia adopts the dialect of the region associated with the location of the object or the artist, thus recreating the linguistic environment of the statue’s site of display. Similarly, the Doric of *Hymn* 5 (to Athena) may be designed to evoke an imagined Argive performance context created by the internal occasion of the hymn. Alternatively, the combination of Doric color and hexameters in both *Hymn* 5 and 6 may have taken their inspiration from Erinna’s *Distaff*, whose hexametric lament also marries epic form to the

298 Hunter 2005, 201.
299 For discussion, see n.215.
representation of an occasion for song. The multifarious dialect usage of Callimachus has Archaic and Classical antecedents, and any sense of newness or aberrance, then, is the result of the poetic-critical environment in which it appears; an environment where rules of poetic propriety and authenticity has established singular relationships between genres and dialect or model poets and dialect.

The Third Strand: The Euphonists

The euphonists, literary critics who measure the quality of poetry in terms of the sound produced more than by its content, represent the third strand of literary criticism for which we have some, albeit limited, metapragmatic testimony on the propriety of dialect mixture. The origins of euphonist criticism are found in the dual sources of Peripatetic musical theory and atomist philosophy. Democritus employed the analogy of letters as the atoms of the words in which they appear, and titles of his lost works include Περὶ ἑῳφόνων καὶ δυσφόνων γραμμάτων. The influence of atomist thought, in particular, differentiates the materialist criticism of the euphonists that emerges in the early Hellenistic period from their moralist/utilitarian and formalist interlocutors. The primacy of aural effects over form or

---

300 Rispoli 1986 ably surveys the fragmentary evidence for the origins of euphonic thought.
301 Kroll 1907 was the first to demonstrate the relationship between Hellenistic euphonists and earlier musical theories beginning with Theophrastus. Aristoxenus applies the term σόνθεσις (used by later euphonists to refer to word order) in his discussion (El. Rhythm. 2.8) of the proper ordering of musical intervals relating it to already recognized rules in the ordering letters. He also discusses the relationship between the choice of individual letters and the sounds they produce, cf. fr. 87 Wehrli=Athen.11.467a: Aristoxenus reports that the οἱ μουσικοί recommended the avoidance of sibilants in songs performed to aulos because the sounds produced were hard to pronounce (σκληροστόμον) and thus unwelcome to the ear of the listener. See Janko 2000, 175-76 on this passage’s relationship to euphonist theory: “this show that Pausimachus’ tenet that euphony depends on ease of pronunciation” has its roots in the musical theory of Aristoxenus and other earlier musicologists. For the influence of atomist thought on euphonist criticism, see Porter 1986 as well as Janko 2000, 136-7 and 173-6 for a summary of the evidence and further bibliography.
302 The title is listed amongst his Μουσική at D.L. 9.48=68A 33 X.1 DK.
303 See Porter 1989 for the heretofore ignored materialist base of euphonist criticism.
content in the evaluation of poetry unites euphonist criticism, but within the euphonist tradition we find a division regarding the components responsible for said euphony. One tradition singles out good ἐκλογή, defined as word choice and includes within it the selection of particular sequences of letters; the other values σύνθεσις, word order and the sound that supervenes upon it. Since dialect choice can directly effect the aural properties of a word, e.g. even the simple variation in the reflex of inherited *ā between the η of Attic-Ionic for the α of Doric, it raises the question of whether euphonist critics would endorse the mixture of dialects in situations where said mixture would produce a striking aural effect. Answers to this and similar questions are necessarily tentative given the fragmentary knowledge of euphonist poetics for the Hellenistic period. In the following I discuss the evidence for thoughts on dialect in the ἐκλογή and σύνθεσις traditions separately.

To anticipate my conclusions: emphasis on word or letter choice as conduits of aural pleasure appear to be the most likely of the traditions in which we might well expect that one could see evidence for the acceptance of dialect admixture; yet there is no concrete evidence in the surviving fragments of Hellenistic euphonists. The works of later literary critics, whose views display significant points of contact with euphonist thought, do express some opinions on the aural properties of dialect features, and so can guide our reconstruction of the critical tradition. Among the two approaches (ἐκλογή and σύνθεσις), the σύνθεσις tradition, as we shall find, emerges as the more radical in their rejection of formalist criteria of poetic judgment, including dialect usage. Dialect choice, in this view, does not place a constraint on poetic practice; indeed it does not rate consideration since word order remains unaffected.

The majority of fragments of the Hellenistic euphonists, including those that touch upon dialect, derive from the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus’ *On Poems* a five-volume aesthetic

---

304 cf. *P.Herc.* 1676 col. 17.1-14 for Philodemus’ summary of the euphonist’s criteria for poetic excellence.
treatise, which survives in a greatly damaged and confused state on carbonized fragments of papyri excavated from the aptly named Villa of Papyri in Herculaneum. Beyond the physical state of the fragments, the intellectual context of the testimonia further complicates any reconstruction of euphonist thought from the Herculaneum papyri. In *On Poems*, Philodemus is not merely reporting the positions of various earlier euphonist critics; rather he engages in a sustained, and polemical rebuttal of the euphonist judgment of poetry. Poetic excellence for Philodemus is the proper marriage of words and the sense they seek to convey; the mind is the primary consumer and interpreter of poetry, and so it requires the expression of rational thought. Consequently philosophers, not literary critics, are the most equipped to judge what makes a poem good or not. Moreover Philodemus does not engage directly with the critical viewpoints of the many of the euphonists he opposes. A work by Crates of Mallos, a second-century BCE Stoic philosopher and grammarian, is the intermediate source. Philodemus refers to Crates and the other euphonists as οἱ κριτικοὶ, but the current scholarly consensus does not consider the term to denote a specific school or tradition of poetic criticism; rather it functions as short-hand designation whose use probably influenced Crates who, as Janko correctly observes, “by grouping these theorist together, encouraged Philodemus to coin this title for them, and sometimes to apply it to Crates too.”

---

305 The introductory matter of Richard Janko’s 2000 edition and commentary of *On Poems* remains a standard resource for concise discussions of matters historical, philosophical, aesthetic, and papyrological.
306 My formulation of Philodemus’ poetics relies on Janko 2000, 8; fundamental studies of Philodemus as literary critic include Greenberg 1955; Asmis 1991; Asmis 1995; Porter 1989; and Porter1995a.
307 The published surviving portions of *On Poems* do not name the work of Crates that Philodemus used as a source. For Crates’ views on good poetry see Asmis 1992.
308 For arguments that seek to identify the οἱ κριτικοὶ as a group or school of literary critics antedating or contemporary with Crates, see Schenkeveld 1968. Janko 2000, 125 observes that since Crates labels himself a κριτικός (*Suda* κ 2342 Adler and Sextus Empiricus *M.* 1.79) as well as critics with whom he disagrees, the term is unlikely to have been used of a special group (5.27.3-8).
309 Janko 2000, 125; see also Blank 1994 and Porter 1995b.
Book 1 of On Poems provides our most complete discussion of euphonist poetics. Philodemus summarizes the views of several euphonists, some of whom are practically unattested outside of this work, including Andromenides, Heracleodorus, and Pausimachus. The order is chronological and likely recreates the discussion of the critics in Crates. I begin my discussion with the ἐκλογή tradition and Andromenides, who was active in the early third century BCE and is the earliest of the critics treated by Philodemus. Accordingly, a number of the fragments of Andromenides concern poetic diction. An entry in Hesychius’ Lexicon attributes to Andromenides a learned gloss on Artemis’ epithet ἐνοδία to Andromenides, which reflects his larger interest in rare poetic vocabulary. The words chosen by a poet must possess, in addition to the correct metrical form, μεγάλην [λαμπρήτα [καὶ κ]άλλος; however, what qualities define “splendid and beautiful” words is not further elaborated in the surviving discussion of Philodemus.

διάλεκτος appears twice in Andromenides’ fragments. On the function of poets, Philodemus quotes Andromenides (1.131.5-8) to the effect that ποηταῖς | ἐπιτρέπει[ν τ]ῇ[ζ τῆς τε δι[αλέκτου καὶ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἐξεργασίας (“the working out of the language and of the vocabulary is fitting for poets’”). The pairing of διάλεκτος with ὀνομασία (“diction”), a technical stylistic term, may suggest we should interpret διάλεκτος in a similarly specialist light. Given this context, διάλεκτος likely means something closer to a language variety than a more general

---

310 See the discussion at Janko 2000, 151-3, who places Andromenides’ date within the range of the late fourth and early third century BCE; however Janko’s reconstruction relies itself on inconclusive arguments over the dating of the tripartite division of poetics into ποίημα, ποίησις, and ποιητής. Our most concrete evidence for dating the mention of τῆ [λαμπρήτα τῶν Βάκτρων (1.170.15-16), which would provide the completion of Alexander’s conquests of the East as a terminus post quem. Janko 2000, 143-51 collects the fragments of Andromenides.

311 Epikleses were a subject of interest in the Hellenistic period, as attested by the multiple lists of epithets applied to gods by Lycophron in is Alexandra. Having demonstrated that many of these epikleses have inscriptive origins, Hornblower 2014, 116 suggests that Lycophron likely drew them from a number of sources, including collected lists in the works of local historians. McNelis and Sens (forthcoming) has argued that the layout of organization of the lists in Lycophron reflect the use of an alphabetic compendium of epikleses.

312 The second appearance of διάλεκτος in Andromeides’ fragments (1.187.21-24), again found with ὀνομασία, more clearly supports a translation of “dialect” in the technical sense and thus supports the understanding of a similar sense here.
term for “speech.” If we understand διάλεκτος to refer to language variety, Andromenides’ opinion on dialect mixture still remains opaque: a poet is in control of dialect choice, as he is in control of ἐκλογή, but what restrictions, which we know exist elsewhere in the critic’s theorization of word choice, are placed on this ἔξεργασίας διαλέκτου?\(^{313}\) The quotation that immediately follows is of little help: the aim of the poet is not to say what has never been told, but rather to speak in a way that is expressly unique. This injunction is borrowed from Isocrates (Paneg. [4] 10) and, like the call for “splendid and beautiful” words, does not further elucidate the place of dialect forms.

The second use of διάλεκτος in a statement ascribed to Andromenides involves the variety of Homeric diction. A model for excellent ἐκλογή, Homer accomplished his linguistic artistry, in part, since he (1.187.21-24) ἐκ πάσης ἔξελέξατο διαλέκτου τὰς ὄνομασίας (“chose his words from every (kind of) dialect”).\(^{314}\) This statement likely refers to the artificial nature of Homeric language. Andromenides’ assessment of Homeric language as an artificial composite form is an approximation of the linguistic truth. By the time of Andromenides, scholars had erroneously detected a greater range of dialects in Homer than actually exist, and they often assigned to these forms epichoric designations. The degree of artificiality that was the hallmark of Homeric poetry’s euphonic success cannot shed much light on aesthetic evaluation of the type of marked and studied dialect mixture which interests us here. Homer, in the view of euphonists like Andromenides, chose each word for its intrinsic qualities of sound apparently paying little to no attention to its surrounding dialectal environment.

\(^{313}\) *De poeum.* 5 col. 34.35-35.1 (τὸ λέξιν προσφέροντας πρόπουσιν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις προσώποις. [“diction is added fitting to the present character.”); here Andromenides requires the poet to choose diction that is appropriate to the character represented. The language of this passage (πρόπουσιν) and other statements in the surviving fragments offer evidence for Andromenides’ Peripatetic background. Ardizzone 1953, 87-90 first mustered the evidence, pace Jansen 1923, of Andromenides’ Peripatetic outlook; see Janko 2000, 151-3.

\(^{314}\) Philodemus refutes a similar statement on the notion of epic drawing its diction from every dialect in his rebuttal of Andromenides at 1.163.2-4. For a discussion of the passage quoted above, see Rispoli 1986, 143-47.
We do not know if Andromenides expanded elsewhere on the quality of dialect mixture that improves poetic sound. Did Andromenides disapprove of certain dialects or dialect combinations? Did dialects and their particular sounds have associated qualities? We cannot answer to any degree of specificity questions such as these. While certain dialect forms of words were likely considered variously more beautiful or ugly, Andromenides’ statement about Homeric diction does not shed light on such a euphonic account of dialect or dialect mixture.

Comments on the sound quality of various dialects in later literary critics possibly have their source or model in the euphonist tradition of ἐκλογή, and thus can supplement the limited evidence for the third and second centuries BCE. While we cannot be sure at what point such conceptions of dialect entered the critical discourse, recognition of and commentary upon dialects is likely to have a Hellenistic source, since by the Roman period the leveling of the Greek dialects in both spoken and written contexts and the rise of Atticism greatly diminished the interest in linguistic variety outside of grammatical treatises. This is not the place for an exhaustive discussion of the sources. I include, instead, some well-known passages. In his On Style, Demetrius, whose identity and date remains a question, comments on the absence of Doric features from Attic comedy (Eloc. 177): the broad sonority of Doric α is not as suitable (πρέπον) to the tone of comedy, he contends, as is Attic phonology which is συνεστραμμένον (“terse”) and δημοτικόν (“popular”). The crass popularity of Attic comedy finds its linguistic pendant in

315 For Hellenistic statements on the sound quality of a particular dialect see the complaint of the Alexandrian in Theocritus Id. 15 about the “broad vowels” (πλατατώνδοσαι) of the Syracusean dialect of Praxinoa and Gorgo. This complaint, however, is likely more indicative of certain contemporary conceptions of spoken Doric rather than literary Doric. In a likely ironic turn, Theocritus has the Alexandrian voice his complaint in the same dialect coloring as the Syracusean women he reproaches, and, furthermore, this Doric dialect is not at all imitative of Syracusean but is rather akin to the standard form of literary Doric. So while some urbane Alexandrians may have cringed at the sound of certain Doric phonological features, Theocritus has the last laugh by making them speak the same dialect they abhor within a sophisticated and elegant Alexandrian hybrid of bucolic and urban mime.

316 Demetrius Eloc. 177: ἡ γὰρ ἀλλήλους γὰρ πάντα οἱ Δωρικὲς, διόσπερ οὐδὲ ἐκκομόδουν δορίζωντες, ἀλλὰ πικρὶς ἤττίκικον· ἢ γὰρ ἀλλήλῃ γλώσσῃ συνεστραμμένον τι ἐχει καὶ δημοτικόν καὶ ταῖς τοιαύταις εὐφρατείαις πρέπον. (“The Doriens speak in broad vowels, for this reason those speaking Doric did not write comedies, but those who
the similar cultural characteristics applied to the sound of the Attic dialect. Although much later, the third-century CE musicologist Aristides Quintilianus (*De musica* 2.13) ascribes contrasting human traits to Doric (masculine) and Ionic (feminine), a division which has its origins, in part, in Pythagorean musical theory that distinguishes between male and female sounds. As with Andromenides, these sources do not comment upon dialect mixture (sometimes they possibly suggest the inappropriateness of dialect mixture; whether such opinions are the product of euphonist thought is debatable), but they do expand our understanding of the various qualities ascribed to particular dialects, and thus may influence the types of dialect used and their mixture for poets seeking to color or vary the sound quality of their poetry.

I turn now to the advocates of σύνθεσις (“word order”) Heracleodorus and Pausimachus. In contrast to Andromenides, who tied a judgment of the sound produced by word choice to the content of the poetry, these two critics emphasized word order and “the sound that supervenes upon it.” Since evaluative priority is given to the sound produced from word order, distinctions among the stylistic registers of genres are not a factor. In a lacunose sentence, Heracleodorus claims that there are no such differential categories such as epic, iambic, or comic when it comes to poetic language (*De poem* 1.192.13-17).

spoke the sharp Attic dialect. For the Attic language has a terseness and popular quality fit to lively wit such as this.”)

317 Heraclides of Pontus 162 SA with Janko 2000, 177 n.1. Cassio 1984 treats the cultural opposition between Doric and Ionic (in architecture, music, and language) and includes a discussion of this passage. Hermogenes, while commenting (*Id*. 336 Rabe) on the “sweetness” (γλυκύς) of Herodotus’ language and style, contributes a part of this quality to his use of Ionic, which he describes as “pleasant by nature” (φύσει ἐστὶν ήδεια).

318 Janko 2000, 156. *P.Herc*. 1676 col. 6. 2-7 (quoting Heracleodorus): καὶ τὸ “τὴν μὲν ἐπεφατοµένην ἐπιφανείαν ἱδίον [ἐ]ϊνα, τὰ δὲ νοὴ [τ]ὶ μετὰ καὶ [τ]ὸς λέξεις ἐκτὸς εἶναι καὶ κοινὰ συνάγεσθαι δεῖ[ν]… (“the good sound that supervenes is particular (to poetry), but the contents and diction are external and necessary to be reconciled as common…”)

319 Text and translations from Janko 2000.
The topic of the generic modifiers ἐπική, ἰαμβική, and κωμική is lost, but the feminine gender of the adjectives suggests emendations such as λέξις, preferred by Janko, or possibly διάλεκτος.

Pausimachus of Miletus, the last κριτικός treated by Philodemus in Book 1 and considered the “most radical of the euphonists” surveyed, likewise does not consider conventions of genre and style important criteria to the judgment of poetry; sound is paramount. According to Philodemus, Pausimachus states that (1.77.9-22):

"...δι-οίσει δὲ οὐδὲν", φησιν, "οὖδ' ἐ-ἀν Ἀρχίλοχον ἢ Εὐριπίδο-δὴν ἢ ἄλλον τινά Ὁμή-ρωι συμβάλλομεν, ἢν μό-νον ἐκατέρου τὴν ἐπαι-νουμένην ἀντιπαρατι-θόμεν λέξιν. οὐ γάρ, ὅτι διάφορόν ποιο τραγω-δία καὶ ἰαμβος καὶ τὸ ἐμ-μελές, διὰ τούτο ὑπάρχοντος καὶ τοῦ τέλους ἐν τῇ ποιητῇ ποιητεῖ, τοῦ γένει ταύτα(υ)

“...It will make no difference”, he says, “even if we match Archilochus, Euripides, or anyone else against Homer, if we juxtapose only the praiseworthy diction of either with his. For it is not because tragedy, iambus, and lyric are in some way a different (genre), that we shall match one poet against another from another genre, since the end is the same for every genre.”

---

321 Janko 2000, 188.
and similarly referring back to this previous claim (1.83.14-22):

καὶ “ἐν Ἀριστοκράτω" ἐπὶ πῶν "παρεστα-κέν[α] διστή μόνοι ταύτο
πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Σοφοκλῆς καὶ Φιλόξενος, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Τιμόθεως τὰ ποήμα-
τ᾽ αὐτῶν μίσγων...

And after saying “I have established elsewhere that only Homer, Archilochus, and Euripides are doing the same thing [i.e. producing good poetic sound], and in addition to them Sophocles and Philoxenus, and likewise Timotheus too mixing their verses…”

Here Pausimachus varies Heracleodorus’ use of generic terminology with the names of well-known authors but the argument is essentially the same. Elizabeth Asmis, noting that Pausimachus chooses to include in this catalogue the mixed compositions of Timotheus and so “draws attention to irrelevance of generic differences”, concludes that the critic “licenses the mixing of genres.”³²² Commenting on Heracleodorus, Janko describes the critic as representing the “advocacy of the mixture of dialects, styles, and genres, and of fine-sounding but not necessarily intelligible σύνθεσις” present in poets like Callimachus and Lycophron,³²³ and one could plausibly extend his claims to include Pausimachus, especially since the Miletean was a more strident supporter of σύνθεσις. Given, however, that nowhere in the surviving sources do critics like Heracleodorus or Pausimachus discuss dialect, Janko’s portrayal of these critics as advocates of dialect mixture is an aesthetic supposition grounded entirely on indirect evidence. Since euphonists do not recognize differences in stylistic registers in their evaluation of good poetry based on good sound, it would seem, by this same line of reasoning, that the mixture of

³²² Asmis 1992, 168.
³²³ Janko 2000, 164.
words from different genres and, therefore, words from different dialects, would be allowed in poetry. While a reconstruction of this sort is not unfounded, there is no evidence that these critics would “advocate” the mixture of dialects. The more likely scenario is the exact opposite: the emphasis on the sound produced from word order makes the sound of individual words of secondary interest.

Since we currently lack any definitive statements on dialect from the sources for σύνθεσις-focused euphonist thought on dialect usage (if any did exist originally), the statements of a later critic, who was clearly influenced by this critical tradition, are our next-best resource. Recently scholars have begun to better appreciate the close connection between Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Roman rhetorician, historian, and critic, and the euphonists, including their views of σύνθεσις. In book three of On Composition, Dionysius examines the method of μετάθεσις, the modification or rearrangement of words in a passage, which he employs in order to demonstrate the importance of composition (σύνθεσις) to the beauty and value of a written works. In a well-known passage, Dionysius rewrites the narrative of Gyges and Candules from Book 1 of Herodotus’ Histories from the original Ionic to Attic. He leaves the word order of the original entirely intact. This dialect “translation” was undertaken, Dionysius tells his readers (Comp. 3.12.18-13.2), ἵνα δὲ μὴ τις ύπολάβη τὴν διάλεκτον εἶναι τῆς ἡδονῆς αἰτίαν τῇ λέξει ("in order that no one should assume the dialect to be the cause of beauty in the passage"). Ionic was generally considered the most beautiful and poetic of the dialects, due in large part to its association with the archaic epics of Homer and Hesiod.

324 On Dionysius’ intellectual debt to the euphonists de Jonge 2008 provides the most detailed treatment; see also Schenkeveld 1968 and Janko 2000, 178.
325 e.g. the passage of Hermogenes on Herodotus cited in n.319.
Dionysius uses this dialect translation as an example of μετάθεσις that does not alter, either positively or negatively, the effect of the passage on the reader. The true pleasure of this passage remains intact despite the loss of its Ionic coloring. “It remains remarkable,” in the eyes of de Jonge, “that it does not seem to bother Dionysius that, together with the dialect, he also changes the sounds of the original text, in spite of the fact that euphony is such an important aspect of σύνθεσις.” de Jonge is correct in noting that euphony is an important aspect of σύνθεσις, but he does not properly appreciate to the degree to which euphony in σύνθεσις is largely a product of word order and not the shape of the individual words themselves. This observation is, in fact, exactly what Dionysius’ linguistic experiment underscores. If Dionysius is drawing his thoughts on σύνθεσις from the tradition represented in Philodemus, which is quite likely, his “translation” of Herodotus is our clearest evidence that dialect choice and mixture, while no longer regulated by formalist or utilitarian concerns, has reached the other extreme of treatment in that their presence, in the minds of an important segment of the euphonist tradition, is indifferent, or at least quite secondary, to the production of good sound.

**Conclusions**

Beginning in the fourth century BCE style and language became an increasingly significant area of poetic criticism. At the same time, philosophers were exploring the nature of language and scholars were beginning to collect, systematize, and evaluate the material of Greek language. Literary dialect lay at the intersection of these two avenues of inquiry. Dialectal

---

326 On Dionysius and his method of μετάθεσις, see de Jonge 2008, 367-89.
information from earlier poetry was appropriated, integrated, or adapted by later writers into their discourses on the function and value of dialect in contemporary literature.

This chapter has highlighted several competing and divergent treatments to dialect usage in poetry. Most of Hellenistic criticism, however, is lost and there surely existed a wide array of views on dialect mixture. By drawing these disparate pieces into dialogue with one another, I have been able to reconstruct three strands of critical discourse on dialect. The first strand recognized the enrichment of Archaic and Classical poetic language with rare words. Aristotle advocated a poetic language that struck a balance between clarity of expression and lively and pleasurable ornamentation. An important component of the ornamental aspect of poetic lexis was γλῶσσαι, rare words within which he included dialect features. Good poetic language allowed for the presence of γλῶσσαι and therefore dialect mixture as long as the practice did not overwhelm the clarity of expression. Aristotle’s prescriptive statements regarding poetic λέξις find expression in early third-century scholarship and poetry. Philitas produced collections of γλῶσσαι, including dialect forms, as reference works for contemporary poets; Callimachus composed individual poems and entire poetic collections that borrowed from and adapted dialect practice from earlier traditions.

An impetus to categorize and classify the literary past, to make the complexity and richness of poetry easily intelligible and reproducible, underlies the thought of the second critical strand. For the fictional and nameless critic of Iambus 13, Callimachus’ mixture of dialects in his collection of iambic poetry violates generic conventions and thus undermines the creation of authenticity at which poets aim. Dialect usage, in the view of the critic, is in a one-to-one relationship either with the genre in which a poet writes or the earlier poet whom the author establishes as their model.
Euphonist thought, unlike the previous two formalist strands, has its origins in materialist thought. Thus it privileges the pure sound of individual words or sequences of words over their relationship with content or generic conventions. The excellence of Homeric poetry relies, in part, on the poet’s decision to draw his poetic language from every dialect. Later critics, who were likely influenced by euphonist thought, comment on the sound quality and effects of various dialects. Ionic contributes to the sweetness of a work; Doric expresses a masculine tone. Mixture of dialects can be an effective tool in the production of good sound; however dialect usage—whether mixed or not—is in other instances completely indifferent. An advocate of σύνθεσις, Dionysius of Halicarnassus “translated” Herodotus from Ionic to Attic in order to demonstrate that good sound is a function of word order. Certain euphonists’ rejection of formalist evaluative categories carved out a space for dialect mixture, provided it created good sound; but they did not in any way advocate dialect mixture for this same reason—words and sequences of words are only evaluated as transmitters of pure sound.
Chapter 3: Written in Stone: Dialect in Inscribed Epigram

The project of this final chapter of Part One is to describe and analyze dialect usage in inscribed epigram from the Archaic to Hellenistic periods. In order to contextualize and appreciate fully the poetic potential of dialect in Hellenistic book epigram, which is the aim of the second part of this dissertation, we must first have a proper accounting of the dialect of inscribed poetry, its closest poetic congener. While the poetry of the Archaic and Classical periods contributes meaningfully to the poetics of Hellenistic book epigram, no single literary tradition had a more impactful influence over the language, structure, and themes of the genre than did inscribed epigram. In recent years this engagement has been fruitfully studied from various perspectives, each elucidating the ways in which Hellenistic epigrammatists adopted, refashioned, and responded to the inscriptional tradition. Despite this work, relatively little sustained attention has been given to the impact of inscriptional antecedents on dialect choice and usage in Hellenistic book epigram. I address this topic in detail in the following chapter.

Apart from its obvious influence on Hellenistic book epigram, inscribed epigram is an important and unique source for the tradition of dialect usage in its own right and so worthy of a discussion independent of other poetry from the same periods. This assertion can be made on two accounts. First, inscribed epigram are the earliest Greek verses composed expressly for reading. Although impossible to quantify, it is likely that the use and reception of dialect forms differed between oral and written contexts, especially by the Classical period when inscribed epigram

328 Note, however, that “epigram” as a genre was not formally developed until the Hellenistic period; see Puelma 1996.
329 Important discussions include Walsh 1991; Fantuzzi in Hunter and Fantuzzi 2005, 291-338; Bruss 2005; Meyer 2005; Bettenworth 2007; and Tueller 2008. Conversely, the study of the influence of Hellenistic book epigram on contemporary and later inscriptional practice is only in its infancy. See the recent and important work of Garulli 2008, Garulli 2012a, and Garulli 2014.
developed a more elaborate style, including borrowings from other genres and artfully arranged verses.\textsuperscript{330} Second, inscription on stone or other durable material limits the vagaries of the textual tradition on the transmission of dialect forms, many of which are susceptible to mutation. This is not to say, however, that inscriptions are always faithful transcriptions of the poet’s dialect choices. Although authorial identity in Archaic and Classical epigram is murky topic,\textsuperscript{331} in most instances the stonecutter did not also compose the verses he was hired to inscribe.\textsuperscript{332} Consequently, we must recognize that the stonecutter, like a scribe, might have introduced dialect forms into the text of the epigram not originally produced by the poet. In any event, inscribed epigram still represents an unparalleled witness to dialect usage in poetry for the Archaic and Classical periods.

In the first section of the chapter, I treat the general practice of inscribed epigram to use a simplified version of the local dialect of the deceased or dedicator, paying attention to the retention of a subject’s local dialect in instances of a dedication or epitaph erected abroad. In the second section, I examine the introduction of authorial identity into the previously anonymous world of inscribed epigram on the reception of dialect. I do so through a reading of \textit{CEG} 819 iii (ca. 330 BCE), an epigram at Delphi for a statue group celebrating the Spartan naval commander Lysander’s victory at Aegospotami, which features one of the earliest recorded authorial ascriptions for an otherwise unknown Ion of Samos. This issue is especially apposite, since a notable feature of the artistic development of the poetic voice in Hellenistic book epigram resides in the written presence of the name of an author in the heading of individual epigrams or poetic collections as a whole.

\textsuperscript{330} Tsagalis 2008 is the only substantial, if flawed, treatment of late classical inscribed epigram, the majority of which are of Athenian provenance.

\textsuperscript{331} Tsagalis 2008, 52-55 lays out the questions and problems concerning the authorship of inscribed epigram.

\textsuperscript{332} Arguments in support of stonecutters/sculptors as the authors of epigram see Wallace 1970, 100 and Wallace 1984, 310-11, which are endorsed by Lougovaya 2004, 50 as it relates to Athenian verse epitaphs.
Dialect and Identity in the Inscribed Epigrammatic Tradition

Inscriptions are the most significant resource for the study of the linguistic diversity of ancient Greek. Indeed, inscriptive Greek is the foundation of modern dialect studies.\(^{333}\) Prose inscriptions that record laws, interstate agreements, honorary decrees, and ostracisms or commemorate victories in battle, deaths, and dedications to the gods provide the majority of linguistic evidence. It is from these sources that scholars have been able to catalogue and categorize the numerous epichoric dialects that defined the linguistic landscape of the pre-Hellenistic Greek-speaking world. Inscriptions erected by local governments or individuals for consumption by members of the same linguistic community are invariably rendered in the shared linguistic register. Athenian inscriptions in Athens are composed in contemporary Attic, just as Elean inscriptions are in Elean, Theban in Theban, or Miletean in Miletean. The same process is true, as Buck demonstrated, for so-called “interstate” inscriptions, those inscriptions commissioned and erected abroad by a state or citizen in their native language.\(^{334}\)

To a general degree verse inscriptions, primarily private funerary epitaphs and dedications, replicate the pattern of dialect usage described above. Despite the general tendency for inscribed epigrams to be composed first in hexameters and later, by the early sixth century BCE, primarily in elegiac couplets, the dialect coloring of these epigrams does not adopt the Ionic coloring associated with the language of epic and elegy, the two oral literary products

\(^{333}\) Following the publication of epigraphic corpora in the first half of the nineteenth century, the study of Greek dialects was initiated in Ahrens’ monumental publication De Graecae linguae dialectis (1839-43), which described the Aeolic, “pseudoaeolic,” and Dorian dialects in two volumes. Ahrens’ work was superseded by the studies of Meister 1892-99 and Hoffman 1891-98. Other important reference works on the Greek inscriptive dialects include Meillet 1913 and Bechtel 1921-24.

\(^{334}\) Buck 1913.
associated with these metrical schemes. Instead, the authors of inscribed epigram, as Mickey observed, often composed epigrams in a register of the native dialect of the deceased, dedicator, or region where the epigram was displayed, but which lacked epichoric parochialisms. The result is often a simplified version of the dialect, becoming increasingly stylized and regularized in the fifth-century material, which does not reflect the reality of any spoken variety. Like any poetic language, then, the dialect of inscribed epigram is artificial and admits dialect variance, which can, in certain instances, be marked.

In what follows, I will survey a selection of inscribed dedications and epitaphs from the seventh to fourth centuries BCE, both those erected in the native land of the subject and those erected abroad, describing the relationship between dialect choice and local identity. Since this dissertation is particularly interested in the literary properties of dialect variance, I treat, in the second half of this section, several examples from the inscriptional corpus, whose dialect composition, in my view, has a plausible literary function. Any number of examples could be adduced in support of the practice of matching dialect to the native speech of the subject in epigrams, both dedications and epitaphs, erected in a local or regional context. Here I discuss

---

335 Mickey 1981, 43-52 musters the evidence for a marked avoidance of ionicisms (in not Ionic inscriptions) and archaicisms in verse inscriptions down to 400 BCE. My own survey of the evidence collected in CEG confirms her general conclusions. In her dissertation, as it seems, Mickey does treat the language of verse inscriptions of the fourth and third centuries BCE. The abstract of her conclusions are as follows: “During this period the language might appear to be based on Attic, with metrically convenient forms taken from other dialects, but it is interesting to note that characteristically Attic forms are avoided.” The predominance of Attic verse inscriptions, especially in the corpus of the fourth century BCE, does skew our picture of dialect usage in the late classical period. Fourth-century Attic inscriptions do present patterns of adoption of dialect forms from Ionic and Doric literature that likely had a purpose other than metrical convenience. See, for example, the use of the uncontracted Ionic φάος (CEG 543.4; CEG 595.5; and CEG 604.2, but see φῶς in same line) and ἡλίος (CEG 511.4: ἡλίο λαμπρό ὦ φῶς cf. Il. 1.605 λαμπρόν φῶς ἡλίον) and Doric α vocalization (CEG 512.2: ἀρετᾶς; CEG 520.6: ἀξιόλου); see Tsagalis 2008, 65, 85, and 275-76 for the possible literary implications of this limited dialect admixture.

336 I accept this conclusion from Mickey 1981, 52-54, a summary article of her Oxford dissertation. I was not able to access the data collected in the dissertation, but my own survey of the CEG (to which Mickey did not have access) supports the conclusions she reaches about the linguistic composition of Archaic and Classical verse inscriptions.

337 A complete and up-to-date study of dialect in inscribed epigram remains a desideratum; Mickey’s unpublished research is very difficult to access and her findings have been made incomplete by the epigraphic publications of the last thirty years.
several examples drawn from throughout the Greek-speaking world that demonstrate the prevalence of this practice.

a) *CEG* 137 (Methana; ca. 600 BCE): Commissioned by a certain Eumares, an Archaic epitaph from Methana, a *polis* situated at the entrance to the Saronic Gulf in the Argolid, memorializes in standard terms the death of his son Androkles:

Εὐμάρες με πατέρ Ἀνδροκλῆς ἔντάδε σάμα
ποιήσανς καταθέκε | φίλο μνάμα ἡμέρος ἐμ.|

Eumares, the father of Androkles, having made a tombstone has set me up here to be a memorial for his dear son.

The prominent use of Doric features, diagnostic of the native dialect spoken in Methana at the end of the seventh century BCE, and the epichoric alphabet likely reflects the commissioning of this epigram by and for a native son. Doric features common to Doric-based poetry and present across Doric-speaking communities include the reflex of inherited *ā* as *a* (σάμα; μνάμα) and the infinitive of εἰμί in ἣμεν. The rather early date of this inscription does result in the appearance of two dialect features that are closely associated with epichoric Argolic Doric and absent from literary Doric: a) the retention of intervocalic *ς* in ποι[ήσανς]339 and b) substitution of a voiceless for a voice stop in ἔνταδε (=ἔνθαδε).340 These features would suggest that the composition and inscription was done in a local context, whether the author was Eumares, a paid versifier, or the stonecutter. Regardless of the stonecutter’s possible involvement in the

338 We cannot know for sure that Eumares and Androkles are Methanian citizens, but common practice in insessional epitaphs and dedications is to incorporate the native city of the deceased in the event of the commemorated activity taking place abroad. Accordingly I assume, in this example and the others discussed below, that deceased and dedicators are native to the place of insessional display, especially when the dialect reflects the local language, unless specifically stated or authenticated by some other external evidence.

339 Buck 1955, §77 and 78.

340 Buck 1955, §65 understands this form built on analogy of the dissimilation of aspiration (Grassman’s Law) in Attic ἔνθαδε from ἔνθαδε attested in Attic inscriptions.
composition of the epitaph, the epichoric alphabet, which Nino Luraghi has persuasively argued was used by neighboring communities that shared in a similar dialect to demarcate ethnic boundaries, accentuates the localized voice of Androkles’ tomb.\textsuperscript{341}

b) \textit{CEG} 416 (Thasos; ca. 525-500 BCE): Across the Aegean, a late sixth-century dedication of Aceratus to Heracles, found in the temple of Heracles at Thasos, is composed in a stylized variety of the local Ionic native to the island and the speaker:

\begin{verbatim}
’Ἡρακλεὶ μ’ ἀνένθηκεν Ἀκήρατος, ὡς Θασίοσιν
καὶ Π[ορίοι]ς ἤρχεσθαι μόνος ἐν ἀνφοτέροις\textsuperscript{342},
πολλάς δ’ ἄνγελλας πρὸ πόλεως κατὰ φύλα διήλθεν ἀν[θρώπ]ιον,
ἄρετῆς ἕνεκεν ἀιώνιως.
\end{verbatim}

Aceratus erected me for Heracles, a man who alone held office among both the Thasians and Parians, and on behalf of the city traveled on many missions among the tribes of men, because of his everlasting excellence.

Aceratus expounds upon his singular distinction of having held the archonship in both Thasos and its colony Paros in the local Ionic of the two island \textit{poleis} he served.\textsuperscript{343} Amongst generalized poeticalisms, such as the disyllabic dative \texttt{Θασίοσιν} and the compensatory lengthening in \texttt{μόνος}, we have two expressly Ionic features in the retention of \texttt{η} following \texttt{ε}, \texttt{ι}, or \texttt{ρ} (\texttt{αιώνιος})\textsuperscript{344} and the genitive singular of \texttt{πόλις} in \texttt{πόλεως} which is found, among early Ionic inscriptions, at Chios as well as Thasos.\textsuperscript{345}

\textsuperscript{341} Luraghi 2010.
\textsuperscript{342} The letter \texttt{ν} is used often interchangeably for \texttt{μ} across dialects; cf. Buck 1955, §69.1.
\textsuperscript{343} Aceratus’ epitaph also survives (\textit{CEG} 162; ca. 500-490 BCE) and shares in the Ionic color of his dedication to Heracles (cf. l.3 \texttt{ηὖσιν τε καὶ[.] θαύμασιν}).
\textsuperscript{344} Buck 1955, §104 (\texttt{η} following \texttt{ε}, \texttt{ι}, or \texttt{ρ}).
\textsuperscript{345} Buck 1955, §109.2. The later appearances of \texttt{πόλεως} in inscriptions from Ionic-speaking regions are attributed to the influence of Attic, the dialect to which the form is traditionally assigned.
c) CEG 680 (Cyrene; 4th c. BCE): Inscribed epigrams in the late Classical period present a more stylized and standardized corpus. Several literary and cultural developments account for this process of standardization. First, the decline in marked local features in inscribed epigram is part of a broader trend in Greek literature, dating from the late fifth century BCE, to avoid using language that appeared parochial, which manifests itself, for example, in Thucydides’ use of (e.g.) ξύν and θάλασσα. Second, there was the increased professionalization of epigram composition, including the use of copybooks. Third, we must also account for the growing prestige of Attic koine under the Macedonian empire, which had begun to expand its sphere of influence. Nevertheless, epigrams do survive that retain an artificial version of the subject’s native dialect. One example is a pair of sepulchral epigrams for a certain Arata, the daughter of Kallicrates, from the Cyrenean city of Hesperis.

Arata, daughter of Kallikrates, from Hesperis.

Old ruler of the well-decked boat, you who
sail all the way to the end of night over a shadowy river,
did you see some other virtue than Arata, if
you now led this over to the murky bank?

Never again will you see your Hesperis, the land of splendid children,
nor your spouse, whom you bereaved, and you will not spread

---

346 For the theory of the use of copybooks or pattern books from which stonecutters drew formulas or entire texts for their metrical inscriptions, see Tsagalis 2008, 53-55.
out your bridal bed for your child. Truly a spirit, Arata, has shown a bitter curse to you.

Cyrene, and its satellite cities such as Arata’s Hesperis, was a Doric speaking region, and one that held on to its dialectal roots, traced back to the foundation of Cyrene by Battus I from Thera, well into the Hellenistic period. Indeed, while paired epigrams are not foreign to classical verse inscriptions, these two epigrams, which provide two different reactions to the passing of the deceased, anticipate, as Marco Fantuzzi has recognized, the popular literary techniques of corresponsion and playful variation in Hellenistic book epigram. At the level of language, this playful interchange manifests itself the etymological echoes of Arata’s name in the repeated use of ἀρετή and ἀρά in the second strophe, where the anonymous mourner, perhaps imagined to be the deceased’s father, addresses Arata in her native dialect. Their Doric forms allow for an emphatically sonorous concatenation of alphas between the deceased’s name and her characteristic virtue. 

d) GVI 1149=Bernan d 4 (3rd-1st BCE), from Coptos in Egypt, is a long narrative epitaph commemorating the military and civic prowess of a certain Ptolemaios, a commander in the army of the Ptolemaic king. Ptolemaios addresses the passerby by in the first-person, whose speech the inscription varies between Doric and an epic-ionicized koine. 

---

347 Bubenik 1989, 78.
348 Fantuzzi 2010, 305 and Meyer 2005, 82.
349 The use of Doric color in this word continues at Cos and Rhodes through the Hellenistic period and into the early imperial period, while the use of Doric steadily gives way to the koine, which may suggest that Doric afforded ἀρετή some sort of further resonance. Could the same be said for Cyrene? The inscriptive evidence is lacking. 
350 A similar, though less organized, mixture of Doric and epic-ionic features appears in another Hellenistic inscribed epitaph for a Ptolemaic officer and member of an important priestly family at Magna-Edfu, one Apollonios (GVI 1151=Bernand 5) who died in battle at the end of the second century BCE (103-101 BCE). The poem was composed by a certain Herodes. Given the elite stature of Apollonios and his entire family, it is possible that they admixture of Doric is again related to the affinity for the use of the dialect amongst the Macedonian elites in the Ptolemaic court or, from another point of view given the slightly later date, a fossilized reflection of that association.
Here a tomb conceals me, passerby, the commander Ptolemaios
who died in a mighty battle,
and my son Menodoros fearless in wars
and a courageous warrior with a flag-bearing pole,
when against enemies along with Macedonian troops,
of which I was the commander at that time, I led a furious Ares;
both of us, worsting countless hostile enemies on the
front lines, savage Hades seized.
We perished giving glorious gifts on our fatherland’s behalf.
where previously I was a gymnasiarch,
and often fierce among the soldiers, but when
there was need for council, I received praise on account of my wisdom.
But you, powerful Ptolemy, hail even among the deceased;
and having spoken to his son, passerby, be on your way.

As is common with epitaphs not erected abroad, Ptolemaios does not directly relate his ethnic or
place of burial. In the course of recounting his military and civic activities, however, Ptolemaios
does mention his “fatherland” (l.9: πάτρας), which we is most plausibly identified with Coptos,
where the inscription was erected. Four lines earlier, Ptolemaios points out that he was the
commander, at the time of his demise, of “Macedonian troops” (Μακηδόνι σὺν στρατιώτη). The
ethnic term Μακηδόν had several different implications in the Ptolemaic world of the third and
second centuries BCE, the date to which Ptolemaios’ epitaph has been assigned. First, it could
designate individuals from Macedonia or descended from Macedonians, the Greek ethnic group
the comprised the core of the Ptolemaic elite. Second, Μακηδών was a pseudo-ethnic, applied to
one of the ethnic hipparchies for which a matching ethnicity was not a requirement for
membership and used as a title within in the military that accorded the bearer certain financial
and societal benefits.351 Since we know nothing else of our Ptolemaios, it is unclear whether the
Macedonian troops over which he had command were a band of actual ethnic Macedonians or a
more heterogeneous group of soldiers to whom the pseudo-ethnic had been granted. What is
clear, however, is the focus the poet of the epitaph placed on Ptolemaios’ dedication to his troops
and the Ptolemaic kingdom, whose rulers were proud of their Macedonian heritage. The mixture
of dialectal features, I argue, linguistically articulates the rhetoric of the epitaph as a whole.

On the one hand, the epic language in the epigram clusters around battle imagery,
heroicizing the sacrifices Ptolemaios and his son Menodorus made on behalf of their native
land.352 Ptolemaios died in a mighty battle (κρατερὴν ϕιλόπιδα φθίµενον); he guided his
Macedonian troops into the teeth of the enemy (ἐπὶ δυσµενέσσι); and made certain to be valiant
(ἀρήµος) among his infantrymen (ἐµ πρωλέσσιν). On the other hand, the Doric forms cluster
around his identity as an officer in the Ptolemaic army and an upstanding member of the his local
community, likely at Coptos. The epigram begins with the Doric ἁγεµόνα and when the rank is
repeated in line six so too is the Doric color (ἀγεµόνων). In times of peace Ptolemaios he held
the socially prestigious position of gymnasiarch in his hometown of Coptus and again we find
the presence of Doric (γόµνασιάρχος...γενόµαν).

While Bernand, the latest editor and commentator of the inscription observed the mixture
of Doric and epic-Ionic forms, he did not offer any reasoning for their presence beyond noting

351 On the use of pseudo-ethnics, such as Μακηδών, in the Ptolemaic army, see Fischer-Bovet 2014, 177-95 with
bibliography.
352 Bernand 1969, 52 on l.12: “la valeur du personage reside dans l’union de ses qualities d’action (v.1-8) et de
pensée (v.9-12). C’est là le vieil ideal grec qu’incarne déjà Achille (II. IX, 443).”
the frequency of such mixture in epigrams of this type.\textsuperscript{353} I suggest that an association between dialect and identity has an influence on the pattern of distribution of Doric forms. Macedonians, and particularly members of the Ptolemaic royal court, considered themselves Greek through putative Argive origins.\textsuperscript{354} Scholars have located the cultural import of this origin story, for certain Macedonians, in the use of Doric. The dialect does persist, for example, in the names of Macedonians on Hellenistic census lists and lists of Ptolemaic priestly offices\textsuperscript{355} and it also appears in book epigrams on Macedonian subjects (cf. Theaetetus G-P 1=A.P. 6.357 on deceased Macedonian siblings, Attic-Ionic with with one Doric form: ἕσταμες), including several by Posidippus that celebrate members of the Ptolemaic royal house (AB 87 and AB 88), although the ethnic associations of the Ptolemaic royal family with Macedonia is only one plausible explanation for the dialect choice.\textsuperscript{356} Although we do not know if our Ptolemaios was himself Macedonian or of Macedonian extraction, ethnic and cultural identity during the Hellenistic period, and particularly among the epitaphs of soldiers, was, as Barbantani has observed, a “matter [of] choice, much more than a matter of genes.”\textsuperscript{357} The poet of Ptolemaios’ epitaph has chosen to emphasize the deceased’s leadership position in the Ptolemaic army at the command of “Macedonian” troops, his social standing as a gymnasiarch, a Greek cultural institution, and his dedication to Ptolemy, the Macedonian ruler of the kingdom. Given all of this, it is plausible that the poet of this epitaph has drawn his dialect choice partially from the broader cultural association between Argive blood and Macedonian identity and the Macedonian homeland.

\textsuperscript{353} Bernand 1969, 52.  
\textsuperscript{354} For a discussion of the evidence see Bearzot 1992. On Greek-Macedonian identity more broadly see Engels 2010. The close identification of the Ptolemies with their Macedonian identity is reinforced by the trend of those seeking favor with the court to claim Macedonian ancestry; on which see Kosmetatou 2004.  
\textsuperscript{355} The dialect color of these documents is studied by Clarysse 1998, whose conclusion (12) that Doric was the “prestige dialect which the Macedonian kings spoke among their peers.”  
\textsuperscript{356} Arguments in support of this reading can be found in see Sens 2004 (on Posidippus’ epinician epigrams for the Ptolemaic royal family) and Hunter 2005. I will return to the putative Macedonian resonances of Doric later in chapter five (229-39).  
\textsuperscript{357} Barbantani 2014, 306.
Greeks from throughout the Mediterranean visited the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries of Olympia, Delos, and Delphi. They commonly left behind monuments and dedications as commemorations of their visit, feats, or aspirations. At these sites, as Buck has demonstrated, the dedications of the visitors to the sanctuary often retain the dialect coloring of the dedicator’s home polis, and sometimes the epichoric alphabet forms as well.\footnote{Buck 1913, 136-38; Buck was not the first to notice this phenomenon, cf. von Premerstein 1910.}

a) \textit{CEG} 388 (ca. 450-425) from Olympia is a clear example:\footnote{Buck 1913, 136. Pausanias describes this monument in his tour of Olympia at 5.27.8.}

\textit{Ἑρμεί marzo αἰτὶ ἀλεξ[\(\alpha\)]ρ ἐποίε.}
\textit{Γλαυκίς ὁ Λυκίδεο \(\tau\) Ἑρμή' Ἡ[\(\eta\)]γίνος.}

Calon of Elis made me for Hermes.
Rhegian Glaukies, the son of Lukkides, for Hermes.

The inscription preserves the signature of the artist as well as the dedication; artist and dedicator are from different poleis and different dialect regions. The dialect choices make these differences clear. The Elean artist, a local to the sanctuaries of Olympia, has his signature rendered in the Elean alphabet. The surviving fragments of the signature preserve aspects common to the dialect of Elis, namely the preservation of \(\alpha\) for \(\eta\) in the name of the city (\(\varphi\)\(\alpha\)λεξ[\(\alpha\)]ρ). The use of word initial digamma is found in a number of dialects including the Northwest Doric group of which Elean is a part.\footnote{Buck 1955, §52 and 239.} Additionally, the correction of \(\Lambda\) to \(\alpha\) in [\(\big{\varepsilon\}ρμεί\)]\(\alpha\)τ produces the expected Doric form of the proper name.\footnote{This error is found elsewhere at \textit{CEG} 171 (Egypt; 475-400 BCE) and \textit{CEG} 320 (Attica; ca. 420 BCE).} Finally, that \(\gamma\)\(ε\)\(ν\)\(e\)\(t\) is to be supplemented with the Doric dative ending (-\(\vartheta\)ι) seems likely but is unprovable. The dedicator hails from Rhegium in southern Italy and his dedication also appears in his local Rhegian alphabet and employs features from the
Ionic spoken there at the time, namely the retention of \( \eta \) following \( \varepsilon, \iota, \) or \( \rho \) ([\( \Gamma\lambda\varsigma\upsilon\kappa\iota\varsigma \)]) and the genitive singular of masculine \( \alpha \)-stem nouns in \( \varepsilon\omega \) (\( \Lambda\gamma\kappa\kappa\iota\delta\omega \)). While one can imagine a scenario in which the artist composed his signature in his own dialect and Glaukies did the same for his single line dedication, it is rather more plausible that a local stonemason (and/or poet?) at Olympia composed the epigram in the subjects’ native dialects and epichoric alphabets, perhaps in consultation with a copy book or after gaining some type of specialized training in order to work successfully at a pan-Hellenic site. Whatever the exact identity of the composer of \( CEG \) 388, the dedication exemplifies the use of the subject’s native speech in inscribed epigrams commissioned and erected abroad.

While not as uniform as those examples from prose interstate inscriptions or verse dedications at pan-Hellenic sites, this practice is also present in epitaphs.

b) \( CEG \) 131=Simonides \( FGE \) 11 (Salamis; 480 BCE), attributed to Simonides in antiquity, commemorates the death of Corinthian soldiers in the decisive battle that turned to Persian war in the Greeks’ favor.

---

\(^{362}\) Rhegium was a Chalcidian colony, which meant its founders spoke an Ionic dialect. Following the sacking of the city by Dionysius of Syracuse in 387 BCE, the linguistic landscape of the city underwent some significant changes as it was incorporated into the sphere of Syracusean influence. Based on limited inscriptive evidence from the centuries that followed, Doric became the base dialect used in the city’s public inscriptions. Due to the presence of features associated with Rhodian Doric, such as the infinitive in \( \mu\epsilon\iota\nu \), Buck 1955, 254-55 n.100 suggested that the city was likely repopulated with citizens from the Sicilian cities of Gela and Agrigentum, whose dialect shared in these Rhodian features.

\(^{363}\) An additional example of the retention of native dialect in dedications at pan-Hellenic sites not included in Buck 1913 is \( CEG \) 380i (Olympia; ca. 484-461), a victory dedication in Doric by a well-traveled Praxiteles who had more recently lived in Syracuse and Camarina but originally hailed from Mantinea in Arcadia. While the Doric is appropriate for any of Praxiteles’ places of residence, the letter forms are Arcadian, possibly chosen, in part, to underscore his Arcadian origins. That the use of Arcadian letter forms has some significance beyond the fact that this inscription was erected in Arcadia finds support from the two other surviving texts inscribed along with Praxiteles’ dedication on five stones that were a base for bronze statues. The two other inscriptions are artist signatures. \( CEG \) 380ii records the “shared work” (\( \xiυν \)...\( \tau\delta\epsilon \) \( \rho\epsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron \)) of Achaean Athanodorus and Argive Asopodorus, which is inscribed in Syracusean (or Camarinian) letter forms (perhaps they traveled from Syracuse with Praxiteles’?); \( CEG \) 380iii records another “shared work” of two Argive artists, Atotis and Aregeidas, and this inscription is written in matching Argive letter forms.
Stranger, once we lived in the well-watered town of Corinth, but now Salamis, the island of Ajax, embraces us. Here having conquered the Phoenician ships and Persians and the Medes we saved holy Greece.

Addressing the passersby in proprìa persona, the Corinthian soldiers recall their former life in Corinth and the memory of that time is made more vivid through the incorporation of features from their native West Greek dialect. The Doric coloring appears in the substitution of –κα for –τε in the temporal adverb ποκ’ (Buck 1955, §132.11) and the use of –μες for –μεν in the first person plural of ἐναίομες (Buck 1955, §138.3). Whether we should consider the omicron at the end of φορίνθο as Attic-Ionic –ου or Doric –ω is debatable. Tod prints the doricizing Κορίνθῳ, although Boegehold notes that a bare –ο rather than –ου is “unusual in Corinthian inscriptions.” Perhaps the non-Corinthian poet, ignorant of local practice, wished to further stress the Doric features of the epigram’s language. The variability of a bare omicron for a genitive ending allows, however, other possibilities. On the inscription of the kappa in φορίνθῳ, Hansen observes that the stonecutter originally began to inscribe a κ, but then stopped and fixed his mistake. This led Hansen to conclude that “lapidarius Atheniensis fuit.” Wilhelm believed

364 Ionic form required metri causa. Corinthian inscriptions do not usually present examples of the first compensatory lengthening following the loss of the digamma and so ζένε would be the expected form; see Miller 2014, 195 with examples. Hansen plausibly explains the change from ζείνε to ζένε in the manuscript tradition of the epigram as a result of a confusion of the letter forms on the stone on the part of the first copyist of the inscription.

365 Tueller 2010, 51-52 has argued that this epigram and Simonides G-P 22b=A.P. 7.249, which was supposedly erected at Thermopylae, possibly initiated the use of ξένος as the term of address for the passerby on the grounds that in this context ξένος is appropriate since their burial abroad would necessitate that the Corinthian soldiers would consider the majority of passersby as strangers.

366 Boegehold 1965, 182.
that some one attempted to turn the koppa into a kappa,\textsuperscript{367} while Boegehold argued that the
\textit{koppa} was the original and intended letter form and the scratch above the letter is ultimately
“irrelevant.”\textsuperscript{368} I follow Hansen’s reconstruction, but however the \textit{koppa} was originally
inscribed, its presence alone stresses the Doric visual coloring of this epitaph for the dead
Corinthians. The rest of the surviving inscription is too badly damaged to provide evidence for its
dialect composition and the originality of the second couplet, which is only transmitted in the
manuscript tradition, has been questioned.\textsuperscript{369} That the Doric of the first line continued throughout
the rest of the epigram is likely, but ultimately unprovable.

In addition to capturing the deceased soldiers’ speech in a realistic tone, the dialect
choice is also significant in terms of the physical context of the Corinthians’ site of burial on
Salamis. Although at this time a possession of Athens, Salamis was, according to tradition,
originally Megarian.\textsuperscript{370} In this sense, then, the dialect of the epigram is not foreign to its site of
display and, perhaps, could be read, with this history in mind, as an evocation Salamis’ Dorian
past with which it shared a common language with the brave Corinthian soldiers.

The commissioners of the public epitaph for the fallen Corinthian soldiers were likely
honoring their native sons and so the consistent Doric coloring was to be doubly expected on the

\textsuperscript{367} Wilhelm 1899, 227.
\textsuperscript{368} Boegehold 1965, 180-81.
\textsuperscript{369} Scholars have debated the originality of the second distich for which there is no inscriptional evidence. Kaibel
1873, 442 first questioned the authenticity of the lines on the grounds of the Doric scansion of \textit{Πέρσας} and the
anachronistic, in his view, distinction drawn between Persians and Medes; Wilhelm 1899, 227 and Wilamowitz-
Moellendorff 1913, 193 adopted Kaibel’s arguments against the couplet. Following the arguments of Boegehold
1965, there is no strong evidence to doubt that the epigram was originally a quatrain. There is enough space on the
stone, now a hollow depression, present for a further two lines. The argument that Greeks did not, in the wake of
Salamis, draw distinctions between Persians and Medes is impossible to verify. The continuity in Doric coloring
between the couplets can be viewed as either evidence for or against authenticity; however the use of Doric scansion
demonstrates, if the lines are not original, a sensitivity to the Doric coloring of the original couplet that is notable in
its own right. The larger point of my discussion does not rely on the originality of the second couplet, although I do
find no reason to doubt its authenticity.
\textsuperscript{370} Philolaeus, the son or grandson of Ajax, was believed to have gifted the island to the Athenians (cf. Plu. \textit{Sol. 10.3}
and Paus. 1.35.2). Sens 2011, 196 discusses this history in relation to Asclepiades G-P 29=A.P. 7.145, an epitaph for
Ajax whose Doric coloring, he argues, may “be intended to reflect the mild Doric spoken at Megara.”
Salamanian inscription. Across the straits of Salamis in the Athenian cemetery near the Acharnian gate stood a gravestone for the heroic Pythion of Megara, who by guiding the Athenian commander Andokides and the three tribes under his command through Boetia helped them escape the onslaught of a Peloponnesian force.

c) In Pythion’s epitaph we find a mixture of Doric and Attic features (CEG 83; ca. 446-425 BCE).

This is a memorial set upon the grave of an excellent man: Pythion from Megara having slain seven men, and having broken off seven spear-heads in their bodies achieved excellence, bringing honor to his father among the people. This man, who saved three tribes of Athenians leading them from Pagae through Boeotia into Athens, brought honor to Andokidas by (capturing?) two-thousand slaves. Having harmed no one of the men who live upon the earth he went down to Hades most blessed for all to see. These tribes are: Pandionis, Kekropis, Antiochis.

---

371 On Pythion’s Megarian origins, see the discussion of the historical context of the epigram in Köhler 1889, 92-100 and accepted by later scholars such as Threte 1980, 2.542 and Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 137.

372 I follow Köhler 1889, 94 in understanding Andokides as the Athenian general aided by Megarian Pythion; cf. Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 137. Bowie 2010, 360 argues that Andokides is Pythion’s father, whom the epitaph mentions in line four as also receiving honors (ἐυκλείζων) through the deceased’s actions, since otherwise the father would not be named. Bowie cites CEG 58 (Attic; ca. 510-500 BCE) for the “postponement of the father’s name”, but the comparison is not apt. This epitaph does not present the similar situation of first mentioning the father without naming him and then inserting his name without explicitly stating (beyond the common usage of a verb) the relationship to the deceased.

373 For a narrative of the events see Diodorus 12.5; the dating of the inscription see Köhler 1889, 92-100, accepted by Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 137. In the abstract of an unpublished paper given at the 1969 General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America Edmonson 1970, 193 argued that the events and route of the rescue described in the epitaph better fit with the battle of Tanagra in 457 BCE.
Previous treatments of this epigram have attacked its style. Köhler described the language as “roh und plump”, and Tod declared the entirety “curiously illiterate.” A factor in this stylistic criticism is the dialectal variance between Doric and Attic. While the poem is hardly the most elegant example of fifth-century inscribed epitaph, the verses hardly qualify as illiterate and their dialectal color, in my view, contributes to the Athenian epitaph’s praise of a foreign ally.

Doric coloring is applied, with one interesting exception, to terms closely associated with the memory (σάματι), actions (δαιώσας), and characteristics (τὰν ἀρετάν) of Python, the Megarian (Doric-speaking) savior of Athenian troops. Attic vocalizations, which accord with the location of commemoration, are present in terms used to denote the Athens-based grave maker (µνῆµα), references to Athens and Athenians (Ἀθηναίων and Ἀθήνας), and the term δήµος, although used for Python’s own Megarians, which has Athenian resonances as well.

The division of Doric and Attic variance is not completely precise. Most notably, at line seven the name of the Athenian general, Andokides, appears in Doric (Ἀνδοκίδαν). Despite the application of a Doric vocalism to Ἀνδοκίδαν, there still exists the potential, in my view, for an effective distribution of the dialect variance, as was argued above for the Hellenistic epitaph for Ptolemaios, that can be explained as more than the haphazard mixture of a quasi-literate

374 Köhler 1889, 94.
375 Tod 1985, 82.
376 At line seven, the epigram recounts how Python, through his heroic guidance, “brought honor to Andokides by (capturing?) two-thousand slaves.” The poet here renders the name of the Athenian general in Doric (Ἀνδοκίδαν). While this form could be taken as further evidence for the poet’s clumsy mastery of dialect features, we might also consider, in light of the pattern of association between the Doric forms and Python, that the poet chose to doricize the name of the Athenian general to underscore the essential role Megarian Python played in saving Andokides from certain disaster and loss of respect if not ultimately life.
377 While an error or carelessness may well explain the doricization of Athenian Andokides’ name, we might also consider, in light of the pattern of association between the Doric forms and Python, that the poet chose to doricize the name of the Athenian general to underscore the essential role Megarian Python played in saving Andokides from certain disaster and loss of respect if not ultimately life.
poet.\textsuperscript{378} Perhaps, then, in recognition of Pythion’s decision to aid the Athenians against his own city,\textsuperscript{379} which was in revolt, his Athenian friends sought to re-create, in the evocation of his native dialect, a “home” burial for Pythion abroad.\textsuperscript{380}

d) \textit{SGO} I 01/01/07, a first-century BCE epitaph for a certain Atthis from Cnidos, a Doric-speaking city, offers an instructive and more dynamic parallel for the meaningful variance of dialect argued for in the epitaphs of Ptolemaios and Pythion. Articulated in four elegiac stanzas (of alternating lengths of four and six lines), the epitaph is an expanded example of inscribed dialogue,\textsuperscript{381} particularly the simpler question-and-answer epitaphs.\textsuperscript{382} The epitaph for Atthis records an exchange between Theios and his deceased wife. Theios, who is the first-person speaker in the first, second, and fourth stanzas, laments the premature death of his young and dedicated wife; the deceased Atthis replies to Theios in the third stanza. The alternating lengths of the stanzas are mirrored by an alternation in dialect. Stanzas one and three

\textsuperscript{378} Where others may charitably approach the Doric admixture as an attempt to inject the epitaph with an elevated tone on the assumption that Doric would have created a link with choral lyric, I resist this easy association, especially in a case like this epigram where none of the doricized language evokes choral lyric or its performance occasions.

\textsuperscript{379} Not all Athenian commemorations of allied war dead chose to incorporate aspects of the deceased’s native dialect into the fabric of the inscription. \textit{CEG} 12 (Athens; 433/2 BCE) memorializes the death of Silenus from Ionic-speaking Rhegium, who traveled to Athens to defend the city. In this epitaph we find only dialect forms best understood, given the context, as Attic (πάτρας; συµµαχίαν).

\textsuperscript{380} \textit{CEG} 108 (Eretria; ca. 450 BCE), an epitaph for the Aeginetan Mnesitheus, displays a similar practice to that found in the epitaphs for the Corinthian soldiers and Pythion. The epigram mixes Doric features (cf. τοι; ἀνάµεναι; τύµοι; ἡταξ) from his native dialect into the Attic-Ionic base appropriate to an internment in Eretria. On the other hand, dialect mixture occurs elsewhere in inscribed epigram where its application is unlikely to be influenced by regional associations. This is not the place to provide an exhaustive list let alone treatment of the various types of mixture present in archaic through Hellenistic inscribed epigram: cf. e.g., \textit{CEG} 83 (Attica; 446-425 BCE: A-I/d [AWN] cf. 75 and 302); 520 (Attica; ca. 370-60 BCE: D/A-I); 692 (Rhodes; 4\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE: D/A-I); Bernard 5 (Edfu; 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BCE: I/D); Bernard 35 (Edfu; 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BCE: I/D).

\textsuperscript{381} A similar lengthy stanzaic epitaph (\textit{GVI} 1873=Bernard 33), dated by letterforms to the second half of the second century BCE, represents the speech of the tomb, the husband who commissioned the memorial, and the deceased wife, which are separated by the heading of ἄλλο, an inscriptive practice commonly used to separate a series of discreet epigrams. The epitaph has very limited admixture of Doric features (Zucker 1954), especially if you set aside the names Ἀµµωνία and Μάτρων then the only Doric form would be βιοτᾶς. As such the use of dialect does not have a parallel with that found in the Atthis epitaph.

\textsuperscript{382} Peek 1980 collects six examples of this type of dialogic epitaph (1873-77 and 1880), the earliest—and least developed—example of which dates to the fourth century BCE (\textit{CEG} 530; cf. discussion in Tsagalis 2008, 260).
Hellenistic koine with a light Ionic patina, most notably in the retention of η following ε, ι, or ρ (παρηγορήτω), and epic color (e.g. lack of contraction in ἥλιον).  

Stanzas two and four transmit markedly Doric features, most notably α for η (e.g., Ἄδαν; ἀμετέρας; τῷ; ἀρετῶς; μνάμαν). While imperfectly arranged (since Theios also is the speaker of the first stanza, although we do then have a ABAB balance in dialect distribution), the dialect variance of the epitaph divides itself between speakers: Theios speaks in Doric, while Atthis replies in an ionicized koine.

Read against the background of dialect use in inscribed epigram, the Doric of Theios’ voice proclaims his identity as a native of Cnidos. More interesting, on this account, is the poet’s decision to use a contrastive Hellenistic koine for the voice of the deceased Atthis. Hanink suggests that the dialect choice could be related to the deceased’s status as a foreigner, since her name (Atthis) “is suggestive of Attica”, or be designed to evoke the imagined dialect of the dead on the model of the epic-Ionic language of the Homeric nekyiai. Leaving aside quibbles with Hanink’s classification of Atthis’ speech as Ionic, I have found no evidence for the association of a dialect with the speech of the dead. Indeed, the deceased, more often than not, speak in the dialect they used when alive. Regarding dialect choice, Hanink, then, is correct to question the ethnic status of the deceased. Ἀτθίς was a common term to refer to Attica or an Attic quality, including dialect. Based on this further evidence, there is a great likelihood that a reader who would encounter the name Ἀτθίς would have had the region and city of Athens first in his or her mind. Comparative material bears out this assumption. In another first-century BCE epitaph for an Atthis, also in koine, the voice of the deceased explicitly refers to the association between her

---

383 Hanink 2010 classifies this dialect composition of stanzas one and three as Ionic throughout her discussion (cf. 23 and 25), despite the fact that the base dialect draws most of its forms from an unmarked koine.

384 Hanink 2010, 23.

385 Hanink does not offer any citations in her footnotes.

386 Ἀτθίς, with or without γῆ, was used to refer to Attica: e.g. Eur. Iom 13; Epin. 1.6 K-A. For use of the term in reference to the Attic dialect cf. Strabo 8.1.2.
name and the region. When considered in conjunction with the doricized voice of Cnidian Theios at a time when Doric was disappearing from inscriptions, it is quite probable that the poet used a koine dialect as a playful acknowledgement of the resonances in Atthis’ name. The question of Atthis’ actual status as a foreigner, for which there is no evidence, is moot since the variation in dialect is entirely decipherable within the closed system of dialect usage in the epitaph and the tradition of inscriptive practice.

The Emergence of the Poet: Ion of Samos

In the preceding examples, I have outlined a pattern of dialect usage in inscribed epigram related to the place of the inscription’s display/commission or the native dialect in those instances where the dedicator or deceased hailed from a different city and linguistic region. While not all inscriptions erected by or for foreigners abroad incorporate aspects of the native dialect (still even in these instances the influence of geography on dialect choice—here the dialect of the location of the commission and display of the epigram—is strong), epigrams like those for the dead Corinthian soldiers in Salamis or Python of Megara in Athens underscore the association between place and dialect in the Greek mind.

Part of the allure of inscribed epigrams is the sense of immediacy that they create in the use of the voice of the deceased or dedicator. The dead Corinthian soldiers at Salamis, for example, directly address the reader. The anonymity of these inscriptions, as scholars have recognized, is a significant contributing factor. By not knowing the name or identity of the poet of these words, the reader can more readily collapse the distance between the subject and the

---

\(^{387}\) cf. \textit{SGO II 08/01/36.1} (Cyzicos, 86 BCE): Ἄτθις ἐγὼ· κέινη γάρ ἐμὴ πόλις ("I am Atthis, an Athenian; for that is my home city."), cited by Hanink 2010, 17.
verses that they ‘speak.’ Less well recognized, but equally important, is the use of native dialect in these poems. The dialect of an epigram injects the silent stone on which it is inscribed with an approximation of the local soundscape of the subject. The deceased or dedicator does not only speak these lines to the reader, she speaks them in her native language.

The introduction of the identity of the author complicates this previously neat equation between voice and inscriptional speaker. The name of an author reminds the reader that the voice they hear is not the unmediated speech of the inscriptional subject but the creative product of a poet. The specter of authorial presence has obvious and serious implications for the reading of dialect choice as a marker of place. What effect, in the case of an epigram that reproduces the native dialect of the dedicator, is produced by the knowledge that this dialect is not that same as the author to whom authorship is ascribed? Such knowledge would encourage a reader, I contend, to think about the artificiality of the direct association between the voice of the epigram and the language and pause to consider more closely its role in articulating the conceits of the poem. In short, authorial identity can activate two levels of reading, one which notes the inscriptive reality created by the traditional use of native dialect and another that seeks out the authorial role in composing an epigram in one’s non-native dialect.

In chapter five, I will examine the effects of authorial identity, and the various developments it brings to epigram, on the geography of dialect in Hellenistic epigram, the period in which authorship replaced anonymity. This process, however, predates the third century BCE. Unlike the epigrams to follow, which are transmitted in the manuscripts of the Greek Anthology or papyri and whose original inscriptional contexts are unknown (if any existed), there do survive several inscribed epigrams that announce their authorship. Most notable are the epigrams by Ion of Samos for a statue group dedicated by the Lacedaemonians at Delphi in
commemoration of the Spartan admiral Lysander and his defeat of the Athenian navy at Aegospotamai. Since this epigram shares a component that defines the Hellenistic period of epigram but survives in an inscriptionsal context, it is an ideal poem through which to begin an investigation of the effects authorship can have on the reception of dialect as a marker of place in epigram.

In the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, as Pausanias reports, there was a group of bronze statues of Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, the Dioscuri, and Poseidon, who fittingly crown the Spartan admiral Lysander (Paus. 10.9.7-10). Three quatrains were appended to the group statue base, but the letter forms suggest that these epigrams were later additions, perhaps more than a half-century after the original dedication, an important point to which we will return. The epigrams on the Dioscuri and Lysander survive in varying states of preservation. I will focus on the latter, since it is the best preserved and takes as its subject a historical event (CEG 819 iii; ca. 330 BCE).

εἰκόνα ἔδω ἀνέθηκεν ἐπὶ τῶν ὅτε νικῶν
ναυσιδοιός πέρισσον Κέρσοδαν δύναμιν
Λύσανδρος, Λακεδαιμόνη ἀπόρθητον στεφανώσας
Ἑλλάδος ἀξιόπολες [νυ, κ]ἀλλήρων πατρίδα.
ἐξάμο ἀμφίρυτης [ης] τεῦξε ἔλεγεῖον: ἰων.

388 Since we know nothing else of Ion of Samos, including his dates, his relationship to Lysander and the original commissioning of the sculpture group is unclear. Based on letterforms dating to the end of the fourth century BCE, scholarly consensus has viewed these epigrams as a later edition; see Pouilloux and Roux 1963, 59 the opinion adopted by Hansen 1983. Bousquet 1956, 580 argues that the letter forms do not preclude inscription close to the date of the event which the statue group commemorates. Whether Ion was originally commissioned to compose the epigrams for the statue group or later appended the verses on his own accord does not affect our understanding of his use of dialect as a marker of place, except in establishing a relative timeline of developments in the practice. 389 i.e. ἐξ Σάμου. Starting at the end of the fifth century (403/2 BCE) ἔξ before σ fused, as Thraette 1980, 1.586 observes, into ἔξ in Attic inscriptions and elsewhere; cf. e.g., IG II² 1.24 (ἐξάμο 403/2 BCE) and IG II² 1672.274 (ἐξαλαμβάνως 329/8 BCE). For the incomplete ἀμφίρυτης Hansen 1983, 227 has chosen to supplement the Doric genitive –ας by analogy to the Doric coloring in Κέρσοδαν. Since, however, it is impossible to know what was originally present on the stone, the restoration of the Attic- Ionic ἀμφίρυτης [ης] (supplemented by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1903, 7) is equally justifiable, especially given the language of Ion and of Samos. A supplement of ἀμφίρυτον (Tod 1946, 329) is unlikely, as Hansen recognized, based on the size of the lacuna, while ἀμφίρυτον (Homolle 1901, 685) would contrast with the use of –ο (ἐξάμο) earlier in the line, although the stonemcutter need not
Lysander set upon his own image on this monument when in conquest he destroyed with swift ships the power of Kekrops’ descendants and so crowned unravaged Laconia, the citadel of Greece, his fatherland with beautiful dancing-grounds. Ion, from sea-girt Samos, composed this quatrain.

The quatrain on the statue of the Spartan admiral contains two Doric features set against a background of Attic-Ionic. The third person singular possessive adjective ἑάν has α for η (ἐός is absent from Attic prose and tragedy, but in Homer) and this particular form is found elsewhere only in Doric contexts. The genitive plural Ἐ[κ]ροπιδᾶν features the Doric -άν for Attic-Ionic ὀν. ναοσί is dialectally ambiguous between Attic and Doric; given the subject matter of the epigram it is possibly that a reader could have construed the form as Doric. Although limited, the Doricisms in the inscription on the plinth of a statue group dedicated in memory of Lysander’s victory over the Athenians follows the practice of marking the native dialect of the dedicator or subject of dedication at pan-Hellenic sites.

Appended to the quatrain is an extra pentameter, which Ion of Samos, an otherwise unknown poet, used as a sphragis. Here we likely have one of the earliest recorded instances of an affirmation of authorship in epigram. The presence of Ion’s name significantly reorients a reader’s reception of the poetic voice in the epigram that preceded it. Where previously had been an anonymous third-person voice common to dedicatory or honorific inscriptions, now the voice have remained consistent in his orthography. Nevertheless a feminine form is more likely obscured by the lacuna, since it was a common poeticism to use it when modifying islands; cf. LSJ s.v. 390 cf. Pind. O. 10.38; P. 4.159; I. 8.29 and Antipater of Sidon G-P 25=A.P. 7.241.

391 CEG 888.1-19, a poem in seventeen hexameters on the military triumphs of the Xanthian king Arbinas inscribed on the base of a statue bearing the dynast’s likeness found in the Letoon of Xanthus, has appended to it a single elegiac distich in which a certain Symmachos of Pellana, described as a μάχης, is identified as the fashioner of these ἐλεγήματα for Arbinas. Arbinas is known to have been in power at Xanthus in the late fifth to early fourth century BCE; following the original editor (Bousquet), Hansen gives a broad dating of the fourth century BCE to the poem. See also the discussion in Petrovic 2009, 196-200 with further bibliography. CEG 700.3 (4th c. BCE; Cnidos) and CEG 889.7-8 (4th c. BCE; Lycia) also from the Letoon in Xanthus are considerably more uncertain examples of a poet’s signature. On signed funerary epigrams from the Hellenistic period onward, see Santin 2009.
of Ion emerges. The possible identification of the epigrammatic voice with Ion establishes a new relationship between the reader, the statue group, and its inscriptions. As Fantuzzi has perceptively observed, Ion relates to the reader, in a mode similar to the tour guides known to have led visitors through sites like Delphi, the events that led to the erection of the monument. Lysander commemorated his great victory over the Athenians, which brought honor to Sparta. Lysander’s metaphorical crowning of Sparta, replicates the physical crowning of Lysander by Poseidon at the center of the statue group. In a fashion fitting of a commentary, Ion, through the imagery of crowning, brings past and present together within his epigram. This dialogue between past and present is especially fitting for a set of verses devised for a later reinscription of the statue base.

In Ion of Samos’ choice to incorporate Doric forms into his epigram on the image of Lysander, we have our first evidence of a self-conscious engagement with the dialect conventions of inscribed epigram. Read as an anonymous dedication accompanying the erection of the statue group, the Doric coloring, as we have already suggested, recalls Lysander’s native dialect and follows inscriptional practice at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries. Lysander or another Spartan admirer would naturally include language (perhaps more than we find here) from his native city when commemorating such an important civic event. Conversely, Ion’s Samian origins, which we have no reason to doubt, make it quite probable that his native language was Ionic. The presence of Ion’s artist signature, one which includes a marker of a linguistic background different from the dialect of the epigram and epigrammatic subject, highlights the intervention of an authorial identity into what was previously a linear relationship between the epigrammatic subject and the language of the inscription. The signature, in other words, draws attention to the artificiality of the dialect choice.

392 Fantuzzi in Hunter and Fantuzzi 2004, 290.
While scholars have recognized the significant influence the injection of Ion’s poetic voice has had on the transformation of the epigram from a dedication to a studied commentary on the dedication, no one has discussed the play with dialect that results from this changed perspective. Ion delays the identification of the εἰκόνα until the beginning of the second couplet with the alliterative Λύσανδρος Λακεδαίμονα. Although Lysander might have been identifiable to some readers from iconography in the statue group or a label appended elsewhere on the plinth, the epigram has a structure that moves from puzzling opacity—which victory over the Athenian navy (who are further referred to a in learned periphrasis)?

Who was the commander?—to pleasurable clarity—yes, Lysander at Aegospotamai—that presages similar structures that creatively exploit the absence of a physical context in book epigram. Ion has limited Doric forms to the opening couplet. For a reader who knows the subject of the statue group from the outset, the Doric color simply echoes the common dialect practice in dedicatory epigrams from which Ion’s later reinscription takes inspiration. For a less knowledgeable reader, however, the presence of Doric forms are likely to only make retrospective sense upon reaching the second half of the epigram, where Lysander’s identity is revealed.

From this perspective, the dialect forms are akin to hints at the identity of the statue, which Ion, in the guise of an informed reader of the statue group, has incorporated for the benefit of other readers. The distribution of Doric forms, in other words, is its own sort of commentary, namely one on the conventions of inscribed dedicatory epigrams.

---

393 Athenians are referred to in this fashion only once elsewhere in classical inscribed epigram: CEG 890.1 (Κάρπος Ἀθηναίων).

394 Is there any further significance to doricizing Κ[ε]ροποδιν; I tentatively suggest that the Doric color emphasizes Lysander’s defeat of the Athenians, which was so thorough that not even the shape or texture of their name remained unaffected.

395 A similar delayed contextualization of dialect choice is present in several book epigrams. Note, for example, Callimachus G-P 15=A.P. 5.146, on the graceful beauty of Berenike II, where the Doric color of the opening couplet only becomes apparent when Berenike, who hailed from Callimachus’ own Doric-speaking Cyrene, is named as the subject at the end of the third line (see discussion at 231-32); or Heraclitus G-P 1=A.P. 7.465, an epitaph for a
Conclusions

The primary function of dialect in the inscribed epigrammatic tradition was to act as a marker of the ethnic or regional identity of the dedicator or deceased. The locality of inscribed epigram, as a commemorative token of a person or event often erected, especially early in the poetic type’s history, in their native city, clearly influenced its linguistic development as the one pre-Hellenistic genre that does not have a consolidated base dialect. Even as individual mobility increased, the Greek-speaking world expanded, and other poetic types exerted thematic and dictional influence on inscribed epigram, it continued to present dialect as a marker of identity. Dedications at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries retained the dialect (and the alphabet to a certain period) of the dedicator, even while the monuments themselves were often produced by local craftspeople who often had a different linguistic background. For those individuals who were unfortunate enough to die abroad, they were still commonly memorialized in their native language, as we saw with Megarian Pythion at Athens and the Corinthian sailors on Salamis.

A further influence on the dialect practice of inscribed epigram is the absence of a tradition surrounding an originator of the poetic type. In other poetic types from the period, the identity of the putative early practitioner often gave shape to its dialect conventions. The anonymous authors of inscribed epigram, who were likely, at least early on, to have been local artisans, kept the poetic type rather decentralized, which aided the continuation of a placed-based use of dialect. When authorial identities began to be attributed to previously anonymous epigrams and epigrammatists attached their own names to their works, the reader was reminded of certain Aretemias of Cnidos, whose first quatrain, which sets the scene of the epitaph ‘read’ in the second half of the epigram and shares in the epitaph’s Doric color (for further discussion of the relationship between voice and dialect in this epigram, see 187-90). Contrast with the inversion of the association of dialect and place in Theocritus G-P 15=A.P. 9.599, where the voice of an imaginary inscription to a statue of the poet Anacreon on the Ionic-speaking island of Teos is in Doric (see discussion at 242-43).
of the artificiality of the voice speaking to them through the verses. This artificiality had a significant effect on the inscriptive use of dialect to mark native speech practices. Ion of Samos, our earliest known inscriptive epigrammatist to sign his name to a work, recognized the literary possibilities of his authorial identity. By appropriating the structure and context of anonymous dedicatory epigram for an interpretation of the dedicated object, Ion interjected his own identity into the previously linear relationship between epigraphic text and reader. Through the redeployment of dialectal conventions, Ion’s verses act as an archaeology of dedicatory epigram, pointing backwards to the expected dialect of an original dedication as they simultaneously demonstrate their self-conscious nature.

We have seen that the dialectal heterogeneity of pre-Hellenistic inscribed epigram was a reflection of the poetic type’s commemorative function of capturing the identity (and voice) of the deceased or dedicator in stone. Indeed this relationship between dialect and identity, which is so pronounced in inscribed epigram, also appears, as demonstrated in chapter two, in other pre-Hellenistic poetic types. In the chapters that follow, the associations of dialect with place will be a continual leitmotif. Hellenistic book epigrammatists continued to employ and explore, as Ion of Chios had, the potentiality of the identity function of dialect even as they purposefully and inventively decoupled epigram from its inscriptive environment.

---

306 I borrow this terminology from the title of Hunter 1996 (Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek).
Part 2: Hellenistic Book Epigrams
Chapter 4: Place and Identity

Among the many sepulchral epigrams for fallen soldiers transmitted in the seventh book of the *Greek Anthology* is a quatrain ascribed to Mnasalces:

\[
\text{o} \iota \text{δε πάτραν πολύδακρυν ἐπ᾽ αὐχένι δεσμὸν ἐχοῦσαν}
\text{ῥυόμενοι δυναμαν ἀμφεβάλοντο κόνιν·}
\text{ἀρνύνται δ᾽ ἀρετάς αἴνον μέγαν. ἀλλὰ τις ἀστῶν}
\text{τούσδ᾽ ἐσιδῶν θυόσκειν τλάτω ὑπὲρ πατρίδος. (Mnasalces G-P 7=A.P. 7.242)}
\]

P Pl

4 θυόσκειν P: θυόσκειν P⟩

These men rescuing their country from the tearful yoke that sat upon its neck put the dark dust around themselves; They have won great praise for their valor. But let anyone of the citizens gazing on these men have the courage to die on their country’s behalf.

Besides the courage that the soldiers displayed in the brave sacrifice they made for their country, we can garner little else about the identity of the deceased men. If this epigram was originally commissioned for inscription, it is possible that a list of the names of the men would have accompanied the monument. Having offered up their lives for the public good, the name of their fatherland would likely be apparent from the physical context of the monument’s display, if not made explicit somewhere on the stone itself.

As it stands, this epitaph only appears—if it was ever actually inscribed in the first place—on the page in a collection of other book epigrams. The divorce of this epitaph from a real, physical context creates gaps in a reader’s reception of the text. Our reader does not stand in front of the tomb for these valorous men, but rather she must imagine a context into which she can situate and make further meaning of the text on her bookroll.\(^{397}\) Who were these men, she

\(^{397}\) Bing 1995 famously defined a poet’s deliberate exclusion of pertinent information about an epigrammatic subject—e.g. their name, native city, or cause of death—and a reader’s concomitant process of supplementation as
may have asked herself, that made this ultimate sacrifice? The lemmatist to Mnasalces’ epigram offers one possible supplementation available to an ancient reader, when he included a note to the effect that these verses commemorated the Spartans who fell at Thermopylae.

There is no evidence internal or external to the epigram that would lead one to necessarily privilege this identification over any other group of deceased soldiers. Rather the opposite. At the time of Thermopylae, the Spartans were not an enslaved people, as Gow and Page observed, and their dead were buried on the battlefield not back at home among their fellow citizens. And yet the lemmatist, or his source, chose to identify the dead, to enter into the act of supplementation. Dialect had a role to play here. Besides the Spartans being an exemplar of valorous sacrifice, the dialect of the epigram almost certainly influenced the identification of these anonymous dead soldiers. The predominant dialect color of the epigram is Doric. ἀρετᾶς and θνάσκειν are unambiguously Doric, and their presence make πάτραν and ὄνοφεράν, whose shared vocalism is a feature of Doric and Attic, most naturally read as the former. That numerous Hellenistic book epigrams on Spartan subjects share the dialect coloring in Mnaslaces’ epitaph demonstrates that Spartan identity did find expression through a literary Doric.

Doric coloring, for example, enlivens the humorous exchange between the Laconian river Eurotas and Aphrodite on the topic of her taking up arms for the famous Spartan cult of Aphrodite Enoplos:

Εἰπέ ποκ’ Ἐυρώτας πότι τὰν Κόπριν· “Ἡ λάβε τεῦχη
Њ ἢ ξίζθι τᾶς Σπάρτας· ὁ πόλις ὀπλομανεῖ.”
ἀ δ’ ἀπαλὸν γελάσασα· “Καὶ ἔσσομαι αἰὲν ἀτευχής,”
ἐπε, “καὶ οἰκήσω τὰν Λακεδαιμονίαν.”

---

Ergänzungsspiel, a self-conscious game of literary detective work. The approach has been used to read book epigram quite successfully by a number of scholars, even though it is applied too liberally in certain instances where the point of the epigram does not demand supplementation, but rather its patent rejection of contextualization (cf. Theocritus G-P 15=A.P. 9.599 and my discussion at 242-43).

398 Gow and Page 1965, 2.404.
Once Eurotas said to Aphrodite: “Take up arms or leave Sparta. The city is battle-crazed.”

Aphrodite gently laughing said: “I will always be unarmed And I will dwell in Lacedaemon.”

Aphrodite is unarmed; shameless are the historians who say how the goddess bears arms with us.

It is natural for the anthropomorphized Eurotas, a significant toponymn of Spartan territory, to speak the native dialect of the region whose boundaries he marks. The presence of Doric color in the speech of the epigram’s narrator isn’t similarly clear until the final verse. By castigating the “shameless historians” (ἀναιδέες… ἱστορεῖς) for spreading misinformation about the cult of Aphrodite at Sparta (which this epigram as set out to correct), the previously anonymous speaker reveals his loyalties: the goddess does not bear arms with us (ἁμῖν χάθεος ὀπλοφορεῖ). What at the beginning of the epigram appeared to be an anonymous third-person narrator turns out to be a Spartan with a bone to pick about local religious history.

Returning to the epigram with this knowledge, the marked Doric color of the first line (Εἰπέ ποκ’ Ἔυρωτας ποτ τὰν Κύπριν) has more impact: more than simply matching the dialect of the subject matter, they signal the particular perspective on the topic of Aphrodite’s Spartan cult that will be offered in the following lines. Aphrodite’s reply to the Eurotas further underscores the expressive ability of dialect when it comes to identity. The Olympian goddess fittingly uses an epic-Ionic form of the first-person singular future of εἰμί (Ξάσσομαι) when declaring her...
intentions to remain unarmed in contravention of the famous Spartan cult, but at the same time honors her local hosts by still rendering τὰν Λακεδαιμονίαν in its native Doric.\footnote{Given the Ionic color of ἔσσομαι, we might consider the possibility that the Attic-Ionic articles in lines three and four (ἂ...τὴν Λακεδαιμονίαν transmitted in \textit{P.Vind. phil.} 311 could be original to the text, further differentiating the local voice of the Spartan Eurotas from the Olympian god.}

Although undoubtedly postclassical, the lemmatist’s identification of Mnasalces’ soldiers with Spartans underscores a fundamental aspect of dialect’s role as a literary device in Hellenistic book epigram. In the absence of any supporting evidence, this late reader of book epigram, recognizing an association between dialect and notions of identity and place present in other epigrams, chose to supplement an identity to the dead that made sense of Mnasalces’ dialect choice. While the lemmatists’ reading does not stand up to scrutiny, the treatment of dialect as an active part of a poet’s presentation of his text implicit in it inspires the project of this chapter and the dissertation as a whole.

In what follows, I explore the relationship between dialect, identity, and place in Hellenistic book epigram. Discourses of place and identity are integral to the genre. The inscriptive tradition, which exerts a significant influence on the formation and development of the genre, is very much associated with physical placedness in terms of its inscription on stone and display in a landscape. Inscribed dedications and epitaphs were physical means for perpetuating the memory of an individual and her identity as a member of a specific family and local community. Conversely, the Hellenistic world was noticeably decentralized, marked by mass migrations of Greek-speaking populations and the expansion of the Greek sphere of influence that together brought different peoples and cultures into various forms of contact and integration. This decentralization finds expression, in part, in the development of the epigram book. Through its artful arrangement of epigrams, the epigrammatist brings people and places from throughout the Hellenistic world together in the new and capacious landscape of the
bookroll. Indeed, to understand the great flourishing of epigram in the Hellenistic period—to which most poets tried their hand—requires a concomitant understanding of the genre’s play with dialect. Drawing on examples from literary epitaph, dedication, and beyond, I will show that dialect, as the linguistic expression of identity and place, takes on a significant and dynamic role in the formation, expression, and interrogation of this epigrammatic discourse.400

In the first section of the chapter, I examine the identity function of dialect in dedicatory epigrams, beginning with examples that closely mimic inscriptive practice, before moving on to dedications that do not expressly state the identity of their subject, but whose dialect suggest a regional supplementation. In the second section, I examine the dialect of epitaphs, following the same sequence of discussion found in the first section on dedications. Here I include self-epitaphs by several Hellenistic epigrammatists, paying close attention to the dual role that dialect takes on in these contexts as a marker of poetic as well as regional identity. In the final section, moving from poems with clear inscriptional antecedents, I examine epigrams where the speech of the subject or the imagined location of the action guides the use of dialect.

400 The topic of dialect as a marker of identity and place has received passing notice in earlier studies of individual epigrams. Gow and Page (1965) occasionally note the practice, but limit their discussion to the explanation of particularly unfamiliar forms or the suggestion of an emendation to render uniform dialect usage or to better match dialect choice to ethnic identity. Representative of the former is a note (2.323) to line one of Leonidas G-P 12=A.P. 7.448, an epitaph for a certain Pratalidas of Crete, in which they comment on the realistic Doric color of the deceased Cretan’s name (Πραταλίδα). And in Asclepiades G-P 28.1=A.P. 7.11.1 they print the Doric genitive Ἡρίννας, despite that fact that both P (Ἡρίννης) and Pl (Ἡρίννης) transmit the epic-Ionic –ης, on the basis of Erinna’s putative origins on Doric-speaking Telos (more on this epigram below) and the presence of Doric forms in the remainder of the quatrains. More recently, scholars have begun to accord literary meaning to the interrelationship between dialect and identity, see Palumbo Stracca 1993-94; Sens 2004; and Gutzwiller 2014.
Putting Dialect in its Place

I begin with a simple but elegant dedicatory epigram by Anyte that captures the early book epigrammatists’ artful reinvention of inscriptional traditions for the bookroll. ⁴⁰¹ In the scope of a quatrain, the poet commemorates Kleubotos of Tegea’s dedication of a λέβης to Athena (G-P 2=A.P. 6.153). The imagined location of the dedication is presumably a temple to Athena in the region of Tegea, a home which Anyte shares with the dedicator.

Βουχανδῆς ὁ λέβης· ὁ δὲ θεὸς Ἐριασπίδα υἱὸς
Κλεῦβοτος, ἀ πάτρα δὲ εὐφύχορος Τεγέα·
tάθάνα ὑπὸ τὸ δώρον· Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐπόησεν
Κλειτόριος, γενέται ⁴⁰² ταῦτα λαχῶν ὅνομα.

P Sud. s.v. βουχανδῆς (1-2)
4 γενέται Salmasius: γενέτῳ P

The cauldron is big enough to hold an ox. Eriapidas’ son, Kleubotos, dedicated it; his fatherland is spacious Tegea. The gift is Athena’s, and Aristoteles from Cleitor fashioned it, sharing in the same name with his father.

⁴⁰¹ Excepting the reference to the sack of Miletus in 277 BCE in G-P 23=A.P. 7.492, whose ascription to Anyte is questioned, a very general dating for Anyte can be posited based on the relationship between her epigrams and those ascribed to Mnasalces and Nicias. On the points of contact between the poetry of Anyte and these epigrammatists, see Reitzenstein 1893, 123-127. The former is dated to the middle of the third century BCE (Gow and Page 1965, 2.400) and so appears very likely to have borrowed from Anyte. If we are right in identifying Nicias with the physician friend of Theocritus, then Anyte must date, at the least, to the first-half of the third century BCE. Furthermore, if Nicias, like Mnasalces, is the imitator rather than the imitated, then Anyte should be considered to number among the first generation of Hellenistic book epigrammatists. A dating to the first quarter of the third century may find further support in the statement of Tatian (Or. ad Graecos 33) that Euthycrates, the son of Lysippus (ca. 370-300 BCE), and Cephasodotus, the son of Praxiteles (ca. 370-320 BCE), produced statues of the poet. Gow and Page 1965, 2.90 do note, however, that Tatian’s “credibility has been severely attacked.” In addition to references to Tegea in her own poetry (G-P 2=A.P. 6.153), Pollux (5.48), who quotes an epigram that is absent from the Palatine Anthology, and Planudes states that Anyte was a native of Arcadian Tegea.

⁴⁰² I follow most editors in adopting Salmasius’ correction of P’s γενέται, which is a non-existant form. α and ω were often confused in transcription, and Seelbach 1964, 122 has noted this problem in P in particular (“α und ω werden im Codex Palatinus oft vertauscht”). While Geoghegan 1979, 39-40 does note that the “motion ἐς/ος is attested in epic and elsewhere,” there is no similar evidence for Anyte beyond this instance, and the printing of P’s γενέται would also detract from a studied assonance of α in the line.
Despite its syntactically simple structure, the dedicatory epigram for Kleubotos’ λέβης is erudite, borrowing language from other literary contexts and varying regular inscriptive practice. In the first line Anyte appropriates and modifies the simple declaration of the dedicated object common to inscribed dedications. Rather than a deictic pointing to the object that would have stood before the reader of an inscription, Anyte inserts a neologism, βουχανδής, which gives the dedicated item an epic ring. The high-style language of the dedicatory epigram is reinforced when Anyte describes Tegea, the hometown she shares with Kleubotos, as εὐρύχορος. The poet likely borrowed the epithet from an epigram memorializing Tegean war dead ascribed to Simonides\(^{403}\) (G-P 53.3=A.P. 7.512.3: εὐρυχόρου Τεγέης\(^{404}\)). How Anyte came to know this epigram is unclear. If the epigram was an inscription, which Page has dated to the fifth or fourth centuries BCE based on stylistic criteria,\(^{405}\) it is possible Anyte knew of the epigram from its location in Tegea. By Anyte’s time the inscribed epigram could have been ascribed to Simonides, whether or not he was actually commissioned to compose it. Based on the tradition associating polyandria with Simonidean authorship, the epigram is also likely to have been part of the Sylloge Simonidea, which was in circulation during Anyte’s lifetime.\(^{406}\) Whatever the context, we can almost certainly assume Anyte borrowed the phrase, in part, due to its association with Simonides, whose collection of (ascribed) poetry likely acted as a precedent for her creation of

\(^{403}\) Although a number of epigrams ascribed to Simonides are the work of Hellenistic poets, that Anyte is the borrower rather than the copied in this instance is accepted by most scholars; see Boas 1907, 61-63; Page 1981, 278-80; and Gutzwiller 1993, 73.

\(^{404}\) P and Pl transmit the Ionic form of Τεγέης, which most modern editors emend to Doric Τεγέας. This is not the only non-Doric form present in the epigram (l.3: δαιοµένης PPl). Page 1981, 279 claimed that it was “not likely that the Ionic color of the dialect in A.P. 7.512 is original”, likely operating under the assumption that the inscription, if it ever existed, would have been composed in the Doric native to Tegea. It is impossible to know with any degree of certainty if Τεγέης and other Ionic forms are a result of later regularization or original to the poem. That P and Pl also transmit δαιοµένης increases, in my view, the likelihood that the distinctly Ionic Τεγέης is original. We know of Hellenistic editors changing and embellishing the dialect mixture of epigrams that also survive in their inscriptive form; for discussion, see Kazeko 2009. If Anyte knew this version of the epigram, she may have chosen, for whatever reason, to eliminate the dialect variance for a consistent Doric color. But such statements must remain in the realm of speculation.

\(^{405}\) Page 1981, 279.

\(^{406}\) On the composition and date of the Sylloge Simonidea, see Sider 2007, 113-30.
an epigram book.\footnote{Gutzwiller 1993, 10.} Finally, Anyte modifies epigraphic dedicatory conventions by deftly incorporating the signature of the artist, Aristoteles of Cleitor, into the second couplet. Regular inscriptive practice was to render the artist’s signature, if mentioned at all, in an extra-metrical location on the stone.\footnote{Most similarly \textit{CEG} 198 (‘Ἄρχερ υἱὸς ἔποίεσεν ὁ Χῖος) as noted by Geoghegan 1979, 38, and commonly elsewhere, e.g. \textit{CEG} 199 and 209.} Anyte’s inclusion of Aristoteles into the fabric of her verse can be plausibly understood as a tactic acknowledgement of the absence of a real stone, and thus concomitantly suggest a purposeful composition of a dedicatory epigram for a bookroll.

The dialect of the epigram similarly balances the literary and epigraphic. Every diagnostic feature is Doric.\footnote{For discussions of Anyte’s dialect, see the detailed treatment of Baale 91-119. In his commentary Geoghegan 1979 does a good job of noting dialect forms, but limits his discussion to the euphonic properties of dialect choice in specific words and sequences of words.} Doric markers include: the commonplace Doric reflex of inherited \*ā in α (ά πάτρα; τάθάνα; γενέτα) as well as the genitive singular of masculine first declension nouns in –α (Ἐριασπίδα) and the resolution of the εο diphthong to ευ (Κλεύβοτος). The use of the ποε- root of ποιέω (ἐποίησεν) is dialectally ambiguous. The form is a common feature of Attic tragedy (e.g. Soph. \textit{OT} 918) and comedy (e.g. Ar. \textit{Ach.} 410; Men. \textit{Ep.} 307), but also appears in Sappho (e.g. 48.1; 32.1; 16.5), Theocritus (\textit{Id.} 8.18 and \textit{Id.} 29.24) and inscriptions, most notably, a fourth-century Arcadian inscription (\textit{IG} ν (ii) 6.9 ποέντω=ποιούντων). Although we cannot discount a now lost literary influence (especially given the new evidence provided by the Vienna papyrus [\textit{P.Vindob. G} 40611] that suggest we know of only a small percentage of book epigrams in circulation in the third century),\footnote{See the edition and commentary of Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini 2015.} the inscriptive evidence makes it quite plausible that the form of ἐποίησεν was chosen to lend a local inscriptive color to the dedication and as such I have classified it as Doric. The choice of dialect, then, is in line with the Arcadian identity of the Cleubotos and Aristoteles. The later fourth and early third centuries BCE was a time of linguistic
change in Arcadia. Epichoric Arcadianisms were in great decline and epigraphic evidence demonstrates an increased influence of Doric koine, a much-simplified form of Doric that is rather more in line with the language transmitted in Anyte’s epigrams.  

Indeed, it would be surprising if Anyte’s poetic language was thoroughly epichoric, since literary dialects, in general, and the epigrammatic tradition, in particular, have a tendency to avoid such features.

In her presentation of dialect in this epigram, Anyte also subtly integrates the anonymous voice of the local Tegean inscription with her own poetic voice. Like the subjects of her epigram, Kleubotos and Aristoteles, Anyte was also native to Arcadia and likely spoke in Doric. Whether a reader encountered these verses in an authored-organized collection of Anyte’s work or in some type of anthology, her name and ethnic would have appeared in relation to the dedicatory epigram. The reader would know, in other words, that Anyte, not an anonymous poet, Kleubotos, or Aristoteles was responsible for its composition. Since the Greek mind so closely associated dialect with notions of identity and place, Anyte fittingly deploys her Doric features in relation to the heritage of the Tegean dedicator (Ἐριασπίδα...| Κλεύβοτος; γενέτα) and the dedicatory epigram’s place of display (α πάτρα...Τεγέα; τάθάνα). The integration of the artist’s signature hints at Anyte’s own role in the production of the dedicatory epigram. And it is fitting that here we find the most striking dialect feature ἐποήσεν in a verb that describes poetic production as much as it does the act of metalworking.

---

411 Bubeník 1989, 162-167 traces the koineization of the Arcadian cities beginning in the third century BCE. He associates the rapid decline in epichoric features with the integration of this region into the Achaean League. Although Tegea did not become an official member of the league until the last quarter of the third century (223 BCE), Bubeník 1989, 195 states that this form of Doric koine (an unmarked version that shared aspects of Doris mitior found in the Corinth and Sicyon) was in use in Arcadia by the middle of the third century BCE and prior to this Arcadian features were already much reduced and Doric and Hellenistic koinai began to dominate.

412 For Anyte’s development of an epigrammatic voice, see Barnard 1991; Gutzwiller 1993; Gutzwiller 1998, 54-74; Greene 2000; and Bowman 2004.
The use of Doric to convey an association between the poetic voice of Anyte and an imagined Tegean landscape is also operative in a pair of epigrams on springs (G-P 16 = A.P. 9.313 and G-P 18 = AP1 228).

\[ \text{Anyte G-P 16 = A.P. 9.313} \]

\[ \text{Anyte G-P 18 = AP1 228} \]

Ostensibly presented as inscriptions bidding passersby to rest and make good use of the refreshing spring and its shady surroundings, these epigrams were undoubtedly composed for the bookroll and were very likely incorporated into an author-organized poetry book. Read in this context, they can be interpreted as positioning the reader as the addressee, a literary traveler through Anyte’s landscape of dedications, epitaphs, and pastoral epigrams. Anyte has replaced stone with papyrus and, given the slippage between addressee and reader, it is plausible,

413 Gow and Page unnecessarily emend the reading in P and Pl to ἵζεν.

414 Gow and Page emend the reading in P and Pl (πνοιῇ) to the Doric πνοι in order to create uniform dialect usage.
especially in the context of a poetry book, that a reader could identify the organizing voice behind the two epigrams with the poetic persona of Tegean Anyte.\footnote{In this vein, Gutzwiller 1998, 71-73 has observed that some of the qualities given to the springs are shared elsewhere with the experience of reading Anyte’s pastoral epigrams.} In other words, these two pastoral epigrams are both of and not of a place—simultaneously embedded in a landscape and deliberatively separated from its object and place—depending on the reader’s perspective.

Given Anyte’s innovative interrogation of the placedness of inscribed epigrammatic tradition, it is undoubtedly significant that these two epigrams feature a predominant Doric color. First, it is quite possible that a reader of these two epigrams would imagine an Arcadian setting for the springs. As we have seen, Anyte has explicitly associated this dialect choice with her native Tegea in Kleubotos’ dedication (G-P 2=A.P. 6.153). By composing the same epigram for an encounter in a poetry book, however, Anyte also subtly exposes her authorial presence in a previously anonymous poetic tradition. When read within the context of a poetry book, the anonymous voice of the dedication and her own poetic voice are one and the same, and the shared dialect between the identity of the dedicator and Anyte emphasizes this elision.

These two spring epigrams offer a parallel. The epigrams are self-consciously decontextualized, comprising an anonymous voice inviting the reader to rest in an idealized pastoral landscape;\footnote{It is also tempting to read Anyte’s use of Doric in this context as a helping locate the epigrams in a generic landscape, namely the tradition of pastoral poetry. Reitzenstein (1893, 130-33) suggested that Anyte was the head of a Peloponnesian school of bucolic epigrammatic poetry, which inaugurated a tradition of Arcadian bucolic. While Doric came to be associated by the ancients with pastoral poetry, this happened only after the generic canonization of Theocritean pastoral. Since Anyte was a rough contemporary of Theocritus, the desire to read her use of Doric as a generic allusion must be resisted. G-P 18.2-API 228.2, for example, is undoubtedly related to the opening line of Theocritus’ Id.1.1-2 (ἀδὸν τί τὸ φιλόθρισμα καὶ ἀ πίτυς, αἰπόλει, τίγνα | ἀ ποι τοῖς παγαίσι, μελόσδεται), but the direction of influence is uncertain. This leaves us in the position of being unable to evaluate whether or not her use of Doric was meant to effect a generic allusion, or was an independent decision possibly related to place and local identity.} but this anonymous voice, especially if read in the context of a collection of Anyte’s inscriptional epigrams, can plausibly elide with the poetic voice of the Tegean poet. In this instance, then, the Doric color of the epigrammatic voice further exposes Anyte’s
experiments in transforming the anonymity of inscribed epigram into a self-conscious literary genre composed for encounter on the bookroll. As part of her project of reconstructing the possible organization of epigram collections, Gutzwiller has argued that one or both of these epigrams introduced, or at least sat near the head of, a collection of Anyte’s epigrams, thus serving a programmatic introduction to her epigrammatic project. Given what we know from the Milan papyrus, which contains evidence strongly indicative of intentional ordering of epigrams for thematic effect, it is entirely plausible that this pair of epigrams, whose tone and theme transcend the an imagined inscriptive setting, served as an introduction to an epigram book of Anyte’s. On this view, the connection between Anyte’s poetic identity and the use of Doric in these two epigrams, an aspect of the texts Gutzwiller does not address, further stresses the organizing power of Anyte over these dedications and epigrams, particularly if these epigrams appeared in close proximity of the poet’s name and ethnicity that would have been part of the collection’s heading.

For an instructive parallel to Anyte’s dedicatory epigram for Kleubotos’ λέβης, we may look to the banausic dedications of Leonidas of Tarentum, another third-century epigrammatist. Among a group of epigrams on shepherds and humble craftspeople, Leonidas G-P 42=AP 6.289 commemorates a dedication by three Cretan sisters of weaving instruments to Athena on the occasion of their retirement.

417 Gutzwiller 1998, 73.
Autonoma, Meliteia, Boiskion, the three Cretan daughters of Philolaides and Nico, stranger,
the first the thread making, ever whirling spindle,
the second the dark wool basket,
the third the shuttle of the loom, the well weaving worker of the peplos,
the guard of Penelope’s marriage bed,
they dedicated these things as gifts to Weaver Athena in her temple,

having retired from the labors of Athena.

The structure of the dedicatory epigram is straightforward. In a concise opening couplet,
Autonoma, Meliteia, and Boiskion identify themselves as the Cretan daughters of Philolades and Nikes. The two couplets that follow list the dedicated items. The first two sisters are each given a line for their dedication, while the dedication of the third sister is expanded to an entire couplet.
The final couplet efficiently reports the dedicatee (Athena) and the occasion for the dedication (retirement).
The only detail that would be superfluous on an inscribed dedication is the disclosure that the dedicatory epigram was erected in Athena’s temple (ἐνὶ ναῷ), since the inscription’s location would be apparent to any reader standing before the stone. The simplicity of the dedicatory epigram’s structure has an accord with the objects of dedication, a collection of weaving implements likely worn down over a lifetime of use.

Leonidas’ use of neologism and piled-up epithets to describe the craft implements contrast with the epigram’s simple list structure common to inscribed dedications. In line three the compound adjectives μιτόεργον and ἀειδίνητον, which are applied to the spindle (ἄτρακτον), are both unattested before Leonidas. The following line follows the same pattern of two adjectives for one noun, in this instance only one of the pair is unattested before Leonidas (ὁρφνίταν), while εἰροκόμον is a Homeric unicum (II. 3.387). In line five Leonidas replaces...
piled-up adjectives with an erudite periphrasis for the shuttle, which also incorporates a reference to Homeric poetry in the figure of Penelope’s lucubrations before the loom.

A hallmark of Leonidas’ contribution to Hellenistic poetic aesthetics is the balance of the low and high, and it has been observed that much of the pleasure and skill of this epigram resides in the integration of elevated language into the simple and straightforward structure and subject matter of a dedicatory epigram for a humble group of weavers.418 Like those finely executed statues and miniature figurines of grotesques (dwarves, drunks, the elderly poor), Leonidas unifies, through his editorial touch, the marginalized and the literary.419 What has not been previously recognized, however, is the place of dialect in Leonidas’ technique. Through the integration of Doric features, these verses explicitly evoke the native language of the Cretan dedicators. For example, the repetition of the Doric feminine nominative article at the head of lines three to five, which simply designates each of the three sisters, reinforces their collective Cretan identity: as weavers they each have a specific task in the creation of textiles, making them cogs in a larger production cycle. Note also the surprising use of an epitaphic convention, in the address to a passerby (ξένε) rather than the receiving divinity.420 Since epitaphs often contained the directive from the tomb or deceased to pause and listen to their voice, such an address may well have heightened the identification by an early reader of the epigram between the Doric voice of the dedication and the Cretan sisters who commissioned it. Additionally, we cannot discount certain literary affiliations the dialect choice may have had. In literary contexts, such as pastoral, the Doric dialect came to be often associated in the third century, if not before under the

418 For discussion, see Gutzwiller 1998 90-97; on Leonidas’ application of elevated language to low or banausic situation and figures, see also Gigante 1971 and Criscuolo 2004. For a discussion of the “everyday and low” in Hellenistic poetry more broadly, see Zanker 1987, 155-227, with Leonidas at 162. Zanker draws a sharper distinction between Leonidas’ gestures at realism (“an attitude…in fact quite distant”) and his “artificial style.”
419 On the fascination with grotesques and poor figures in Hellenistic art, see e.g. Fowler 1989, 66-78.
influence of Epicharmus and Sophron, with the humble simplicity of rusticity. By recalling the voices of these lower-class Cretan sisters, who spent their entire lives working at the loom, the Doric also manufactures in the minds of early readers a rustic and humble tone befitting the Cretan soundscape.

Leonidas counteracts the realism conveyed in the Doric through the recherché stylistic environment into which he inserts the dialect. But that contrast makes sense within the context of Leonidas’ literary aims in this epigram. Leonidas doricizes two of the high-style epithets (ὀρφνίταν and εὐάτριον) in consecutive lines, incorporating language that would be out of place in the mouths of the weaver sisters. In line six, he appropriates the Doric of his humble weavers’ native speech for the purpose of learned etymologization, a type of activity one might not readily associate with work at the loom. By doricizing Athena’s cult epithet (Παντίδι), Leonidas echoes the name of Penelope, one of Greek literature’s most famous weavers for whom Athena held a special regard, in the previous line. Through his choice and deployment of Doric, Leonidas reinforces the contradictions between his style and subject matter that make this literary experiment so successful.

We cannot discount the possibility, however, that Doric appeared in sophisticated or elevated literary contexts. The clearest example is the Doric of choral lyric and tragedy. Indeed, the fragments of Epicharmus include evidence of a sophisticated engagement with the intellectual culture of the period, although his language retains its general colloquial register even in these contexts; Willi 2008, 119-92 offers an essential discussion. In this context, however, given the banal subject matter, it is rather more likely the Doric has the effect, in addition to recalling the native speech of the Cretan sisters, of creating a contrast with the elevated diction of the dedication. Of course, one can not rule out the Doric being read as calling on epinician and thus (ironically?) elevating the sister’s craft to the commemoration of pan-Hellenic athletic success. I generally resist, however, the simple identification of Doric color with choral lyric, unless there is other explicit evidence—such as motifs, imagery, or diction—of an engagement with the genre.

Based on the dialect choice, Vaillancourt 2013, 92 has argued for a purposeful etymological link between the epithet and Penelope.
Leonidas composed a companion piece to his Cretan sister-weaver dedication (G-P 41=A.P. 6.288), and the two epigrams were transmitted together in the Greek Anthology within a long Meleagrean sequence (A.P. 6.262-313): 423

Αἱ Λυκομήδεως παῖδες Ἀθηνό καὶ Μελίτεια καὶ Φιντώ Γληνίς θ’, αἱ φιλοεργόταται, ἔργων ἐκ δεκάτας ποτιθύμια τὸν τε πρόσεργον ἄτρακτον καὶ τὰν ἄτρια κριναμέναν κερκίδα, τὰν ἰστών μολπάτιδα, καὶ τὰ τροχαία πανία ἀρτηστάς τούσδε ποτιρρόγεας, καὶ οπάθας εὐβριθεῖς ἀμπολυάργυρα τῶς δὲ τε πενιχραῖς οἷς ὀλίγον οἷλην, 424 μοῖραν ἀπαρχόμεθα, τὸν χέρας ιεν, Ἀθάνα, ἐπιπλῆσαις μὲν ὀπίσσω, 425 θείης δ’ εὐαπτύους εξ ὀλιγησιτῶν. (Leonidas G-P 41=AP 6.288)

P Sud. s.vνν. ἦτρια (3-5), πηνίον (5-7), σιπύ (10)
I Λυκομήδεως Meineke: λυκαμήδης C: λακαμήδης P

The daughters of Lycomedes, Atheno and Meliteia and Phinto and Glenis, the most industrious, destitute we offer as a tithe from our work these welcome gifts, the laborious spindle and the shuttle that passes between the thread of the warp, the songstress of the loom, and the spinning spools….. and wool-laden blades…a little portion from our meager holdings. Ever after, Athena, fill our hands, and render us rich in bread out of our current poverty.

This epigram shares with its companion piece a Doric coloring, but it lacks a similar ethnic for the four daughters of Lycomedes. The epigram’s dominant Doric coloring is similar to that found in G-P 42: the prefix ποτι- (for προσ-) in ποτιθύμια and the use of ντ for λτ in the name Φιντώ. 426

423 On companion poems, see Kirstein 2002.
424 Gow and Page emend the koine reading of P (ὀλίγην) to the Doric ὀλίγαν in order to create an artificial uniform usage.
425 I print Stadtmüller’s metrically required emendation of C’s ἵσως.
426 On the latter, a rather unusual dialect feature and one of the few commented upon by Gow and Page 1965, see Buck 1955, §72.
strongly enhance the Doric flavor of the poem.\textsuperscript{427} Under the influence of the association between dialect speech, both written and spoken varieties, and identity, early readers of the epigram may well have constructed plausible regional origins of the dedicators in certain Dorian areas. The position of the two epigrams next to one another in a Meleagrean sequence suggests that the anthologizer recognized their connection or excerpted the two in a similar position from a collection of Leoniadas’ poetry. Accordingly, the likely juxtaposition and shared dialect qualities of the two epigrams would leave a reader free to imagine that these dedications by weaver sisters could have originated from the same background, namely a Cretan landscape. Given the similar nature of the dedications, it is perhaps possible to press this association between dialect choice and supplemented identity even further. Both dedications are made to Athena, and while the epigrams purposefully lack a physical context, the reader could well envision the “inscriptions” next to one another at a popular shrine to Athena in her guise as the patron goddess of weaving.

Leonidas composed at least one other pair of dedications by craftspeople in Doric. Here the dedicators are carpenters; the pair of epigrams feature a certain Theris (G-P 7= A.P. 6.204) and Leontichos (G-P 8= A.P. 6.205), who pledge their tools to Athena upon their retirement.

\begin{verbatim}
Θῆρις ὁ δαιδαλόχειρ τῇ Παλλάδι πήχων ἀκαμπτή
cαὶ τετανὸν νότων καμπτόμενον πρίονα
cαὶ πέλεκουν ῥυκάναν τ’ εὐαγέα \textsuperscript{428} καὶ περιαγές
tρύπανον ἐκ τέχνας ἀνθέτο παυσάμενος. (Leonidas G-P 7= A.P. 6.204)
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{427} The Attic-Ionic phrase \(εξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγην\) ὑγάραν is the only contrastive dialect feature in the epigram. A version of the phrase is only found once elsewhere in an epigram of the imperial poet Agis (A.P. 6.238), who likely borrows it from Leonidas. The gnomic rhythm of the phrase may explain its dialect variance; perhaps Leonidas knew the phrase from oral circulation in a non-Doric form.

\textsuperscript{428} I print the manuscript reading (P and Sud. s.v. ῥυκάνα), which Gow and Page 1965, 2.316 emended on grounds that “bright is plainly unsuitable, and perhaps due to the anticipation of περιαγές.” Salanitro 1969, 71-72 argues, however, that the metal of a file, when inserted “obliquamente” into a piece of wood could create a bright or shining effect. Taking a more literary approach, Gutzwiller 1998, 92 n.111 defended the manuscript reading “if we imagine the tools from the craftsman’s perspective”, who would view his possessions favorably. Waltz interprets the form as a compound of \(εὐ\) and \(ἄγω\), for which there is not ancient evidence, translating the phrase as “un rabot qu’il guidait habilement.”
These are the implements of the carpenter Leontichos: the toothed files and the planes, devourers of wood, plumb-lines, storage-vessels, double-headed hammers, rulers stained with red ochre, drills, a polisher, a handled ax weighty, the lord of the trade, easily-turned borers and spinning augers, these four turners of bolts, and a polished axe: to Athena the artificer the man dedicated these thing upon retirement from his trade.

Like the sister-weaver dedications, the epigrams borrow a simple dedicatory structure and expand its epigraphic boundaries with elaborate lists of craft implements. In this case neither Thēris nor Leontichos are given ethnics that would make the choice of dialect internally coherent to inscriptive dialect conventions. As mentioned previously, the presence of Doric, through its use in pastoral and other lower-class literary contexts, may evoke a general sense of humble

429 For a discussion of Meineke’s emendation, which I tentatively adopt, see Gow and Page 1965, 2.317, who do correctly note that βορέυς is not attested elsewhere in this sense. There is a possibility, based on Philip of Thessalonica’s imitation (GP 76=A.P. 6.203), that this reading contains or masks a reference to a saw (πρίων), which is the only implement, as Geffcken 1896, 114 noted, that is unable to be identified in the rest of the epigram.
rusticity. Given, however, the close structural, dictional, and thematic ties between this dedicatory pair and the sister-weaver epigrams, it may well be the case that Leonidas originally designed these epigrams to be read as a group. If this was the case, early readers of Leonidas may have allowed the dialect association between Doric and Cretans in G-P 42 to influence their interpretation of the entirety.

Leonidas presents himself in his epigrams as an itinerant (see especially G-P 93=A.P.7.718, discussed in detail below), and some of his epigrams are located in Cos and Athens in addition to Crete. Perhaps inspired by a visit to Crete (or an encounter with one of the many Cretan diaspora populations) he designed a group of finely wrought dedications on the local craftspeople whom he encountered. Considering his large surviving corpus, a stand-alone collection of Cretan inscriptive-type epigrams is an alternative speculation. The epigraphic conventions of dialect use, then, have provided another lens through which to consider the organizational principles of a sequence of book epigrams.

This preceding series of reading speaks to the larger question related to the use of dialect to code for the imagined inscribed context from which the epigrammatist has deliberately removed his poem by composing it for the placeless landscape of the bookroll. This sort of play with the localized association of dialect would appear to complement the self-conscious incorporation of gaps and indeterminacies—such as the identity of the epigrammatic subject—into the text, which Peter Bing has termed Ergänzungsspiel. The approach has been used to read book epigram quite successfully by a number of scholars, demonstrating in the process the genre’s self-conscious play with the inscriptive tradition. But not every inscriptive-type epigram demands supplementation in order to create poetic meaning; indeed some generate meaning through a patent rejection of supplementation and contextualization. The same applies

---

430 Bing 1995.
to dialect. While dialect has a primary association with place, it does not necessarily draw on those associations in every instance of its use. Nevertheless, despite the need to be wary of constructing inscriptive contexts where there is no evidence that the epigram suggests such a reconstruction, the tradition of dialect—both in inscribed epigram and other literary traditions—to communicate place and identity warrants further investigation into the mechanics of dialect to recall and play with the absence of place inherent to the rhetorical strategy of a number of early Hellenistic book epigrams. In what immediately follows, I treat dialect and the supplementation of identity in dedications; I return to the hermeneutic approach again in my treatments of epitaphs and non-inscriptive type epigrams later in the chapter.

I begin with Leonidas G-P 56=A.P. 6.305, a humorous and obviously fictional dedication of cooking implements by a certain Dorieus to personified Gluttony and Voracity.

Λαβροσύνα τάδε δώρα φίλευλείγα 431 τε Λαφυμῷ θήκατο δείσοζος Δωριέος κεφαλά, τάς Λαρισαίας κυτογάστορας ἐψητήρας καὶ χύτρως καὶ τάν εὐρυχαδῆ κύλικα καὶ τάν εὐχάλκωτον ἐγναμπτόν τε κρεάγραν καὶ κνήστιν καὶ τάν ἔτνοδόνον τορύναν. Λαβροσύνα, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα κακοῦ κακὰ δωρητήρος δεξάμενα νεόσαις μὴ ποκα σωφροσύναν. (Leonidas G-P 56=A.P. 6.305)

P Sud. s.vv. κνήστις (5-6), ἐτνήρυσις (6), τορύνη (6)

To Gluttony and amuse-bouche-loving Voracity these gifts
the head of filthy Dorieus dedicated,
capacious bellied Larisian caldrons,
earthent pots and the wide-mouthed cup,
the well-wrought and well-bent flesh hook,
and a cheese-grate and the soup ladle.
Gluttony, once you have received these evil gifts of an evil giver
don’t ever grant him temperance.

431 I print Brunck’s emendation for the nonsensical φίλευχυλόν transmitted in P (and defended by Geffcken 1896, 119), since it remedies an easily understandable transposition of two consonants. Lobeck suggested the emendation φίλευχυλόν, which Gow and Page, leaving the manuscript reading daggered, print in their apparatus criticus; Hecker offered φίλευχύλον, which Waltz adopts.
In a similar stylistic vein to the dedication of the sister-weavers and carpenters, Leonidas employs the structure of dedicatory epigram as a vehicle through which to investigate the combination of the everyday and practical—a list of cooking implements—with the erudite and the literary, which takes the form of elaborate compound adjectives that are often first attested here (e.g., εὐρυχανδής and εὐχάλκωτόν, whose inventiveness is underscored by its appearance with the Homeric unicum ἔγναμπτόν). It is quite unlikely any such dedication existed or should be imagined by the reader to have been erected, and the juxtaposition of the banausic and the erudite are foundational to the epigram’s parodic response to inscriptions.

Leonidas’ focus is on the humorous cultural association between overindulgence and cooks, who would be the only character-type to dedicate his elaborate collection of cooking implements to Gluttony and Voracity as a means of staving off temperance (σωφροσύναν).

In the culinary landscape of ancient Greece, Southern Italy and Sicily were known for luxurious meals. The gastronomic reputation of the region is attested as early as the fifth century, notably in a fragment of Aristophanes’ Banqueters (fr. 225 PCG), wherein the speaker lists the corrupting influences a young man encountered at school including lavish dinner-parties pithily described as a Συρακοσίαν τράπεζαν. Literature from the region supports this etic association with luxurious dining practices. Food, its preparation, and consumption are common topics in the comedies of Epicharmus; the comic’s surviving fragments include settings at dinner-parties,

432 Gow and Page 1965, 2.365 say that there are no other examples of adjectives in –χανδής, but there are a few examples of adjectives in –χανδής, including Anyte G-P 2=Α.P. 6.153 βουχανδής. Although the relationship between Leonidas and Anyte, in terms of priority is unclear, we might consider the possibility that Anyte’s coinage of an adjective for a dedicated λέβης varies the unique usage here in Leonidas.

433 Od. 18.294: κληίσιν ἐὑγνάμπτοις.

434 As is the case with many fragments of poetry dealing with food, this passage survives in the Deipnosophistai (12.527c). Athenaeus quotes the fragment as evidence of the famous reputations of Syracuseans and Sicilians, in general, for luxury (διαβόητοι δέ εἰσὶ περὶ τροφῆν Σκυλελώτατε καὶ Συρακόσιοι...).

435 Wilkins 2000, 312-68 and Olson and Sens 2000 offer thorough treatments of the culinary literature of Sicily.
descriptions of luxurious, often fish-based meals, and elaborate cooking implements (notably *The Muses or the Marriage of Hebe*, 42-74 Kassel-Austin). Over a century later, Archestratos of Gela composed the *Hedupatheia*, a hexametric catalogue poem of various foodstuffs. Likely inspired by Sicilian prose cookbooks popular throughout the Greek world for their innovative and elaborate cuisine, such as those attributed to Mithaikos and Herakleides, and other gastronomic poetry, like Philoxenos’ *Dinner-party*, the *Hedupatheia* includes treatments of many exotic ingredients and recipes drawn from Sicily and Magna Graecia.

The abundance and variety of Doric forms in this epigram is designed, I argue, to give Doreios and his dedication a local Sicilian flavor. The language used to describe the cooking implements and the type of meals produced from these implements share the quality of luxury bordering on overindulgence found in the authors briefly treated above. Leonidas accentuates the Doric coloring of the dedication from the first word and incorporates *Doris severior* forms in the resolution of secondary ō following the compensatory lengthening of final *–ns to –ως in τῶς Λαρσάιως and χύτρως, which are attested sparingly elsewhere in his corpus. While Sicilian Doric appears to belong to the *Doris mitior* group (in which the resolution of secondary ō would be the diphthong ou), some South Italian colonies, including Tarentum, used *Doris severior* features in their inscriptions. Moreover, in earlier and contemporary literature both of these

---

436 See the discussion with bibliography in Wilkins 2000, 320-31.
437 On the literary and cultural background to the *Hedupatheia*, see Olson and Sens 2000, xxviii-lv.
438 It should be noted that all other examples of this type of *Doris severior* form are the product of required modern emendations; however this should not be surprising given the unfamiliarity of these forms to a Byzantine scribe, which would lead to simple corrections through the addition of an iota adscript: G-P 12.1=A.P. 7.448.1 (Ἀκαττί) [Salmassius: -τω P, -τωι C]); G-P 49.1=A.P. 6.263.1 (πυρσ [Meineke: -σιω P]); and G-P 49.5=A.P. 6.263.5 (µοσχε [Meineke: -ειωι P])
439 On Sicilian dialect, which presents very little local variance, as a *Doris mitior* type, see discussion in Membra 2012, 202 and 217-18 with bibliography.
440 Others include Sybaris, Croton, and Terina; a citizen of Terina is mentioned in *anon. Dor. 20* (θάσσον ὁ τόκος Ἡρκλείτω τῶ τεριναίῳ τρέχει) where the *Doris severior* vocalisms, as Cassio 2002, 61 commented, are fitting.
forms appear in works composed by Sicilians, the most notable being Theocritus, or on Sicilian topics, but in the instances of forms of *Doris severior* in Epicharmus (e.g. 135.3 Kassel-Austin: τούτω) and Sophron (56 Kassel-Austin: τῶ) we must be especially aware of the possible intervention of later editors into the text. Nevertheless, the combination of subject matter and marked Doric coloring of Dorieus’ dedication justifies at least considering how Leonidas’ linguistic choice may contextualize the intemperate character of the dedicator, injecting the parodically overblown dedication with a layer of humor drawn from the stereotypical association between gluttony and Sicilian culinary culture.

Leonidas’ choice of name may well reinforce the identification of the dedicator with Sicily. Traditionally, scholars have wished to identify Dorieus with a poet of the same name, whom Athenaeus (10.412) mentioned as having composed an epigram on the gluttonous appetite of the famous athlete Milon (*SH* 396; in Ionic). On this reading, the dedication would be a vehicle for scoptic attack, a more common aspect of imperial Greek epigram, but for which several Hellenistic parallels exist, particularly Theodoridas’ poem on Euphronion (G-P 14=A.P. 7.406) and Aratus’ on Diotimus (G-P 2=A.P. 11.437). Hecker adduced this passage as evidence for Leonidas’ satirization of Dorieus’ possible penchant for compositions on voracity; Gow and Page judged the identification “not unattractive.” While this identification is not implausible, it does fail to provide any context, beyond a possible fascination in over-eating (a not entirely unique one at that), for the marked dialect coloring.

---

441 Theocritus predominantly uses accusative plurals in –ος in his Doric *Idylls*, see Molinos Tejada 1990, 60 and 163-67.

442 See the discussion in Cassio 2002, 58-62.

443 Among the typologically identifiable incipits in the new Vienna papyrus (Parsons, Maehler, and Maltomini 2015), we do find several scoptic examples, a discovery that further suggests the development of the sub-genre in the Hellenistic period, which was previously obscured by the selection criteria/preferences of Meleager.

444 Gow and Page 1965, 2.364.
The name Dorieus, besides sharing a common root with the Doric dialect, has a historical connection to Sicily. In the fifth book of his *Histories* (5.42–48), Herodotus provides an account of the actions of a Spartan prince of the same name, who, upset at the ascension to the throne by his half-brother Cleomenes, fled Laconia and attempted the first (and ultimately failed) colonization of Sicily in 510 BCE. Admittedly, Dorieus is not an uncommon name, but what both the Doreius of Herodotus and Leonidas’ Dorieus further have in common is the dialect color of their name. The Ionic genitive form (Δωρίεος) of Dorieus’ name stands out from the dialect coloring of the rest of the epigram. The dialect form of this name appears elsewhere in Greek literature only in Herodotus’ recounting of the Spartan prince’s failed colonization attempt. Beyond superficially recalling the dialect of the epigram, then, the fact that the dedicator, who “commissioned” his epigram in a strong Doric, shared his name with an early colonizer of the Sicily, who was equally intemperate in his desire for power, further accentuates, for the learned reader, the connection of the dedication to the region.

Elaborate or marked linguistic display, like that found in the Dorieus dedication, is not required to suggest an association between dialect choice and place or identity. Given book epigram’s concise and pithy nature, the incorporation of just a single dialect form can (in the right context) generate poetic meaning. Callimachus G-P 21 (=A.P. 6.347), a dedication—simple and straightforward in its language and design—to Artemis by a certain Phileratis offers an instructive example:

```
Ἄρτεμι, τίν τόδ’ ἰγαλμα Φιληρατίς εἴσατο τήδε·
```

Alternatively, if one still finds convincing the identification of Dorieus the cook with the epigrammatist of the same name, it is interesting to note that name of the dedicator shares in the same dialect as the one surviving epigram of Dorieus, and perhaps would replicate the dialect form of the poet’s name in the heading to the epigram when encountered on the bookroll the context to which this dedication undoubtedly belongs.
ἀλλὰ σὸ μὲν δέξαι, πότνια, τὴν δὲ σάου.446 (Callimachus G-P 21=A.P. 6.347)

P
1 τίν Salmiasius: τήν P 2 σάου P: σάω Fabri

Artemis, to you Phileratis dedicated this statue here.
But you receive, mistress, and save her.

The verses share in many of the qualities of inscribed dedication, and indeed it is possible that Callimachus did originally compose this distich for inscription. The use of the deictic τῇ δε to refer to the unnamed place of dedication (likely a shrine to Artemis) and the generalizing τόδε ἄγαλμα for the votive statuary (whether of the goddess or the dedicator remains unclear) are most notable in this regard. Encountered on the page of the bookroll, and thus completely decontextualized from any real (or imagined) insessional context, a reader would likely seek to supplement, as Peter Bing has recognized, the gaps in the text—particularly the where and what of the dedication.447 It is in this context of supplementation that we should evaluate the presence of the Doric second person pronoun τίν.

Another piece of information absent from Phileratis’ dedication is the dedicator’s home city.448 Salmiasius’ cogent emendation of P’s nonsensical τήν to the Doric pronoun τίν, a correction that requires no serious textual intervention, quite likely offers a clue to Phileratis’ origins. Callimachus uses this pronomial form elsewhere in his poetry and in a variety of

446 Fabri first suggested an emendation to σάω, a form whose vocalization would be in line with the Doric coloring of τίν (secondary ou>ω), but which can also be categorized as an epicism like σάου (σάω at Il. 16.363; Il. 21.238; and Od. 13.230). Callimachus uses the form elsewhere in his Doric hymns (H. 5.142 and H. 6.134); cf. Cougey 3.4, χαίρε, Ζεὺς βασιλέω, καὶ σάο Αρκαδίαν. And yet there is nothing to disqualify P’s σάου, which appears in Theodoridas G-P 3=A.P. 6.157 (Pl does transmit σάω) and Hedylus G-P 3=Athen.11.486a. It makes some sense for Phileratis to address a goddess in the elevated language of epic.

447 Bing 1995, 119-123, esp. 121: “Set in the scroll of Callimachus’ epigrams, or in an anthology, the couplet becomes—self-consciously, I believe—‘dislocated’, or better ‘unmoored’; τόδε and τῇ δε float free, a provocation to imaginative play. Where is this place? What was this ἄγαλμα?”

448 If originally composed for inscription, only later to be incorporated into a poetry book, Phileratis’ place of origin may have been included extra metrum. That said, I am only considering here the poetic effect of encountering the epigram on the page of a bookroll.
dialectal contexts. I think there is a distinct possibility that τίν is a scribal error, which masks the less familiar, but original, Doric τίν required for the sense of the line. If Salmasius’ emendation is correct, Doric τίν offers the reader one piece of evidence to grasp on to as they undergo the pleasurable act of crafting an identity, event, and place for this dedication. On this model, the τίν may well spur the reader to mentally recreate the place of dedication in a Doric speaking area or assign a Doric identity to Phileratis.

Callimachus G-P 22 (=A.P. 6.351), another dedicatory distich in which a certain Archinos of Crete offers an oaken club to Heracles, gives support to my previous reading of τίν in G-P 21.

\[ \tau\i\nu \mu\epsilon, \lambda\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\tau\acute{a}\gamma\zeta \ \delta\omicron\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\omega\kappa\omicron\tau \omicron\omicron\nu, \phi\acute{h}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\nu\nu \ \delta\acute{e}\omicron\nu \ \tilde{\theta}\acute{h}\acute{e}k\acute{e}—\tau\acute{e}z;—\text{	extalpha} \text{Ρ}"\textupsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron;—π\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron;—\acute{o} \text{\textomicron} \text{\textkappa} \text{\textomicron} \text{\textomicron};—
\delta\acute{e}\acute{x}\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon. (Callimachus G-P 22=A.P. 6.351)\]

P

To you, lion-throttling swine-slaying lord, me an oaken club dedicated—Who?—Archinos.—What type of man?—A Cretan.—I accept.

Similar to G-P 21, the epigram-initial τίν is the only Doric feature present in the epigram. The use of Doric only makes sense when the reader finally learns, in the humorously curt exchange that stretches across the pentameter, that the club’s dedicator is a Cretan. And yet Callimachus, possibly recognizing the identification between dialect and place, then renders the spatial deictic

---

449 For τίν cf. H. 3.90 (interestingly used in an address to Arcadian pan); Aet. 24 Pfeiffer (similarly in an address to Dryopian Thiodamas; and (possibly) H. 6.25. Callimachus demonstrates a general familiarity with and affinity for Doric pronouns (perhaps an affectionation from his Cyrenean background?): νήν (also very rarely in Homer, Il. 4.480 and hAphr. 280) at H.1.4; fr. 260.21; 471.1; 592 Pfeiffer [appearance in Doric hymns: H.5: 65, 96, 105, 121; H.6: 72, 74, 103]; φίν: H.3.125, 213; fr. 260.4, 287, 288.4 Pfeiffer; τφ: G-P 3=A.P. 12.1509; fr. 197.46 and 281.1 Pfeiffer (=Hollis 15), the latter example possibly appears in the context of Theseus’ boyhood in Doric-speaking Troezen.

450 While both dedicatory distichs are transmitted near one another in the Greek Anthology they are not part of a Meleagrean sequence, so unfortunately the manuscripts provide no evidence for a pairing by Meleager or, if the two epigrams were part of a single authored collection, by Callimachus himself. Considering their polar opposite engagement with the traditions of inscribed dedication, when read together the two epigrams do make, in my opinion, an interesting study in the literary development of the dedicatory genre.
τῇ δε, pointing to the unnamed location of the dedication, and the accusative feminine article τήν, which represents Phileratis, in Attic-Ionic. If these forms are original to the composition and not regularizations of Doric vocalizations by later editorial or scribal intervention (unfortunately the epigram is only transmitted in P), then Callimachus may well have designed the switch in dialect from Doric to Attic-Ionic as an acknowledgement of the “unmoored”, to borrow the language of Bing, quality of a markedly inscriptional type epigram dislocated to the landscape of the bookroll.\textsuperscript{451} While τίν suggests a Doric identity for the place of dedication or the dedicator, τῇ δε and τήν quickly undermine or reverse such a ready identification, leaving the reader, I propose, to further ponder or invent a scenario to explain the dialect shift (for example); the place of dedication is in a Doric-speaking region, a scenario bolstered by the dedication to Artemis who is a Doric goddess, but Phileratis herself is not Doric,\textsuperscript{452} and so the verse dedication, much like a non-native speaker, mindlessly slips back into her “native” Attic-Ionic.

The Voice from Beyond the Grave

Epitaphs that incorporate information related to the ethnicity or regional origins of the deceased greatly outnumber those found in the surviving examples of Hellenistic literary dedications. While this may simply be a result of the vagaries of transmission, or, more particularly, the selection habits of Meleager, the increased focus on identity in these (generally

\textsuperscript{451} Of course this reading approaches the epigram from the point of view of a reader of a bookroll. The nuance of the shift in dialect only makes sense in that context. If the epigram was first composed for inscription, such a dialect admixture, if present in the original inscription, would not have had the same sort of impact. It is possible that Callimachus, in placing the epigram in a single authored collection, if in fact he did so, modified the dialect features to exploit the movement from stone to bookroll. Kazcko 2009 has demonstrated that later editors of classical inscribed epigrams often changed or embellished the dialect of the inscribed original for literary effect.

\textsuperscript{452} It should be noted that Phileratis is attested only once epigraphically (\textit{IG} V (I) 942.4) at Kythera in Laconia dated to the Hellenistic or imperial periods. The lack of attestations of the name make it difficult to argue that the name was exclusively associated with Laconia, although it is interesting that the name of the dedicator has some association with a Doric speaking region.
fictional) book epitaphs is quite certainly motivated by readers’ desire to develop a finer-grained picture of the characteristics of the deceased—they are, after all, often “speaking” directly to the reader from beyond the grave.\textsuperscript{453} In light of the increased use of ethnics, we find a greater number of epigrams that employ dialect features, to differing degrees, in order to recall the native speech of the deceased for various literary effects.

We turn first to Leonidas of Tarentum’s epitaph for Prexo, a young Samian woman, which poignantly distributes the information about the deceased’s life, culminating in the revelation that she passed in the course of childbirth, leaving behind two children and a husband:

\begin{quote}
Τίς τίνος εὖσα, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ κίονα κείσαι; —
“Πρηξώ Καλλιτέλους.” —Καὶ ποδατή; —“Σαμίη.” —
Τίς δὲ σὲ καὶ κτερέιξε; —“Θεόκριτος, ὦ με γονῆς ἔξεδοσαν.” —Θήσισεις δ’ ἐκ τίνος; —“Ἐκ τοκετοῦ.” —
Εὖσα πόσων ἐτέων; —“Δύο κεῖκοσιν.” —Η ἡρ’ ἅτεκνος; —
“Οὐκ, ἄλλα τριτῆ Καλλιτέλην ἐλιπον.” —
Ζῶοι σοι κεῖνος γε καὶ ἐς βαθὺ γῆρας ἱκοῖτο. —
“Καὶ σοί, ἐξεῖνε, πόροι πάντα Τύχη τὰ καλά.”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{G-P 70= A.P. 7.163}

\textsuperscript{453} For a discussion of the various positions of address in Hellenistic book epitaph, see Tueller 2008.
Leonidas almost certainly composed the epigram as a literary investigation of the potential of epitaph to act as a vehicle for the expression of character and narrative. At first reticently, in snatches of answers that mimics the inscriptive brevity of a real tombstone, Prexo furnishes the reader (in the position of the passerby) with her genealogy, native land, and the circumstances surrounding her demise. From this information a figure, personality, and history begin to emerge. Drawing on epigraphic conventions, Leonidas composed the young Samian’s epitaph in a marked Ionic redolent of the sociolinguistic environment of third-century Samos, a center of Ionian culture, a choice that also stands in distinction to the Tarantine’s native Doric. In addition to the presence of η following ε, ι, or ρ (Παρήνη; Σαμίη), the manuscripts transmit the compensatory lengthening of ε to ει following the loss of the digamma and the contraction of the diphthong ευ to ευ (εψα for Attic οψα at lines one and five as well as the proper name Καλλιτέλευς at line two). This resolution of the contraction first appears in inscriptions from East Ionic-speaking regions in the fourth century BCE, and then later in Doric inscriptions. Though the form can be interpreted as dialectally ambiguous between Ionic and Doric (marking only a difference between Ionic and Attic), given the strong Ionic flavor and subject matter of the

---

454 In addition to later imitation by other book epigrammatists such as Antipater of Sidon (G-P 21=A.P. 7.164) and Archias (GP 13=A.P. 7.165), this epigram also inspired and influenced the authors of later inscribed epitaphs, as Garulli 2012, 116-133 demonstrates.

455 In line one at P, it appears as if the original reading was οψα, but careful study of the letter forms reveals a small bit of ink creating a ligature between the first letter and the υ, which is similar in composition to the ligature of ευ elsewhere in P. Additionally, when P writes ου elsewhere, see particularly A.P. 7.440.5 (οψα) and A.P. 7.441.2 (οψα), he does not link the two letter forms. It is then quite probable that P originally wrote εψα, which C then corrected to οψα, in line with the reading in line five. The opposite process likely explains Planudes’ correction of οψα to εψα, who retroactively made the change after coming across the Ionic form in line five of his exemplar. In line two previous editors have reported that C altered P’s koine genitive form of Καλλιτέλους to Ionic Καλλιτέλευς, but I see no clear evidence of correction in Preisedanz’s facsimile, but that does not mean such evidence does not or did not exist for earlier readers of P. As such I leave the reported correction in my apparatus criticus to the epigram.

456 For the dating of this general phenomenon, see Buck 1955, §42.5. Surviving inscriptive evidence suggests the feature was especially prominent in the East Ionic language region e.g., Chios, Erythrai, Mitetus, and Teos; see Scherer 1934, 17 (Miletus) and Garbrah 1978, 48-49 (Erythrai). In her study of the dialect composition of East Ionic inscriptions, Stüber 1996, 60-61 does not list evidence of this form from Samian inscriptions, although this does not eliminate the possibility that this feature is also present in Samian.
epigram, it is almost certain that the form was principally chosen to evoke Prexo’s East Ionic heritage.

Leonidas’ choice does more than communicate an essential aspect of her identity, injecting a sense of realism into the book epitaph. As the reader (in the position of the passerby) “hears” Prexo’s voice, the Ionic timbre of the verses imbues this epigrammatic narrative of a life cut short with a deeper pathos. The emotional content of the epigram takes on a heightened register when we recognize the hints that Leonidas inserts into the text to suggest Prexo died and was buried abroad. Upon first hearing the name of the deceased, the passerby does not recognize it and next asks from where she hails. It is in response to this question that we learn of Prexo’s Samian origins, and the choice of dialect begins to make sense. That the passerby has not heard of Prexo and then assumes, by the choice of his next question, that she is not a native combine to suggest to the reader that one imagine Prexo buried abroad. In response to the question, Prexo’s answer of Σαµίη rather than “from here” (vel sim.) further suggests that she is a visitor to her land of burial. The use of Ionic also has a role to play in this aspect of the drama of Prexo’s demise. Where exactly abroad is never answered, but the Ionic coloring of the passerby’s speech possibly intimates another Ionic speaking location.457

Elsewhere in the corpus of Hellenistic book epigrams survive epitaphs that make the theme of burial abroad explicit, and, like their inscriptional counterparts, employ markers of the native language of the displaced deceased. A clear example of this practice is Hegesippus G-P

457 Compare with Antipater of Sidon G-P 20=A.P. 7.161, a dialogue between a passerby and an eagle on the tomb of the Messenian hero Aristomenes. Originally buried in Rhodes, Aristomenes body was later repatriated to Messenia and buried in the gymnasion with a pillar for a tomb (Pausanias 4.24.3 and 4.32.3). Both the eagle (whether living or a stone ornament is unclear), who represents Aristomenes and the passerby speak in a Doric color in fitting with the imagined Messenian context. On this model, Gutzwiller (2014, 92-94) has perceptively observed how in Meleager G-P 121=A.P. 7.79 (quoted and discussed below), a dialogic epitaph for the Ephesian philosopher Heraclitus, the unidentified passerby begins speaking in Doric (e.g. φαµί), suggesting a foreign origin, only to conclude his combative conversation with Heraclitus in Ionic (e.g. τρηχός; τρηχώτερον), revealing, as the philosopher himself comments (l.6: σὺ δὲ ἐξ Ἐφέσου), that he was a local all along.
4=A.P. 7.446. The book epitaph commemorates a certain Zoilos from Hermione on the southeastern coast of the Argolid, who died and was buried abroad by his wife among “foreigners” (albeit seemingly in neighboring Argos).

\[\text{Ἑρμιονεύς ὁ ξεῖνος, ἐν ἄλλοδαπῶν δὲ τέθαπται}
\text{Ζωῖλος Ἀργείαν γαῖαν ἔφεσσάμενος,}
\text{ἄν ἐπὶ οἱ βαθύκολπος ἀμάσατο δάκρυσι νόμφα}
\text{λειβομένα παῖδες τ᾽ εἰς χρόα κειράμενοι.} \text{ }(\text{Hegesippus G-P 4=A.P. 7.446})

3 ἄν C: ἄν P

The stranger was from Hermione, but buried in the land of foreigners, Zoilos, wrapped in Argive earth, which his deep-bosomed wife, drenched in tears, and his children, completely shorn, piled on him.

For everyone involved in this act of commemoration there is a sense of foreignness. From the first line, Hegesippus chooses to emphasizes the theme of foreignness and displacement. Firstly, Zoilos’ name is delayed until the pentameter; instead we find the deceased named in periphrasis as Ἀρμιονεύς ὁ ξεῖνος, and the people among whom this visitor is buried are also qualified in similar terms as ἄλλοδαπών. In the placement of ξεῖνος and ἄλλοδαπῶν in equipoise at that midway point of the hexameter, even the metrical shape of the line draws attention to the thematization of foreignness. The Doric coloring, which recalls the native language of Hermione (and similarly Argos, if this is indeed the imagined place of burial\(^458\)), neatly contrasts with the despair at being a foreigner in one’s final resting place—a linguistic keepsake of sorts. The distribution of Doric forms further accentuates the pathos for Zoilos’ plight. The dialect highlights words associated with the deceased’s homeland (Ἀργείαν and ἄν—even if we recognized that Argos can ironically be read as his foreign location of interment and his

\(^{458}\) For such a reading see Waltz 1929- (ad loc.). Gow and Page 1965, 2.301 assert that “γαῖαν ἐπὶ οἱ ἀμάσατο suggests no more than a normal burial.”
homeland) and family (νόμφα and λειβομένα). In Hegesippus’ distribution of Doric forms, then, a reader may well have recognized language and actions that could be associated with rites or final words spoken by Zoilos’ wife over her husband’s tomb, but now narrated at a remove in the anonymous third-person voice of the epigram.

The aural realism of the native dialect of a person who died abroad has built within it the potential to underscore the impossibility of the epitaphic conceit from which the epigram originates. The deceased in Asclepiades of Samos G-P 31=A.P. 7.500, Euhippos of Chios, suffered the most lamentable of demises, a death at sea and a watery grave. Lost at sea while on a shipping expedition, Euhippos’ commemoration must take the form of a cenotaph. Denied a proper burial, the disembodied voice of Euhippos asks the passerby to carry word of his death to his father, Melesagoras, on the Ionic-speaking island of Chios.

Ὦ παρ’ ἐμὸν στείχων κενὸν ἄριον, εἶπον, ὁδίτα, εἰς Χίον ἐπὶ τ’ ἄν ὅπη πατρί Μελησαγόρη, ὅς ἐμὲ μὲν καὶ νήφα καὶ ἐμπορίην κακὸς Εὐρος ὅλεσεν, Εὐίππου δ’ αὐτὸ λέλειπτ’ ὄνομα. (Asclepiades G-P 31=A.P. 7.500)

O passerby walking past my empty grave, report, whenever you should come to Chios, to my father Melesagoras that a bad East wind destroyed me and my ship and my cargo, and only the name of Euhippos is left.

Previous treatments of this epigram have centered upon Asclepiades’ play with the voice of inscribed epitaph, noting in particular the tension inherent to a cenotaph erected abroad that could contain such detailed information about the unrecoverable deceased. The epitaph contains many of the components common to a real inscribed epitaph—name, father’s name, place of origin—but conjures an epitaphic voice from these pieces that is quite impossible in

By having the voice of Euhippos address the passerby in an Ionic timbre that emphasizes his Chian origins, the dialect locates the deceased in a linguistic community to which he will never return, forever lost to the sea of the bookroll where he survives and speaks only in the imagination of readers.

Perhaps inspired by Asclepiades’ epigram for Euhippos, Callimachus similarly composed a cenotaph for a lost merchant. In this instance a certain Naxian named Lykos perished on a trip from Aegina:

Νάξιος οὖκ ἔπι γῆς ἔθανεν Λύκος, ἄλλ’ ἐν πόντῳ ναὸν ἀμα καὶ ψυχὴν εἶδεν ἀπολλυμένην, ἐμπρὸς Λιγίνηθεν ὅτ’ ἔπλεε. χω μὲν ἐν ὑγρῇ νεκρός, ἐγὼ δ’ ἄλλος οὐνόμα τῦμβος ἐχον κηρύσσον πανάληθες ἔπος τόδε: “Φεῦγε θαλάσσῃ συμμίσγεν ἔριφων, ναυτίλε, ὅδεμένων.” (Callimachus G-P 38=A.P. 7.272)

P Pl
I ἔθανεν Pl: θάνεν P

Naxian Lykos did not die on land, but in the sea he saw his ship and life destroyed at the same time, when as a merchant he set sail from Aegina. His corpse is in the watery deep, but otherwise I, his tomb, retain his name and will announce this absolutely true saying: “Avoid commerce with the sea, sailor, when the Kids are setting.”

In addition to adopting the dichotomous cenotaphic motif of a missing body but a surviving voice, Callimachus also made his epitaphic subject a citizen of an Ionic-speaking island. This choice allowed him to retain the dialect of his model, while still conveying the native speech of the deceased in the voice of his tomb. A keen and agonistic reader, Callimachus expands and varies the contents of Asclepiades’ epigram in this variation. Part of his variation is the greater detail given to the circumstances surrounding Lykos’ watery demise: having set out from Aegina,

presumably on the return trip to Naxos, his ship met an unwelcome end. While ἐμπορός in line three recalls ἐμπορήν in Asclepiades, the mention of Aegina offers Callimachus an opportunity to refine the use of dialect as a marker of place a practice found in his model. The zeugma in line two draws attention to the simultaneous loss of life and ship (and cargo), and it is here that Callimachus notably inserts the only non-Ionic form attested in the manuscripts of this markedly epicizing epigram. The accusative singular ναὸς is ambiguously Attic or Doric. The mention of Aegina as Lykos’ port of departure may offer a plausible explanation for reading the form as Doric, whose effect would be to mark the origin of the deceased’s fateful journey.

The desire of Callimachus’ Euhippos to connect with a distant homeland has its antipode in Posidippus’ epitaph for Menoitios of Crete preserved on the Milan papyrus:

τί πρὸς ἐμ’ ὥδ’ ἔστητε; τί μ’ οὐκ ἡδίσατ’ ἱαὐεῖν,  
eἰρόμενοι τίς ἔγω καὶ πόθεν ἢ ποδαπός;  
στείχετέ μου παρὰ σήμα: Μενοῖτιός εἰμι Φιλάρχῳ  
Κρῆς, ὀλιγορρήμων ὡς ὅν ἐπὶ ἐξενίς. (Posidippus AB 102)

Why do you stand beside me? Why won’t you allow me to rest,  
Inquiring who I am and where I am from or where I was born?  
Pass by my tomb: I am Menoitios, son of Philarchos,  
a Cretan, of few words since I am on foreign soil.

In place of the standard appeals of epitaphs for the passerby to pause and read the inscription, thus perpetuating the deceased’s identity, the voice of the epigram urges any passerby to keep on his way, and not bother with the common graveside questions about family and fatherland (πόθεν ἢ ποδαπός). Humorously, the deceased eventually answers those questions that he originally sought to avoid: his name is Menoitios, son of Philarchos, and he is Cretan. Before, however, the reader learns from the deceased his Cretan origins, two striking dialect forms signal that the
speaker cannot easily keep aspects of his identity concealed. In line one the verb ηάσατ’ displays secondary *ē as η, the reflex for this verb found in Doris severior (Attic-Ionic and Doris mitior would have είδασαςε). Posidippus represents secondary *ē only once elsewhere in the Milan papyrus, at AB 64.2 (ηργάσατο) in an epigram on another subject with marked Cretan associations, the statue of the Cretan hero Idomeneus by the local sculptor Kresilas. A second Doris severior form, here the rendering of the secondary long [o:] as ω, appears only once in Posidippus in the genitive singular form of the name of the deceased’s father (Φιλάρχω). Regularly attested in Cretan inscriptions, both of these forms contribute meaningful to the revealing realism of Menoitios’ voice and identity. There is also art in the distribution of these marked dialect forms. At lines three to four, Posidippus enjambs this Doris severior genitive with the deceased’s ethnic, the piece of information which Menoitios has sought to evade disclosing and retroactively makes meaning out of these two marked Doric forms. Menoitios may want to be left in peace to spend the eternity of his afterlife in anonymity, but he cannot escape the cultural connection between language and ethnic identity.

While these two Doris severior forms are the most notable dialect features in the epigram and clearly contribute to the light-hearted humor of the epigrammatic conceit as well as engage with the insessional epigrammatic tradition, Posidippus does not choose to compose the entirety of the epigram in the dialect of the deceased. First, Menoitios refers to his own tomb as a

---

461 Palumbo Stracca 1993-94, 408-409 and Sens 2004, 71-72 discuss the Doris severior forms, but do not recognize their function in the context of the inversion of the epitaphic conceit.
462 Sens 2004, 71 does observe that Attic and the koine also sometimes treat the augment of this verb in η, but rightly concludes that the Doric associations of the reflex of the secondary long [ε:] are bolstered by the general Doric color if the epigram.
463 Sens 2004, 71 claims that the unique attestation of [o:] as ω “must be considered a particularly marked Doricism.”
464 Bubeník 1989, 82 reports that o-stem genitive singulars in –ω appear in 58% of third century public and private inscriptions in Crete (53 out of 91 possible forms) and at the slightly higher rate of 62% (352 out of 570 possible forms) in the second century BCE. The same detailed data does not exist for the usage rate of η for secondary long [ε:], but Buck 1955, §25a states that this was a common feature of Cretan inscriptions from the earliest periods. On the whole, koinéization of the island’s inscriptions does not begin in earnest until the first century BCE; see Bubeník 1989, 80.
σῆμα, the Attic-Ionic form of the noun. Second, the deceased uses the Ionic adjective ξενίης to refer to the foreign land of his burial. Of course, Doric σάμα and ξενίας are not unwelcome for any technical reason such as meter, and the interchange of Attic-Ionic η for Doric α in metrically equivalent contexts is not uncommon in the manuscript tradition. Although the more or less contemporary papyrus witness and the retention of the more marked Doricisms plausibly suggest that σῆμα and ξενίης are original to Posidippus, we have no definitive way to prove that the dialect variance is a not a product of textual corruption. Nevertheless, given the poetic potential in the Doric forms, a literary explanation for the transmitted forms bolsters arguments for their retention and justifies a discussion.

In a similar fashion to the Doric features in this epigram, the presence of σῆμα becomes clearer when the reader reaches the conclusion of the quatrain. Menoitios reveals that he has died abroad and this fact, he explains, is the reason behind his taciturn mood (ὀλιγορρήμων ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ ξενίης). On foreign land (ἐπὶ ξενίης) and presumably, as we shall see, separated from those who share his native language as well as cultural background, the deceased is not disposed to enter into conversation (ὀλιγορρήμων) with the strangers who venture past his tomb. As we saw in the inscriptive tradition, epitaphs for those who died abroad often incorporate features of the deceased’s native language into a background dialect coloring reflective of the native speech of the location where the inscription is on display. σῆμα and ξενίης replicate, I believe, this inscriptive practice. The resonance of Ionic ξενίης as the final word in Menoitios’ epitaph is exemplative of Hellenistic book epigram’s penchant for a pointed denouement, and underscores

---

465 In a humorous touch, Posidippus has his misanthropic Cretan articulate his reticence to engage in a chat with a passerby with a lengthy, five-syllable neologism.
the unhappy dislocation felt by the deceased in having his σῆμα (not σάμα) erected far from Crete.\footnote{Contrast with the use of Ionic in the ξεῖνε of the Prexo epigram as a possible means of making connections across time and space.}

In his one surviving epigram, Heraclitus of Halicarnassus takes the composition of literary epitaphs to their logical end point providing an imagined \textit{mise en scene}, when he movingly memorializes the death of a young mother, Aretemias of Cnidos.

\begin{quote}
\textit{ά} κόνις \textit{ἀρτίσκαπτος}, \textit{ἐπὶ στάλας} \textit{δὲ} \textit{μετώπων}
seiontae phullov hmybaleis stefanoii.
grammai diakrínantes, ðoitope, pétron ñòwmen,
leura peristélleivóstéa pati tíнос.
``ξεῖν', \textit{Ἀρετημίας} eimi: \textit{πάτρα} Κνίδος: Eúphronos ñlthov
eis léchos- ðódínov ouk ámoros \textit{γενόμαν},
ðissá ð' ðomov tiktousa tò ñen lítov ándri podhýón
γήρως, ën ð' ápágo \textit{μυαμόσυνον} pósios.'' (Heraclitus G-P 1=A.P. 7.465)
\end{quote}

The dust is freshly-dug, and on the face of the tomb half-green wreathes of flowers quake.
Let us look at the stone, passerby, deciphering the letters, whose smooth bones it says that it covers.
``Stranger, I am Aretemias; Cnidos is my fatherland; I married Euphrhon; I was not bereft of the pangs of childbirth, Giving birth to twins, the one I left behind to his father an attendant in old age, but the other I carry off as a reminder of my husband.''

I begin with the second half of the epigram, Aretemias’ “epitaph” proper. The deceased speaks in the first-person, and the presence of Doric forms, solely the substitution of $\alpha$ for $\eta$ (Ἀρετημίας; πάτρα; γενόμαι; and μυαμόσυνον), conveys the general color of her native speech, as a citizen of Doric-speaking Cnidos. In a similar vein to Leonidas’ Prexo epigram, the use of the native dialect of the deceased increases the pathos for the loss of a young mother and one of her infant
sons. By giving a realistic voice to Aretemias, Heraclitus also honors her by letting the mother and wife speak for “herself.”

Besides this emotional punch, Heraclitus’ epigram has been much admired for its play with the conventions of inscribed epitaph.\footnote{For discussion, see Hunter 1992 and Gutzwiller 1998, 250-52.} In the first quatrain of the poem an anonymous speaker describes the state of the freshly dug grave before him—the funeral wreaths have not yet wilted—and then invites a similarly unidentified passerby (ὁ δοιπόρε) to join with him in reading the epigram inscribed on the tomb, which follows in the second quatrain. The dramatization of reading, interpreting, and reacting to an epitaph is also found in other third-century epigrammatists, most notably Callimachus,\footnote{See, for example, G-P 40=A.P. 7.522 an epitaph for Timonoe of Methymna.} but here the unidentified speaker of the epigram does not place himself in the position of the passerby; rather he acts a guide to the reading. Based on the epigram’s patent fictionality and likely placement in a epigram collection,\footnote{Pace Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924, 2.122, Gow and Page 1965, 2.304 do not completely dismiss the inscriptional origins of the epigram.} Richard Hunter has argued that early readers of the epigram would have identified the anonymous voice of the epigram with that of the poet who composed the epitaph in the second half of the epigram:

“In Heraclitus [G-P 1]...the voice which invites any traveller to join in the task of deciphering the γράµµα can only be that of ‘the poet’; looking back, we are forced to recognise that is also ‘the poet’ who has ‘set the scene’ for us in the opening couplet.”\footnote{Hunter 1992, 115, whom Gutzwiller 1998, 251-52 follows and expands upon when she describes the epigram as constituting (251) “a text in the process of composition.” Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924, 2.122 recognized the different quality of the voice of the identified speaker, which he identified with the “dieselbe unbestimmte Person...wie in den kallimacheischen Hymnen.”} The readers, in turn, would have placed themselves in the position of the passerby. The physical journey past rows of gravestone is replaced by encountering epitaphs on a bookroll.\footnote{Hunter 1992, 116: “The ‘traveller’ whom the poet addresses is in fact a reader on a poetic journey; the act of travelling, of walking past tombstones, is the act of reading.”} This interpretation, while suggestive, is, of course, only one possible reaction to the framing quatrain. It could also, for
example, be read as a conversation between a passerby and another visitor to the tomb. In discussing the dialect I will take both types of readings into account.

The first quatrain of the epigram shares the same Doric color with the epitaph of Aretemias. If we read the quatrain as a conversation between a visitor and another passerby, the Doric of the epigram could suggest, as the following epitaph for the deceased makes explicit, that the unidentified speaker is also from a Doric-speaking region. That one should identify the speaker as a fellow citizen of Cnidos is not at all certain. It has been observed that when an epitaph, such as Aretemias’, mentions a place of origin it often indicates that the person is buried elsewhere. Of course in literary epigram, the mind of the reader is allowed to freely supplement as he or she desires, but this convention may speak against such a purposeful use of Doric to associate both speakers with Cnidos.

I turn now to consider the role of dialect in the interpretation of the epigram if a reader chooses to identify the epigrammatic speaker with the poet of Aretemias’ epitaph. On the one hand, the Doric color of the poet’s voice could simply be interpreted, as we have suggested in the previous reading, that the poet shared the same dialect as the deceased or possibly hailed from Cnidos. On the other hand, the design of the epigram—a poet pointing out and then reading ‘aloud’ his own composition that is ostensibly in the voice of another individual—acts as a commentary on the inscriptive tradition of epitaph, where the voice of the anonymous poet was effaced in order to bring to the fore the reality of the voice of the deceased.\(^{472}\) From this perspective, the shared dialect between the voice of the poet and the voice of Aretemias underscores the artifice of book epigram that partially motivates Heraclitus’ epitaph for

\(^{472}\) See the comments of Hunter 1992, 116 who locates a central preoccupation of the epigram “in exploring the implication of a form of writing which, by its very nature, projected an ‘other’ voice, and assumed the anonymity of the poet.”
Aretemias: it is the speaker who ultimately animates the deceased, and part of their shared poetic DNA is present in the consistent Doric color of both halves of the epigram.

At this point, I would like to move on from examples of the accord between dialect and identity (or the suggestion of such an accord) to an instance where the contrast between the two is equally productive. The epigram is Callimachus’s epitaph for a certain Cretan goatherd Astakides, whose sudden passing is situated in an aural landscape of pastoral lament:

Ἀστακίδην τὸν Κρήτην τὸν αἰπόλον ἐρρασε Νόμφη
ἐξ ὀρέως, καὶ νῦν ἱερὸς Ἀστακίδης.
οὐκέτι Δικταίσιν ὑπὸ δρυσίν, οὐκέτι Δάφνιν,
ποιμένες, Ἀστακίδην δ᾽ αἰὲν ἄεισόμεθα. (Callimachus G-P 36=A.P. 7.518)

A nymph carried off Cretan Astakides, the goatherd, from the mountain and now Astakides is holy.
No longer under the Dictaean oakes, no longer, shepherds, will we sing of Daphnis but always Astakides.

Notable Theocritean echoes include the use of anaphora bucolica, as Pfeiffer observed, in the repetition in line three of οὐκέτι at line-head and after the bucolic diaeresis and the characterization of the speakers as ποιμένες, the same term with which Thyrsis’ anonymous interlocutor in *Idyll* 1 identifies himself (ll. 7 and 15). Given the epigram’s affinity to pastoral lament and *Idyll* 1 on Daphnis in particular, the Cretan shepherds’ adoption of Astakides as a new Daphnis, the inventor of pastoral poetry, offers, as scholars have observed, a challenge to supremacy of a Theocritean pastoral poetics. Unlike their Theocritean counterparts, Callimachus’ shepherds will no longer dedicate their songs to the Sicilian Daphnis, but rather to

---

473 Pfeiffer 1949-51, 2.86. On allusions to *Idyll* 1, see Bing 1995, 129-30. In the course of her argument for identifying Astakides as a byname for contemporary pastoral poetry, Larson 1997, 133 n.17 connects the threefold repetition of Astakides’ name to a similar repetition by Heracles of Hylas’ name in *Id.* 13.58-59.

a fellow native son of Crete. In doing so, they tacitly reject the dominant tradition of pastoral poetry for a new, localized tradition centered on the heroicized apotheosis of Astakides.

I propose that dialect is an active component in Callimachus’ critical engagement with the Theocritean tradition of pastoral poetry. Given the ethnic and literary associations of the dialect, it is plausible that ancient readers might expect that a pastoral epitaph for a Cretan goatherd would feature Doricisms. Indeed there is precedent in Callimachus’ own epigrammatic corpus. At G-P 3=A.P. 12.150, on the curative power of song and hunger for lovesickness where he references the story of Polyphemus and Galatea, Callimachus deploys a marked Doric color that undoubtedly recalls Theocritus *Idyll* 11. And yet Astakides’ epigram is markedly lacking Doricisms. When speaker or speakers of the epigram—depending on if one imagines the speaker to be the poet himself addressing other fictional singers of bucolic or Astakides’ fellow Cretan shepherds—distance themselves from pastoral songs on Daphnis, from whom they and all other pastoral singers ultimately descend, it is undoubtedly significant that they do so in a smattering of Ionicisms. The claim of the speaker(s) in the final line that they will no longer sing of Daphnis, naturally recalls Theocritus *Idyll* 1, whose centerpiece is the shepherd Thrysis’ dirge for the Sicilian shepherd. Like Astakides, Daphnis, Thrysis sings, is a victim of *eros*. His song too begins with a mention of nymphs, in this case an apostrophization asking them where they had gotten off to in Sicily while Daphnis was wasting away from love.⁴⁷⁵ Although it is unclear who or what is exactly to blame for Daphnis’ condition, Astakides’ alpine rape by a nymph is

---

⁴⁷⁵ πᾶ ποκ’ ἄρ’ ἐσθ’, ὡκα Δάφνις ἔτάκετο, πᾶ ποκα, Νύμφαι; ἢ κατὰ Πηνεῖον καλὰ τέμπεα, ἢ κατὰ Πίνδοι; οὐ γὰρ δὴ ποταμίῳ μέγαν ῥόδον εἶχεν Ανάποι, ὦ νδ’ Ἀτηνας σκοπιάν, οὐδ’ Ἄκιδος ἵππιον ὑδωρ. (Id. 1.65-68)
(“Where were you, when Daphnis wasted away, where were you, nymphs?/ At Peneius’ beauteous valley or Mt. Pindus?/ For you did not dwell in Anapus’ great stream/ nor Etna’s peak, not Acis’ holy river.”)
The reminiscence of Thyris’ song continues at lines 120-21 where Daphnis composes his own epitaph:

Δάφνις ἐγὼν ὃδε τῆνος ὁ τὰς βόας ὃδε νομεύων,  
Δάφνις ὁ τῶς ταύρως καὶ πόρτιας ὃδε ποτίσδον.

I am that Daphnis who herded his cows here,  
the Daphnis who watered his bull and calves here.

Thyris’ Daphnis identifies himself first and foremost as a cowherd and the repetition of ὃδε in both lines stresses the localized scope of his action to Sicily. Astakides too restricted his herding to the valleys shaded by Mt. Dikte. More importantly, the form of Daphnis’ epitaph recalls the *sphragis* with which Thyris introduces himself and his song at lines 64-65 (Ἄρχετε βουκολικάς,  
Μοῦσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ’ ἀοιδᾶς. | Θύρσις ὃδ’ ὑξ Αἰτνας, καὶ Θύρσιδος ἄδεα φωνά).477 This association between Thyris and Daphnis fashions a genealogy of pastoral song originating with Sicilian Daphnis, transmitted through Sicilian Thyris, and ultimately expressed by Sicilian Theocritus. A common point of contact between and across these different strata in the “archaeology” of pastoral, to borrow the language of Hunter, is the Doric dialect, which is not only a generic marker, but also fittingly native to the speech of all three singers. In the place of Thyris and this tradition of pastoral song, at Callimachus G-P 36 we have anonymous Cretan shepherds who will now sing only of Astakides, thus initiating a different tradition of pastoral poetry. Read through the lens of Theocritean poetics, it is quite likely that the absence of Doric features in the memorialization of Astakides is part of Callimachus’ epigrammatic

476 On the object of Daphnis’ erotic fixation, see the discussion in Anagnostou-Laoutides and Konstan 2008, who review previous scholarship on the topic and then offer an argument for Daphnis’ enamourment with Aphrodite.  
While epigraphic and literary conventions would lead a reader to expect Doric, Callimachus has subverted these expectations just as he has subverted the ur-text of pastoral poetry offering a new tradition in its place.

**Epitaphs on Poets**

Until this point, the discussion has focused on dedications and epitaphs whose subjects, whether real or imagined, are not known to us in the literary record beyond their appearance in the epigrams under study. Since we know nothing of these men and women beyond what the epigrammatists tell us, the possible resonances of dialect as a marker of identity and place are somewhat circumscribed. A popular subtype of book epitaph, however, took as their subject poets and other famous figures (mythical or historical), whose histories, works, and later receptions can enrich our understanding of their treatment in an individual epigram. This enrichment also applies to the study of dialect color.

With its obscenities, colloquialisms, and vivid Ionic color, Archaic iambic was the pre-Hellenistic poetic type whose language was most closely associated with (the earthier aspects of) the region from which it was traditionally considered to have originated. Callimachus, in one of the programmatic poems to his collection of *Iambi* (13.63-65), marks his departure from the tradition by rejecting the requirement of being from or visiting Ionian Ephesus, the native city of Hipponax, in order to properly compose iambic verses, and earlier in the same poem, as we have already discussed, he combats criticism directed at his use of dialect other than Ionic (*Iamb.* 13.11-14). In his epitaph for Hipponax, Leonidas conjures the irascible persona of Hipponax in

---

478 In a recent oral paper delivered in Thessaloniki on pastoral markers in Hellenistic book epigram, Nita Krevans also noted the striking contrast between the Theocritean content of the epigram and the lack of Doric color, but did not offer any explanation.
an Ionic color that simultaneously captures the language of his invectives and his native Ephesus:

\[\text{Ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβετε μὴ τὸν ἐν ὕπνῳ πικρὸν ἑγείρητε σφήκ’ ἀναπαυόμενον. ἂρτι γὰρ Ἡπώνακτος ὁ καὶ τοκέων βαύξας ἂρτι κεκοίμηται θημὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ. ἀλλὰ προμηθήσασθε, τὰ γὰρ πεπιρωμένα κείνου ρῆματα πημαίνειν οἴδε καὶ εἶν Ἀἴδη. (Leonidas G-P 58=A.P. 7.408)\]

Quietly pass by the tomb, don't rouse the piercing wasp lying asleep. For recently the wrath of Hipponax, having barked at his own parents, recently has it been put to rest. But take care, for this one’s fiery verses know how to do harm even in Hades.

Contrary to the wishes of most epitaphs (as we saw with Posidippus AB 102), the tomb of Hipponax encourages its readers to pass by in silence lest they awaken it occupant and face the heat of his poetic invective. As a precedent for Hipponax’s unrelenting abuse, the tomb refers in line three to the fact that the Ephesian even directed iambic barks at his own parents. While the meaning of the line is quite clear, the manuscript transmission is damaged, and its reconstruction impacts our understanding of the epigram’s dialect composition. P and Pl are confused on the reading at the end of this line. τοκέων εἰα in P leaves the hexameter woefully incomplete; C supplemented the aorist participle βαύξας from his other exemplar, but despite this intervention line remained confused and incorrect. The τοκέων ἐο βαύξας of Pl is not much better. Headlam observed that βαύξας is always trisyllabic in verse, and so the original word that laid behind τοκέων εἰα (P) and τοκέων ἐο (Pl) must have had the metrical shape ⏑⏑-⏑. He offered

---

479 For a discussion of Hipponax and Archilochus in Hellenistic book epigram, see Rosen 2007b.
480 Alcaeus of Messene G-P 13=A.P. 7.536 (no marked Ionicisms) and Philip of Thessalonica GP 34=A.P. 7.405 (composed in an undifferentiated koine) likely both borrow from Leonidas; on the similar conceit in funerary epigrams for Archilochus, see Rosen 2007b, 464-66.
the emendation τοκέωνε.\textsuperscript{481} The nominal form is quite rare because it is found only in old Ionic, and, as Headlam recognized, the form may well have been in use at Hipponax’s home city of Ephesus.\textsuperscript{482} While Leonidas’ poem suggests there was a tradition that Hipponax directed his invective at his own parents, until the time more fragments of his poetry come to light, it must remain purely speculative whether τοκέωνε (and/or βαΰζειν) is a more direct allusion on the part of Leonidas to Hipponax’s works. At a minimum, the old Ionic form of τοκέωνε, in conjunction with the general dialectal color of the epitaph, recalls Ephesus, whose linguistic and popular culture were considered to have greatly influenced Hipponax’s iambics.\textsuperscript{483}

Perhaps as a corrective to Leonidas’ characterization of Hipponax as a indiscriminate dispenser of invective,\textsuperscript{484} Theocritus’ epitaph on the iambicist focuses on that fact that only those who are bad (πονηρός) have reason to fear his vituperation:

\textit{ὁ μουσοποιὸς ἐνθὸδ’ Ἰππόνας κεῖται.}
ei μὲν πονηρός, μὴ προσέρχεσθαι τῷ τῶμθῷ;  
ei δ’ ἐσθι κρήνας τε καὶ παρὰ χρηστῶν,
θαρσέων καθίζου, κἂν θέλης ἀπόβριζον. (Theocritus G-P 13=A.P. 13.3)

Here lies the poet Hipponax.  
If you are base, don’t approach the tomb.  
If you are good and among the kind, 
Taking heart sit down, and if you want, go to sleep.

\textsuperscript{481} Headlam 1901, 402.  
\textsuperscript{482} Headlam 1901, 402.  
\textsuperscript{483} Headlam 1901 also supplements a form of τοκεών in Meleager G-P 121=A.P. 7.79 (τοκεῶνας, ἰδο: τοκεῶν ἄσεωι C [τεκ.- P]) on the Ephesian pre-socratic philosopher Heraclitus, where this and other old Ionic forms, as Gutzwiller 2014, 92-94 observes, similarly evokes the language of Ephesus and the biting tone of the annoyed philosopher’s barbs.  
\textsuperscript{484} See Degani 1995, 132, who read the epigram as a “polemica riposta”, and the more reasoned statement of Rossi 2001, 301 that “this epigram serves almost as a correction of the Leonidean generalisation” of Hipponax as a cruel misanthrope. Rosen 2007b, 471 disagrees with this approach, arguing that we understand Theocritus’ epigram not as correction of previous critical statements on Hipponax and the nature of iambography, but rather as “articulating a particularly Hellenistic analytical interest in how the iambus worked, why poets would engage in vituperation to begin with, and what distinguishes ‘legitimate’ invective from unjustified attack.”
The choliamb of the epigram mimic the limping meter of Hipponax’s own Ionic iambics, and given the metrical context and subject matter, a reader would be justified in interpreting the dialect features, although in several instances dialectally ambiguous, as principally Ionic. Admittedly, the only diagnostically secure Ionic form is κρήγυος, but it is markedly so.\(^{485}\)

Otherwise the remaining dialect features could be interpreted as either Ionic or Doric. The contraction of the εο diphthong in the second-person singular imperatives προσέρχευ and καθίζευ is a feature of Ionic; however εο was written, it appears, primarily in synizesis in Ionic inscriptions until the fourth century BCE and the contraction is not attested in Ephesian inscriptions until even later. Contemporary Doric, perhaps through contact with Ionic speaking-regions, also adopted this resolution. Similarly, the crasis κήν can be interpreted as Ionic or Doric. In this case most dialect handbooks consider the crasis to be a Doricism,\(^{486}\) whereas Archaic and Classical Ionic authors would resolve the vowels to κάν.\(^{487}\)

In his analysis of the language of Herodas, Schmidt has convincingly argued that the crasis in κήν and its congener are hyperionisms done in (conscious or unconscious) avoidance of the κάν that had entered into the koine.\(^{489}\)

Like the resolution of εο there are no secure examples of κήν in Hipponax.\(^{490}\)

Additionally, κάν is attested in a fifth-century inscription from Ephesus. The second-person singular ἐσσί appears in both epic and Doric compositions, although

\(^{485}\) See the discussion of the noun at Sens 2011, 205 in the context of its appearance in Asclepiades G-P 30=A.P. 7.284 (an order directed at the sea to steer clear of Eumares’ tomb), where Sens suggests κρήγυος “may thus originally have been a feature of the Ionic vernacular.”

\(^{486}\) Thumb 1909, §79.3b; Buck 1955, §94.6; and Kühner and Blass 1978 (1) §51.7.

\(^{487}\) Hoffmann 1891-98 (3), 540; Bechtel 1921-24 (3), 98. For the crasis in Herodotus, see Powell 1938, 180 and for Hipponax (and other iambographers), see Hawkins 2013. Schmidt 1968, 22 collects some exceptions to the general practice.

\(^{488}\) For Callimachus cf. e.g., 191.61 Pf. (κῆδιδαξε); 191.68 Pf. (κηγώ); 195.11 Pf. (κῆς); and 205.53 Pf. (κημέ); for Herodas cf. e.g., 2.33 (κημέ); 2.54 (κήν); 3.35 (κηστί); 4.54 (κηπί); and 6.13 (κηγώ).

\(^{489}\) Schmidt 1968, 20-27, particularly 26-27.

\(^{490}\) Note, however, that P.Oxy 2175 fr. 5 transmits ἱκηγωχ, but Lobel, the editor of the papyrus, observes that ἱκηγωχ is also possible from the ink.
in the former it can be adduced as a borrowing meant to lend an epicizing veneer to the compositions. In either instance, the form is not attested in Hipponax. If we read the contraction of εο and the crasis κην as Ionic, perhaps influenced by the identity of the subject, then Theocritus has reproduced somewhat anachronistically (at least in comparison to Leonidas) the Ionic of Hipponax’s iambics. Herodas was, of course, inspired by Hipponax and it is possible that the crasis of κην was particularly associated with contemporary iambicizing poetry.

Who speaks these lines? The epigram gives no clear indication whether the reader should interpret the speaker of the epitaph as the tomb or Theocritus himself. If interpreted as the tomb of Hipponax, the Ionic background of these forms, perhaps informed by the presence of κρήγυος (if original to the text), would reinforce the dialect conventions of the epitaphic tradition. Considering the undeniable fictionality of the epitaph, it is also distinctly possible that a reader of the epigram could imagine the voice as that of Theocritus directing one’s attention to the imaginary tomb of Hipponax. If one approached the epigram with this primary reading in mind, the strong association of Theocritus with Doric may well have activated the Doric associations of some of these forms. While I think the former is the primary orientation of the dialect features, the built-in ambiguity between Ionic and Doric subtly points to the issues of voice and language inherent in Theocritus’ experiments in composing epitaphs for book poetry. I discuss below a more marked example of this clash between dialect and the identity of the subject and the poetic voice of Theocritus.

Hipponax was credited by Polemon of Ilium, a second-century BCE author of a multi-book treatise on the authors of parody, with inventing parody (fr. 76 Preller= Athenaeus

---

491 Callimachus and his *Iambi* (esp. *Iamb. 1 and 13) played a pivotal role in the Hellenistic revival of Hipponax, and it is perhaps worth considering, all while recognizing the difficulties of dating Callimachus and Theocritus in relation to each other (if this epigram is by Theocritus), that the dialectal ambiguities could be designed to reflect Callimachus’ mixture of Ionic and Doric in his *Iambi*. 
15.698b), a claim which he illustrated with the lines against a certain gluttonous Euromedontiades that sought to deflate the target’s sense of self-importance by cultivating a mock-heroic tone through their reuse of the opening verses of the *Odyssey* (fr. 128 W).\(^{492}\) In a fictional epitaph for the Mnasalces, Theodoridas mockingly commemorates his fellow epigrammatist’s corpus by turning (likely exaggerated) aspects of Mnasalces’ poetic style against him:

\[
\text{Μνασάλκεος τὸ σάμα τῷ Πλαταίδα τῷ ἀλεγησιούτῳ ἀ Μῶσα δὲ αὐτῷ τὰς Σιμωνίδα πλάτας,\(^{493}\) ἢς ἀποσπάραγμα κενά τε κλαγγαν,\(^{494}\) καπιλακυθίστρια †ἀθυραμβοχάνατι: τέθνακε, µὴ βάλωµες: εἴ δὲ κ’ ἔζοεν τοµµανὸν κ’ ἑφύσῃ. (Theodoridas G-P 15=A.P. 13.21)}
\]

P Strabo 9.2.31
1 σάμα P: µνάµα Strabo Πλαταίδα P: Πλαταιάδα Strabo 5 κλαγγάν Jacobs: καὶ γαν P

This is the tomb of Mnasalces of Plataeaea, composer of elegies.
His Muse was a shred from Simonides’ page empty despite the sound, a bombastic gush of dithyrambs.
He’s dead, but don’t thrown stones. If should be alive, he would puff (?) the tympany.\(^{495}\)

\(^{492}\) For treatments of this fragment as an epic parody, see, e.g. Pianko 1951; Degani 1973-74; and Guida 1994; contra Faraone 2004 who argues the fragment has its generic origin in hexametric expulsive incantations.
\(^{493}\) I print Salmasius’ emendation, here understood to be a synonym for σελίδας after Ar. *Thesm.* 771, for the incoherent πλάθας in the paradosis; Gow and Page print πλάθας and tentatively suggest the word may mean here “modeled figure, creation” (Gow and Page 1965, 2.546) on the formation of πλάσσειν.
\(^{494}\) I print the emendations of Toup (κενά) and Jacobs (κλαγγαν) for καινα τε και γαν in the paradosis.
\(^{495}\) For a possible meaning of this final line, see Gow and Page 1965, 2.547-48 who believe τύµπανον most likely refers to some type of instrument of torture—they offer a block or cudgel—rather than a drum (2.547: “but the context calls for something to contrast with µὴ βάλωµες—’the man is dead, so let us spare him; if he were alive he would meet his deserts’”); but all is very much obscured by the presence of ἑφύσῃ (2.548: “the verb remains enigmatic and, since the precise sense required cannot be discerned, it can hardly be defended or emended convincingly). φυσάω regularly translates as “puff” or “blow out” (in the sense of exhale). They conclude by tentatively proposing a translation of (2.548) “he would stink of the block, i.e. be ready for execution.”
Although damage to the text has obscured specific points of the epigram’s argument, the general force of the attack on Mnasalces’ overblown style is clear. Alongside its neologisms (ἀποσπάραγμα; κάπιλακυθίστρα; διθυραμβοχάνα), the epigram features a number of features drawn from Doris severior, including the genitive singular of masculine o-stems in –ω (τώ; ἀπογοποιώ; αὐτώ), the resolution of the secondary *ō in ὕ (Μῶσα), and the first-person plural ending in –μες (βάλωμες).

Mnasalces, as the epitaph states, was a native of the deme of Plataeae in Sicyon, and so he would have spoken Doric. Located within the sphere of Corinthian influence, the Doric of third-century Sicyonian public and private inscriptions present a standard mild Doric, in which the forms elaborated above are not found. Of Mnasalces’ eighteen surviving epigrams, I have categorized sixteen as either predominantly Doric or featuring the admixture of Doric features. With the exception of ἔσταμες in G-P 10 (=A.P. 7.491), aspects of Doris severior are also absent from Mnasalces’ literary Doric. This is not to exclude, of course, the possibility that Mnasalces employed such forms in other, now lost, epigrams, or that they may have been removed in the course of transmission. Theodoridas, a native of Syracuse, also composed the majority of his epigrams in Doric, but again these specific Doric forms are limited in his surviving corpus to the epitaph of Mnasalces. As it stands, then, Theodoridas’ use of Doric has a parodic purpose beyond recalling Mnasalces’ native Sicyon or his proclivity for Doric-based poetic language. Parody derives its sting from evoking the serious aspects of its model and then putting these same forms to a comic effect. In the case of Theodoridas’ reading of Mnasalces’ epigrammatic

---

496 The discovery of a range of dialect usage in the epigrams of Posidippus from the Milan papyrus should remind one of exactly how much we have lost and still do not know about many of our epigrammatists’ corpora and language use.

497 On ancient parody, often exemplified by the incongruous reuse of epic or tragic language, see Most 1993 and Olson and Sens 1999 on parody of epic and Silk 1993 on the difference between Aristophanic paratragedy and the parody of tragedy. For theories and taxonomies of parody, from ancient to modern, see Rose 1993.
output, the latter’s consistent composition in Doric, itself perhaps influenced by Anyte who was a model for numerous epigrams, was an essential characteristic of his poetic identity, and so became a target for mocking and parodic exaggeration.\footnote{We should not discount, of course, the possible influence of the epodic meter (iambic trimeter plus ithyphallic), unique in epigram, on dialect choice. The jagged rhythm certainly contributes mocking tone of the epigram and there is the possibility, although the evidence is currently lacking, that this metrical combination had some sort of association with severe Doric. At a minimum, the repeated use of ω for ου does imbue the epitaph with a heavier almost bellowing aural effect.} Theodoridas’ epitaph for Mnasalces sought to define, in part through the use of dialect, the poetic identity of his subject, and whether designed as playful or serious, this epitaph for Mnasalces fashions the poet as a bombastic Doric versifier.

While Theodoridas and others used epitaph as a form to comment on the poetry and poetics of other authors, several third-century epigrammatists harnessed the summative potential of epitaph to shape preemptively their own poetic self-representation. In two famous examples of self-epitaphs—Nossis and Leonidas of Tarentum—dialect plays a significant, but until now underappreciated, role in the poets’ articulation of their poetic identity and epigrammatic program. For Nossis, who situates herself in the Sapphic tradition of female-centered poetry, the use of Doric, which is evocative of her native Epizypherian Locris, recalls not only the association between female poetic voices and native dialects, but also grounds her collection of female dedications and epitaphs in a imagined local soundscape. While Nossis seeks out connections across space and time, Leonidas of Tarentum, on the other hand, fashions himself as an itinerant poet, and his self-sufficiency and detachment from society makes itself felt in the Ionic color of his epitaph.

Scholars have long recognized Nossis’ debt to Sappho in her surviving corpus. While her focused attention on female communities and her expression of same-sex praise and desire would have suggested to a reader Sapphic associations, Nossis makes the model explicit by
featuring Sappho prominently in two epigrams that contain programmatic statements, and which possibly bookended the Locrian’s poetry collection. G-P 1=A.P. 5.170, suggested by some scholars to have served as the proem to a collection of her epigrams,\textsuperscript{499} is an allusive \textit{tour de force} through earlier and contemporary poetry at the end of which Nossis declares her poetic allegiance to female poetry and Sappho in particular.\textsuperscript{500}

\begin{quote}
δόλιον οὐδέν ἐρωτος, δ’ ὀλβία δεύτρα πάντα
ἐστίν· ἀπὸ στόματος δ’ ἔπτυσα καὶ τὸ μέλι.
τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς: τίνα δ’ ἄ Κύπρις οὐκ ἐφίλησεν\textsuperscript{501}
οὐκ οἶδεν κῆνα\textsuperscript{502} τάνθεα ποία ρόδα. (G-P 1=A.P. 5.170)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
P
1 ο δ’ Grüter: τάδ’ P
\end{quote}

Nothing is sweeter than love, every pleasant experience is secondary. I even spit the honey from my mouth.
Nossis says this: she whom Aphrodite does not love that woman does not know what sort of flowers roses are.

At the opening of the epigram, Nossis conceives of her poetics in opposition to Hesiod and his description of poets as those blest (ὁλβιος) by the love of the Muses, a love which allows them to

\textsuperscript{499} Luck 1954, 183 first suggested, and Gutzwiller 1998, 75 later endorsed, the programmatic function and introductory position of this epigram.
\textsuperscript{500} Skinner 1989 remains the most complete treatment of Nossis’ engagement with Sappho; on various aspects of Nossis and her poetic self-fashioning as a female poet, see also Cazzaniga 1970; Gigante 1974 and 1981; Skinner 1991a; Skinner 1991b; and Gutzwiller 1998, 74-88.
\textsuperscript{501} Gow and Page emend P’s reading and print ἐφίλασεν in order to create (as elsewhere) an artificial uniform dialect usage.
\textsuperscript{502} Stadtmüller and Page print τήνας following Ap.G. and understand the Doric genitive pronoun to refer to Aphrodite; others emend to the Aeolic genitive κῆνας (cf. Degani 1981; and Skinner 1989 and 1991a) with Gow and Page 1965, 435 suggesting that the pronoun refers to Nossis not Aphrodite. P transmits the nominative κῆνα.
Scholars had been hesitant to accept the manuscript reading since they found it jarring and unusual to have a pronoun, for which there is no known antecedent, act on its own as an antecedent to τίνα; cf. Degani 1981, 52 and Skinner 1989, 8. Gow and Page 1965, 2.435 reject this reading on grounds of metrical roughness. Gutzwiller 1998, 78 n.83 has provided convincing evidence for the similar use of a pronoun as an expressed antecedent. The pronoun κῆνα is Lesbian and appears in Sappho (2.1), but also is found in Doric inscriptions from Crete, Rhodes, and Cos. Considering the predominance of Sapphic allusions in this epigram, perhaps the incorporation of a Lesbian form draws a further connection between Nossis and her model of erotic poetry. Ironically, Nossis, as an inheritor of Sapphic inspiration, marks out the woman who knows nothing of the flower of love and, by extension love poetry, whom Gutzwiller 1998, 78-9 convincingly identifies with Erinna, with language drawn from the female love poet \textit{par excellence}. 
issue sweet song from their mouths (γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή).\textsuperscript{503} By spitting (ἐπτυσα) honey from her mouth (ἀπὸ στόματος), a placeholder for Hesiod’s γλυκερή...αὐδή, which he elsewhere associates with dew, a counterpart to honey in Greek poetry, Nossis demonstratively rejects Hesiod’s masculine notion of epic inspiration.\textsuperscript{504} In place of Hesiod, Nossis champions Sappho; the erotics of Aphrodite (Ἅ Ἐφίλησεν) rather than the inspiration of the Muses authenticates poetic production.\textsuperscript{505}

Nossis emphasizes her Sapphic affiliation through an unrecognized dialectal reminiscence of the language of the Lesbian poet in the final line of the poem. P, the only manuscript witness to the epigram, transmits the nominative pronomial form κήνα which is Aeolic for Attic ἐκεῖνος and Doric τίνος. Although the form appears in Sappho (2.1 \textit{PMG}), scholars have remained reticent to accept the manuscript reading since they found it jarring and unusual to have a pronoun, for which there is no known antecedent, act on its own as an antecedent to τίνα;\textsuperscript{506} however the use of a pronoun as an expressed antecedent is not without parallel in Hellenistic poetry.\textsuperscript{507} There are no grammatical grounds, then, on which to correct the manuscript reading, whether to the Aeolic genitive κήνας\textsuperscript{508} or more radically to the Doric τήνας,\textsuperscript{509} and given the predominance of Sapphic allusions in the epigram we are justified in considering its literary potential. Here Nossis assigns the Aeolic form to the woman whom she describes as knowing nothing of the flower of love, a pleurally ironic designation since the image of the flower of love is generally accepted as a metaphor for female-centered erotic poetry.

\textsuperscript{503} Cavallini 1981; Skinner 1991b, 91-92; and Gutzwiller 1998, 76.
\textsuperscript{504} Th. 83 cited from Gutzwiller 1998, 76. On the associations between honey, dew, and song in Greek literature, see Waszink 1974.
\textsuperscript{505} For the various Sapphic allusions found in this poem see the citations listed above in n.503
\textsuperscript{506} See Degani 1981, 52 and Skinner 1989, 8. Gow and Page 1965, 2.435 reject the manuscript reading for undue metrical roughness.
\textsuperscript{507} See the examples from Callimachus and Theocritus collected at Gutzwiller 1998, 78 n.83.
\textsuperscript{508} Degani 1981; Skinner 1989; and Skinner 1991a print this form.
\textsuperscript{509} Stadtmüller and G-P print τήνας after Ap. G.
in the tradition of Sappho. This is not the only diagnostically Aeolic form that we will find Nossis incorporating into her markedly doricized poetic language.

Although Nossis clearly articulates a Sapphic poetics in G-P 1, the Lesbian poet is only explicitly named in Nossis’ self-epitaph, which quite possibly closed a collection of her epigrams.

Ω ξέινε, εί τυ γε πλείς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλήναν
tāν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος
εἰπεῖν ός Μοῦσαι φίλαν τὴν τε Λόκρισσα
τίκτεν· ἵσαις δ’ ὅτι μοι τούνομα Νοσσίς, ἵτι. (G-P 11=A.P. 7.718)

O stranger, if you sail to Mytilene of the fair dancing grounds
to borrow the flower of Sappho’s graces
report how the Muses and Locris bore one dear to that woman.
Having known that my name is Nossis, go.

In a literary play on inscribed epigram, Nossis inverts the epitaphic convention in which the deceased/tomb asks a passerby to bring news of their demise to their family/home city.

Locrian born and raised, the recipient of this announcement surprisingly is not her mother Theuphilis. Instead, Nossis envisions her true homeland as Mytilene and by extension Sappho, that city’s most notable woman and poet, as her surrogate mother. By reworking epitaphic convention and the tradition of sphragis poetry, Nossis clearly articulates to readers, as has been

510 The use of κήνα would further resonate if one follows Gutzwiller (1998, 78-79) in identifying the unnamed woman as Erinna, whose own innovative hexameters took linguistic and thematic inspiration from Sappho.
511 Reitzenstein 1893, 139 was the first to suggest that this epigram likely closed Nossis’ poetry collection; for the possible position of self-epitaphs at the conclusion of epigram collections, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913, 298-99 and 1924, 1.135 and 140 and Gutzwiller 1998, 85-88 (Nossis), 107-8 (Leonidas), and 308 (Meleager).
512 An early and famous example in Simonides FGE 22b for the Spartan dead at Thermopylae; the form “re-emerges with vigor” (Sens 2011, 206) in the Hellenistic period in inscriptions (cf. Bernand 30; Alexandria ca. 290 BCE) but particularly in book epigram; e.g., Asclepiades G-P 31=A.P. 7.500; Callimachus G-P 43=A.P. 7.521; and Nicaenetus G-P 2=A.P. 7.502.
observed, her Lesbian poetic genealogy. Through time and space the inspirational and aesthetic mode of Sappho has traveled abroad.

The epigram is composed in a marked Doric color reminiscent of her native Epizypherian Locris. In addition to α as the reflex of inherited *ā, also present are the feminine genitive plural of the definite article in τāν, the second-person singular pronoun in τύ, and ποτί for πρός. The final couplet has a complicated editorial history, which has a bearing on the dialect color of the epigram. First, the manuscript reading of τῆνατε follow φίλαν in line three has been variously emended, but Brunck’s τήνατε, which I print, is the simplest and most convincing. Nossis likely wrote, then, the feminine dative singular of the Doric pronoun τῆνος for Sappho to whom, along with the Muses, the poet is dear. Second, there is the interpretation of ἵσαις in line four. While it is agreed that ἵσαις is based on the Doric conjugation of οἶδα, the form has been understood variously as the masculine present participle or the second-person singular present. If the former, the diphthongization –ας from *-ants, both phonologically regular and not entirely absent from Doric poetry, originates in Aeolic, although it later becomes a feature of literary Doric, most notably in Pindar. I have marked this hybrid form as both Doric and Aeolic in the text of the epigram (underlined, italicized, and bolded). Arguments for ἵσαις as the second-person singular are less convincing. While attested in Theocritus (cf. Id. 5.119 and 14.34), it is not the expected form of the verb and syntactically ill fitted to the subordination of the imperative ἴθι. I have thus chosen here to translate the form as a participle. The hybrid form of

---

513 Gutzwiller 1998, 86. See also the discussion in Bowman 1998, who reads the self-epitaph’s proclamation of kinship to the Lesbian poet as a (39) “bold attempt to gain the wide audience which Sappho’s poetry had, and which Nossis here claims her own deserves.”

514 Relying primarily on palaeographic arguments that I consider exceedingly weak, Cazzaniga 1972, 434 prints Ionic γαῖη με; with equally strained logic Gallavotti 1971, 245-46 offers ἵν άν τε, which requires, among other arguments, the emendation of a clearly written iota with a nu. Despite this Gallavotti (1971, 245-46) and Cazzaniga (1972, 431-34) are right when they argue on stylistic and linguistic grounds for the retention of Π’s Λόκρισα pace the editorial tradition, likely inaugurated by Brunck, of replacing it with the banalization Λοκρίς γα.

515 For ἵσαις as a participle, see Meineke 1842; as a verb, see Gallavotti 1971, 246-47 and Cazzaniga 1972, 435-37.

516 On this phenomenon of Pindar’s language, see the discussion in Verdier 1972, 65-103.
the participle—recalling her native dialect and the language of Sappho—is exemplative, as we shall find, of Nossis’ poetic self-fashioning. In the specific context of G-P 11=A.P. 7.718, the application of this hybrid dialectal form to ὀϑα encaptulates the duality of Nossis as a daughter of Locris and Sapphic poetry, which the reader, in the position of the anonymous passerby, is to have learned in the course of reading her epitaph.

Nossis’ positioning of herself and her poetry as an inheritor of the “flower of Sappho’s graces” (τὰν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος) is undeniable. An integral aspect of Sappho’s poetic identity, as we have just seen, is her association with Mytilene and Archaic Lesbian culture. Beginning from the poetry itself, the long-standing association between Sappho and the female community of Lesbos anchored her poetic voice and language to this specific landscape and cultural context. While admitting epicisms, Sappho’s poetic language was based in her native Lesbian. We know that scholarly activity surrounding the text and language of the Lesbian poets had begun in the Classical period and influenced the Alexandrian editors, such as Aristarchus who established Sappho’s text. Although evidence for detailed discussion of Sappho’s dialect is not found until the first and second centuries CE in the works of Herodian and Apollonius Dyscolus, by this time the prestige and specificity of the Lesbian literary dialect is clear. In discussions of Lesbian forms, ancient grammarians and dialectologists consistently describe them as “Aeolic”. To be Sapphic, then, is to write in a local dialect, to write in a language constituted by your insider community—in this instance a community of women.

---

517 There are several other instances in Nossis of dialect forms that could be identified as either Doric or Aeolic, based on their inclusion in the Doric choral lyric; see G-P 4.1 (ἐλοίσαι) and the possible reading of ὀϑα in G-P 5.3. They continue the practice of subtly evoking the dialect of Sappho in contexts of female communities and female desire, while also remaining welcome to Nossis’ consistent use of a literary version of her native Doric. I have marked these forms as both Doric and Aeolic.

518 Aristotle, for example, had access to and quoted from a text of the Lesbian poets (Rh. 1367a and Pol. 1285a). On the preservation of Sappho in Alexandrian culture and her presence in Hellenistic poetry, see Acosta-Hughes 2010, 12-61.
What should we make, then, of Nossis’ decision to compose in a Doric base, here and as we shall see throughout her surviving epigrams, that rarely admits the admixture of other dialect features, including Aeolic?\textsuperscript{519} Are we to construe this linguistic decision, in part, as a declaration on Nossis’ part of her innovation or independence from the Sapphic tradition?\textsuperscript{520} As we have seen, her self-epitaph does engage with the temporal and spatial displacement between Sappho, her poetic tradition, and Nossis. Not only does Nossis reference her Locrian origins, but, moreover, she stresses, through her order to the imagined passerby, that they announce her name upon arriving at Sappho’s homeland. Acknowledgment—of her allegiance to Sappho as well as the power and beauty of her own poetry collection—seemingly rests at the rhetorical center of the epitaph.

Let us consider, however, the literary implications if we read the use of Doric from the point of view of the matrilineal continuity between Sappho and Nossis that the self-epitaph also creates. The presence of Doric can be seen as an attempt to participate in the creation of women-centered poetic environments in the mold of Sappho. In other words, Nossis chose to write in a literary version of her native dialect because that is what her poetic model was considered to have done; indeed an entire strand of the female poetic tradition—particularly Corinna and Erinna—appear to have chosen to compose their lyrics and epigrams in a literary version of their native dialect. The Doric coloring of Nossis’ self-epitaph thus not only follows epitaphic convention in recalling her place of origin, but also places her in a female poetic tradition, starting from Sappho, in which writing about women, desire, and landscape takes place in a literary version of one’s local dialect.

\textsuperscript{519} Gallavotti 1971, 246 notes the distinct difference between Nossis’ dialect and the Aeolic of Sappho, particularly in relation to G-P 11=A.P. 7.718.

\textsuperscript{520} Gutzwiller 2014, 94 too notes in passing the way in which Nossis possibly differentiates herself from Sappho here.
When considered in the context of an author-oriented poetry book, the Doric dialect of Nossis’ self epitaph also lends an internal coherence grounded in a Locrian identity to her surviving epigrams. The likelihood of a single authored epigram book is strongly indicated by the shared structure, tone, and subjects of her surviving epigrams, particularly a group of dedications given by women.\footnote{G-P 3 to G-P 9 record dedications of luxurious and finely wrought votives and portraits of women, and each epigram displays the same range of Doricisms, predominantly the reflex of inherited *ā as α as well as the genitive plural of –α nouns in -ān, the demonstrative pronoun in τίνος, present active infinitive in –ην. Similar to ἵσις in G-P 11, these epigrams also feature the diphthongization of *-onsa to –οισα in feminine participles, a feature adopted into literary Doric from Aeolic, and so having a dual resonance.\footnote{This is not to suggest that these epigrams were placed in a similar order in Nossis’ now lost poetry collection; Gutzwiller 1998, 80-83. The women-centered discourse and same-sex eroticism of Nossis’ epigrams has received a significant amount of focus; in addition to the discussion in Gutzwiller 1998, see Skinner 1989 and Skinner 1991.\footnote{These epigrams are also united, as Gutzwiller 1998, 80-83 observed, in their praise of feminine perfection—both the surface perfection of a luxury votive bought with the money earned by one’s own physical beauty (cf. G-P 4.4=A.P. 9.332.4), and the internal perfection of a blameless life expressed through portraiture (cf. G-P 6.4=A.P. 9.605.4: οὐ τινα γὰρ μέμψιν ἐξει βιοτάς).}}

\begin{verbatim}
Ἐλθοίσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἱδώμεθα τὰς Ἀφροδίτας
tὸ βρέτας, ὡς χρυσῷ δαιδαλὸν τελέθει.
εἶσατό μν Πολυαρχῆς ἐπαυρομένα μάλα πολλάν
κτίσιν ἀπ’ οἰκείου σώματος ἀγλαίς. (Nossis G-P 4=A.P. 9.332)
\end{verbatim}

P P1
1 Ἐλθοίσαι P: Ἐλθοίμεν P1 3 πολλάν P: πολλήν P1

Going to the temple let us see the image of Aphrodite,
how it is cunningly wrought in gold.
Polyarchis dedicated it, very much enjoying the benefit of her wealth accrued from the beauty of her own body.

\begin{verbatim}
Χαίροισάν τοι ἕοικε κομᾶν ἅπο τὸν Ἀφροδίταν
ἀνθείμα κεκρύφαλον τόνδε λαβεῖν Σαμόθαρας,
δαιδάλεός τε γὰρ ἔστι καὶ ἄδο γε νέκταρος ἡσδεὶ. \footnote{The correction of C likely derives from another witness of the epigrams, but what exactly he intends by placing ὅ over ζ is unclear. From my own survey of C’s editorial activities, the writing of a letter in superscript denotes a substitution in most instances. The replacement of ζ with ὅ creates a nonsense verb; the combination of ζό is no better. Perhaps C forgot to include a σ, used ὅ as shorthand for the notation σό, considered the sound produced by ζό.}
\end{verbatim}
It seems that Aphrodite joyfully accepted this dedication a headband from the hair of Samytha. For it is cunningly wrought and smells somewhat sweetly of nectar; with this that one also anoints handsome Adonis.

Τὸν πίνακα ξανθᾶς Καλλῶ δόμον εἰς Ἀφροδίτας εἰκόνα γραψαμένα πάντ’ ἀνέθηκεν Ἰσαν. ὡς ἀγανῶς ἑστακέν· ἵδ’ ἄ χάρις ἀλίκον ἀνθεί. χαιρέτω, οὐ τίνα γὰρ μέμψιν ἔχει βιοτάς. (Nossis G-P 6=A.P. 9.605)

P
2 Ἰσαν Valckenar: Ἰσα P

Callo dedicated her portrait at the house of yellow-haired Aphrodite, having painted for herself an exacting likeness. How gently she stood; see how her charm is similar to a blossom. Let her take pleasure; for she does not have a blameworthy life.

Θαυμαρέτας μορφάν ὁ πίναξ ἔχει· εὖ γέ τὸ γαύρον τεῦξε τὸ θ’ ὡραῖον τάς ἄ γανοβλεφάρον. σαίνοι κέν σ’ ἐσιδοίσα καὶ οἰκοφύλαξ σκυλάκαινα δέσποιναν μελάθρων οἰομένα ποθορῆν. (Nossis G-P 7=A.P. 9.604)

P
P λ
2 τᾶς Π: τῆς Πλ 3 ἐσιδοίσα Π: ἐσιδοίσα Πλ 4 οἰομένα Π: οἰομένη Πλ

The portrait captures the form of Thaumarete; and well does it fashion the splendid youth of the gentle-eyed girl.

approximate to σδ, misplaced the δ from another context, or was attempting some sort of other emendation. Salmaise likely interpreted the C’s superscript delta above P’s zeta as standing for the consonant cluster *sd, or perhaps it is a learned conjecture by the copyist of Ap.B. Whatever, the case the reading is not witness to the manuscript tradition; yet I think it is at least plausible that C had a reading of σδει in one of his exemplars, enough so to print the form and consider briefly here its possible dialectal meaning. The substitution of the consonant cluster σδ for ζ is a feature of the literary dialects of Sappho, Alcaeus, Alcman, and Theocritus. While the form is likely Aeolic in its origins, it is also not markedly out of place in doricizing poetic contexts, as witnessed by its presence in Alcman (the question of originality to the text aside) and, more importantly, Theocritus. In his study of the feature in the manuscript tradition of Theocritus, Molinos Tejada 1990, 130 observed the continued association of the form in later bucolic poetry (e.g., Bion and Moschus) as “uno de los rasgos más característicos del dórico artificial.” Nossis was likely a contemporary of Theocritus and one could perhaps wonder if the poet adopted the form, in part, due to its association with pastoral landscapes. On the other hand, Sappho, as we have seen, was a formative model for Nossis’ poetry of female praise and it is quite undeniable that this features further evokes the great Lesbian poet, in a similar fashion to κήνα at G-P 1.4, ἐλθοῦσαι at G-P 4.1, and Ἰσας at G-P 11.4. On this account, I have marked the form as Aeolic and Doric, especially given the context: it is unlikely Nossis would have considered σδει unwelcome in her Doric epigrams, while simultaneously recognizing its potential to evoke different literary traditions...
Even your house-guarding puppy, looking upon you, would wag its tail, believing that it beholds the mistress of the house.

The essential Melinnna has been wrought. See how splendid is her visage. She seems to look sweetly upon us. How truly the daughter takes after her mother in all ways. Indeed it is good, whenever children resemble their parents.

Recognizeable to us, even from afar, is the likeness of Sabaethis in form and stature. Behold! The wisdom and sweetness of that one from even here I believe I can see; may you enjoy much, blessed woman.

Although any ethnics are absent from these dedications, Nossis identifies herself with this group of women through a dedication to Hera of a linen robe finely woven by herself and her mother Theuphilis (G-P 3=A.P. 6.265):

"Hra timáesσα. 526 Λακίνιον ἄ το θυόδδες

524 While it seems rational that Nossis would be consistent in her substitution of ποτ- for προς as a verbal suffix within an individual epigram, Bentley’s emendation is acceptable less on these grounds—variety, including dialect variety, is a notable aspect of poetic language—but rather needed for metrical necessity: ποτόκει accommodates the second dactyl required in the fifth foot of the pentameter.

525 Gow and Page print τιμάεσσα.

526 I have chosen to print the emendation of Gow and Page in place of the Attic-Ionic (τιμήσσα) version transmitted in P and the Suda. The Doric color is plausibly appropriate to the dialect of the epigram, where Nossis and her mother offer a dedication to a local cult of Hera whose name is doricized in P, and Nossis’ corpus in general. The same form is found once elsewhere in the Greek Anthology at Perses G-P 2=A.P. 6.272 (P), but here it is a proper name. C corrects the name to the Attic-Ionic.
Πολλάκις οὐρανόθεν νεισομένα καθορής,
δέξαι βύσσινον ἐίμα, τό τοι μετὰ παιδὸς ἁγιώς
Νοσσίδος ὄφανεν Θευφίλς ἀ Κλεόχας.

P Sud. s.vv. θυῶδες (1-2), εἴμα (3), βύσσινον (3)
1 Ἡρα P; Ἡρη Sud. 2 νεισομένη P; νισομένη Sud. καθορής P; καθοράς Sud. (om. F)

Esteemed Hera, you who look upon your fragrant
Lacinian temple when often coming from the heavens,
Receive the linen robe, which for you noble
Theuphilis, daughter of Cleochas, wove together with her child Nossis.

Breaking with inscriptional practice and thus displaying its bookish quality, the dedication notes
its own (imagined) place of display at the temple of Hera on the Lacinian promontory, an
important site of worship not far from Locris. Again Nossis develops the practice of
supplementing place through the nexus of the poetic voice and inscriptional practice. Nossis,
then, inscribes her name into the imagined landscape of Doric-speaking southern Italy.

Whatever the original ordering of these dedications in a poetry book, Nossis writes
herself into this poetic community of women, and in doing so invites the reader of her poetry
book to further contextualize this sphere of female action in Locris. The most readily
recognizable form of self-inscription is the presence of Nossis’ name in the dedication to Hera,
which we have seen, has a relationship to other dedications given to women. An inheritor of her
mother’s textile mastery made manifest in her artful weaving of words, Nossis positions
herself—and so her voice and her language—in what Skinner describes as a “tradition of female
craftsmanship and service to Hera handed down…through generations of nobly born mothers
and daughters.”

As a collection of literary dedications, the shared context and aestheticization of the
dedicator objects in the epigrams discussed above link Nossis and these women to the same

local cultural context. The consistency of Doric coloring between G-P 3 and the rest of the dedicatory epigrams grants them a location not provided by any information internal to the epigrams themselves. We can imagine, perhaps, the temple of Aphrodite, which receives the dedications of Polyarchis, Samytha, and Callo, not far from the Lacinian promontory mentioned in G-P 3. In every instance Nossis renders her name in its Doric form. When in G-P 4 the speaker politely asks a collected group of women to come with her (ἐλθοισαι) to see Polyarchis’ dedication at the temple of Aphrodite, the coloring of the appeal crafts the limits of the imagined community of mothers and daughters (cf. Doric ματέρι and γονεῖσιν in G-P 8), while also subtly recalling the aural landscape of private female speech at Lesbos.

Viewing and gazing are a constant theme which draws together this group of epigrams. In constructing these epigrams around the visual, Nossis invites her readers to imagine themselves participating in these acts of viewership. Of those epigrams that refer to acts of looking, most render at least one of the verbs or participles in a Doric form. In G-P 8, the poet comments on how sweetly the portrait of Melinna looks upon (ποτοπτάζει) the viewer; the speaker of G-P 9 orders the reader/viewer to behold (θαεο) the likeness of Sabaethis; in G-P 3 Nossis makes Hera, the dedicatee of the epigram, a viewer, looking down on her temple (καθορῆς); and in G-P 7 the speaker of the epigram focalizes the life-like quality of Thaumarete’s portrait through the perspective of her dear pet dog (ἐσίδοσα and ποθορήν). The physical forms of these women, now splendidly rendered in a plastic art, also receive a Doric tinge in G-P 7 (μορφάν) and G-P 9 (μορφα καὶ μεγαλειοσύνα). The color of Aphrodite’s hair in G-P 6 is given a Doric hue

528 Although she does not take the shared dialect into account, Gutzwiller 1998, 82 suggests that Nossis’ collection, taken as a whole, was designed to as to delineate “a society of Locrian women.” Skinner 1991a, also recognizes a community-focused aspect in Nossis’ works, when she comments on the tension between the public genre of inscriptive epigram and the private character of the subject matter: “thus, despite the overtly ‘public’ character of Nossis’ chosen subgenre, we receive the distinct impression of writing directed exclusively toward a relatively small, self-contained female community.”
(ξανθᾶς...Ἀφροδίτας). Indeed the entire sensual realm often occurs in Doric form. Samytha’s headband in G-P smells (ὅσδει) sweet (ἀδὸ),\(^{529}\) and the participle ἐπαυρομένα in G-P 4, which here has the sense of enjoying the benefit of something, has built within it a haptic component.\(^{530}\)

We see and experience, then, this Locrian community of women through Nossis’ eyes, a set of Doric-colored glasses, so to speak. In the confines of a poetry collection the anonymous first-person viewer takes on the identity of the poet, and the nuanced connections between the descriptions of the dedications further suggest a singular identity behind the guiding eye of the viewer. This nexus of connections between the dialect, poetic identity of the speaker, and repeated references to Locris in other epigrams in the collection, make it quite plausible that we, the reader, are meant to imagine Nossis acting as enthusiastic tour guide of the local Locrian shrines.\(^{531}\)

Nossis imagined her burial in the native soil of Epizypherian Locris, all the while her poetic soul sought a connection to Archaic Lesbos. For Leonidas of Tarentum this situation is the exact opposite: he imagines himself as having died far off from his native Italy, and this almost unbearable separation is only mitigated by the knowledge that through his poetry, concerning the many types of places and people he met on his travels, will his name will live on: \(^{532}\)

\[
\text{Πολλὸν ἀπ’ Ἰταλῆς κεῖμαι χθονὸς ἐκ τε Τάραντος πάτρης, τοῦτο δὲ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου. τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἀβίος βίος, ἄλλα μὲ Μοῦσαι ἐπιρέξαν, λυγρὸν δ’ ἀντὶ μελιχρόν ἔχω,}
\]

\(^{529}\) The Doric form ἀδὸ may also have certain programmatic importance based on its use in G-P 1.
\(^{530}\) cf. LSJ s.v. 1.2 (“to touch or graze”).
\(^{531}\) I borrow the image of Nossis as tour-guide from Gutzwiller 1998, 83. On the whole, Gutzwiller’s recognition that the focus on female praise and the perspective of the dramatic narrator likely ground the collection in a community of Locrian women greatly influence my own reading of the dialect usage in the contextualization of the epigram collection, an aspect of Nossis’ poetic fabric that Gutzwiller does not discuss.
\(^{532}\) On the possible concluding position of the poem, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924, 2.140 and Gabathuler 1937, 67-68. The notion of a self epitaph lead Geffecken 1893, 12 to reject Leonidean authorship, however it is not clear this is the weakest of grounds to question an attribution; for the bibliography supporting Leonidas’ authorship, see Gutzwiller 1998, 108 n.48.
I lie far off from Italy and from the Tarantine soil
my fatherland; I have this more bitter than death.
The itinerant life is not such life at all; but the Muses
favored me, and I have honey-sweetness instead of miseries.
The name of Leonidas has not fallen. These gifts
of the Muses shall proclaim my for all time.

In celebrating the immutable nature of his poetry, Leonidas adopts a pseudo-epic persona and
lays claims to epic kleos for himself. In particular, the Leonidas of this epigram cuts an Odyssean
figure, the original beleaguered wanderer of Greek literature to whom Leonidas alludes with the
proliferance of words beginning with π (πολλὸν; πάτρης; πικρότερον; and πλανίων), echoing a
similar alliterative patterns in the opening lines of the Odyssey.533

Sing to me, Muses, of the man of many wiles, who having suffered
many terrible things, after he sacked the holy city of Troy;
He saw the cities of many men and knew their minds,
and he suffered in his heart many pains at sea.

Like Odysseus the Muses perpetuate the name of Leonidas; however, unlike his epic exemplar,
Leonidas’ voyage is an anti-nostos, which reaches its conclusion on the soil of a far-off land.
Leonidas receives the favor of the Muses despite ending his life abroad, and the poetic kleos he
assumes from this life of itinerancy thus inverts the ideology of the Odyssey, which champions
the narrative of homecoming. Dialect also factors into Leonidas’ engagement with the dual

533 This allusion to the Odyssey is discussed in Gutzwiller 2012, 105-107 and Campbell 2014, 51-52.
concepts of epic *kleos* and poetic commemoration through his reconfiguration of the Odyssean figure from triumphant wanderer to reluctant itinerant. Given the intertextual points of contact with the *Odyssey*, Ionic color of Leonidas’ epitaphic voice certainly evokes the language of Homeric epic, a choice that only further highlights the asymmetry (both thematic, and possibly generic) between the heroicization of homecoming in epic and dislocating itinerancy in the Tarantine’s epigrammatic reworking.

Leonidas’ subtle interrogation of epic *kleos*, however, is only one aspect of dialect’s contribution to Leonidas’ poetic self-fashioning. We must also take into account the inscriptive conventions of dialect use that are also operative in a self-epitaph. Tarentum was a Spartan foundation and Doric continued to be the inscriptive language of the city well into the Hellenistic period. On this model, the Ionic coloring of Leonidas’ epitaphic voice stands in stark contrast to what would be expected of the poet’s actual epitaph. By inverting the inscriptive conventions of dialect use, Leonidas underscores the bitter displacement he feels at dying abroad. Leonidas has wandered so far away from home over the course of a life as an itinerant poet that he has “lost” his native voice.

In support of this interpretation we have two other epigrams written by Leonidas *in propria persona*. After a long period of travel, the poet has finally come to rest in his old age, and now lives a life of self-sufficient poverty.

Λαθρίη, ἐκ ῥπλάνης ταύτην χάριν ἐκ τε πενέστεω κης 534 ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω.

534 Bubeník 1989 does not treat the process of koineization in Sicily and southern Italy, but there is no reason to think that the pattern of linguistic change would vary greatly from that described for mainland Greece, the Aegean islands, and the Ionian coast. In other words, Tarentum in the early third century BCE would be undergoing the early process of replacing its epichoric Doric with a version of the Doric koine; complete integration of the Hellenistic koine would likely have post-dated Leonidas by many decades or a whole century.

535 On the dialectal identity of the crasis of α and ε to η see the discussion above on page 196 with notes. Considering the marked Ionic coloring of the epigrams and the appearance of this crasis in contemporary ionicizing works, which contrasts with the epigram’s content, it is possible to interpret κης as a hyperionism. Indeed an Ionic
ψαιστά τε πιήνετα καὶ εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίνην
cαὶ τοῦτο χλωρὸν σύκον ἀποκράδιον
κεφοίνου σταφυλῆς ἔχ’ ἀποστάδα πεντάρρωγον,
πότνια, καὶ σπονδήν τήν’ ὑποπυθμίδιον.
ἡν δὲ μὲ χώς ἐκ νοῦσου ἀνειρύσω, ὀδὶ καὶ ἐχθρῆς
ἐκ πενής ρύσης, δέξο χιμαροθύτην. (Leonidas G-P 36=Α.P. 6.300)

P Sud. s.vv. πιήνετα (3), ψαιστά (3), ὑποπυθµίδιον (5), ἀνειρύσω (7)

Lathria, receive this gift from a wanderer, from a pauper
from Leonidas the one of a small bread-basket,
rich ground barley and well-stored olive oil,
this fig fresh right from the branch,
five grapes torn from a flavorful bunch,
mistress, and this libation from the bottom of the vessel.
If you should rescue me from disease, as you saved me
from hostile poverty, receive a goat sacrifice.

Φεύγεθ’ ὑπὲκ καλύβης, σκότιοι μύες· οὐτὶ πενηρή
μῦς σπονδὴ βόσκειν ὀδὲ Λεωνίδεω.
αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχων ἀλα καὶ δύο κρίμα.
ἐκ πατέρων ταύτην ἱνέσαμεν βιοτήν.
τῷ τί μεταλλεύεις τοῦτον μυχόν, ὃ φιλόλιγχε,
ὁ νόος ἀποδειπνιδίου γευόμενος σκυβάλου;
σπεύδων εἰς ἄλλους οἴκους ἴθι (τάμα δὲ λιτά),
ἄν ἄπο πλειοτέρην οἴσεαι ἄρμαλιήν. (Leonidas G-P 37=Α.P. 6.302)

P Pl Sud. s.vv. σκότιος (1), κρίμον (3), ἱνέσαμεν (4), μεταλλεύει (5), σκυβάλιζεται (6), ἄρμαλιά (8)
8 οἴσεῖαι PPISud³⁶: οἴσεται Sud³⁶

Flee from my hut, clandestine mice. The poor
cupboard of Leonidas does not know how to feed a mouse.
The old man is strong enough to live on salt and two crumbs;
From our fathers we learned this way of life.
Why do you mine your way into this nook, o nibbling one,
since you are not going to have a taste of supper’s leftovers?
Go hastening into other households (my stores are poor),
from which you will gain fuller rations.

In life as in death, Leonidas speaks in Ionic. Inherited *ā is consistently rendered as η, including
after ε, τ, or ρ (e.g. Ἰταλίης, ἐλαίην, πενηρή). Additionally there is the compensatory lengthening
form, drawn primarily from Hellenistic iambography, is quite fitting in the position it is found, preceding a
Leonidean neologism. The poetry of Leonidas is defined, in part, by its stylistic contrast between the elevated and
the banausic.
of *ō to ou (οὖνομα and νοῦσον) and the genitive singular of masculine α-stem nouns in uncontracted –εω, where Doric would have –ā and Attic –ou (Λεωνίδεω and πενέστεω).

These two epigrams thematize the dialectal content of the self-epitaph as a marker of displacement and a life on the edges of society. The dedicatory format of G-P 36=A.P. 6.300 also results in an inversion of epigraphic dialect conventions; again Leonidas stresses the wandering (εκ πλάνιος) that preceded the imagined dedication, a wandering that has left him penniless and even stripped of his native dialect. As such, G-P 36 foretells the thematic and dialectal content of the self-epitaph, which it also likely preceded in any collection of Leonidean epigrams. G-P 37=A.P. 6.302, in which the aged and destitute poet inhospitably tells off some thieving mice, Leonidas presents himself as a poor, but self-sufficient (αὖτάρκης) old man (πρέσβυς) living off of salt and crumbs (ἄλα καὶ δόξο κρῆνα). Although Leonidas presents himself at peace with his place in life, he is also clearly alone, cut off (whether by his own choice or other some other factor) not only from his past and native land.

This epigram also shares with the self-epitaph an inversion of epic conventions, again partially evoked by dialect choice. It has recently been observed that Leonidas’ poetic persona in the epigram resembles the characterization of Molorchos, a poor man who hosts Heracles enroute to his battle with the Nemean lion, in the opening elegy of the third book of Callimachus’ Aetia.536 Unlike the poor cowherd Eumaeus, who properly enacted xenia and generously treated Odysseus, disguised as a beleaguered beggar, to a meal and warm quarters despite his modest means, Molochoros’s reception of Heracles is a studied burlesque of epic conventions of hospitality, which is made readily apparent when Molochoros questions Heracles at length before the meal, an act which Eumaeus explicitly eschews in his reception of

536 See the discussion in Campbell 2014, 47-49.
Odysseus. Molorchos too has a rodent infestation problem: mice have raided his stores, making the proposed meager menu even less appealing. It is in this context that Molorchos, like Leonidas, berates his unwelcome dinner guests (SH 259=177 Pfeiffer), and although the direction of influence (if any exists) between the two texts is uncertain based on the authors’ overlapping chronology, the similarities of subject matter and theme suggest a shared background in the studied adaptation of and play with the epic tradition.

But for Leonidas, likely moreso than for Callimachus, this engagement with epic finds expression in the choice of language, for his use of Ionic imbues the epigrams with a sense of double mobility, both physical and generic.

Although we only have a selection of Leonidas’ corpus, epigrams with similar themes to those in his self-epitaph and old-age epigrams also appear in Ionic. Leonidas consistently ionicizes his epitaphs for victims of shipwrecks, lost forever to the sea, a liminal and dangerous space in the Greek mind. So while the Ionic color of these epitaphs could possibly enoble the unfortunate deaths of their subjects through associations with epic, it more plausibly incorporates these poems into Leonidas’ own fascination with the power and effects of travel on identity. The lack of ethnics in all but one of Leonidas’ shipwreck epithets underscores this point. We the reader do not know the origins of these dead men, just that they are far from home—whether lost at sea or buried on the shore upon which they washed up—and so Leonidas has chosen Ionic for their epitaphs, like he did for his own imagined burial abroad.

The sea has a fickle nature, as demonstrated by its sudden surface transformations and the temperament of Poseidon, and those men who place themselves most readily at its mercy

---

537 Ambühl 2004, esp. 32-40 lucidly examines the intertextual relationships between the Molorchos episode and the portrayal of Eumaeus’ reception of Odysseus in Od. 14 and Hecale’s reception of Theseus in the Hecale, which provides a contrasting model as well; for further discussion see Rosenmeyer 1991 and Harder 2012, 2.389.

538 Campbell 2014, 48.
sometimes find themselves ultimately spared an anonymous, watery grave. Leonidas explores this dichotomy in his commemoration of the elderly fisherman Theris.

Thrice-aged Theris, who made his living from lucky traps swam better than a gull,
a fish filcher, a drag-netter, a cave creeper,
but not a seaman of a many-oared vessel
and at any rate Arcturus did not ruin him nor did a squall drive the many decades of his years to an end,
but he passed away in a reed hut, like a lamp extinguished of its own accord in the long course of time;
no children nor a wife set up this tomb,
but the cooperative guild of fishermen.

Since Reitzenstein it has been observed that the epigram inverts the standard narrative of epitaphs for those who perished at sea;\textsuperscript{539} Theris has such skill as a diver that the sea could not make for him a watery grave. On this account, the use of Ionic, especially if the epigram was encountered in an anthology, could again be read as an attempt to heroize the humble fisherman, whose multiple epithets give Theris (slightly humorous?) \textit{gravitas} of an Achilles or Nestor. Still, the second half of the epigram focuses on how Theris, much like Leonidas we can presume, passed away alone in a simple hut, at the edges of Greek society where he was not

\textsuperscript{539} Reitzenstein 1893, 147. See also Guidorizzi 1977.
memorialized by members of his household but rather those other dispossessed souls at the bottom of the social hierarchy.

The itinerant lifestyle Leonidas presents in his self-epitaph and elsewhere, I suggest, also informs the breadth of dialect use present throughout his surviving corpus. Among Hellenistic book epigrammatists, Leonidas’ mixture of dialects is as much of a hallmark of his poetic aesthetic as his fascination with the poor. Subjects drawn from throughout the ancient Mediterranean populate his epigrams and in a number of instances his dialect choice recalls their native origins. We have already examined how the three Cretan sisters in G-P 41= A.P. 6.288 dedicate their weaving instruments to Athena in Doric and the young mother Prexo at G-P 70= A.P. 7.163 speaks to the anonymous passerby of her tomb in the strong Ionic of her native Samos. We will soon discuss Leonidas’ epigram (G-P 23= API 182) on Apelles’ Aphrodite Anadyomene, painted for the temple of Aphrodite on Cos, which is described in a Doric color that likely captures the local perspective of a Doric-speaking Coan. Although we know almost nothing about the organization of Leonidas’ epigram collection or collections, given the size of his corpus, it is plausible, in the final analysis, that this variety of places, identities, and dialects present in his surviving poems was an active component of the poet’s presentation of his collective epigrammatic works, articulating in their mixture an ideology of itinerancy with which Leonidas directly identifies himself in his self-epitaph.

**Beyond Dedications and Epitaphs**

Dialect may reflect speech in all its forms, written or spoken. Indeed, a hallmark of Hellenistic book epigram writ large is its play with voice and speaker. These verses often prompt
us to ask who is speaking, to try to supplement the identity of speaker, or to place the poetic voice in a certain imagined context. As a marker of identity and place, dialect, as we shall see, can enrich as well as guide our readings for a wide gamut of Hellenistic book epigrams. The literary potential of dialect is not limited, then, to book epigrams that have their basis in the inscribed traditions of dedicatory or sepulchral epigram.

Within the popular subgenre of epigrams on poets, first collected and studied by Gabathuler, are a group of epigrams which have long been considered “book tags,” epigrams that were composed for an edition of an author’s work. Whether placed at the head of the text or appended to the outside of the bookroll, they had the function of identifying the author and his or her work. It is extremely unlikely that any of these epigrammatic book tags may have been expressly designed for such a purpose, but they nevertheless borrow the conventions of the subgenre. Read against this backdrop, these epigrams are display pieces, minor literary commentaries in a similar vein to epitaphs for poets. Like with epitaphs where either the tomb or the deceased are most common speaking position, in some instances the work itself is the speaker of the book tag, while in others the voice is that of the poet. The preceding discussion of epitaphs on poets showed an interplay between dialect choice and the ethnic as well as literary identity of the poet. Building on the conclusions of that discussion, I analyze the poetic effect of similar dialect usage in book tags.

I begin with Asclepiades G-P 28=A.P. 7.11, a book tag for Erinna’s dialectally eclectic Distaff:

Ὁ γλυκὺς Ἡρίννης οὗτος πόνος, οὐχὶ πολὺς μὲν, ὡς ἄν παρθενικὰς ἐννεακαϊδεκέτευς, ἄλλῳ ἐτέρῳν πολλών δυνατότερον: εἰ δ’ Ἀίδας μοι μὴ τοχύς ἦλθε, τίς ἄν ταλίκον ἐσχ’ ονόμα; (Asclepiades G-P 28=A.P. 7.11)
This is the sweet work of Erinna, not great in size,
since she was a nineteen year old maiden,
but more powerful than many others; if Hades
had not come early for me, who would have had so great a name?

The epigram contains a change in speaker in the second couplet, beginning presumably with the
voice of the bookroll (l. Ὅ γλυκὺς Ἡρίνης οὗτος πόνος) and then shifting to that of the
deceased Erinna (μοι). Heraclitus’ epigram on Aretemias, where the reader moves from hearing
the voice of a narrator to the voice of the deceased, provides a clear parallel. In this case, a reader
could identify the majority of diagnostic dialect forms, both in the voice of the πόνος and Erinna,
as either Doric or Aeolic, since both dialect share in the use of α for η. The only exception is the
genitive ἐννεακαίδεκέτευς in line two which should be read as Doric. This ambiguity is fitting,
since Erinna’s Distaff, as we discussed previously, was of interest to Hellenistic and later
scholars due to its mixture of Doric and Aeolic features (cf. Sud. η 521).540 The dialect admixture
in her poetic language led ancient scholars to identify her native land with various islands,
including Doric-speaking Rhodes and Telos and Aeolic-speaking Lesbos.541 Asclepiades does
not wade directly into this issue, but the two dialect forms that are placed in the mouth of Erinna
could be either Doric or Aeolic, perhaps linguistically signaling the scholarly debate.

On the other hand, the voice of the bookroll devotes the entire second hemistich of the
pentameter in line two to ἐννεακαίδεκέτευς. The practice of filling a hemistich with one word
was quite rare in pre-Hellenistic and early third-century poetry. The same word appears in a
fragment of the Distaff (SH 401.37), although here it might refer to the age of Baucis rather than
Erinna. It is unclear, then, if one should read the presence of the form here as the book-roll

---

540 Scholars have recognized the relationship between the dialect and Erinna’s poetry and origins. For discussion, see
541 See discussion with citations above at 80-81 with notes.
(correctly) referencing the poem which it holds or reapplying the young death of the *Distaff*’s heroine to the poet, perhaps as a means of aligning the circumscribed quality of Erinna’s poetic output with her biography. Nevertheless despite this uncertainty, it is at least worth noting that the one word shared between the book tag and the work it comments on appears in a dialect form that is absent in her surviving fragments.

With the poet’s name (ʼἩρίνης), the voice of the bookroll also contains the only non-Doric form transmitted in the manuscripts. Both P and Pl preserve the epic-Ionic genitive –ης in the name of Erinna; however Stadtmüller emended the form to the Doric/Aeolic –ας, and most editors have followed suit. While P and Pl share the same dialect vocalism, the two manuscript witnesses depart from one another as regards another linguistic feature that can factor into analysis of dialect color, namely the aspiration of Erinna’s name. P transmits aspirated ʼἩρίνης to the psilotic form ʼἩρίνης in Pl. The division between a rough breathing and psilosis appears in the other epigrams on Erinna, where P regularly transmits the aspirated form, except where no breathing is given, and Pl commonly has the psilotic. When C intervenes in these texts, it has been reported that he commonly corrects the rough breathing of Erinna’s name to a smooth breathing; however in my own examination of the facsimile of P I have not been able to tell, based on the presence of erasures or differences in ink color, if C in fact made a change to the

---

542 For a further discussion on the interrelationship between Asclepiades’ epigram and Erinna’s biography, see Sens 2003.
543 On the dialect of Erinna, see Neri 2003, 521-58.
544 Most recently, Neri 2003; Guichard 2004; and Sens 2011. All print the aspirated ʼἩρίνης to Stadtmüller’s psilotic ʼἩρίνας. On the aspiration of Erinna’s name see the discussion below.
545 cf. *A.P.* 2.108 (ʼἩρινα C?: ʼἩρινα P); *A.P.* 4.1.12=Meleager G-P 1.12 (ʼἩρίνης P); *A.P.* 7.12.5=Anon. *FGE* 39 (ʼἩρινα P[PL]: ʼἩρινα P[PL]); *A.P.* 7.13.2=Leonidas G-P 98.2 (ʼἩρινα P: ʼἩρινα P); *A.P.* 7.710.8=Erinna G-P 1.8 (ʼἩρινα P[PL]); *A.P.* 7.713.1=Antipater of Sidon G-P 58.1 (ʼἩρινα P: ʼἩρινα P); *A.P.* 9.26.5=Antipater of Thessalonica *GP* 19.5 (ʼἩριναια P[PL]: ʼἩριναια P [Neri 1996, 119 n.24 reports ʼἩριναια P[PL]: ʼἩριναια P[PL], non vid.]); *A.P.* 9.190.1, 7 and 8=Anon. *FGE* 38.1, 7 and 8 (1.1: ʼἩρινης PPL; l.7: ʼἩρινης P; 1.8: ʼἩρινα P[PL]); and *A.P.* 11.322.3=Antiphanes *GP* 9.3 (ʼἩρίνη P[PL]: no aspiration in P [Ἡρίνη]). The breakdown in psilotic and rough breathing also is evident in the lemmata to epigrams in P and Pl; for rough breathing lemmata in P, see below at n.550; for smooth breathing lemmata in Pl, cf. *A.P.* 2.108 and 7.11. In addition to Neri 1996, 115-20, for discussion see Guichard 2004, 352.
546 See Neri 1996, 118-19 with notes.
form originally copied by scribe A in P in several of the reported instances.\textsuperscript{547} Questions of C’s pattern of corrections aside, Neri has argued that the psilotic rendering of Erinna’s name is the result of a tradition associating Erinna with Lesbos, whose dialect shares psilosis with East Ionic and this line of interpretation has some merit in certain circumstances.\textsuperscript{548} In the case of G-P 28=\textit{A.P.} 7.11, while the manuscript division in the aspiration of Erinna’s name is interesting in its own right, it is unlikely that Asclepiades wrote the name with psilosis—if he even knew of the tradition surrounding aspiration—since nowhere is Erinna associated with Lesbos or is the issue of her possible Lesbian origins explicitly broached.\textsuperscript{549}

Given the appearance of the dialect variance in the name of the epigrammatic subject, whose own poetry was dialectally eclectic, I would like to entertain more seriously the originality of the epic-Ionic. Although one cannot rule out some form of textual corruption from later correction and regularization of Doric/Aeolic –ας, there are several factors that justify considering the possible literary potential of reading the transmitted form. First, both manuscript witnesses (leaving aside their division over the aspiration of the name) transmit the genitive in –ης. Although not without errors, P is usually quite consistent in the transmission of α for η and in every other possible instance P has the alpha forms in this epigram. Conversely, Pl regularly atticizes alpha forms that P retains, but here the only form that would apparently reflect this common practice is the one with which P agrees.

\textsuperscript{547} Possible instances of correction are limited. Neri 1996 reports corrections to the breathing of Erinna’s name by C at \textit{A.P.} 4.1.12=Meleager G-P 1.12 (‘Ἡρίννης C: Ἡρίννης P), also reported by Stadtmüller, which I cannot see, and \textit{A.P.} 7.713.1=Antipater of Sidon G-P 58.1 (‘Ἡρίγνα P) where some sort of correction is visible but the exact mechanics, whether from rough to smooth or vice-versa, are unclear to this author. In the lemmata and \textit{inscriptio} to epigrams, however, C does consistently write Erinna’s name with a smooth breathing, cf. \textit{A.P.} 9.190 (lemma: Ἡρίγνα); \textit{A.P.} 7.710 (\textit{inscriptio}: Ἡρίγνης); and \textit{A.P.} 7.712 (\textit{inscriptio}: Ἡρίγνης). Conversely, when scribe A provides lemmata and an \textit{inscriptio} that include Erinna’s name the form is regularly rough, cf. \textit{A.P.} 7.11 (‘Ἡρίγνα); \textit{A.P.} 2.108 (‘Ἡρίγνης); \textit{A.P.} 6.352 (\textit{inscriptio}: Ἡρίγνη).

\textsuperscript{548} Neri 1996, 115-20.

\textsuperscript{549} The psilotic form almost certainly has some resonance in Anon. \textit{FGE} 38=\textit{A.P.} 9.190 (Ἀδεσποτον Ἡρίννης τόδε κηρίον) and possibly in Antiphanes \textit{GP} 9=\textit{A.P.} 11.322 where Erinna and her poetry are the focus of scholarly interest from the \textit{Γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη} and \textit{Καλλιμάχου πρόκλωνες}, which could have included her island of origin.
Second, Meleager almost certainly alludes to Asclepiades when he lists (G-P 1.12=A.P. 4.1.12) as one of the poetic flowers he has woven into his Garland (γλυκὺν Ἱρίννης παρθενόχρωτα κρόκον), retaining the same dialect form for Erinnia’s name. Alex Sens has dismissed the dialect evidence of Meleager on the grounds that the Ionic form of Erinnia’s name accords well with the predominant dialect color of the proem to the Garland, thus rendering the text’s ability to support a marked dialect variance in Asclepiades useless.550 However, Meleager’s introductory poem to his Garland is much more dialectally complex than Sens makes it out to be in his discussion. In addition to the Doric coloring in the opening prayer to the poem, perhaps devised to recall the native language his early readers on Cos the island where Meleager likely composed the Garland,551 Meleager appears, as Gutzwiller has plausibly argued, to deploy dialect forms in the naming of certain epigrammatists that recall their native language or dialect of composition. The Doric article τὰν appears in the line for the Syracusan poet Theodoridas (τὰν τε φιλάκρητον Θεοδωρίδεω νεοθαλῆ | ξρυπυλλον), and similarly Meleager included a cluster of Ionic forms in the couplet on Posidippus, Hedylus, and Asclepiades (ll. 45-45, cf. ἀρούρης; Σικελίδεω), all of whom wrote sympotic-erotic epigrams in the tradition of Anacreon and two of which (Asclepiades and Hedylus) hailed from Ionic-speaking Samos.552 Although Meleager juxtaposes the Doric τὰν with an ionicized form of Theodoridas’ name (Θεοδωρίδεω), partially a metrical necessity, the article marks out his corpus—likened to a sprig of thyme—in the native dialect of the poet and the predominant color of his surviving epigrams. Based on this practice and Meleager’s evocation of Asclepiades G-P 28.1=A.P. 7.11.1, I think we consider the possibility that the epic-Ionic form of Erinnia’s name in Asclepiades is not simply a product of later editorial or scribal intervention.

550 Sens 2011, 189.
551 On this point, see Gutzwiller 2014, 83.
552 Gutzwiller 2014, 82.
To what literary end could Asclepiades have put this form of Erinna’s name? Ἑρίννης appears in key position in the epigram’s introduction, at the point where the reader has been tasked with identifying the voice and context of the epigram. Tombs in inscribed epitaphs often speak to passersby of the deceased whose identity and life they commemorate, and it has been observed that this opening line has affinities with epitaphic convention.\(^{553}\) And indeed copulative statements like we have in line one, as Sens has noted, are a very common feature of inscribed epitaph.\(^{554}\) In inscribed epitaph the name of the deceased was regularly transmitted in its native dialect form, regardless of the larger dialect context in which it found itself. But we are reading a book tag for Erinna’s *Distaff*, not an epitaph for the poet who died all too young. This distinction is fundamental to the rhetorical strategy of the epigram, and so perhaps Asclepiades chose to render Erinna’s name in its non-Doric form so as to indicate his reuse of epitaphic motifs in the context of book tags. The voice of the book, a product, in part, of contemporary editors, is thus initially distinguished from the voice of the poet who created the poetry, which speaks solely in Doric in the second half of the poem. More simply, the use of Ἑρίννης may reflect contemporary renderings of the poet’s name on editions of her book poetry. Finally, we should factor in the contextual contingency of an epigram’s meaning on the dialect choice. If encountered in an author-organized poetry collection, the use of the epic-Ionic form in the first line, when the reader is still deciphering the identity of the speaker, could acknowledge Asclepiades’ origin from Ionic-speaking Samos, since it is ultimately the poet who stands behind the voice of the poetry book as epigrammatic narrator.

In Callimachus G-P 55 the book tag addresses the authorship of the cyclic epic *Oechaliae Halosis*. Like Asclepiades’ epigram on Erinna, this book tag also opens with a simple copulative

\(^{553}\) Knauer 1935, 26-27; Gow and Page 1965, 2.136; Sens 2011, 186.
\(^{554}\) Sens 2011, 188 with examples.
statement redolent of epitaph, including πόνος to describe the literary labor. But here the work speaks in the first-person.

τοῦ Σαμίου πόνος εἰμὶ δόμω ποτὲ θείον ἀοιδόν
dεξιαμένω, κλείῳ δ’ Εὐρυτον ὄσσ’ ἔπαθεν,
καὶ ξανθὴν Ἰόλειαν, Ὄμήρειον δὲ καλεῦμαι
grάμμα. Κρεωφύλῳ, Ζεῦ φίλε, τούτο μέγα. (Callimachus G-P 55)

I am the work of the Samian, who once welcomed the godly poet into his house. I celebrate how much Eurytos endured, and yellow-haired Ioleia. I am called a Homeric text. This is a great thing, dear Zeus, for Creophylos. The dialectal color of the epigram is, on the whole, unremarkable for an epigram on a cyclic epic. κλείῳ and ὄσσ’ are Homeric forms. The one notable feature is καλεῦμαι, which displays the contemporary Ionic contraction of the diphthong εο. Although this contraction does appear in Homer, there is no evidence for the practice in Ionic inscriptions until the fourth century BCE. This suggests that the appearance of the form in Archaic and early Classical poetry is the product of later editorial interference. I suggest καλεῦμαι has added significance in light of its position in the argument of the epigram: it is just at this point in the poem that we reach the surprising twist in Callimachus’ engagement with the tradition surrounding the authorship of the epic. The work states that she “is called Homeric,” but Ὅμήρειον, as Graziosi has recognized, is not used to indicate authorship, as expected, but rather its stylistic quality.555 And, indeed, up until this point in the epigram the Samian πόνος has spoken in Homeric language (and also befitting Archaic Samos). Callimachus’ use of non-epic-Ionic dialectal color in καλεῦμαι acknowledges, in my opinion, the editorial intervention into dialect practiced by some contemporary critics, a number of whom still classified the Oechaliae Halosis as authored by Homer, a literal Ὅμήρειον γράμμα.

555 Graziosi 2002, 190, who also cites a Callimachean parallel in his poem on Aratus whose work is described as Hesiodic (G-P 56.1=A.P. 9.507.1: Ἡσιόδου τὸ τ’ ἐπίσημα καὶ ὁ τρόπος).
In an intellectually engaging fashion Callimachus has turned their language of critical discourse against them, using a feature of contemporary dialect for the verb that declares this tradition ultimately mistaken.

While no book tags on authors or works survive in the Milan papyrus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309), its publication significantly expanded our knowledge and appreciation of the generic developments of early Hellenistic book epigram. As part of the poetry book, Posidippus or the editor of the collection created several artfully organized sequences of epigrams on less traditional epigrammatic topics such as precious gemstones, omens, statuary, and equestrian victories. These topics afforded Posidippus the opportunity to experiment at the intersection of dedicatory, sepulchral, and ecphrastic epigram. This experimentation extended to the use of dialect in the generation of poetic meaning. The sequences on statuary and equestrian victories included epigrams on historical subjects, making them particularly useful test cases for the extension of dialect as markers of identity or setting beyond epigrams devised around dedicatory or epitaphic formats.

The seventeen-epigram sequence on equestrian victories, some of which could possibly be imagined as inscriptions for the bases of victory statues, celebrates the accomplishments of several members of the Ptolemaic royal house. The dialectal coloring of these epigrams varies between Attic-Ionic with a light Ionic patina and a predominant Doric. The Attic-Ionic epigrams (AB 78, 79, and 82) celebrate the victories of a Ptolemaic queen Berenike, variously identified as Berenike II (267/6-221 BCE), the Cyrenaean wife of Ptolemy III, or Berenike Syria (275-246

---

556 Among the various sections in the Milan papyrus, the Hippika has been the focus of a good deal of scholarly attention covering both the literary and social-political aspects of the epigram series. Important studies include: Bingen 2002; Fantuzzi 2004; Bettarini 2005; Fantuzzi 2005; Thompson 2005; and Kosmetatou 2004.
BCE), the daughter of Ptolemy II Philadelphus and Arsinoe I and the wife of Antiochus II.\(^{557}\)

The Doric epigrams (AB 87 and 88) celebrate respectively the Olympic chariot victory of Berenike I,\(^{558}\) the wife of Ptolemy I and mother of Ptolemy II, and the accomplishment of Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II, and Berenike I as the first set of royals to each win the Olympic chariot race.

\[
\text{ἵπποι} \ έθε' \ ἄμεσ ἐν Όλυμπιάκοι, Βερενίκας,}
\]
\[
\text{Παλαιατάς ἀγάμομες στέφανον,}
\]
\[
\text{ὁς τὸ [πο]λυθρύλατον }^{559}\text{ ἔχει κλέος, ὡς ὁ Κυνίσκας}
\]
\[
\text{ἐν Σαρποταὶ χρόνιον κύδος ἀφελόμεθα. (Posidippus AB 87)}
\]

When still mares, Pisians, we won the Olympic crown of Macedonian Berenike, which has the much celebrated kleos, with which we surpassed Cynisca’s ancient glory in Sparta.

\[
\text{Πρῶτοι[ι] τρεῖς βασιλέες Ὄλυμπια καὶ μόνοι ἄμεσ}
\]
\[
\text{αρμασι νικόμες καὶ γονέες καὶ ἐγώ·}
\]
\[
\text{εἰς μὲν ἔγω [Π]τολεμαίου ὁμόνυμος, ἐκ Βερενίκας}
\]
\[
\text{ψή[ός], Ἐορδαία γέννα, δόω δὲ γονεῖς·}
\]
\[
\text{πρὸς μέγα πατρὸς ἐμὸν τίθεμαι κλέος, ἀλλ' ὅτι μάτηρ}
\]
\[
\text{εἰλε γυνᾶ νίκαν ἄρματι, τούτο μέγα. (Posidippus AB 88)}
\]

We alone were the first three kings at Olympia to be victorious in the chariot race, my parents and I.

\(^{557}\) The very fragmentary AB 80, whose surviving words are rendered in the Hellenistic koine, had also had its subject identified with a Ptolemaic queen. Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001, 206), the original editors of the Milan papyrus, identified the Berenike of these epigrams with Berenike II, who was the subject of other contemporary poetry, including Callimachus’ *Victoria Berenices* (*SH* 254-69) that celebrated her Nemean chariot victory.

Criscuolo 2003 and Thompson 2005 have advanced arguments for Berenike Syria as the subject of AB 79, AB 80, and AB 82. I agree with Clayman 2014, 148 that Criscuolo and Thompson “rely on too literal a reading of the poems” based in matching the epinician epigrams to specific historical moments, and consequently I favor an identification of Berenike II in each of these epigrams.

\(^{558}\) Clayman 2014, 154 argues that we also identify this Berenike with Berenike II since her Spartan background—Cyrene was originally settled by Spartans—makes her a more fitting rival to Cynisca. I am not convinced by her discussion, since it is clear that the two clusters of royal epigrams differentiate themselves by treating subsequent generations of the Ptolemaic royal family. If one does consider Berenike II the subject of the epigram, my interpretations of the use of Doric in an agonistic manner is not drastically altered and perhaps reinforced.

\(^{559}\) Since there does not exist (143) “un sostantivo θυρόλα su cui possa essersi formato θυρόλαω (verbo denominativo),” Palumbo Stracca 2003, 142-43 categorizes this form as a hyperdorism, which she believes entered the text not through (143) “l’intervento di uno scriba pseudodotto”, but rather at the hand of Posidippus himself through a desire to make the epigram markedly Doric. To my mind, this appears to be a case of special pleading, since fewer assumptions need to be ascribed to the motivations of Posidippus if we recognized the ease with which a scribe could erroneously attempt to change an uncommon word in the correct dialect form to produce a veneer of uniform usage.
I am one, the namesake of Ptolemy, son of Berenike, Eordean in origins, my two parents. I add my glory to that great one of my father, but that my mother won a victory in the chariots, as a woman, this is a great thing.

The original editors of the Milan papyrus, Bastianini and Gallazzi, posited a pattern between those poems celebrating Olympic victories and Doric, and suggested the association might be motivated by the prominence of the Peloponnese and success of the Lagid dynasty at those events. Yet other victories at games from Doric speaking regions, such as the Nemean and Isthmian games, are not celebrated in the associated dialect, which lessens the Peloponnesian argument somewhat as does the fact, as we shall soon see, that Posidippus consistently uses the dialect elsewhere, to realistic effect, for subjects from a range of Doric-speaking locales. Others sought the roots of dialect choice in generic conventions. Recognizing the influence of Pindaric epinician on these agonistic epigrams, Casanova has suggested that that genre’s association with Doric possibly played a role in Posidippus’ dialect choice. This suggestion, in my opinion, simplifies the dialectal identity of Pindaric epinician in the Hellenistic period. Doric is not a marked feature, for example, in Callimachus’ Victoria Berenices or the epinician for Sosibios’ Nemean victory (384 Pfeiffer). A further strike against understanding Posidippus’ use of Doric as primarily an evocation of Pindaric epinician involves the character of Posidippus’ Doric. As Bettarini has correctly observed, some of the Doricisms present in these epigrams are absent from Pindar, most notably the first-person plural in –μες, where the Boeotian’s epinicians always have –μεν.  

---

560 Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001, 22: “Al lettore non sfuggiranno le forme doriche presenti in molti degli epigrammi per vincitori di gare sportive, dove prominenti sono il Peloponneso e le proiezioni peloponnesiache della dinastia lagidica…”  
561 Casanova 2002, 137 and Palumbo Stracca 2003, 142; Sens 2004, 73 and Bettarini 2005, 16 n.25 assign a similar argument to Fantuzzi 2005, but I was not able to find such an assertion in the published version of the essay.  
562 Bettarini 2005, 18.
In his study of the dialect color of the Milan papyrus, Sens offered a partial explanation of the Doric in these epigrams by recourse to the Macedonia royal house’s putative Argive ancestry, which, in his view, would have “lent Doric a particular ideological importance for the Alexandrian court” as they sought to validate and authenticize their rule. Sens cites Ptolemaic census lists and lists of priestly offices, which retain Doric name forms rather late into the Hellenistic period, as evidence that Macedonian elites of the Ptolemaic court wished to associate themselves with their Argive origins through the use of Doric. More importantly, the early Ptolemies did take a keen interest in representing themselves as a Macedonian dynasty. Pausanias, for example, records the inscriptions (noticeably in koine) of Ptolemy I from Olympia (6.3.1) and Delphi (10.7.8) in which the king defines himself as Μακεδόν. And Posidippus indeed employs Doric conspicuously in epigrams celebrating the accomplishments of immediate members of the Ptolemaic royal house in Berenike I, who like her husband Ptolemy I were from Macedonia, and her son Ptolemy II Philadelphus (who is the speaker of AB 88). Ptolemy II reminds the reader of this fact when he proudly states that he is the son of Berenike “of Eordean stock” (Ἐορδαία γέννα), thus connecting the Egyptian born ruler to the mainland. Berenike I’s horses, the poetic voice of AB 87, stress the queen’s Macedonia identity, in a cross-couplet hyperbaton (Βερενίκας...Μακέτας), when they celebrate her great feat of surpassing the honors (κλέος) of the Spartan queen Cynisca. That Posidippus might be using Doric as a marker of

---

563 Sens 2004, 74 n.43. Hunter 2005 echoes many of the same interpretations made by Sens. This is not the place to discuss the linguistic background of Macedonian as regards its historical identification as a different, but related, Indo-European language or an irregular type of Northwest Greek. Evidence can be mustered on both sides. Measured discussions, not marred by competing nationalist agendas, include Crespo 2012; Méndez Dosuna 2012; and Panayotou-Triantaphyllopoulou 2007.

564 See Clarysse 1998, whose conclusion (12) that Doric was the “prestige dialect which the Macedonian kings spoke among their peers” influenced Sens’ approach to the dialect of these epigrams.

565 See the previous discussion at chapter three (131-35).
Macedonian ethnicity, then, does find some support in our understanding of the linguistic and identity politics of the Ptolemies.566

But if this was the purpose of Posidippus’ dialect practice, then it must be recognized as likely the product of an ethnic concern specific to Ptolemy I and his immediate family, especially given the absence of Doric in the other royal equestrian victories for Berenike II of the third generation. After all, the non-Doric AB 78, in which Berenike II calls upon Posidippus to recount her numerous victories within the context of her family’s successes, seemingly would have presented the poet with another venue for employing dialect in the service of Macedonian ethnic identity, and indeed the lengthy cataloguing of the accomplishments of previous generations presages Ptolemy II’s shorter epinician history in the Doric AB 88. Although not part of one continuous sequence of royal epigrams, AB 78 and AB 88 introduce and conclude the two interrelated clusters that focus on royal subject matter, and so are pendants of a sort. The contrast in dialect between AB 78 on Berenike II and AB 88 on Ptolemy II, her father-in-law, and his family is, then, highly suggestive of a generational division when it came to dialectal identity—if indeed this is what motivates the use of Doric in AB 87 and 88.

Furthermore, Doric would not be foreign to the voice or identity of Berenike II. Callimachus G–P 15=A.P. 5.146 celebrates a royal Berenike as one of the Graces.

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες, ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ κεῖναις
ἀρτὶ ποτεπλάσθη, κῆτι μύροις νοτεῖ,
εὔαθον ἐν πάσιν ἄριζηλος Βερενίκα.

566 The identification of a subject with the ethnic Μακεδῶν is rare in Hellenistic book epigram, appearing only once at Theaetetus I=A.P. 6.357. The epigram is interestingly ambiguous when it comes to the identification of Macedonian identity with a dialect. The epitaph is a dialogue between an anonymous passerby and a brother and sister. The base dialect of the epigram is koine with the exception of the Φίλα, the name of the deceased sister, and the notable Doric verbal form ἔσταμε, which appears in the last line of the epigram. Here Phila stresses to the passerby that she and her brother are fraternal twins (ἐκ δ’ εὐχής τοκέων ἔσταμες ἄμφοτέρου). While there is no evidence to support the claim, it is possible that Theaetetus originally composed the epigram in Doric (cf. G-P 3=A.P. 7.727). On the other hand, one could interpret, although I am hesitant to, ἔσταμες as focusing attention on their joint Macedonian identity.


\[\text{ἄς ἄτερ οὖθ' αὐταί ταῖ} \text{ Χάριτες Χάριτες.} \text{ (Callimachus G-P 15=A.P. 5.146)}\]

Four are the Graces, for in addition to those three one has just now been modeled, and is still moist with perfume. Berenike is fortunate and envied among everyone, without whom the Graces are not themselves Graces.

Modern scholarly uncertainty surrounds the identity of the Berenike praised by Callimachus. Based on Callimachus’ dates she could be Berenike I or Berenike Syra as well as Berenike II. Recently Dee Clayman has plausibly argued that we should identify this Berenike with Berenike II since the epigram is written in Doric, the dialect of the Queen’s native Cyrene.\(^{567}\) Callimachus too hailed from Cyrene, and Clayman has proposed that he chose to write this flattering treatment of Berenike II in their shared native dialect in order to increase the sense of intimacy between the royal and the court poet.\(^{568}\) Doric, then, could be doubly significant as a marker of place and identity in association with Berenike II, indicating both the Queen’s land of origin (following Clayman) and the Macedonian heritage of the family into which she married (following Sens). And yet the voice of Berenike II in AB 78, which finds itself in a context associating other members of the Ptolemaic family with Doric, celebrates her own victory in an epic-Ionic timbre.

The literary effect of rendering Berenike II’s voice in Ionic is more difficult to parse, but not hopelessly so. I offer here one possible reading of the dialect that locates the voice of the speaker and the epigram itself not in any physical landscape, but rather a poetic one. The artistic structuring of the Hippika is notoriously complex and different reconstructions have been

\(^{567}\) Clayman 2014, 58.

\(^{568}\) Clayman 2014, 58; she has recently expanded upon this reading of the Doric as a rhetorical strategy of Callimachus, as a fellow Cyrenean, to cultivate a relationship with Berenike II in an oral paper at the Trends in Classics conference on the language of Greek epigram at Thessaloniki in May 2015.
proposed.\textsuperscript{569} Marco Fantuzzi divided the section into four “clusters” of epigrams of varying lengths that alternate between non-royal and royal subjects.\textsuperscript{570} The “interpretive key” to understanding this arrangement, he argues, resides in the structure of Callimachus’ \textit{Aetia}.\textsuperscript{571} Like the four sections of the \textit{Hippika}, the \textit{Aetia} is broken down into four books and within these four books the beginning of the third, namely the middle of the entire work, and the conclusion of the fourth are extended encomiastic treatments of Berenike II: the so-called \textit{Victoria Berenikes}, an \textit{aetion} for the Nemean games at which Berenike II was victorious, and the \textit{Lock of Berenike}. Fantuzzi has proposed that the poet or anthologizer of the \textit{Hippika} attempted to recreate this alternation between “courtly and non-courtly” voices present in the \textit{Aetia}, with AB 78-83 and AB 87-88 roughly mapping on to the \textit{Victoria Berenikes} and the \textit{Lock of Berenike} respectively. This interpretation is highly suggestive, and the significance this structural relationship between the \textit{Aetia} and \textit{Hippika} may have on the dialectal color of AB 78 warrants further consideration.

AB 78 is along with AB 74 the longest epigram in the section at 14 lines, and so, while not exceedingly long for Hellenistic book epigrams, the poem does have a greater affinity with the narrative elegiacs found in the \textit{Aetia}. More importantly, AB 78 and the \textit{Victoria Berenikes} also share the same subject (if AB 78 is on Berenike II and not Berenike Syria) and both poems, in their own ways, narrate a story related to the accomplishments of the Ptolemaic queen: in the case of the \textit{Victoria Berenikes} it is an extended \textit{aetion} of the founding of the Nemean games at which Berenike II was victorious, while for AB 78 it was a tradition of equestrian excellence in the Ptolemaic royal family that led to her own victory at Olympia. Admittedly, there is no one

\textsuperscript{569} The first editors of the Milan papyrus, Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001, 197), divided the section in two (AB 71-82 and AB 83-88), producing two uneven sections that both concluded with epigrams celebrating a Ptolemaic queen. Ultimately, however, the two remained agnostic on the presence of any artistic organization in the \textit{Hippika} (cf. Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001, 24).

\textsuperscript{570} Fantuzzi 2004, 213.

\textsuperscript{571} Fantuzzi 2004, 221.
singular aspect of AB 78 that directly ties the epigram to Callimachus’ masterly encomiastic
elegy, but there are enough points of contact between the two to entertain, at the least, the
influence of Callimachus Ionic elegiac language on Posidippus’ treatment of Berenike II in AB
78.

Whereas the dialect of Berenike II’s voice in AB 78 may well have expressed a literary
affiliation, to return to the dialect of AB 87 and AB 88, I believe that there is a primary
mechanism behind the choice of Doric that is related to ethnic identity—just in this case Spartan
rather than Macedonian. AB 87, on Berenike I’s Olympic chariot victory, is agonistic in two
senses. Beyond celebrating this significant feat, the epigram proudly announces Berenike’s
eclipsing of the χρόνιον κόσος of Cynisca, the Spartan queen who was the first woman to breed
horses, enter them into the race, and then be victorious at Olympia, first in 396 BCE and then
again in 392 BCE. In celebration of the victory, Cynisca had a monument erected at Olympia
that depicted, according to Pausanias, a chariot, the team of horses, the charioteer, and Cynisca
herself. On the base she had inscribed an epigram the text of which survives partially on stone
(CEG 820), and in a more complete version the Greek Anthology (Anon. A.P. 13.16):

Σπάρτας µὲν ἑπάστιλης ἐμοί | πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί,
ἀριστάρτι δὲ ὄκυπτοδόν ὑππον | νικάσσα Κυνίσκα
εἰκόνα τάνδ’ ἔστησε(α), µόνιµαν | δ’ ἐμὲ φαµὶ γυναικῶν
‘Ελλάδος ἐκ πάσας τόν ἱδὲ λαβεῖν στέφανον. (CEG 820=A.P. 13.16)

P CEG 820
3 τάνδ’ ἔστησα (e lapis) CEG: τήνδε ἔστησε P

My father and brothers are Spartan kings,

572 There are, however, echoes of the Victoria Berenikes before and after AB 78: the koine AB 79 commemorates Berenike’s victory at Nemea, the same victory that motivates Callimachus’ extended aetion, and the phrase πᾶς ἐκ λαγόνον in AB 72.2 in conjunction with νεμεοδροµέων in the following line possibly recalls fr. 54a.12 Harder (ἐκ λαγόνον[..].θερ); Harder 2012, 2.419.
573 I follow the dating established in Robert 1900, 175. An alternative dating of the victories to 380 BCE and 376 BCE is presented in IAG 43.
but winning with a chariot of swift-footed horses I, Cynisca, set up this statue, I say that I am alone of women from all of Greece to take this crown.

As expected in a Classical inscription, the Doric color of the epigram matches Cynisca’s Spartan ethnicity. Posidippus’ epigram for Berenike I has rightly been interpreted as a direct response to the heroic boast of Cynisca’s epigram that the Spartan was the only woman in all of Greece to win the Olympic crown. It is quite likely Posidippus expected his reader to have the Cynisca epigram in mind, and its presence in the Greek Anthology raises the possibility that the epigram was already circulating by the third century BCE. The special attention accorded to Berenike I’s mares as the speakers of the epigram suggest an imagined victory statue similar in design to Cynisca’s. Scholars have previously recognized the parallels between AB 87 and Cynisca’s dedicatory epigram. Fantuzzi, in his study of the political ramifications of AB 87, notes that Cynisca would have been an especially “alluring model” for a royal house seeking validation through a link to the Greek past, since the Spartans represented one of the few monarchies from the Greek-speaking world. Despite the salience of his discussion, Fantuzzi is silent on the topic of dialect. Bettarini, by contrast, recognizes the dialectal affinity between the language of Cynisca and Posidippus’ correction of the exaggerated boast that the Ptolemaic queen has recently surpassed, but his discussion, as we shall shortly find, fails to appreciate properly the use of Doric in its literary context.

Ptolemy II’s praise of his family’s Olympic success (AB 88), with which the editor of the collection concludes the Hippika, also has points of contact with the Cynisca epigram that can convincingly explain its shared Doric color with AB 87. Cynisca opens her epigram by

---

574 Fantuzzi 2005, 258 and 266 where the author recognizes that (266) “the success of Berenike I finds in the Spartan woman an aetiological starting-point for the aptitude to victory of the Ptolemaic queens.”
acknowledging her royal Spartan roots, dedicating the entire first line to a recent history of the Eurypontid dynasty in which her father, Archidamus II, and brothers, Agesilaus II and Agis II, were kings (Σπάρτας μὲν βασιλῆς ἔμοι πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί). In the first line of AB 88, Ptolemy II similarly focuses attention upon his royal lineage (πρῶτο[ι] τρεῖς βασιλῆς Ὀλύμπια καὶ μόνοι ὁµές). Posidippus’ Ptolemy II does not, as Fantuzzi has recognized, fall prey to the same exaggerated boast of Cynisca, when he makes sure to carefully circumscribe the limits of the accomplishments of the Ptolemies at Olympia to comparison with other monarchs.\textsuperscript{576} Despite this, the poem lavishes the most attention on the victory of Berenike I. Indeed it does so more prominently than the Cynisca epigram, since here a male relative, Ptolemy II, turns his attention to the historical ramifications of the victory, which he emphatically concludes is a τοῦτο μέγα.\textsuperscript{577}

Taken together, then, the AB 87 and AB 88, in part through their use of Doric, repurpose the overweening claim of Cynisca into two epigrammatic monuments that adopt an appropriate laudatory mode.

In his study of the language of the \textit{Hippika}, Bettarini anticipated the association between the Doric of AB 87 and AB 88 and the model Cynisca epigram for which I have argued above.\textsuperscript{578} Where we depart, however, is over the political meaning one should assign to the epigrams’ motives. Bettarini reads the epigrams, and their Doric patina, as seeking to establish Berenike as a new Cynisca and her family as a new dynasty ready to inherit the Spartan mantle. I am not persuaded by Bettarini’s argument on two accounts. First, I believe the poems are designed, primarily, as studies in appropriate celebration in an agonistic context. The Doric, then, draws a

\textsuperscript{576} Fantuzzi 2005, 254: “[Posidippus] is very careful…and stresses only records that are by definition almost unbeatable, since they concern specific, ideal competitions with other kings. This is especially clear in AB 88.1…”

\textsuperscript{577} Fantuzzi 2005, 266 reads this aspect of AB 88 as a fitting conclusion one aspect of the “encomiastic strategy” of the \textit{Hippika} towards the Ptolemies, namely that focused on female victories as “a ‘specialization’ of the Ptolemies’ aptitude for victory.”

\textsuperscript{578} Bettarini 2005, 21-22.
contrast through its similarity with the Cynisca epigram. Second, a political agenda, if present, would, in my opinion, draw a distinction between the Spartan dynasty and the Lagids. While the Ptolemyes sought to gain cultural prestige through their victories at Olympia and other pan-Hellenic games, their Macedonian ancestry and new imagery as inheritors of Pharaonic rule marks the royal house out as a new development in Greek kingship. Principally, then, we should read these two epigrams, their dialect color, and engagement with the Cynisca epigram as an artful act of literary reception rather than boldfaced political commentary.

With Posidippus’ ecphrastic epigrams on statues, we are more directly confronted with the literary extent of the association of dialect with identity and place. Some ecphrastic epigrams employed dialect to evoke the regional origins of the artist or the original site of display thus adding a linguistic color in their process of reading and interpreting the absent art object. By composing the epigram in a Doric color that emphasizes the artist’s Sicyonian origins, Asclepiades’ epigram on Lysippus famous statue of Alexander the Great comments on the realistic facture of the sculpture—not only did Lysippus capture the form but also the character of his royal subject.

Τόλμαν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ὀλαν ἀπεμάζατο μορφάν
Δύσσιππος—τίν’ ὁδ’ χαλκὸς ἔχει δύναμιν—
αὐδάσασοντι δ’ ἑοικεν ὁ χάλκεος ἡ ΚΑ λεύσσων,
‘γὰν ὑπ’ ἐμοὶ τίθεμαι, Ζεῦ, σὺ δ’ Ὠλομπον ἔχε.’ (Asclepiades G-P 43 = APl 120)

The boldness of Alexander and his whole form Lysippus modeled—

579 Sens 2011, 294 has also suggested the Doric, in relation to Alexander as the subject of the sculpture, may recall the “putative Argive origins of the Macedonian royal house.” On this connection between Doric and Macedonian royal identity, see the discussion of Posidippus’ Hippika above. SEG 39.1334 (ca. 220-30 BCE), a dedication in Phalaecians of sculpture by Thoenias of Sicyon at Pergamon, provides an instructive epigraphic parallel, since when the statue is identified as the work of Thoenias we find Doric (lI. 4-5: ἀ ὃ δὲ τέχνα | Θοινίου). On the inscription, see Müller 1989 (editio princeps); Kerkhecker 1991, especially 32-34 (on dialect); and Lehnus 1996, who wishes to identify the author of the inscribed dedicatory epigram with Mnasalces.
what force this bronze holds—
the bronze, as it gazes at Zeus, seems as if about to speak,
‘I place the earth under my control, Zeus, you keep hold of Olympus.’

Among Posidippus’ Statue Poems in the Milan papyrus, Sens noted three Doric epigrams on famous statues whose sculptors each hailed from a Doric-speaking locale. In regard to these poems, Sens argued that through the use of dialect each “narrator is thus represented as a member of the linguistic community of the artist he praises.” While Sens’ treatment of the dialect—as related to the effect it has on locating the speaker in the same linguistic realm as the artists—significantly advances our understanding of dialect’s literary potential, it is not the only way, in my opinion, to approach the effect that the Doric color has on the reception of these poems. The use of Doric in each instance captures an essence of the sculptures inexpressible through the stone itself, thus placing these epigrams in a complementary position to the artwork they describe. Sens, indeed, appears to anticipate such a reading when he notes that in the poem on the Cretan Cresilas’ bronze statue of the Cretan hero Idomeneus, Posidippus incorporates a Doric form into the imagined speech of the statue, which adds a layer of realism to the bronze that transcends the realism in the work which inspired the epigram.

Leonidas’ iambic verses on Apelles’ Aphrodite Anadyomene offers an instructive parallel for dialect choice as a reproduction of the “linguistic community” of the artwork’s producer or, as we shall see, its original location that Sens has found in the Doric epigrams of the Milan

---

580 AB 64 on Cresilas of Crete’s bronze statue of the Cretan hero Idomeneus (dialect discussed in Sens 2004, 75-76); AB 65 on Lysippus of Sicyon’s bronze statue of Alexander the Great (dialect discussed in Sens 2004, 69-70); and AB 68 on Chares of Lindos’ colossal statue of Helios (Sens 2004, 76-79). Bettarini 2005, 16-17 understands Sens’ claim that Doric effects a sense of realism too pedantically when he complains that each of these epigrams has at least some forms that would be out of place in the epichoric inscriptional language of the subject. As we have seen, as early as Classical verse inscriptions, poets avoided epichoric forms and allowed an admixture of poetic features. Bettarini is then guilty of developing a false dichotomy between Sens’ “realism” and the use of dialect (2005, 19) “dell’omaggio alla patria d’origine del destinatario-committente, o ancora in funzione del contesto dorico di destinazione del componimento…”

581 Sens 2004, 75.
582 Sens 2004, 75-76.
Statue Poems. The famous painting of Aphrodite’s birth was dedicated, according to Pliny the Elder (NH 35.91-92), at the Temple of Asclepius on the Doric-speaking island of Cos.

Fleeing from her mother’s bosom,
still frothing with foam, Cypris who brings wedded bliss
see how Apelles figured her most lovely beauty
not painted but alive.
Beautifully does she squeeze out with her hair with her fingertips,
beautifully does gentle desire flash forth from her eyes,
and her breast, the prime of her youth, swells.
Athena herself and the wife of Zeus
will say “O Zeus, we are left wanting in this judgment.”

The epigram has a Doric patina with the admixture of two koine features (ἀκμής and τῇ). After two lines that establish the content—Aphrodite’s birth from the sea foam—line three opens with a command to see (ἵδ᾽) how Apelles compellingly brings the mythic scene to life. While the identity of the speaker is never given, one possibility is we are meant to imagine that we are hearing the eyewitness report of Leonidas, who elsewhere in his collection focuses on his life of itinerancy. If that is the case, the Doric may well be meant to reflect an artificial version of the poet’s native Tarantine dialect. The epigram also borrows its structure from the informative

583 Stadtmüller, Beckby, and Gow and Page all report that Pl has the Attic-Ionic reading κόμην to the Doric κόμαν transmitted in the remainder of the witnesses (Σ SQ). This is an error on the part of all previous editors. Examination of high-resolution photos of Pl reveal that Planudes actually wrote κόμαν in a raised abbreviated form; compare with API 178.3 (χαίταν) also at line end.
inscriptions appended to works of art, most notably on the bases of statues. Considering the epigraphic antecedents that lay behind the epigram and the painting’s display context on Doric-speaking Cos, I suggest we read the Doric of the epigram as reproducing the original context of viewing. Any simple label written for the painting was likely to have been in Doric, and the use of the dialect in the voice of our guide focalizes the painting through a Coan perspective. The localizing effect of the Doric contrasts with the dialect color of the brief quotation given to Athena and Hera that closes the epigram. Here the two Olympian gods are imagined by the speaker of the epigram as (finally) capitulating to the judgment of Paris and they speak, appropriately enough, in an epic color.

Theocritus’ epigram on a statue of Anacreon on his home island of Ceos inverts the process of dialect focalization we saw operative in the dialect coloring of Leonidas’ commentary on the *Aphrodite Anadyomene*:

θάσαι τὸν ἄνδριάντα τούτον, ὦ ἔνε,
σπουδᾶ, καὶ λέγ’ ἐπῆν ἐς οἶκον ἐνθῆς;
“Ἀνακρέοντος εἰκόν’ ἔδων ἐν Τέω
τῶν πρόσοθ’ εἰ τι περισσὸν φῶςποιῶν.”
προσθείς δὲ χώτι τοῖς νέωσιν ἁδέτῳ
ἐρέις ἀπεκέεσσε σῶλον τὸν ἄνδρα. (Theocritus G-P 15=A.P. 9.599)

P Buc. (K et D ἀκμῆς)
2 ἐπῆν K: ἐπὶν P 6 ἁδέτῳ Buc.: ἁδέτῳ P

Eagerly gaze upon this statue, o stranger,
and say, when you have returned home:
“I saw the image of Anacreon in Teos
the most remarkable of the poets of the past.”

---

584 While epic-Ionic μαζός is most likely present for metrical reasons (Attic-Ionic μαστός and Doric μασδός would not allow an opening dactyl), the presence of ἀκμῆς rather than Doric ἀκμᾶς (if, as always, the manuscripts are to be trusted here) does, I believe, have a literary purpose. ἀκμῆ, as an art-historical term, was a core aspect of Apelles aesthetic mode. A mosaic from Byblos, which Moreno 2001, 118-20 identifies as deriving from a painting of Apelles, contains the personifications of καιρός, ἀκμή, and χάρις, the essential qualities of Apelles’ art. The ἀκμή in line seven, then, refers not only to the developmental stage of Aphrodite’s body but to a “flowering” intrinsic to Apelles’ aesthetic. Consideration of the word in art-historical terms relies, in part, on the retention of the Attic-Ionic form; the Doric, while perhaps more fitting to the dialect composition of the epigram, would obscure the point.
And having added that he enjoyed young boys
you will have precisely described the man in his entirety.

The epigram deftly mixes the ecphrastic, in its opening commands to “look at” (θᾶσαι) the statue, with the epigraphic, most recognizable in its appeal to a passerby (ὦ ξένε). The former characteristics lead earlier scholars to characterize the epigram as an inscription commissioned to accompany an actual statue of Anacreon on Teos.\(^585\) In actuality, the verses are patently epideictic, as emphasized by their Doric coloring, which hardly accords with epigraphic conventions and the linguistic practice on Teos, an Ionic-speaking community whose dialect the poet shared.\(^586\)

But does the epigram even invite the reader to imagine the inscription and statue of Anacreon \textit{in situ} on Teos? While the speaker of the epigram could be construed as the inscription itself, in part because of the epigraphic address to a passerby, the dialect of the speaker agrees with the Doric color associated with the poetic voice of Theocritus. Indeed, Theocritus limits the Doric color to the speech of the unidentified narrator. Theocritus’ dialect choice, then, lays bare the fictitious veneer of monumentality (which probably should not have been taken seriously in the first place); the poem was only designed to be encountered on the bookroll where the anonymous voice of the epigram, most easily elided with Theocritus, addresses the reader in the “native” dialect of his poetic landscape. The Doric dialect, in other words, focalizes the bookishness underlying this ecphrastic experience.\(^587\)

\(^585\) Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1910, 86; Gabathuler 1937, 75; and Gow and Page 1965, 2.532. Rossi 2001, 280 n. 10 also cites Rosenmeyer 1992 as a proponent of the inscriptional reality of the epigram; however I find no statement of the sort in Rosenmeyer’s treatment of the epigram in her survey of the representation and reception of Anacreon.\(^586\) Gow and Page 1965, 2.532 note that the use of Doric as “odd”, but this factor does not ultimately change their assumption of the epigram’s epigraphic reality. Gabathuler 1937, 75 is silent on the topic of dialect.\(^587\) A similar process may be at play in Asclepiades G-P 41=\textit{A.P.} 7.217 on the Colophonian hetaera Archeanassa composed in a marked Doric, which would be at odds with the Ionic spoken at Colophon. The epigram’s play with inscriptional language allows it to be purposefully read as either an epitaph or one of Asclepiades’ many erotic
Two ecphrastic epigrams by Leonidas on portraits of Anacreon (G-P 31=API 306 and G-P 90=API 307), in his standardized guise as an incorrigible drunk and lover of boys, appear in a similar Doric color. Although the Theocritean epigram only comments on Anacreon’s proclivity for boys and not his drinking, these two epigrams likely served as models, chiefly in their use of dialect. Since Leonidas was also associated with a Doric speaking community, although when he does speak in *propria persona*, as we have see, he does so in Ionic, the similar commands to look, which appear at the beginning of both epigrams (G-P 31.2: θάεο; G-P 90.1: ἴδε), can also be read as focalizing the act of viewing through the perspective of the Dorian poet.

In both epigrams the Doric forms cluster in terms related to his drinking (G-P 31.1: χύδαν σεσαλαγμένον οἶνῳ; G-P 90.1: ἐκ μέθας) or disheveled appearance that result from it (G-P 31.4: ἀστραγάλων ἐλκεται ἀμπεχόναν; 31.5-6: δισσὸν δ’ ἀρβυλίδων τᾶν μὲν μίαν μεθυπληξ| ὀλεσεν, ἐν δ’ ἐτέρα ῥικνὸν ἄραρε πόδα) and his song (G-P 31.8: αἰωρὸν παλάμαρ τᾶν δυσέρωτα χέλυν; G-P 90.5: μελίσσεταί δὲ τὰν χέλυν), acknowledging important components of his characterization. If read from the perspective of Tarantine Leonidas, the use of Doric highlights the aspects of the portrait the poet contemplates, akin to cinematic zoom-ins.

---

588 For discussion of the standardization of Anacreon’s character, see Rossi 2001, 280-85. On the image of Anacreon in later art and literature, see Rosenmeyer 1992, 12-49.

589 In the *Carmina Anacreontea* the latter half of the corpus, which is generally considered to contain later verses (West 1984, xvii), includes a number of non-Ionic features (expected from imitations of Anacreon and found consistently in the first half of the collection represented by the two earlier sylloges) that are most likely to be interpreted as Doric (West 1984, xi-xii and Sens 2014, 104-107). Sens 2014, 104 argues that the Doric in many of these poems suggests that by the time of composition their authors “did not treat dialect as a defining feature of the literary form in which they were working;” rather for these poets “the ‘Anacreontic’ voice was the product of theme and meter.” In a more speculative vein, I would like to suggest that these later authors were also influenced in their dialect choice by the Doric coloring of these earlier ecphrastic epigrams attributed to well-known Hellenistic epigrammatists. In support of this, we should note that in CA 35, the poet likely borrows its Doric coloring from the likely spurious) Theocritus *Id.* 19, see Sens 2014, 104-105.
Finally, Meleager almost certainly exploits the association between dialect and the identity of an artwork’s artist in his clever erotic epigram on the beguiling beauty of a certain young man named Praxiteles (Meleager G-P 110=A.P. 12.56):

Εἰκόνα μὲν Παρίην ζωογλύφος ἄνυσ’ Ἑρωτος
Πραξιτέλης Κύπριδος παίδα τυπωσάμενος;
νῦν δ’ ὁ θεὸν κάλλιστος Ἑρως ἐμψυχον ἅγαλμα
αὐτὸν ὀπεικονίσας ἐπλασε Πραξιτέλην,
δὸρ’ ὁ μὲν ἐν θνατοῖς ὁ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι φίλτρα βραβεύη,
γῆς θ’ ἁμα καὶ μακάρων σκηπτροφορώση Πόθον.
διβίστη Μερόπων ἱερὰ πόλις ἄθεοπαιδὰ
καινὸν Ἐρωτα νέων θρέψεν ὄφαγεμόνα.

Praxiteles the sculptor fashioned a statue of Eros out of Parian marble, he molded the child of Kypris; but now Eros, the most handsome of the gods, having made his own living image molded Praxiteles, so that the one among men, and the other in the heavens may control love-charms and at the same time wield a scepter over desires on earth and among the blessed. Blest is the holy city of the Meropes, which nurturing the son of a god has reared a new Eros of the young men.

Although Gow and Page judge the epigram “heavy and unusually verbose” they nevertheless acknowledge the “ingenious” inversion of the ecphrastic conceit: Praxiteles of Cos once made a beautiful statue of Eros and now Eros has returned the favor, so to speak, and made a beautiful Coan boy named Praxiteles. The first quatrain of the epigram is in Attic-Ionic with the presence of one Ionic form fittingly for the marble from Ionic-speaking Paros (Παρίην). In the second quatrain, Doric forms begin to appear. The majority of Doric forms cluster in the last couplet, for it is here that the poet makes mention of the Doric-speaking island of Cos, which is blest (ὄλβλιστη) to have reared such a beautiful male specimen. Of course, Praxiteles the sculptor was

---

590 Meleager wrote a variation of this poem Meleager G-P 111=A.P. 12.57, but it does not display the same level of dialect variance.
not from Cos (he was Athenian), but rather received the appellation from his famous statues of
Aphrodite commissioned by the residents of the island, and his statue of Eros was never
displayed there either, but rather at Thespiae in Boeotia.

So while Meleager has wrongly conflated the appellation and the native origins of the
sculptor, his switch to Doric when speaking of the living Coan namesake of the sculptor
nevertheless captures the local color of Eros’ living creation. Just as we viewed Lysippus’ statue
of Alexander the Great through the Doric-tinged glasses of the sculptor’s native dialect, so here
the same applies to a real-life Praxiteles of Cos. In view of the marked variance in the dialect
color of the different halves of the epigram, we may be justified in considering that some further
Doricisms may have been lost in transmission; γᾶς for γῆς in line six (corrected by Brunck and
suggested by Gow), which could perhaps be retrospectively read in reference to Cos just as the
transmitted Doric θνατοῖς for Coan citizens, and more likely the adjective ὀλβίστα for ὀλβίστης
(emended by Graefe and endorsed by Gow and Page) in line seven which refers to the charmed
state of Cos.591

Conclusions

Hellenistic book epigrammatists had one foot in the physical world of the inscription and
the other in the new literary world of the bookroll. Drawing on epigraphic conventions as well as
driven by a desire to enrich the imaginative experience of reading the verses, Hellenistic book
epigrammatists often employed a literary version of the dialect associated with the identity of the

591 It is possible, of course, that the entirety of the epigram originally was composed in Doric (perhaps with the
exception of Παρίην since Meleager has been shown to retain the local dialect color of proper names). If that was
the case the general effect of the dialect presented above remains, although a stark division of dialect is still
plausible based on rhetorical movement of the epigram.
speaker or imagined landscape of display. For many of the dedicatory or epitaphic epigrams in which this practice appears it was likely employed to recall the conventions and immediacy of epigraphic models. The Ionic color, for example, of Samian Prexo’s responses to her passersby not only mimics epigraphic convention in tandem with the epigram’s dialogic format, but also presents the reader with a pathetic simulacrum of the deceased young mother’s now silenced voice, an effect made even more poignant when we recognize that Prexo has been buried abroad.

In the humorous dedication of cooking implements by Doreius, also by Leonidas, the use of Doris severior forms, despite the lack of an explicit regional identification for Doreius, quite possibly suggested that the gluttonous cook hailed from Sicily, the epicenter of gustatory indulgence. Identity politics could also be quite serious. Posidippus’ decision to doricize equestrian victory epigrams for Berenike and her immediate family was likely, in part, a response to boasts of Spartan glory that took the form of the inscription celebrating Cynisca’s first chariot victory at Olympia.

This writtenness of Hellenistic book epigram, present in the fictitious dedication of Doreius or the voice of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in his victory epigram, impacted and expanded the application of the identity function of dialect. Despite epigraphic conventions, readers encountered such epigrams not in temples, cemeteries, or pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, but on the papyrus landscape of the bookroll. The voice of Locrian Nossis frames the remains of her poetry collection. What survives of the collection is a series of dedications made by women all composed in the same Doric dialect that is present in the poetic voice of Nossis and the city she calls home. From the nexus of this shared dialect emerges, I argued, an invitation to imagine the poetry collection as capturing the sounds and voices of the female community in Nossis’ home city of Epizypherial Locris.
Nossis’ choice to express her own poetic voice in an artificial version of her native dialect also placed her in particular literary landscape. Like Sappho, Corinna, and Erinna before her (whose epigraphic treatments also attempt to reproduce her unique admixture of Aeolic and Doric features), Nossis composes her female-centric poetry in her native dialect. Leonidas purposefully inverted epigraphic conventions by composing his Odyssean self-epitaph in Ionic, a choice that linguistically manifested the sense of displacement decried in the epigram. Dialect choice could also be an act of literary criticism as I have argued for Callimachus’ pointed use of Ionic in his pastoral epitaph for the Cretan goatherd Astakides or Theodoridas’ (polemic?) caricature of Mnasalces’ overblown style with this use of numerous Doris severior forms. Finally, for Theocritus dialect could be used to interrogate and expose the artificiality of the appropriation of this epigraphic convention in book epigram. Unlike many other epigrammatists, most notably Nossis, the Syracusean chaffed against adapting his personal poetic voice to the public voice of epigram. The verses on the imagined base of Anacreon’s statue at Teos in G-P 15 is in Doric because it was never designed to be inscribed; rather it was composed expressly as an innovative showpiece for display in Theocritus’ bookroll. The poem may initially invite the reader to imagine the voice of a lithic Anacreon, but the Doric color of the epigram unequivocally declares the guiding influence of Theocritus.

The relationship between dialect and place is so integral to its use in Hellenistic book epigram that it will continue to appear throughout this dissertation. In the next chapter I turn to the erotic epigrams of Asclepiades, whose melding of epigraphic format and erotic content represent a significant development of the genre in the Hellenistic period. Where Theocritus employed dialect to underscore the faultline between literary fiction and inscriptional reality, Asclepiades developed a dialect practice that sought to bridge the seeming divide in his erotic
verses between their epigraphic form and the new thematic content drawn from a long tradition of elegiac love poetry.
Chapter 5: The Erotics of Dialect in Asclepiades of Samos

A man in hot pursuit of a sexual conquest will exhaust all of the rhetorical strategies at his disposal. The anonymous lover of Asclepiades G-P 2=A.P. 5.85 resorts to an extreme line of argumentation that starkly sets the earthly and transient pleasures offered by sex in opposition to the ahedonic finality of death:

Φείδῃ παρθενίης καὶ τί πλέον; οὐ γὰρ ἐξ Ἄιδην ἔλθωσ' εὑρήσεις τὸν φιλέωντα, κόρην. ἐν κοῦσμι τὰ τερπνὰ τὰ Κύπριδος ἐν δὲ Ἀχέροντι ὀστέα καὶ σποδή, παρθένε, κεισόμεθα. (Asclepiades G-P 2=A.P. 5.85)

You are being sparing with your maidenhood. But cui bono?
For after arriving in Hades you will not find anyone to love you, girl.
Among the living are the delights of Aphrodite; in Acheron we shall lie, maiden, as bones and ash.

By pleading his case to the target of his amorous desires in this aphoristic manner, the first-person lover has adopted, as scholars have observed, the paraenetic rhetoric of a Theognidean symposiast. Indeed, the argument of the epigram, that pleasure is only available to the living and thus should be seized while the opportunity still presents itself, is a commonplace of Archaic elegy. At Theognis 567-9, for example, the first-person speaker recognizes that he must take delight in the vigor of youthful prime (ἠβῆ τερπομένος παίζω) before death eventually renders him as mute as a stone (λίθος | ἄφθογγος), and Solon (24W) advises that no man can avoid the

592 For discussions on the elegiac voice of the speaker, see Gutzwiller 1998, 124-25 and Sens 2011, 7-12. Giangrande 1968a, 101 claimed that the motifs of “the exhortation to drink and enjoy life before old age arrives…were too general and too popular to appeal to the Alexandrians, who, on the whole, shunned it in their epigrams.”
deterioration of bodily strength or take his wealth with him to Hades. With these parallels in the background, the speaker consequently positions himself in relation to the nameless maiden as the traditional male elegiac advisor on love and life, whose gnomic utterances will (hopefully) grant him the sexual quarry he seeks. In order to stress the necessity for immediate sexual coupling, the speaker of the epigram also litters his elegiac argument with the people (Hades), places (Acheron), and objects (bones and ash) associated with mental and visual images of death and decay. Given the morbid subject matter, Asclepiades fittingly drapes the rhetoric of the nameless lover in epitaphic language, principally in the final line as he drives his point home. The collocation ὀστέα καὶ σποδή has a clear funereal ring and some epitaphic parallels, while the epigram-end verb κεισόµεθα echoes the use of the first-person singular κεῖµαι in inscribed verse to refer to the deceased. Asclepiades’ subtle interfacing of the erotic, sympotic, and sepulchral, innovatively dissolve the barriers between oral elegy and inscribed epigram, thus providing the previously rather static genre new avenues for expression at the turn of the third century.

593 Theognis 1303-4 and Mimnermus 1.1W both associate the meaningfulness of life with the experience of erotic pleasure. On the urging of beloveds to concede their physical graces while they are still young, cf. Theognis 1327-31.
594 cf. CEG 545 (Attica, ca. 350 BCE), where ὀστέα is placed in a collocation with σάρκας. Phoenix fr. 1.22-4 Powell uses σποδός in the epitaph of Ninus. An exact parallel of the phrase is found in a first-century CE epitaph from Teos (GVI 2006.4: ὀστέα καὶ σποδή κειµένη ἐν χθονίοις).
595 cf. CEG 153 (Amorgus, 700-650 BCE); CEG 162 (Thasos, 500-490 BCE); CEG 80 (Aegina, 475-450 BCE); and CEG 720 (Pella, 400-350 BCE). For discussion of this sepulchral echo, see Tueller 2008, 125-126 and Sens 2011, 11-12.
596 Asclepiades’ floruit is generally dated to the last decades of the fourth century BCE into the first decades of the third century BCE; however his surviving epigrams are a poor source for more precise dating. The statue of Alexander by Lysippus (G-P 43=A.P. 16.12) and members of the Ptolemaic court are mentioned in several epigrams (G-P 39=A.P. 16.68 [Berenike]; G-P 44=A.P. 9.752 [Cleopatra]), but none of these poems can be securely ascribed to the Samian. G-P 39, a flattering distich on a statue of Aphrodite likened to Berenike, is alternatively ascribed to Asclepiades or Posidippus. Cameron 1995, 238 (also Cameron 1990, 294) used the metrical shape as an argument against Posidippean authorship on the basis that no epigrams securely ascribed to the author are in distichs. While Sens 2011, 263 provides convincing arguments disqualifying this criteria, he concludes that on the basis on style the epigram could well be by Asclepiades. Previously Gow and Page 1965, 2.143 and Fernández-Galiano 1987, 25 argued against Asclepiadean authorship on the grounds that he did not write court poetry, a notion which the evidence presented below will refute. The Berenike of the poem should be identified as Berenike I the wife of Ptolemy I Soter, who married in 317 BCE and gave birth to the future Ptolemy II Philadelphus in 308. Cameron
Asclepiades’ experiment in erotic epigram contains a number of Ionicisms, a dialectal choice that both accommodates and focalizes the innovative contamination of elegiac rhetoric and epitaphic format present in G-P 2=A.P. 5.85. \(\pi\alpha\rho\theta\varepsilon\nu\iota\varsigma\) and \(\sigma\pi\delta\iota\hbar\) retain \(\eta\) following \(\iota\), where the koine and Doric (or Aeolic) would have \(\alpha\); the participle \(\phi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha\) and \(\acute{o}\sigma\tau\acute{e}\alpha\) avoid vowel contractions that would occur in the koine and other dialects, but are a common feature of literary Ionic. On a micro-level, the deployment of Ionic in specific words aids the poet in thematizing for the reader the conceit of the epigram, which experiments on the boundary of sympotic-erotic elegy and sepulchral epigram. Positioned in the first and last lines of the epigram, \(\pi\alpha\rho\theta\varepsilon\nu\iota\varsigma\) and \(\sigma\pi\delta\iota\hbar\) encapsulate the equation between sexual abstinence and death which the Ionic voice of the elegiac speaker emphasizes in the attempt to persuade his beloved to undertake amorous intercourse. More broadly, the dialect composition recalls the dialect conventions of Theognis in whose literary tradition Asclepiades positions his experiments in erotic epigram. Just as the metrical shape of the verses has a clear affinity with elegy, so the dominant Ionic color of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams engages with the language of his Archaic models.

A number of Asclepiades’ surviving erotic epigrams share a great deal in structure, tone, and subject with that present in G-P 2=A.P. 5.85, including the voice of an anonymous first-

---

1995, 238 argues that the poem could not have been written until 280 BCE upon the death of the queen, on the grounds that Berenike was not assimilated to Aphrodite until after her death (cf. Theocritus *Id.* 15.106 and 17.36-52). Gutzwiller 1995, 396-97 has persuasively demonstrated that the Macedonian elites in the later fourth century BCE were identifying wives as Aphrodite during their lifetimes. G-P 44=A.P. 9.752, on the amethyst ring of Cleopatra, is alternatively ascribed to Asclepiades or Antipater of Thessalonica, a late first-century CE epigrammatist, in P and to Asclepiades alone in Pl, but most scholars view Asclepiadean authorship as quite probable based on stylistic, thematic, and historical grounds; see Gutzwiller 1995 and Sens 2011, 301-2 who follows the arguments of Gutzwiller. *contra* Cameron 1990, 291-94 has argued that the epigram is by Antipater of Thessalonica and the Cleopatra is to be identified with Cleopatra Selena, the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, an argument strongly refuted in Gutzwiller 1995. If written by Asclepiades, the Cleopatra named in the epigram would be identified with the sister of Alexander the Great, who married Alexander Molossos (370-331 BCE), king of Epirus, and was assassinated in 309/8 BCE, which would provide the *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the epigram and make Asclepiades’ birth unlikely to have been before 330 BCE. Gow and Page 1965, 2.115 place his birth over a decade earlier in “ca. 320 BCE”, which would not allow for the composition of the Cleopatra epigram by Asclepiades, although they concede that “Asclepiades has the much stronger claim” (148) on authorship than the imperial-era Antipater of Thessalonica.
person lover. They also share an ionicized dialect color in common. If these poems were read together in an epigram book, a possibility which I argue for below, it is plausible that their structural, tonal, and thematic unity would lead an ancient reader to construct a singular “I” of a lover, rather than a set of distinct voices, that could be closely identified with the poetic persona of “Asclepiades.” In this context, there is the potential that the use of Ionic could also activate ethnic associations. As we saw in the previous chapter, the dialect color of speech, whether spoken or written, has the ability to suggest or emphasize the identity of the speaker. In a similar fashion to the consistent Doric color of Nossis’ epigrams including her self-epitaph, when read in the context of an author-organized poetry book, the Ionic voice of the lover “Asclepiades” could plausibly recall the actual poet’s native language as a resident of Ionic-speaking Samos, as well as activate the epigraphic convention between epitaphs and the language of the speaker/deceased.

Due to their consistent light Ionic color, the uniform dialectal composition of G-P 2 and the rest of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams have not received study beyond the description of notable features. 597 This silence is likely due to the conceived regularity of the dialect coloring. Asclepiades’ dialect, which I describe in detail below, contains many features of the Attic-Ionic koine, generally considered unmarked due to its association with language standardization in the Hellenistic period. 598 On this view, the Ionic patina is a muted echo of the dialect conventions of traditional language in Archaic elegy that inspires Asclepiades’ erotic-sympotic thematics and

597 For descriptions of Asclepiades’ dialect, see Knauer 1935, 58; Guichard 2004, 103-8; and Sens 2011, lxv-lxxii. Giangrande 1968a and Gutzwiller 1998 do not once mention Asclepiades’ dialect. While more recently Guichard 2004 and Sens 2011 selectively comment on particular features, neither attempts to interpret dialect choice within the poetic context of Asclepiades’ corpus.

598 Of course, the koine had its own cultural associations, namely with the Macedonian empire through which it was partially spread to the rest of the Greek-speaking world; however I find no evidence that Asclepiades used koine features to engage with notions of Macedonian identity of hegemony. On the spread of the koine and the development of a standard Greek language, see Silk 2009 and Colvin 2009 for two conceptually different, but equally rewarding, discussions of the topic.
nothing more. The uniformity of dialect, however, especially in a generic tradition known for and open to the mixtures of dialect, suggests an act of purposeful selection and delimitation. As my reading of G-P 2 suggests, we should approach Asclepiades’ dialectal consistency as a choice with significant implication for how we read his self-conscious engagement with elegiac and epigrammatic traditions. In what follows I offer a holistic approach to Asclepiades’ dialect choice as a vehicle in the generation of his poetics of the erotic. The aim of the discussion is to demonstrate that dialect is fundamental to the poet’s construction of an amatory discourse and voice within an epigraphic framework. For Asclepiades, I argue, dialect had a dual and coordinated literary purpose. First, his choice of dialect color expresses his debt to and repurposing of Archaic elegy. Second, this same dialect accommodates the integration of the private voice of erotic-symphotic poetry within the public context of the inscribed epigrammatic tradition. Through attention to the epigraphic and literary association of dialect, Asclepiades crafted a linguistic space that would unify his epigrammatic world of lovers.

**Asclepiades’ Erotic Dialect**

Before we turn to the literary resonances of this dialect choice, it is important to identify which forms themselves would have been considered diagnostically Ionic.\(^{599}\) The most

---

\(^{599}\) I discuss the dialect features present only in those erotic epigrams securely ascribable to Asclepiades. They include G-P 1-24. In most instances the dialect of these doubly ascribed poems do not differ from the general pattern of dialect usage found in the securely Asclepiadean erotic epigrams. G-P 41=A.P. 7.217, on the Colophonian courtesan Archeanassa, is the one exception. The epigram, which explores the boundaries between epitaphic (Reitzenstein 1893, 183 n.1 and Gow and Page 1965, 2.144-45) and erotic conventions (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924, 2.116), is ascribed solely to Asclepiades in P and Pl, where versions of the epigram appear in the main body of the manuscripts as well as in the margins of P. In the manuscripts the epigram has a mixture of Doric and Ionic features (see discussion in Sens 2011, 279). A version of the epigram, which differs in the second couplet from that transmitted in the main body of the manuscripts of the *Greek Anthology*, is also transmitted in the manuscripts to Athenaeus and Diogenes Laertius. Both authors ascribe the epigram to Plato and the manuscripts transmit an undifferentiated Attic-Ionic koine (Gow and Page 1965, 2.144-45 and Sens 2011, 278-9). While the ascription to
prominent Ionic form in Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams is the retention of η following ε, ι, or ρ.\textsuperscript{600}

Other common markers of literary Ionic are rather more circumscribed in erotic contexts.

Compensatory lengthening appears twice;\textsuperscript{601} η for original *ȧ,\textsuperscript{602} contraction of εo diphthong to ευ (also diagnostically Doric),\textsuperscript{603} and κεῖνος for ἐκεῖνος are attested once each.\textsuperscript{604} Uncontracted nominal and verbal endings are another, albeit less marked, indicator of literary Ionic, which originate in the Homeric \textit{Kunstsprache}. Typical examples are –εος in the genitive singular of –ζ stem third declension nouns,\textsuperscript{605} –εων in the genitive plural of –ζ stem third declension nouns and pronouns,\textsuperscript{606} –εα in neuter nominative/accusative of second declension nouns,\textsuperscript{607} and –εο- in participial forms.\textsuperscript{608} Alexander Sens has noted a systematic avoidance of forms associated with Homer and the Ionic epic tradition with few exceptions (cf. the epic-Ionic verb forms ἤλυθες [G-

Plato is likely influenced by a tradition connecting the Attic philosopher to a courtesan of the same name, it does demonstrate that multiple versions of this epigram were in circulation and that the authorial ascription had not completely solidified (on this point, see Ludwig 1963, 63-68; Gutzwiller 1998, 253-56; Thomas 1998, 208-9; and Sens 2011, 281). The mixed Doric and Ionic dialect composition of the Asclepiadean versions of the epigram transmitted in P and Pl follow the common pattern of regularization of inherited *ȧ to η in Pl, making it highly likely the Asclepiadean epigram was composed originally in Doric. Considering that Archeanassa describes herself as Colophonian, the Doric of her voice stands in contrast to epigraphic conventions and the dialect color expected of her native speech. The juxtaposition in dialect and identity may be part of Asclepiades’ playful engagement with the boundaries of generic expectations (see Sens 2011, 280 on this broader point). If this is the case the use of dialect is an interesting outlier to the pattern of accommodation of the epigraphic voice and the voice of the symptotic-erotic lover through the use of light Ionic dialect.

\textsuperscript{600} G-P 2.1 (παρθενίς); 2.4 (σποδή); 4.2 (Παρθή); 8.1 (λαμπή); 9.3 (δολήν); 12.4 (θύρης); 14.2 (Βορέης); 14.4 (θύρης); 16.4 (σποδή); 17.2 (ήσυχήν); 17.4 (τέφρην); 17.4 (κάνθρακήν); 18.2 (Νυκτόρην); 23.3 (χρυσέν); 24.4 (φιλής).

\textsuperscript{601} G-P 16.3 (μούνο); 16.7 (ποιλάν).

\textsuperscript{602} G-P 19.3 (ἀνισχός).

\textsuperscript{603} G-P 18.1 (ἀρεσοῦμενον).

\textsuperscript{604} G-P 5.3 (κεῖνος). Jacob’s emendation of P’s ἀλλά το κείνου (C: ἀλλά τα κείνης) and Pl’s ἀλλ’ ἄντ έκείνους (Pl\textsuperscript{68}; ἀλλ’ ἄν έκείνους Pl\textsuperscript{69}) to ἀλλ’ ὑπ’ κεῖνος is a marked improvement; see Sens 2011, 34. On the form of the pronoun there has been some disagreement. One could emend to ὑπ’ έκείνους without changing meter. While Knauer 1935, 17 argued that Asclepiades avoids elisions between short syllables at this point in the hexameter, Sens 2011, 34 provides counter examples of elisions in the same position from securely ascribed epigrams. Since this is the only example of the pronoun in the erotic epigrams, there is no evidentiary pattern of usage and so the articulation of the form must remain uncertain. Guichard 2004 prints the emendation of Jacobs without comment.

\textsuperscript{605} G-P 23.3 (Φιλόκρατος).

\textsuperscript{606} G-P 17.6 (/vndον).

\textsuperscript{607} G-P 2.4 (ὄστέα); 24.4 (ἄνθεα). At G-P 4.3 ABV transmits χρύσεα, and C corrects P’s χρύσια to the same form. χρύσια could be interpreted as an Aeolic form (cf. Sappho fr. 44.8 and Theocritus 29.37.), but is very likely a scribal error.

\textsuperscript{608} G-P 1.3 (φιλέοντας); 2.2 (φιλέοντα); 9.1 (παρεούς).
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P 13.1 = A.P. 5.164.1) and ἔλησατο [G-P 14.2 = A.P. 5.167.2]). To this I add the disyllabic dative plural in –ουσι(ν), which is absent from later dialects but remains a poeticism.\(^{610}\) I collect the examples here but do not include these forms in my evaluation of the dialectal composition of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams since they are evocative of a general elevated poetic tone, rather than of any particular Ionic and Ionic-based literary traditions.\(^{611}\) Asclepiades consistently uses the koine –αις for the first declension feminine dative.\(^{612}\)

The Attic forms are all commonplaces in the spreading koine of the Hellenistic period. They include the use of the modal particle αὖ;\(^{613}\) consistent augmentation of past verbal forms;\(^{614}\) the contraction of like and different vowel combinations in nominal and verbal forms, such as –ους in the genitive singular of –ς stem third declension nouns and contract verbs in –εω and –

---

\(^{609}\) Sens 2011, lxvii: “there seems to be a tendency in the corpus, for instance, against morphology and diction specifically marked as epic, and especially against stereotypical and ‘trivial’ elements of the Homeric formulaic code.” See also the earlier Sens 2002 in which the author conducts a broader survey into Asclepiades’ engagement with Homer and observes (213) that “Homeric language is borrowed less intensively and more obliquely” in the epigrams securely ascribed to the Samian.

\(^{610}\) G-P 2.3 (ἰοίητος); 3.1 (πόθοις). Kaibel emended G-P 3.3 ἐπὶ προθύρως ἐμάραν πο (P) to προθύρως μαράν in the basis of Asclepiades’ usual metrical practice to have a tetrasyllabic word (---x) at hexameter end preceded by a monosyllabic prepositive (cf. G-P 2.3: δ’ Ἀχέροντι); since such a prepositive is absent here, Kaibel removed the temporal augment. In an almost certain allusion to this passage (Giangrande 1968b, 57-58 and Tarán 1979, 95) Meleager (G-P 73 = A.P. 5.191) has ἐπὶ προθύρως μαράνς in the same sedes, but this could be a conscious variation of the model. Sens 2011, 18 notes that the prepositive preceding a tetrasyllabic word is “an inevitable consequence of the extremely high rate of bucolic diaeresis in the corpus” and that it is “regularly violated” elsewhere in Hellenistic epigrams (cf. Callimachus G-P 15 = A.P. 5.146.3) and in “even the most restrictive stichic hexameter.” That said, metrical violations of this type are not attested elsewhere in Asclepiades’ corpus, and it is wise not to project metrical practices from other authors on to another when there is not evidence that he must have followed a similar path. A further argument against Kaibel’s emendation is that Asclepiades consistently employs the temporal augment in his erotic epigrams. Despite the likely imitation of the phrase in Meleager, I conservatively follow P and do not count this line among the examples of the disyllabic dative plural in the corpus.

\(^{611}\) Guichard 2004, 107 includes these forms in his “epigramas en los que aparecen formas jónicas y épico-homéricas, que en el caso de Asclepiades son los más numerosos,” but his interest is dialect is limited to collection and classification. In several instances he places epigrams under this classification that I describe as A-I since the one form present is best considered a general poeticism. They include: 6.2 (χρύσεον) and 6.6 (µεσσοπύλης); 11.6 (χαλκείων); 19.3 (ἀνιήσας); and 22.3 (φιλέων).

\(^{612}\) G-P 1.1 (ναύταις); 17.5 (ἀνίατος).

\(^{613}\) G-P 4.4; 11.3; 11.4; 15.3.

\(^{614}\) There are no exceptions to this practice in the erotic epigrams solely ascribed to Asclepiades, unless we accept Kaibel’s emendation of G-P 3.3 (cf. n.613). For the appearances of unaugmented past-tense verbs in Asclepiades, see Sens 2011, 19.
αω, and long iota for the comparatives in –ίων. There are two possible examples of Attic retention of α following ε, ι, or ρ: (1) G-P 16.8=A.P. 12.50.8 (τὴν μακρὰν), but the dialectal composition of the rest of the epigram could also suggest a reading of the form as Doric (or Aeolic), and (2) C’s ἐταίραν for P’s ἐταίρων at G-P 8.3=A.P. 5.162.3. I discuss the former in the context of my reading of G-P 16=A.P. 12.50, but the latter requires further comment.

Ἑλαμυρὴ μ' ἔτροσε Φιλαίνιον· εἰ δὲ τὸ τραύμα μὴ σαφές, ἄλλ' ὁ πόνος δύεται εἰς ὄνυχα.
οἴχομεν᾽ Ἔριστος, ὀλολά, διοίχομεν· εἰς γὰρ ἐταίραν νυστάζων ἐπέβην ἂν θηγοντ᾽ Αίδα. (Asclepiades G-P 8=A.P. 5.162)

P
3 ἐταίραν C: ἐταίρων P (?) 4 ὡς ἔθηγοντ᾽ ἄιδαι C, ἄιδε ἄθηγοντ᾽ ἄιδα P

Wanton Philaenion wounded me; Even if the wound is not visible, still the suffering seeps into my nails. I am ruined, Erotes, destroyed, completely perished; nodding off I stepped on a hetaera….

ἐταίραν could also be read as Doric especially if one accepts a Doric form of Ἀιδης in the following line, which has been damaged in the course of transmission. Although the manuscripts only transmit variant forms of ἐταίρα, which Meineke and Boissonade understood as a παρὰ προσδοκίαν joke for ἔχιδναν (or similar), Gow and Page, on the grounds of style, have

---

615 G-P 1.1 (θέρους); 15.1 (κοπιῶ); 23.4 (Ἀναγένους); 24.5 (ἀδίκες).
616 G-P: 1.3 (ἥδιον); 19.4 (ἥδιον).
617 Multiple emendations have been offered for this half of the pentameter; Guichard 2004, 206-208 provides a summary of the various positions. For my purposes, I print the obelized reading of C. The most common solution is to rearticulate ἔθηγοντ᾽ τὸ ἔθηγον τ᾽, which most editors do following Bothe, and then print a Doric form of Ἀιδης (e.g. Ἀιδι Piccolos and Paton); see the detailed discussion in Guichard 2004, 206-8 and Sens 2011, 55. However Asclepiades does not use, as Sens 2011, 55 notes, the Homeric connective ἢδε elsewhere in his poetry, which suggests a further corruption in the manuscript readings. The sense of these reconstructions, namely that in his encounter with Philaenion Asclepiades “touched death” makes sense in context, although the exact phraseology is unique. A smaller minority, including Sens 2011, 55-6, suggest that the corruption of the text includes the reading of either Ἀιδι (P) or Ἀιδι (C) and advance the argument these forms conceal the original reading, e.g. ἢ μ᾽ ἔθακς(ν) κραδιάν (Braun 1969, 374) or ἢ δὲ θηγόντ᾽ ἔθακεν (Sens 2011). I endorse a more conservative approach to the question of the originality of Doric Ἀιδι (P) or Ἀιδι (C) to the epigram, and would retain the reading of a Doric form, albeit hesitantly, over a complete emendation. But since the textual issues are so great and patently insoluble to any great degree, I have chosen not to treat the possible literary effects of this damaged portion of the text.
argued rather improbably that Asclepiades would not have written “‘I have inadvertently encountered a harlot’ when the harlot in question is the subject of his epigram.” Consequently, they view the term as an intrusion of an explanatory gloss for the original ἔχιδνα, which they print following Waltz. Finally, features from outside Attic-Ionic are exceedingly rare and are limited to the use of the Doric α for inherited *ā.

What follows is a chart of the twenty-four erotic epigrams securely ascribed to Asclepiades with a brief summary of their content and a description of their dialect composition. Descriptions of epigrams followed by a (1) denotes a first-person narrator. A-I denotes those epigrams in a predominant Attic-Ionic koine and that contain no forms that could be readily interpreted by a reader as deriving from the epic or Ionic literary traditions; A-I/i denotes Attic-Ionic koine epigrams with limited admixture of epic or Ionic features (given in parentheses); I marks those epigrams with three or more Ionic features; similarly D those epigrams with a predominant Doric dialect coloring (d marks limited Doric admixture). Repeated terms with identical dialect coloring are in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epigram Number</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-P 1=A.P. 5.169</td>
<td>Sweetness of mutual attraction (1)</td>
<td>A-I/i (φιλέοντας)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 2=A.P. 5.85</td>
<td>Maiden should give up virginity (1)</td>
<td>I (παρθείης; φιλέοντα; ὀστέα; σποδιή)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 3=A.P. 5.153</td>
<td>Nicarete/paraclausithyron</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 4=A.P. 5.158</td>
<td>Hermione/girdle (1)</td>
<td>A-I/i (χρύσεα CABV: χρύσια P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 5=A.P. 5.210</td>
<td>Desirable dark Didyme (1)</td>
<td>A-I/i (κείνους Pḷ̣̣Q: ἐκείνους Pḷ̣)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 6=A.P. 5.203</td>
<td>Lysidike/dedication</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

618 Gow and Page 1965, 2.122.
619 Borthwick 1967 offers an illuminating discussion of the literary impact of comparing a hetaera to an ἔχιδνα; for a summary of the various scholarly opinions on the topic, see Guichard 2004, 205-6 and Sens 2011, 53-54 with bibliography.
620 Securely attested examples in the erotic corpus are restricted to G-P 16=A.P. 12.50: ἄως (5; PPl) and κοιμησάν (6; P, -ήν Pl).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-P 7=A.P. 5.207</th>
<th>Samian hetaerae</th>
<th>A-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-P 8=A.P. 5.162</td>
<td>Wanton Philaenion (1)</td>
<td>A-I/ι (λαμψήρη) and d? (Αϊδά C: Αϊδά P; έταράν C: έτατάρν P[?])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 9=A.P. 5.7</td>
<td>Herakleia/lamp (1)</td>
<td>A-I/ι (παρεούσα; δολίην)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 10=A.P. 5.150</td>
<td>Niko/lamp (1)</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 11=A.P. 5.64</td>
<td>Paraclausithyron (1)</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 12=A.P. 5.145</td>
<td>Paraclausithyron/dedication of wreath (1)</td>
<td>A-I/ι (θύρης)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 13=A.P. 5.164</td>
<td>Paraclausithyron (1)</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 14=A.P. 5.167</td>
<td>Paraclausithyron (1)</td>
<td>I (βορέης; θύρην; ἠλυθες)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 15=A.P. 12.46</td>
<td>Love-weary 22 y/o (1)</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 16=A.P. 12.50</td>
<td>Symptotic consolation/sphragis</td>
<td>I/D (I: μούνοι; σποδιή: πουλόν; D: ἄως PPL: ἔως S; κομιστάν P: κομιστήν P1; μακράν?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 17=A.P. 12.166</td>
<td>Remainder of soul (1)</td>
<td>I (ἡσυχήν; τέφρην; κάθρακτην; ὕμεως)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 18=A.P. 12.135</td>
<td>Wine/signs of love (1)</td>
<td>A-I/ι (ἀνενύμενον; Νικαγόρην)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 20=A.P. 12.161</td>
<td>Dorkion’s love for boys</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 21=A.P. 12.75</td>
<td>Beauty of a boy (1)</td>
<td>A-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 22=A.P. 12.105</td>
<td>Young Eros (1)</td>
<td>A-I/ι (φιλέων Boissonade: φιλέω P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 23=A.P. 162</td>
<td>Speaker’s young Eros (1)</td>
<td>A-I/ι (χρυσήν; Φιλοκράτεος)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-P 24=12.163</td>
<td>Eros and the mixture of love</td>
<td>A-I/ι (ἄνθεα; φιλής)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart visualizes the uniformity of dialect practice in Asclepiades’ twenty-four securely ascribed epigrams. The one significant outlier, G-P 16=A.P. 12.50, and its use of Doric will be discussed in further detail below.

From a glance at the epigrammatic topics listed in the chart, the remains of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams divide themselves into several sections: e.g., paraclausithyra, female-centered erotic experience, and first-person meditations. Despite the surface variety, Asclepiades has constructed a thematic unity out of the amatory antitheses of reciprocated and unrequited love.
that complements the shared structure and tone I noted in my discussion of G-P 2=A.P. 5.85.621 As we have seen, the thematic unity of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams is reinforced by a dialectal uniformity centered around the use of Ionic.622 While we have already noted that Asclepiades’ use of dialect is motivated by a desire to affiliate the voice of his erotic-sympotic epigrammatic speaker with the traditions of Archaic elegy, the following discussion will demonstrate that the poet’s application of dialect in those contexts is more sophisticated and nuanced than previously recognized. That said, there are more than generic conventions to consider when reading the dialect of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams. Despite the personal amatory content of these poems and, in some instances, their divorce from traditional epigrammatic structures, ancient readers approached and categorized them under the umbrella of epigram and quite possibly read them in an author-organized epigram book or a section thereof. Keeping this hermeneutic framework in mind, I will first examine the dialect of these experiments in erotic poetry from the point of view of epigraphic conventions.

Asclepiades’ Poetic Persona and Dialect Choice

Whereas in the inscribed epigrammatic tradition the first-person voices of dedications and epitaphs are identified with a certain person or object within a setting, in Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams first-person voices often lack the scaffolding of a dramatic setting, such as a burial, komos, symposium, or a lonely night at home, and so effectively evoke the echo chamber of the mind. They are epigrams for a new and unchartered emotional landscape. Epigrams in this

621 See also Gutzwiller 1998, 150.

622 That the level of selection operates within a singular dialect tradition, as we find with Asclepiades’ avoidance of epicizing features, is further evidence of a meaningful process of dialect use.
meditative vein include: G-P 5=A.P. 5.210 on the alluring beauty of Didyme, the painful, but invisible wounds, of Philainion in G-P 8=A.P. 5.162, the complaint of a love-weary twenty-two year old in G-P 15=A.P. 12.46, and the pained exhortation to the Erotes in G-P 17=A.P. 12.166. Absent any contextualizing information—the who, what, and where—found in traditional epigram, the “I” of these epigrams, united as we have seen by a shared tone and thematics, could have found, I believe, identification for early readers with the poetic ego, who stands behind their production.623

The argument for a connection of the lover’s persona with the “I” of Asclepiades’ poetic voice is based on the likelihood that the poet collected these epigrams in a thematized poetry book.624 While we do not know the exact context in which Asclepiades’ epigrams were encountered by readers in the third century, the cumulative evidence provided by our knowledge of epigram rolls (e.g. the Milan papyrus), other third-century Greek poetry books,625 and later Latin poetry books influenced by these Greek predecessors (e.g. Propertius’ Monobiblos and its fashioning of a singular poetic/lover ego) as well as some clues offered by the epigrams themselves for their position in an epigram book,626 strongly suggest that Asclepiades may well

623 In what follows I am expressly not offering a biographical reading of Asclepiades’ epigrams like that found in the naïve Ihm 2004; rather what I am envisioning is akin to the long accepted reading of the first-person lover in the poetry books of Propertius as a unified voice identified with “Propertius’ poetic persona” or just “Propertius” for short.
624 Of course, such an identification between the poetic persona of Asclepiades and the anonymous first-person voice of his erotic epigrams is only one possibility out of many available to a reader. This is particularly the case should the reader encounter one of these epigrams in a different context such as an anthology, where it may be separated from other poems of the same type or other poems by the same poet. In this type of literary environment, a reader, perhaps influenced by the surrounding epigrams, could experience the voice in a wholly different way, which might, in turn, radically refashion the poem’s reception. The contextual contingency of Hellenistic book epigram is one of its most attractive and beguiling characteristics. It is also a characteristic that strongly influences the reception of dialect choice. If we are to attempt, however, to reconstruct possible poetic meanings fashioned by the dialectal color of an individual epigram or an entire series of epigrams, it is equally important to fashion a likely context for the reading of these epigrams, especially if the current one, as we have with the poems of Asclepiades, is greatly compromised by the organizational intervention of a Byzantine editor.
625 On author-organized epigram collections, see Argentieri 1998 and Gutzwiller 1998.
626 Here I am thinking of epigrams whose themes or subjects strongly indicate a programmatic function, such as the self-epitaphs of Nossis and Leonidas of Tarentum, which scholars have long argued could have possibly closed their author-organized poetry books, or Anyte’s companion poems on springs (G-P 16=A.P. 9.313 and G-P 18=AP1 228),
have composed a thematized collection or part of a collection out of his erotic epigrams.\textsuperscript{627} If we make the reasonable assumption that a poetry book is a possible context for his epigrams, then the readers would have strong reasons to identify the voice of the anonymous first-person as issuing from the poet’s persona within the collection, especially if other markers such as consistency of themes across poems or shared dialect are present to encourage the reader.\textsuperscript{628}

The dialect coloring of these anonymous first-person epigrams accord with what we know of the sociolinguistic realities surrounding Asclepiades’ origins on the Ionic-speaking island of Samos.\textsuperscript{629} While Samos is not explicitly mentioned in any of the poet’s surviving epigrams, the identification of Asclepiades with the island of Samos is supported by external evidence. In Theocritus \textit{Idyll} 7, which was likely composed in the 270s BCE,\textsuperscript{630} Simichidas, a mouthpiece for Theocritus, downplays his own poetic accomplishments when compared to the works of Sicelidas from Samos and Philitas (\textit{Id.} 7.40). The latter figure is easily recognized as the important early Hellenistic poet Philitas of Cos. The former, Sicelidas from Samos, is the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{The biographical traditions surrounding many poets is another factor that could allow for an ancient reader’s identification of the persona of the lover in Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams with the poetic ego of Asclepiades. The contents of these biographies often derive from images and events found in the poems themselves, and thus demonstrate that ancient readers were quite comfortable approaching first-person statements in a variety of poetic contexts as representing the voice and mind of the poet; see e.g., Lefkowitz 1981, Parker 1993, and Kivilo 2010 on biographies of various Archaic and Classical poets; for an overview of biographical practice—both literary and political-historical—in the Hellenistic period, see Hägg 2012, 67-98, especially 77-83 on Satyrus’ \textit{Life of Euripides}.}

\footnote{The dialect coloring of these anonymous first-person epigrams accord with what we know of the sociolinguistic realities surrounding Asclepiades’ origins on the Ionic-speaking island of Samos. While Samos is not explicitly mentioned in any of the poet’s surviving epigrams, the identification of Asclepiades with the island of Samos is supported by external evidence. In Theocritus \textit{Idyll} 7, which was likely composed in the 270s BCE, Simichidas, a mouthpiece for Theocritus, downplays his own poetic accomplishments when compared to the works of Sicelidas from Samos and Philitas (\textit{Id.} 7.40). The latter figure is easily recognized as the important early Hellenistic poet Philitas of Cos. The former, Sicelidas from Samos, is the}

\footnote{Samos, which came under the administrative control of the Ptolemaic kingdom in 281 BCE, was from our earliest evidence an Ionic speaking island whose dialect, based on public inscriptions, displayed significant influence from Attic-Ionic koine during Asclepiades’ youth and \textit{floruit} at the turn of the fourth century BCE.}

\footnote{For the relative dating of \textit{Id}. 7, see Gow 1952, l.xviii.}
patronymn, as the scholia to Theocritus relates, for Asclepiades τὸν ἐπιγραμματογράφον.\textsuperscript{631} Whether Sicelidas refers to the name of Asclepiades’ father or is a poetic byname in the vein of Theocritus’ Simichidas or Callimachus’ Battiades, the identification of Sicelidas with Asclepiades finds strong support from its appearance in the proem to Meleager’s \textit{Garland}. In the course of listing the various epigrammatists and their floral exemplars that comprise the poetic garland of his anthology, Meleager groups the “wild flowers” (ἀγρι’ ἀρούρης: G-P1.45=\textit{A.P.} 4.1.45) of Posidippus and Samian Hedylus, whose epigrams were either jointly ascribed to or borrowed from Asclepiades, in the same couplet as “Sicelidas’ blossoms” (Σικελίδεώ...ἀνθεα: G-P 1.46=\textit{A.P.} 4.1.46), vegetal associations that are fittingly rendered, if we identify Sicelidas with Asclepiades, in an Ionic color evocative of the poetic language and regional identity of two of the poets.\textsuperscript{632} Asclepiades’ epigrams appear in Meleagrean sequences and were an important model for the Gadaran’s own erotic poetry, but his name does not appear anywhere in the proem if we do not identify him with this Sicelidas. Given the linguistic realities of Samos, there is a great likelihood Asclepiades was exposed, through family and community ties, to an ionicized linguistic background during his formative years. Consequently, the uniformity of a light Ionic patina admixed with Attic-Ionic koine is open to interpretation, in particular literary contexts, as a faithful literary approximation of Asclepiades’ native Samian Ionic.

Read against this sociolinguistic backdrop, the dominant Ionic in several epigrams, whose structure evokes the tradition of inscribed funerary epigram only to recontextualize it within the emotional landscape of the mind, very likely encouraged a reader to identify these poetic voices with that of the poet who wrote and collected these epigrams. By offering the

\textsuperscript{631} cf. Σ Theoc. 7.21b, 40a-d.
\textsuperscript{632} Like Asclepiades, Hedylus’ surviving epigrams are composed in a very similar Ionic color. The third poet mentioned, Posidippus, while hailing from Pella in Macedon, did compose a great number of his epigrams in a similar dialect color similar to Asclepiades, which accounts for many double ascriptions. Gutzwiller 2014, 82 comments on the use of Ionic in this cluster of poets.
reader the ability to potentially identify speaker and poet, the dialect practice in Asclepiades’ anonymous first-person epigrams artfully negotiates the clash between a private amatory voice and the public epigraphic context of the epigrammatic form.\textsuperscript{633} I first turn to G-P 15=A.P. 12.46, an epigram that captures the seemingly unbearable tortures of adolescent desire.

\begin{quote}
Οὐκ ἐξ’ οὐδ’ ἐτέων δύο κεῖκοσι καὶ κοπιῶ ζῶν.  
Ὑπερτερεῖς, τί κακόν τοῦτο; τί με φλέγετε;  
hydrate ἡν γὰρ ἐγὼ τι πάθος, τί ποιήσετε; δήλον, ἴErotes,  
ὡς τὸ πάρος παίζεσθ᾿ ἄφρονες ἀστραγάλαις. (Asclepiades G-P 15=A.P. 12.46)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{Pl} P.Vindob.G. 40611 v.1 partim

I am not yet twenty-two years of age, and I am weary of living.  
O Erotes, what is this evil? Why do you burn me?  
For if I endure in some way, what will do you? It is clear, Erotes,  
that you will heedlessly play knuckle-bones as before.

Whether or not Asclepiades composed this poem or collection of erotic epigrams in his youth, as some have thought, is beside the point; rather there is nothing within the epigram itself to prevent a reader from identifying the speaker with a younger version of the poet. References to age appear invariably in inscribed verse epitaphs, which would lead the reader to expect the rest of the epigram to be a study in the lament for a premature death. The information revealed after bucolic diaeresis of line one inverts the readers’ expectations of a sepulchral epigram primed by the conventional epitaphic language that precedes. We learn the first-person speaker is not actually deceased; rather he is so tired of living that he chooses to speak of himself in sepulchral language. The verb κοπιῶ, which signals the poem’s turn from epitaphic to the erotic, is contracted, an Attic koine form attested only in Attic comedy and in prose from the fourth

\textsuperscript{633} For Gutzwiller 2007, 314 this contrast between the “private oral speech” of love poetry or emotional reflection and the “public, written speech” of epigram is the animating paradox of Asclepiades’ experiments in erotic epigram.
century onwards. The vernacular quality of this verb form eases the transition from epigrammatic to erotic, since such an Attic-Ionic koine form would not have been unwelcome on youth’s tombstone nor in the private speech of a love-weary young man.

In the opening line of G-P 5=A.P. 5.210 the speaker borrows epitaphic language to describe the dangerously rapturous effects the dark-skinned Didyme has on his mind.

†Τῷ θάλλῳ Διδύμη με συνήρπασεν· ὃμιοι, ἐγὼ δὲ τῆκομαι ὡς κηρὸς πάρ πυρί, κάλλος ὁρῶν.

εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τούτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες· ἄλλʼ ὅτε κείνους θάλψωμεν, λάμπουσα ὡς ῥόδεια κάλυκες. (Asclepiades G-P 5=A.P. 5.210)

Didyme seized me with her young shoot (?); alas, and I melt like wax nearby the fire, looking upon her beauty. If she is black, so what? Even so are coals; but when we heat them, they shine like rosebuds.

In funerary inscriptions, the simplex form ἀρπάζω is often used to indicate the wrenching and unexpected loss of life. But here, however, a woman and her alluring glance, not a disease or accident, has snatched away Asclepiades. Through the use of συνήρπασεν, the poet not only confounds inscriptional and erotic semantic fields, he also inverts the usual power structure of the act as found in the Greek literary tradition in which men carry off women. So when

---

634 cf. e.g., Arist. Av. 735 (κοπάν); Arist. 618 PCG (κοπατ'). Alexis 147.3 PCG (κοπιώ).
635 The paradox has found equally numerous supporters (e.g. Paton, Beckby, an Knauer 1935, 17) and detractors; the most commonly adopted emendation is Wilamowitz-Moellendorff’s τῷ θάλλῳ (see Ludwig 1966, 23). The seductive power of the eyes is a common amatory trope and, as Sens recognizes, this is the “paleographically simplest” solution to the manuscript reading. For the defense of τῷ θάλλῳ see the detailed discussion in Guichard 2004, 174-79 with bibliography. Sens, the most recent editor of Asclepiades, follows Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Gow and Page.
636 Examples of the verb in funerary contexts only appear first in the published record in the fourth century BCE, cf. CEG 591.6 (Attica; ca. 350-325) and CEG 723.4 (Macedonia; 4th c.?). While our record is incomplete, this may suggest that Asclepiades is drawing on contemporary modes of epitaphic expression as a means of elevating the emotional impact Didyme had on the speaker. Sens 2011, 30 collects examples of the use of συνήρπασεν in inscribed funerary epigram, which all appear in the centuries after Asclepiades; cf. SGO 20/30/05.5=GVI 704.5 (Antioch; 1st c. BCE?); CIRB 126.1=GVI 1473.1 (Panticapaeum; 1st c. BCE); GVI 952.1 (Rome; 1st/2nd c. CE).
Asclepiades states he has been seized by Didyme we read the public voice of Asclepiades’ epitaph within the poetic reapplication of a standard literary trope to the personal experience of his desire for Didyme.

Finally, in G-P 8=A.P. 5.162, on the invisible wounds of wanton Philaenion, the epigram has an epitaphic form and rhythm in which the speaker identifies himself as the deceased “poisoned” by his lover. Asclepiades subverts the epitaphic conventions in the rest of the epigram when we learn that the speaker, despite his vociferous exclamations to the contrary (οἴχομι, Ἐρωτες, ὀλωλα, διοἵχομαι), has survived his purely psychic wounds. The tricolon of verbs at the start of line 3 appear individually in funerary contexts, but taken together they crescendo into a lament fit for the tragic stage that brings public and (semi)private lament into contact. While the final couplet is complicated by various textual and interpretive issues, including the possible incorporation of Attic or Doric dialect features, the use of the verb νυστάζω (νυστάζων), “to doze” or “to nod-off”, is a final, winking recognition of the playful contamination of epitaphic and personal voices. The Greek mind commonly associated death with a deep and lengthy sleep, but here the speaker, since he is alive although dispirited, only “nodded off.” The verb itself is restricted in poetry to the colloquial register of comedy, which, in light of the tragic pathos that precedes, moves the voice of the speaker further away from its epigraphic opening; all the while the dialect coloring allows for a seamless transition. By

---

637 The gap between imagery and reality is made all the more clear should one read a comparison between Philaenion and a poisonous snake (Waltz’s conjecture of ἐχίδναν for ἐταίραν in the paradosis), the female variety of which was known in antiquity to brutally bite their mate to death in the midst of intercourse; see Borthwick 1967.

638 For forms of οἴχομαι cf. CEG 121 (Thessaly; ca. 450 BCE); CEG 545 (Attica; ca. 350 BCE); CEG 548 (Attica; ca. 350 BCE). Forms of ὄλλυμι are rather more abundant, although the exact form is not attested in pre-Hellenistic inscriptions; see, however, CEG 99 (ὄλλεσα; Attica; ca. 400 BCE). The compound διοἵχομαι is not attested, to my knowledge, in any form in pre-Hellenistic inscribed epitaphs. On the tragic resonances of these collected verbs, see Sens 2011, 52-3 with citations.

639 On ἐταίραν (C) in line 3, see above at 254-55 and on Doric Ἄιδα (P) or Ἄιδα (C) see n.620.

640 Once again the speaker uses imagery associated with the physical death brought on by poisonous snakes—the bite of an asp, as Borthwick 1967, 254 notes, causes its victim to fall into a “slumberous lethargy” (Nicander Th. 189: ὁπνηλόν νοκαρ) before death—to describe his mental anguish.
identifying the voice of these poems with Asclepiades, the dialect coloring of this epigram and others fosters a slippage between the public voice of epitaph and the private voice of emotional reflection, since in both instances the dialect coloring would be the same.

To conclude this discussion I would like to consider briefly the position of the reader in relation to the dialect coloring of the anonymous first-person speaker of Asclepiades’ erotic corpus from another, related perspective. Even if the reader identified the voice of the epigram with the poet’s persona as lover, as I have argued is one possibility, the emotional content of these epigrams may have also led the reader to associate himself with the position and experience of the epigrammatic speaker. The desire to compose a group of epigrams that speak to personal experiences of contemporary readers may explain, in part, the studied avoidance of markedly Archaic and homericizing language, which Sens has observed.641

Given his influence on later generations of epigrammatists, we can surmise that Asclepiades’ readership was quite geographically diverse. That said, it is probable the original readers of his epigrams were centered in two specific regions, on his home island of Samos and in Alexandria. On the latter location, Gutzwiller has argued that Asclepiades’ epigrams, and their focus on a sympotic context, are most at home in the cultural context of early third-century BCE Samos.642 While a distinct possibility, I would also like to advance the argument for another early readership centered upon Alexandria.

Many poets and intellectuals from the southwest Aegean islands and the neighboring mainland Ionian cities of Asia Minor made their way to Alexandria, the cultural capital of the

---

642 Gutzwiller 1998, 124. We know nothing of the publication history of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams and there is nothing internal to his epigrams, like we find in Anyte or Nossis, that would specifically invite the reader to imagine a Samian context.
Ptolemaic kingdom,°\textsuperscript{43} and there is certainly a good likelihood Asclepiades numbered among these cultural emigres. Ptolemaic control of Samos and a generally increased naval presence in the region would have facilitated the movement between the island and Alexandria. No securely attributed epigrams treat members of the Ptolemaic court;\textsuperscript{44} however the mime-like G-P 26=A.P. 5.185, in which the speaker orders a slave to buy provisions for that evening’s party, includes characters—Amyntas the fishmonger and Thaubarion the garland-seller—whose names are prominently Macedonian (Amyntas) and Egyptian (Thaubarion). Based on points of cultural data such as this, Sens observed that “the poem seems to be located in a specifically Alexandrian context.”\textsuperscript{45} Macedonian influence was not, however, limited to the Ptolemaic capitol in the third century BCE and the use of these names does not present strong evidence for Asclepiades’ residence in Alexandria. The most that can be said of Asclepiades’ use of motifs from mime is that it demonstrates knowledge of a poetic type popular among Greeks in urban Egyptian contexts.\textsuperscript{46}

Passages from Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams also echo throughout the poetry of several contemporary epigrammatists who are more securely known to have been active in the court of the Ptolemies, most notably Posidippus, Callimachus, and Hedylus. Among the dozen surviving epigrams ascribed to Hedylus, a Samian and likely younger contemporary to Asclepiades, is the dedication of a drinking vessel at the temple of Aphrodite-Arsinoe at Zephyrium (G-P 4=Athen.

\textsuperscript{643} Most notable are Philitas of Cos, Zenodotus of Ephesus, and Hermesianax of Colophon.
\textsuperscript{644} If one follows Gutzwiller 1995 and ascribes G-P 44=A.P. 9.752 on the ring of Cleopatra to Asclepiades, then we do have evidence for the Samian composing a poem for a member of the Ptolemaic court. Cameron 1990, 287-91 has suggested that the dark-skinned Didyme of G-P 5=A.P. 5.210 is a reference to the Egyptian mistress of Ptolemy II Philadelphus and designates this tentative identification as “proof” of Asclepiades’ association with the Ptolemaic court and residence in Alexandria. Cameron had hinted at an Alexandrian location for Asclepiades’ poetry in his 1981 article on “Asclepiades’ girlfriends”, where he assumes an identification of epigrams on hetaera and the Ptolemaic capitol.
\textsuperscript{645} Sens 2011, xxxii.
\textsuperscript{646} Sens 2011, xxxii reads the poem as a much firmer evidentiary basis for Asclepiades’ residency in Alexandria, which he concludes as “certain.”
11.497d). While knowledge of the temple does not require residence at Alexandria or the Ptolemaic court, it does suggest a possible first-hand familiarity with the region and/or the patronage of a member of the Ptolemaic elite. The points of contact between these three poets and Asclepiades suggest that they may have known the Samian and read his epigrams at Alexandria. So while there is no concrete evidence to connect Asclepiades with an Alexandrian residency, there are enough points of contact with the city in his poetry and reception history not to reject travel to and poetic composition at Alexandria.

If Asclepiades’ composed for an elite readership centered upon the cultural centers of Samos and Alexandria, we should also take into account their linguistic conventions in relation to the identification with the “I” of Asclepiades’ poems. Like at Samos, the dialect of public inscriptions and quite likely the upper-classes of Alexandrian society was Attic-Ionic koine, meaning that members of these communities would have spoken a version of the literary dialect found in these erotic epigrams. Considered from this perspective, the process of dialect identification inscribed within the epigrammatic tradition, whereby dialect should reflect the native origins of the speaker, would not only activate the assumed connection between speaker and poet, but also further invite the reader to hear one’s own voice in the articulation of the

---

647 For the influence on other Alexandrian epigrammatists as evidence for Asclepiades’ presence in the city, see Fraser 1972, 1.558-59; Cameron 1990, 287-95 and Cameron 1995, 237-39.

648 On the question of Asclepiades’ residency in Alexandria, Gutzwiller 1998, 124 is much more strongly of the opinion that his erotic epigrams, and their focus on a symptic context, “reflect Samian aristocratic life in the first two decades of the third century.” Since we know nothing of the publication history of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams and there is nothing internal to his epigrams, like we find in Anyte or Nossis, that would specifically invite the reader to imagine a Samian context, I cannot adopt Gutzwiller’s opinion that we view these epigrams as composed for a Samian context. The dialect conventions of these epigrams, as we shall see, do match the linguistic qualities found at Samos, but they also match those at Alexandria. Asclepiades’ dialect has a more universalizing quality than that found, for example, in Nossis. Finally, Gutzwiller argues for a Samian context on the grounds that “the most influential of Asclepiades’ epigrams seem to have been composed in his youth,” to which she is referring in particular G-P 15=A.P. 12.46, where a love-weary twenty-two year old complains to the Erotes. As we have already noted, however, there is no reason why we must read the voice of the epigram as that of the young Asclepiades or assume that the author would have only written such a meditation on the trials of young lover while himself a youth.
universal experience of love; to identify, in other words, with the thoughts and emotions expressed in the erotic corpus.

**Dialect and Archaic Elegiac Discourse**

The sympotic world of Archaic elegy inspires the dramatic settings for a number of Asclepiades’ first-person epigrams.\(^{649}\) In the imagined symposium of G-P 18=A.P. 12.135, for example, we find the first-person speaker commenting on the revelatory qualities of wine manifest in Nicagoras’ tears and displaced laurel crown. In several other instances Asclepiades leads the reader along with the lover as he stumbles from the symposium and into the streets. Assuming the role of the deflated komast set before the locked door of a beloved, the poetic speaker alternates his temperament between rancorous outbursts and meditative monologues. With the exception of G-P 19=A.P. 12.153, where the first-person speaker is identified as a woman, there is nothing within these epigrams to dissuade the reader from identifying the voice of the lover with the poetic persona of Asclepiades or the literary tradition in which he works.\(^{650}\) Again, the dialect coloring is a uniformly dominant Ionic and very similar to the first-person epigrams discussed above. A hallmark of these epigrams in comparison to the smaller group of first-person love poetry is their considerable engagement with the tradition of Archaic elegy.


\(^{650}\) As one of Asclepiades’ primary literary models, the Theognidean corpus has a very few examples of the female voice (cf. Theognis 578-79), but this limited variation is unlikely to significantly reduce a reader’s inclination to identify the unmarked first-person speaker with the poet’s presentation of himself (“Theognis”) as a figure embodied in a type of verse, especially if other markers like dialect or place are present to encourage the reader to understand a unified voice behind the collection.
The contact between voice and genre also brought linguistic conventions into contact. As we noted in the introductory discussion of G-P 2=A.P. 5.85, Asclepiades’ dialect accommodated the language of oral-sympotic performance from which many of the epigrams drew inspiration. Beyond a general affinity with the literary dialect of Archaic elegy, Asclepiades used Ionicisms in specific words in order to underline themes or terms borrowed from this literary tradition. In the context of erotic narratives, I submit, Asclepiades refashioned dialect from a marker of genetic or regional origins to one of generic filiation.

I begin with an epigram whose literary affiliation with Archaic elegy is central to its design and conceit. In an elegant priamel, the first-person speaker of G-P 1=A.P. 5.169 claims that love is “sweeter” than a cool drink in the heat of the summer or the opening of the sailing season for sailors.651

```
Ἠδοῦ θέρους διψῶντι χιῶν ποτόν, ἢδοῦ δὲ ναύταις
ἐκ χειμῶνος ἵδειν εἰάρινὸν Στέφανον
ἡδιον δ’, ὀπόταν κρύψῃ μία τούς φιλέουσάς
χαλαίνα καὶ αἰνήται Κύπρις ὑπ’ ἀμφοτέρων. (Asclepiades G-P 1=A.P. 5.169)
```

P Pl Q
3 ἡδιον δ’ ὀπόταν Jacobs: ἡδεῖον δ’ ὀπόταν P (ἡδίστον ss. C), ἢδοῦ δὲ καὶ ὀπότε Pl, ἢδοῦ ὀπότε Q

Sweet as drink in the summer is snow, and sweet it is for sailors
to see after winter the spring Garland;
But it is sweeter whenever one cloak hides
lovers, and Cypris is praised by both.

The tricolon crescens structure of the priamel and the focus on the sweet quality of attaining an object suggest that a principal model for Asclepiades’ epigram was a couplet inscribed on the propylaion of the Letoon at Delos.

```
κάλλιστον τὸ δικαίότατον, λόγιστον δ’ ὕγιαίνειν
```

---

651 On the priamel in ancient literature Race 1982 remains fundamental.
Fairest is that which is the most just, best is health, the most pleasurable of all things is obtaining that which one desires.

The couplet appears, with some variation, in Theognis:

κάλλιστον τὸ δικαίότατον· λόγιστον δ᾽ ὑγιαίνειν·
πράγμα δὲ τερπνότατον τοῦ τις ἔρα τὸ τυχεῖν. (Theognis 255-56)

The fairest thing is the most just; the best thing is to be healthy; the sweetest thing is to have that which one desires.”

The Theognidean variant appears at the head of the larger of two collections of Theognis’ poetry, the Florilegium Magnum, which was likely first edited in the third century BCE and therefore would have been in circulation at the time Asclepiades was composing his experiments in sympotic epigram. Given the survival of several other variants of the Delian couplet, which speaks to the couplet’s aphoristic popularity, it is not of significant importance for our discussion whether we understand the inscribed or Theognidean version as Asclepiades’ primary inspiration. Nevertheless, we may presume that Asclepiades’ readers were likely to interpret G-P I through the lens of its gnomic elegiac model, which he artfully varies from a general statement on the relative qualities of justice, health, and the attainment of personal desires to a focused

---

652 Aristotle EE 1214a5-6 quotes the epigram with a variant pentameter: ἡδιστον δὲ πέφυχ ὦ τις ἔρα τὸ τυχεῖν.
653 A freer variation survives among the fragments of Sophocles (356 Radt): κάλλιστον ἐστι τοῦνίκον περικέναι· λόγιστον δὲ τὸ ζήν ἄνοσον, ἡδιστον δ᾽ ὧτοι πάρεται λήψις ὧν ἔρα καθ’ ἡμέραν. (“The fairest thing is to live justly, the best to live without ill health, the sweetest thing is for whoever is able to partake of that which he desires everyday.”)
654 For the terminology, see West 1974, 54-58, who defines the Florilegium Magnum (255-1230) as the remains of an elegiac anthology that was likely collected, along with the smaller and rather more elegantly organized Florilegium Purum, in the early third century BCE. Papyrological evidence suggests that 255, the first line of our elegy, was considered the introduction of a distinct collection of Theognidean poetry. P.Oxy 2380, dated to the late second or early third century CE, transmits fragments of lines 254-74 in which 255 is substantially indented to the right, a scribal practice which may well suggest the line introduces a new section of the text. The condition of the papyrus, it must be noted, does not allow us to confirm that a title heading preceded this indentation; see Gronewald 1975. For the interaction between Asclepiades and these elegiac models, see Gutzwiller 1998, 128-29, who notes that the allusion to this likely introductory elegiac couplet was an important piece in Asclepiades’ “codification of old elegy as a precedent for his own innovative collection,” and Sens 2011, 1-2. Guichard 2004 does not consider the elegiac couplet a significant model for Asclepiades.
meditation on the incomparable sweetness of mutual amatory desire. It is exactly the sort of apothegm that would be well received at the symposium. The priamel structure, elegiac meter, and shared dialect act together in a way that allow Asclepiades to subtly refocus the generalizing voice of this paraenetic elegiac couplet to the specifically amatory context, which defines his epigrammatic experiments.

The model elegiac couplet is transmitted in an unmarked Attic-Ionic, whose qualities Asclepiades recreates up to the bucolic diaeresis of line three. It is here, when the topic of mutual amatory pleasure is introduced, that Asclepiades introduces the first and only Ionic feature into the epigram: φιλέοντας. Although it is difficult to base arguments on one dialect form, the coincidence of an Ionic form with erotic subject matter is, if nothing, suggestive. The koine forms—contracted θέρους and the comparative ήδιον that has an Attic long scansion of the ι—may take on their own added significance if Asclepiades or his readers knew one of his models had an inscripational heritage. While minor dialectal features, they can be read a placing a subtle

See Sens 2011, 1-2: “Asclepiades’ version not only reinterprets the culmination of the priamel in exclusively amatory terms, but reframes what is in his models a one-sided pursuit of an object in terms of reciprocal sexual desire felt by both members of an amatory pair.”

I do not ignore the notable echoes of Sappho fr. 16, one of the most famous literary priamels, nor, more specifically, Aeschylus Ag. 899-902, in which Clytemnestra extravagantly compares the joy of Agamemnon’s return to the sight of land to sailors or cool water for a weary traveller. The originality of the text in the Agamemnon has been the subject of much discussion, and it is quite possible that it may partially be a result of an interpolation from a marginal citation of Theognis 255-57 or another similar exemplar; see Fraenkel 1950, 2.406-10 and Denniston and Page 1957, 147-48. If Asclepiades is reworking the Aeschylean passage, as Guichard 2004, 140-41 and Sens 2011, 3, believe is the case (contra Raeburn and Thomas 2011), then the epigram is an important witness to the history of the Aeschylean text. On this point see the discussion in Di Marco 2002, 255-61. Literary importance may reside in the fact that Clytemnestra’s love for her husband is counterfeit, and Asclepiades uses similar imagery in contrast to the mutual love that the tragic pair clearly lacks. In terms of dialect, Attic tragedy and the dialect coloring of this poem and others share many qualities. That said, considering the elegiac outlook of Asclepiades’ collection and the primacy of the priamel structure, I believe that the allusion to Theognis/the Delian inscription is the primary one. The latter form is a modern emendation proposed by Jacobs for the certainly itacizing ήδιον of P. The marginal correction by C to superlative ήδιον provides a satisfactory reading, since a superlative form is more commonly present in the climactic phrase of a priamel and it fits the metrical schema making the iota long, but it is also a very simple emendation on the part of the scribe, and so we should give weight to the lectio difficilior provided by the bare comparative ήδιον. Pordomingo 2000, 85 locates a literary purpose in the use of ήδιον, arguing that Asclepiades borrows from popular literature when he closes his priamel with comparative, which subsequently draws attention to the contrast between generalized or metaphorical imagery and a particularized image. For similar constructions in priamels from Hellenistic poetry, see Theocritus Id. 1.7 (.accuracy) and Nossis G-P 1=A.P. 5.170 (accuracy οδόν ήδιον ερωτευσ).
emphasis on the epigraphic quality of this programmatic epigram, a quality which Asclepiades exploits throughout his corpus, as well as also communicating to the reader the koineizing aspects of Asclepiades’ epigrammatic voice as poet, editor, and lover.

Still, the dialect choice of G-P 1=A.P. 5.169 has a significance beyond uniting epigrammatic and elegiac voices. The color of G-P 1 is also an active component, I suggest, in the poem’s commentary on another early Hellenistic book epigram. In Asclepiades’ privileging of the sweetness of a lover’s embrace over the sweet refreshment of icy snow-melt on a hot summer’s day, Gutzwiller has read a coded response to the poetics of Anyte, whose epigrams G-P 16=A.P. 9.313 and G-P 18=APl 228 address the reader as passerby to stop, rest, and partake of cool spring water. As we discussed in the previous chapter, Anyte associates the refreshing qualities of these epigrammatic loca amoena with sweetness: the draught (πόμα) of a seasonable spring (ὥραίου...νάματος) is sweet (άδόυ) in G-P 16, which the same adjective (άδού) is applied to the breeze (πνεύμα) that stirs (θροεῖ) through the pale leaves (χλωρίς...πετάλοις) of a grove. The Doric of άδού and the rest of these two epigrams reflects the base dialect of Anyte’s surviving corpus, and the dialect choice was likely associated with the rural pastoralism that is a theme which runs throughout here epigrams. Although water is a commonplace in the description of a locus amoenus, its cool refreshment in the heat of a country summer is a notable feature of Anyte’s pastoral environment. With the mention, then, of the χιών ποτόν during the summer (θέρους), it is possible that Asclepiades is contrasting the sweetness of his erotic epigrams with sweet drink (άδου πόμα) of Anyte’s pastorals. The dialectal recasting of two terms from G-P 16

---

658 Gutzwiller 1998, 72, who goes on to argue that G-P 1 had a programmatic function in a collection of Asclepiades’ epigram collection. Gutzwiller (1998, 71) also assigns a programmatic function to Anyte G-P 16=A.P. 9.313 and G-P 18=APl 228. While Gutzwiller’s arguments are suggestive, the possible location of these epigrams in their respective poetry collections is not essential to understanding Asclepiades’ use of dialect as an act of poetic commentary. Sens 2011, 2-3 rejects the notion that Asclepiades is demonstrably responding to Anyte; rather he reads the epigram as more broadly contrasting erotic to pastoral poetry.
and G-P 18—άδου and θέρεος—from a literary Doric to Attic-Ionic koine linguistically encapsulate Asclepiades’ appropriation of Anyte into his erotic aural landscape.659

Dialect, erotic voice, and the tradition of Archaic elegy unite to a similar effect in G-P 17=A.P. 12.166, one of his reflective epigrams on the tormenting effects of love:

Τοῦθ’, ὦ τι μοι λοιπὸν ψυχῆς, ὦ τι δήποτ’, Ἕρωτες,
τοῦτο γ’ ἔχειν πρὸς θεῶν ἡσυχήν ἄφετε:
ἡ μὴ δὴ τάξιος ἔτι βάλλετέ μ’, ἄλλα κεραυνοῖς,
καὶ πάντως τέφρην θέσθε με κάνθρωπην.
ναὶ ναὶ βάλλετ’, Ἕρωτες: ἐνεσκληκός γὰρ ἀνίας
τὲξ ὑμέων τούτων ἔτι’ ἐτι’ βούλομ’ ἔχειν. (Asclepiades G-P 17=A.P. 12.166)

This, whatever is left of my soul, whatever it is, Erotes, allow it, at least, to be at rest, by the gods; no longer attack me with your bow and arrows, but with thunderbolts, and render me entirely into ash and coal. Yes, yes, Erotes, attack me! For withered away by anguish I wish to have…

While the text is uncertain in several places,661 it does not affect the recognition of an Ionic patina of feminine accusative nouns that runs throughout the first two pentameters (ἡσυχήν; τέφρην; and κάνθρωπην). As in G-P 2=A.P. 5.85, with which this chapter opened, the ionicized nouns encapsulate the two scenarios the speaker offers to the torturous Erotes: a peaceful existence (ἡσυχήν) or complete immolation in the fires of erotic passion (τέφρην...κάνθρωπην).

659 Scholars have long recognized the Asclepiades G-P 1=A.P. 5.169 was the model for Nossis G-P 1=A.P. 5.170, who develops the primacy of erotic pleasure in her own programmatic epigram; see e.g., Gutzwiller 1998, 72, 76-77. As we have discussed previously, Nossis writes herself into the tradition of Sapphic poetry in several places in her surviving corpus. The priamel of G-P 1 echoes not only Asclepiades but also Sappho (Skinner 1989). Her choice of Doric is fitting within the consistent dialect coloring of her surviving poems, which has some parallels to that we find in Asclepiades’ erotic epigrams. Beyond writing herself into the Sapphic tradition of female poets by composing in a version of her native language, Nossis may have used Doric in G-P 1 as a partial response to Asclepiades who appropriated the Doric model of Anyte, her primary female predecessor in the epigrammatic tradition.

660 I follow the emendation of Hermann, adopted by Dübner, Waltz, Gutzwiller, and Sens, for P’s ἥ μὴ καὶ. Other emendations include: ἥ καὶ μὴ (Jacoby) and εἰ μὴ, ναὶ (Pierson; adopted by Boissonade and Beckby).

661 For discussion and further bibliography see Guichard 2004, 273-78 and Sens 2011, 111-18.
From the outset of the epigram, the speaker communicates his psychic troubles in an elegiac language. Firstly, his appeal to the Erotes (πρὸς θεῶν), besides being humorously apropos for the context, is borrowed—in the same metrical sedes—from Theognis. It is only after this exhortation that the Ionic features then appear. For a knowledgeable reader this exhortation would place Asclepiades’ first-person voice in the position of the elegiac speaker. We should also consider the possible influence of Anacreontic lyric on the language and voice of the epigrammatic speaker. Here I am thinking in particular of PMG 358 and 398 whose image of Eros heedlessly at play with the hearts of human lovers is a leitmotif in Asclepiades’ epigrams and may be evoked by the speaker’s call to the Erotes to strike him.

The use of Ionic forms in the epitomizing of an epigram’s erotic conceit has an analogue in the descriptor Asclepiades applies to the dangerous hetaera Philaenion from G-P 8.1=A.P. 5.162.1: ἡ λαμύρη μετροσε Φιλάνινον. The adjective λαμύρος has the dual meaning of “wanton” or “charming” in Hellenistic literature. The ambiguity of this adjective is especially appealing to Asclepiades as he examines the fickleness of love. Even before the reader reaches Φιλάνινον at the bucolic dieresis, the pejorative meaning of the adjective is already quite clear from the violence of the verb ἐτρωσε. And yet when we learn in the course of the rest of the epigram that the speaker is still alive and his wounds are of the non-physical variety, this may cause the reader to reinterpret the meaning of λαμύρη at the beginning of the epigram, since Philaenion’s wantonness was probably first considered charming by the speaker before the

---

662 Sens 2011, 115.
663 cf. Theognis 810, 1010, and 1182.
664 We should note, however, that Asclepiades is also engaging with and expanding on the standard image of Eros armed with bow and arrows, when he demands the Erotes strike him instead with thunderbolts. Naturally, thunderbolts are an aspect associated with Zeus (cf. Asclepiades G-P 11=A.P. 5.64) and so Asclepiades is asking the Erotes to adopt a power beyond their usual grasp and not wound but completely destroy him only as Zeus would usually be capable of doing; see Defreyne 1993, 204-205 and n. 14.
665 Callimachus G-P 4=A.P. 12.73 and Posidippus A-B 135=A.P. 12.45 both engage with the Asclepiadean model and are composed in a similar dialectal coloring, although no specific dialect feature is shared between the group.
666 cf. LSJ s.v.; Sens 2011, 50-51.
wretched end of the relationship. The ambiguity of this singular term with which the epigram opens lucidly communicates the theme of appearance—hidden and exposed. Philaenion is simultaneously charming and wanton, and the speaker suffers a deep wound imperceptible the naked eye.

Elegiac exhortations to enjoy the moment often involved the motif of wine, and the aphorism on the subject that opens G-P 18=A.P. 12.135 grants it the timeless quality of Theognidean elegy.

Οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος· ἐρᾶν ἄρνεύμενον ἱμᾶν ἡτταν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαιώρην προπόσης καὶ γὰρ ἐδόκησεν καὶ ἐνύστασε καὶ τι κατηπές ἔβλεπε, χῶ σφιγχθεῖς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος. (Asclepiades G-P 18=A.P. 12.135)

— P

667 On λαμψή, see Borthwick 1967, 253; Cameron 1981, 292-93; Guichard 2004, 202-3; Sens 2011, 50-51. Borthwick 1967, 253, reading λαμψή too rigidly within other discourses on dangerous women/hetaerae, questions the presence of ambiguity in Asclepiades’ use of the form (“one might reasonably doubt if the adjective...is used in its weakened sense ‘coquettish’”). However, a similar practice of using an ambiguous term that provokes reinterpretation upon the completed reading of the epigram, which Arnott 1969, 7 dubs as “ambiguous anticipation” having built on the observations of McKay 1962, can be found at G-P 3=A.P. 5.153, G-P 4=A.P. 5.158, and G-P 10=A.P. 5.150.

668 Callimachus G-P 13=A.P. 12.134 reworks Asclepiades, cf. esp. l.1: ἐλκος ἔχων ὃ ζεύνος ἔλάνθεν; see Gow and Page 1965, 2.137-38; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 338-40; and Sens 2011, 119-22). The epigram displays similar dialectal features (ζεύνος; ἀνηρόν), including notably the resolution of ἐο to ἐν in the participle φυλλοβολεῖτα. Callimachus very likely references his own indebtedness to Asclepiades in the final couplet when he concludes with the gnomic utterance: οὐκ ἀπὸ ρουσμοῦ ἐκκάζω, φωρὸς δ᾽ ἔγνω ὕμνον, which scholars have traditionally interpreted to mean that Callimachus has understood the deleterious effects of love on his drinking companion “not out of ῥουσμός, because, as the person who has been in love, he can recognize the sequential series (the rhythms) of signs in a person who is love” (Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 339-40). Fantuzzi notes (in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 340 n.181) that ρουσμοῦ is likely used by Callimachus in a “technical” sense of “seriality” or “orderly succession” that “derives from ‘field of music or medicine.’” These scholars, and all others to my knowledge, are silent on the fact that not only does Callimachus employ the term in a technical sense, although I think the exact field of application has been possibly mistaken, but he uses the Ionic variant, which further signals its derivation. Ionic ῥουσμός is also a terminus technicus in Democritean atomic philosophy for the “shape of a thing”, e.g. its σχῆμα (cf. Democritus 5i DK and Aristotle identifies Democritean ρουσμός with σχῆμα at Met. 985b16 and 1042b14; the Suda s.v. ρουσμός [p. 312] closely associates the term with Democritus when it erroneously states that ρουσμός is an example of the ἀβδοριτικήν διάλεκτον). I interpret the sense of the lines to be rather along the lines of a statement of Callimachus that he does not form a conjecture (ἐκκάζω) on the emotional state of his friend “from the (abstract) shape of things,” but rather as a fellow traveler in love he knows the effects when he sees them. In any event, Callimachus uses Ionic ῥουσμοῦ to signal his engagement with the intellectual spheres of medicine or philosophy in contrast to Asclepiades’ reliance on symptomatic rhetoric in his opening aphorism. This example is one part of a general trend in Callimachean erotic epigram to dramatize the knowledge of and intellectual processes behind love; see Gutzwiller 1998, 214-17.
Wine provides proof of love: though denying to us that he was in love, the numerous toasts left Nicagoras exposed. For he cried and nodded his head and looked quite out of sorts, and the garland bound to him did not stay put.

The remainder of the epigram varies the temporal immediacy of its model passages and continues on with a narrative of a particular event located sometime in the past that proves the point of the opening observation. Again Asclepiades appears to employ an Ionic form in a word central to the sympotic-erotic conceit of the epigram. The speaker emphasizes the denial of lovesickness to which the Nicagoras’ drunken tears proved the lie by incorporating the Ionic contract ευ in the participle ἀρνεύμενον. In the resolution of ε + ο to ευ in ἀρνεύμενον, which describes Nicagoras’ ultimately failed protestations, it is possible, I suggest, to hear an echo of the Ionicized timbre of the oral performance of elegy. By crafting a short historical narrative out of this sympotic conceit, Asclepiades subtly draws a distinction between elegy, a genre suited to the immediacy of oral performance, and epigram whose function is to commemorate past events and memorialize the deceased; he thus incorporates the epigrammatic into the elegiac.

We next turn to a group of four epigrams based on the theme of the paraclausithyron (G-P 11-14). Asclepiades places these epigrams in dialogue with one another through the shared imagery of stormy nights and invocations of Zeus, a practice that evokes the improvisational reworking of songs on a similar theme at the symposium. While the poems of Theognis contain situations drawn from settings before the doors of reticent lovers, there are no exact parallels to these epigrams in the tradition of Archaic elegy. The idea, however, is related to a sympotic context, since paraclausithrya represent themselves as the product of a komos from a night spent drinking and singing at the symposium. The dialect coloring of the voices of our excluded lovers draw a connection between themselves and the voices of the first-person lovers who explicitly

---

speak in the vein of sympotic elegists. Again we find Attic-Ionic koine predominant. Ionic forms are very limited, but the dialect coloring is present in language integral to the conceit and setting of a paraclausithyron.

G-P 12=A.P. 5.145 and G-P 14=A.P. 5.167 contain one Ionic feature each and in both instances it appears in relation to the door—the blocking object that separates the lovers from their reluctant beloved and the site of the lovers’ speech both oral and inscribed. In the latter (G-P 14), the speaker, undercutting the immediacy of most paraclusithyra, recounts the events of a previous stormy evening when he was locked out by Moschos.

There was rain and night and, the third suffering for love, Wine, and a frigid North wind, and I was alone. But handsome Moschus had more resolution. You too came in this state, delaying not a single door, and there, soaked, I bellowed so much: “For how long, Zeus? Zeus, my dear, be silent; even you learned to love.”

At the turn of the second couplet, the speaker addresses an unnamed second person: σὺ γὰρ οὖτως ἢ νῦς καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἄλγος ἔρωτι, οἶνος· καὶ Βορέης ψυχρός, ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος. Ἀλλὰ ὁ καλὸς Μόσχος πλέον ἴσχυε. Καὶ σὺ γὰρ οὖτως ἡλιθες οὐδὲ θύρην πρὸς μίαν ἰσώχασας, τήδε τοσοῦτ’ ἐξόπασα βεβρεγμένος. “Ἄχρι τίνος, Ζεῦ; Ζεῦ φίλε, σίγησον, καῦτος ἐράν ἐμαθες.” (G-P 14=A.P. 5.167)

---

671 Giangrande 1975, 184 and adopted by Tarán 1976, 60.
address to the speaker— I follow Brioso in regarding the addressee as Zeus, who is addressed by name in the final couplet. This reading is particularly apposite since it allows the epigram to be self-contained. By delaying the identity of the addressee until the conclusion of the epigram, Asclepiades impels the reader to reread the epigram. Once we recognize the subject is Zeus, line four (Ἠλυθὲς, οὐδὲ θύρην πρὸς μίαν ἰςυχάσας) only then clearly refers to the god’s ability to enter the house of any beloved he likes, as he famously did in the form of a golden shower with Danae. With this mythological exemplum in mind, Zeus becomes an inversion of the elegiac excluded lover. While the rain-drenched speaker cannot gain access to his beloved, the god never has to cool his amorous desires at the front door (θύρην). In the former (G-P 12=A.P. 5.145), the scorned lover exhorts the tear-sodden wreaths he hung beside his beloved’s door, as a dedication commemorating his visit, to drip on the beloved’s head at the moment “when the doors open and you see him” (ἄλλ᾽ ὅταν οἰγομένης αὐτὸν ὑπτε θύρης). The dedicatory structure of the epigram allows the speaker to reverse positions with the beloved: the wreaths wet with his tears (ἐμὸν ὑπτόν) will make the beloved into the rain-drenched lover while the speaker is at home out of the storm. Moschos’ door likely remained closed to the speaker’s address in G-P 14, although it is unclear if the speaker still stands before it awaiting a movement of the latch. In G-P 12 the dedicatory voice imagines a time in the near future when the beloved’s door does open and the wreaths finally can rain the lover’s tear down upon him. As a botanical substitute for the lover, the wreaths get to experience (ὑπτε) the desired moment of which he has been deprived. The hyperbaton between οἰγομένης and line-end θύρης, which surrounds the act of sight the lover

---

672 Ludwig 1966, 23.
673 Cairns 1994.
675 Pace Gow and Page 1965, 2.401, Mnasalces models G-P 1=A.P. 12.138 on Asclepiades (cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1924, 2.1.39 and Sens 2011, 78); however the epigram is rendered in a very light Doric patina, which is consistent with (albeit reduced) Mnasalces’ use of dialect elsewhere in his corpus. See also Anon. G-P 34=A.P. 12.116 which borrows from the epigram in the imagery of a dedicated garland at the door of a beloved and shares an Attic-Ionic base with a light Ionic admixture (μακρῆν).
cannot attain, captures the tension of the moment in the slow “opening” of the door, a scene at which the lover, as is befitting a paraclusithyron, will be absent.

As Asclepiades’ collection of erotic epigrams may have opened with an evocation of Archaic elegy, so it might have concluded with an epigram that is in theme, structure, and length extremely similar to surviving examples of sympotic Archaic elegy (G-P 16).  

Πῖν’, Ἀσκληπιάδη, τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;
οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληίσατο,
οὐδ’ ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνῳ κατεθῆκατο677 τὸξα καὶ ιοῦς
πικρὸς Ἔρως. τί ζῶν ἐν σποιδῇ τίθεσαι;
πίνομεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα: δάκτυλος ἄως;
ἡ πάλι κοιμιστάν λάθνου ἵδεῖν μένομεν;
†πίνομεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρως;†678 μετά τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νῦκτ’ ἀναπαυσόμεθα. (Asclepiades G-P 16=A.P. 12.50)

Drink, Asclepiades. Why these tears? What are you suffering from?
Cruel Cypris has not ransacked you alone;
nor against you alone has unrelenting Eros sharpened his bows and arrows.
Why do you lie in ashes while still breathing?
Let us drink a pure shot of Bacchus. Dawn is a finger’s breadth.
Or are we waiting to see again the light that puts us to bed?
Let us drink (?)…After not much longer,
unfortunate man, we shall rest for the long night.

---

676 Asclepiades’ name appears only here in his surviving poetry, a fact that has led Gutzwiller (1998, 147-48) to suggest plausibly that the epigram acted as a sphragis for the Samian’s epigram collection. Sens 2011, 103 is non-committal on the position of the epigram in a collection of Asclepiades’ epigrams and Guichard 2004 does not discuss the poem’s programmatic ramifications.

677 Following Gow and Page and Guichard 2004, I print Boissonade’s emendation; the paradosis κατεθήκατο has the difficulty of construing the verb to mean “putting on” rather than “laying down” the arms. Pace Sens 2011, 105 who cites examples of compound forms of τιθήμι used to mean “donning weapons”, but his earliest example from Apollonius Rhodes (3.156: περικάτθετο) features a different compound form, and so is quite weak on evidentiary grounds.

678 The problems with the reading of the manuscript have to do with the presence of an indicative for the required imperative (πίνε) or a hortatory subjunctive form (e.g. πίνομεν, like that found at line five), and the phrase οὐ γὰρ ἔρως is difficult to make sense of in its current state (cf. the translation of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924, 2.112-13 “denn Eros ist nicht,” who wishes to preserve the entire line as transmitted). Guichard 2004, 267-69 summarizes the various approaches to the textual crux.
The identity of the speaker remains disputed by modern scholars, but whether we understand the poem as spoken by Asclepiades to himself, by a friend to the poet, or other alternatives (e.g. a friend to Asclepiades in lines 1-4 and then Asclepiades to the collected parties in lines 5-8 or Asclepiades to himself in line 1-4 and then Asclepiades to the collected parties in lines 5-8), the generic framework of the epigram is easily recognizable.\(^{679}\) The opening command for a companion to drink (πίν’, Ἀσκληπιάδη) is a commonplace of Archaic elegy and lyric, and immediately situates the dramatic setting within the sphere of the symposium. The epigram is richly textured with common sympotic tropes, including some present in other epigrams. The speaker initially offers the consolation that Asclepiades is not alone in his torments and then revisits the argument for drinking on the grounds that one must enjoy pleasures while one is still alive, rhetoric which the first-person lover employed to persuade a virgin in G-P 2. The two Ionic words (μοῦνῳ and σποδῇ) in the first four lines do not merely echo the sympotic tenor of the epigram’s beginning; rather the isolation and despair that they name are specifically the targets of the speaker’s sympotic exhortation to drink.

At the beginning of the second half of the epigram the dialect coloring abruptly shifts. The dialect shift is appears the variation in the reflex of inherited *ā from the Attic-Ionic η to the Doric (or Aeolic) α in κοιμιστᾶν and similarly in the Doric ἀδός (Ionic ἦδος, Attic ἔως and Aeolic αὔως). Although Pl regularizes κοιμιστᾶν to Attic-Ionic κοιμιστήν, both manuscripts transmit Doric ἀδός and there is no manuscript evidence to assume the surrounding lines were originally composed in any other dialect than Attic-Ionic koine with a limited Ionic patina. This shift does not accompany a concomitant change in generic association, but rather these lines, as scholars have long recognized, are a marked allusion to the sympotic call to cups from a fragment of

\(^{679}\) For various interpretations and arguments for the identities of the speaker(s) of this epigram see Handley 1996; Gutzwiller 1998, 147-49; Guichard 2004, 260-63; Hunter 2010, 286-87; and Sens 2011, 102-104.
Alcaeus. The Alcaean speaker exhorts his companions to commence drinking before the sun sets and there is still a “fingers-breadth of day” remaining (πώνωμεν·τίταλύχν᾽ομμένομεν; δάκτυλος ἀμέρα). In a reversal of his model, however, Asclepiades’ speaker exhorts his companions to keep drinking while it is still dawn (δάκτυλος ἀώς). Studied reworking of Alcaeus continues into the next line, where the repetition of λύχνον and μένομεν appears alongside the Doric (or Aeolic) neologism κοιμιστάν, although the exact sense of the question remains in dispute. I believe it should be read as a rhetorical question asking whether the company should keep drinking through to daybreak or quit and take to bed, the answer to which, in line with the argument of the entire poem, is to enjoy the pleasures of life in the moment and thus keep drinking. Ionic compensatory lengthening precedes and immediately follows the allusion to Alcaeus in the words μούνῳ, whose ionicized form is further stressed by the use of the unmarked μόνον in the previous line, and πούλων. Of course, compensatory lengthening is also found in Doric-based poetry, and it is possible to read the forms as such. If not evidence for the broader doricization of the epigram before scribal intervention, which must remain a possibility (albeit one that I believe is quite unlikely), the availability of this linguistic ambiguity only draws further attention to the variation between dialects.

A third possible Doric form appears in the final line of the epigram (τὴν μακρὰν νυκτ’ ἀναπαυσόμεθα). The manuscripts agree on the transmission of the Attic-Ionic article τὴν and if we are to consider this not a later regularization from Doric τὰν, then it is perhaps most prudent to read μακρὰν as Attic-Ionic koine, rather than Doric. It would be the only use of Attic-Ionic koine following ε, ι, or ρ in Asclepiades’ surviving erotic epigrams. That said, we must consider the larger context of the dialect usage. In his discussion of the line, Sens demonstrates that “in

---

680 Of course, compensatory lengthening is also found in Doric-based poetry, and it is possible to read the forms as such. If not evidence for the broader doricization of the epigram before scribal intervention, which must remain a possibility (albeit one that I believe is quite unlikely), the availability of this linguistic ambiguity only draws further attention to the variation between dialects.

681 Guichard 2004, 108 and 262 considers the form as Doric, while Sens 2011, lxx describes it as an “apparent Atticism.”
similar expressions, the verb of resting more commonly takes the object ὑπνος. The substitution of νύξ, which has its own long tradition as an image of death, allows Asclepiades to make the movement of the epigram more cohesive, since μακρὰν νύκτερες would echo δάκτυλος ἀοί: let us keep drinking until day light, since we are all destined to meet the long night of death. Asclepiades may well have wished to underline this movement of thought by doricizing both temporal terms. Since νύξ does not have a distinctive Doric form, he wrote μακρὰν. In this reading one would still have to make further sense of τήν, but all I can currently offer on this particular point is that the juxtaposition of dialect features further highlights the association with ἀοί. Conversely, the phrase also has a clear epitaphic ring. While I know of no examples of the collocation in contemporary inscriptions, νύκτα μακρὰν does appear in a koine inscription from second-century CE Thessalonica (GVI 876.4). Perhaps the use of τήν μακρὰν νύκτερες was meant to evoke the contemporary language of epitaph, and in doing so possibly conclude Asclepiades’ collection of erotic experiments on an epigraphic note.

While some dialect complications remain, especially in the last line, the dialect shift at lines five and six clearly highlights the reference to the Alcaean model. This type of dialect contact is unique in Asclepiades and it appears at important juncture in the development of the epigram, when the speaker, be it Asclepiades or an unnamed third person, switches from a personal address commenting on the torments of love to a broader call to group drinking befitting the sympotic context. The first-person plural πίνω μεν, which initiates the Alcaean intertext, functions in a similar way to a zoom-out or jump-cut in film, revealing the scene, in this case the symposium. Besides fashioning a sympotic setting, these lines’ basis in an Alcaean intertext “may reflect…in a highly stylized way…the practice of ‘real’ symposiasts,” Sens has perceptively noted, “who quoted poetry they had committed to memory in the course of the

---

682 Sens 2011, 110.
festivities." Whether the reader understands another symposiast or Asclepiades himself to address a line of Alcaeus to the Samian, whose own sympotic voice and epigrams are filled with similar allusions, it is a playful concluding recognition of Asclepiades’ experiments with the epigrammatic genre as a purveyor of more than public acts of commemoration and memorialization.

While there is much to commend Sens’ reading, one cannot ignore the use of a demonstrably Doric color rather than Aeolic color in the act of quotation. While κοιμιστάν would be identical in Doric or Aeolic literary dialects, the Doric form of ἀώς, as we have seen, is distinct from αὔως, the Aeolic form of the noun. Sens explains away the discrepancy on the basis of stylization, that Doric, as phonologically distinct from Attic-Ionic and sharing in several basic qualities of Aeolic, sufficed to underscore the act of quotation. Ancient dialecticians, probably as early as the Hellenistic period, did view Doric and Aeolic as an outgrowth of the same linguistic origins, and the incorporation of Aeolic features, primarily drawn from the Lesbian lyric tradition of Sappho and Alcaeus, into the Doric-base choral lyrics of Pindar likely influenced Alexandrian poets and scholars to classify some of these forms as Doric. Nevertheless, as the poetry of Nossis and Theocritus most clearly attests, Hellenistic poets could distinguish between Aeolic and Doric poetic compositions and were interested, more broadly, in the different registers, types, and forms that comprised the Greek language.

The simplest explanation is that the upsilon of the Aeolic form fell out during transmission of Alcaeus’ poem. Αὔως would have been equally at home as ἀώς in the final
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683 Sens 2011, 106-7 and Hunter 2010, 286, who reaches similar conclusions, but fails to comment on the dialect: “the quotation of Alcaeus in v. 5 is a call to proper sympotic behavior, authorized by a ‘classical’ sympotic model, and a reminder that ‘in a densely textual poetics, the poet is never [Hunter’s emphasis] alone.’”
684 Sens 2011, lxx (“it is tempting to see the dialectal coloring as a stylized representation of the Aeolic dialect…of Asclepiades’ model) and 106-7
spondaic foot of the hexameter. If the loss of the putative Aeolic form did occur, it is impossible
to say whether act was a result of scribal error or a purposeful act of emendation to a more
familiar dialectal form and one that would match the putative dialect coloring of κοιμιστάν (and
possibly μακράν). While a distinct possibility, the manuscripts do not preserve any evidence for
such a process. Bearing this in mind, I argue that it is worth considering the use of Doric at
greater length before accepting Sens’ notion that Doric, as a stylized echo of Aeolic, sufficed to
recall the Alcaean intertext, which is operative, we should remember, with or without the use of
a dialectal shift.686

An invitation to consider the mixture of dialects carefully is hinted at by Asclepiades’
introduction of the Alcaean model into his epigram. At PMG 346.5-6 Alcaeus instructs the slaves
to mix up powerful cups with one part water to two parts wine (ἔγχε εκέρναις ἕνα καὶ δύο | πλήσις κὰκ κεφάλας). In his condensed version of the lyrics, Asclepiades dispenses with the
same detailed level of instruction, but appears to increase the imagined alcohol content of the
drink, as Hunter has observed, when he has the speaker call for a ζωρὸν πόμα of Bacchus, which
is likely indicative of a drink bordering on pure, unmixed wine.687 The purity of the wine is
swiftly juxtaposed with the mixture of Doric after the bucolic diaeresis of the same line in the
phrase δάκτυλος ἀώς, which is the closest echo of Alcaeus. This transference of the imagery of
mixture from wine to dialect recreates the Alcaean situation at the level of the text, thus exposing

686 In a similar vein to Sens 2011, Guichard (2004, 262) considered Asclepiades’ use of Doric in relation to the
hyperdorisms in Callimachus’ Hymns, which are likely original to the text, as Cassio 1993c has argued, having
originated under the influence of Sappho and Alcaeus, whose literary dialect shared many aspects in common with
Doric and was itself being edited and studied during the period. These forms are artificial reproductions of the
dialect of the influential or model text. Although Cassio’s discussion is significant and convincing in its own right,
Guichard’s reference to it in relation to Asclepiades’ use of Doric in this epigram does not follow. In the case of the
dialect coloring of ἰός, surviving literary evidence does not suggest Asclepiades is likely to have confused Doric
ἀώς with or developed it by analogy from an Aeolic form. Doric ἀώς appears only in Doric-based poetry (e.g.,
Pindar, Bacchylides, and Theocritus’ Doric Idylls), while ἰός is restricted to Sappho, Julia Balbilla, the Hadrianic
imitator of Sappho, and imperial-era dialectological studies in which the form is cited as an aeolicism (cf. e.g.,
Herodian p. 401.28). Admittedly neither form appears in the surviving corpus of Alcaeus, which prevents us from
saying that ἰός would have echoed or reworked his usage.

687 Hunter 2010, 287.
Asclepiades’ epigrammatic *rewriting* of an Archaic, oral song. Why, then, mix Doric (not Aeolic) with Attic-Ionic?

We need to interrogate the use of Doric in Asclepiades’ usage beyond a stylistic affectation. Perhaps the use of Doric is part of the inversion of the Alcaean conceit or there existed an intermediary text written in Doric that had already reworked the passage of Alcaeus to which the sympotic speaker is more directly appealing. There is also, of course, the consideration of the imagined speaker of the poem. The variety of modern opinions on the identity of the speaker points up an inherent indeterminacy, and the switch in dialect, in addition to underscoring an important intertext, further complicates the identity of the voice—does the dialect switch to mimic a (partial) quotation or does it switch because there is a new speaker, perhaps from a Doric-speaking region? In the mixture and shifting of dialects from Ionic to Doric and then back to Ionic and possibly concluding with Attic, Asclepiades may be attempting to capture, as with the indeterminacy of the imagined speaker(s), the polyphony of the symposiastic setting.

Then there is the linguistic shape of the model and variation to consider. The Alcaean model for this phrase (δάκτυλος ἁµέρα) can be read as Doric or Aeolic in isolation (the markedly Aeolic ὀµένοµεν precedes by a word) and Asclepiades’ use of ἄως would match simple phonological resolution of η to ο, which Aeolic αὔως would not as well as echo the aural experience of the Alcaean model until the final syllables. Whether or not we can understand the dialect shift as an act of “quotation,” it is quite apparent that the use of Doric was meant to draw

---

688 On the use of different levels/types of mixture in this epigram, see the instructive discussion of Hunter 2010, 287, who finds in the gap between the degree of mixture between model and imitation Asclepiades exploring the fictionality of the symposiastic setting in his epigrammatic recreation of the Alcaean drinking party. To my mind, the shift in dialect, not commented upon by Hunter, emphasizes the erudite entextualization of the original sympotic performance context of Alcaeus.
the reader’s attention to the incorporation of this text (and its possible reception history) within the sympotic fabric of the epigram.

The collection of Asclepiades’ epigrams, as currently constituted, is a sort of textualized symposium. The ideas of incorporation, integration, and exchange are a vital component of Asclepiades’ erotic epigrammatic program. As I noted earlier in the chapter, the varying perspectives on love present in Asclepiades develop out of a notion of erotic experience as a contrast between pleasure and pain. The refraction of this trope through multiple perspectives recreates the improvisational expansion and reworking of selected sympotic-erotic themes. If we are to imagine the epigrams as collection, to a not insignificant degree, of “symposium talk,” an aristocratic and masculine form of discourse, I ask, then, what should we make of the group of epigrams that narrate or comment on the erotic entanglements and proclivities of women?

Although there is some evidence for Theognis having composed elegiacs that capture the complaints of women regarding unsuitably matched relationships, and may very plausibly be read as mocking imitations of standard uxorial grousing, none of these passages contain the focus on the feminine erotic experience that we find in Asclepiades. On the whole, however, literary expression of the female erotic experience is extremely rare before the Hellenistic period. Asclepiades constructs these innovative examinations of what Gutzwiller describes as “women as desiring subjects or as being in control of their own sexuality” by offering these women the same erotic situations and perspectives as their male counterparts. In a creative reversal of standard komos narratives, the speaker of G-P 3=A.P. 5.153 focuses on the physical reaction of
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689 I develop this idea from the statements at Gutzwiller 1998, 149: “To the extent that the book itself is troped as a symposium, the entire cycle of desire and rejection—the dice game of the Erotes—becomes the subject of the symposium talk conducted by Asclepiades and his drinking companions.”
690 cf. Theognis 579-80 with a possible response by the husband in 581-82.
Nicarete to the appearance of the suitor Cleophon on her doorstep. The intensity of Cleophon’s silent gaze, likened by the narrator to “lightning flashes” (αἱ χαροπαί...ἀστεροπαί), drains all color (μάραναν) from Nicarete’s lovestruck visage, surprisingly placing the latter in the position desiring subject rather than desired object as would be expected from generic conventions and the language of the opening line (Νικαρέτης τὸ πόθοις βεβαμμένον ἢδον πρόσωπον). Dorcion, the subject of G-P 20=A.P. 12.161, who dresses like a ἀπαλος παῖς, adopts an aggressive, masculine position when she similarly shoots lightning from her eyes (ἀστράπτουσα κατ᾽ ὀμματος) in her search for a sexual partner.

Women need not always be masculinized in order to govern their own sexual desires and narratives in Asclepiades. G-P 7=A.P. 5.207, for instance, features the homosexual relationship of two Samian women, Bitto and Nannion. While the anonymous speaker of the epigram comments disapprovingly on couple’s same-sex fulfillment, one should not necessarily read the epigram as a strict condemnation of lesbianism, especially considering the erotic background to Asclepiades poetry (not the allusion to Sappho in G-P 19=A.P. 12.153 discussed below) and the fact that Samos was notorious for its hetaeras, which may suggest, as has been observed, that the speaker is a frustrated john; indeed the praise of the mutuality of the erotic experience in G-P 1=A.P. 5.169 possibly further undercuts our speaker’s criticism, although here the lovers are either male or a heterosexual couple (τοὺς φιλέοντας), a pairing which may suggest that mutual desire has its limits of acceptability. Finally and most notably, in G-P 19=A.P. 12.153, a woman speaks of a failed relationship with a man named Archeades. Since Asclepiades composes heterosexual and homosexual erotic epigrams with first-person male speakers, the gendered identity is only made clear by the speaker’s self-address with τάλαινα, an adjective reserved for

---

693 I rely here on the discussion at Sens 2011, 12-13.
694 On the characterization of the poetic speaker, see Sens 2011, 45.
women in Attic tragedy. In other words, our nameless female’s meditation on love is not enough to distinguish her from the other masculine first-person lovers who find themselves in similar positions of anguished erotic rejection.

In the second couplet of G-P 19=A.P. 12.153 the speaker attempts to console herself by noting that pain in love is often accompanied by an increased sweetness. In doing so she draws on the language of Sappho, who famously described love as “bittersweet” (fr. 130.2: γλυκύπικρος). Our unnamed female lover, however, does not speak in the dialect of the Sapphic tradition (Aeolic/Doric), but rather in a uniform Attic-Ionic koine. As the chart above demonstrates all of these epigrams share the same dialectal qualities as the rest of the masculine-centered erotic-sympotic epigrams. In addition to incorporating these women into the erotic-sympotic landscape of masculine Archaic elegy, Asclepiades, by having them share in its uniform dialectal coloring, makes these epigrams part of the erotic fabric of his poetry. Female sexuality, in other words, becomes naturalized through its incorporation in the linguistic register of the masculine first-person voice of the sympotic lover at the core of the corpus and the literary tradition.

Conclusions

As Hellenistic book epigram developed beyond reworkings of dedicatory and sepulchral models and began to borrow their thematic and narrative structures from other genres, poets had to negotiate the contact between different conventions of dialect usage. The first part of this chapter has highlighted how Asclepiades of Samos situated the place-based conventions of epigrammatic dialect usage within poems thematically and rhetorically indebted to the tradition of sympotic Archaic elegy. Inscriptional practice dictated that dialect should reflect the native
language of the deceased or dedicator. Asclepiades deftly employed the anonymous “I” of the first-person speaker in numerous epigrams in order to enact a slippage between the identity of the speaker and the poet himself. On this reading, the use of an Attic-Ionic koine with a limited Ionic patina could have been read as evoking the contemporary language of Asclepiades’ native Samos, a Ptolemaic holding. Since this dialect also captures many of the qualities of the spreading Hellenistic koine, its use has a universalizing dimension that would have allowed many readers to more actively identify with the epigrammatic voices of the first-person lovers. In addition to evoking the contemporary language of private speech and public inscriptions, Asclepiades’ dialect also accommodated the language of oral sympotic performance from which many of the epigrams drew inspiration. Archaic elegy was traditionally associated with the Ionic dialect and the genre is, as currently constituted, one of the most dialectally consistent from the pre-Hellenistic period. And in several examples we have found Asclepiades using Ionic forms to underline themes or terms borrowed from the literary tradition of Archaic elegy.

We can now see that the dialectal uniformity of Asclepiades’ epigrams is anything but uniform when it pertains to the development and expression of his erotic program; rather the prevalence of ionicisms played an integral role in adapting the public voice of epigram to the private world of the symposium. Indeed, Asclepiades’ dialect practice, in a manner somewhat analogous to that of Nossis, fashions an imaginary landscape. But while Nossis’ dialect tied her female dedications to a Locrian soundscape, Asclepiades’ monuments to the erotic experience, whose numerous points of contact combine the exchange between neighboring inscriptions with the witty sympotic improvisations on a theme, fashion a diachronic sympotic landscape that stretches from the present backwards in time to the Theognis.
Chapter 6: Dialect and Imitation in Late Hellenistic Epigram

The previous two chapters have demonstrated that the selection, distribution, and mixture of dialect in Hellenistic book epigram are complex and meaningful components of an epigrammatist’s presentation of her text. Dialect has the potential to mark the ethnic identity of an epigrammatic subject, suggest a context in which to imagine the display of a dedication or epitaph, construct a poetic self-identity in the cases of Nossis and Leonidas, or engage with an earlier literary tradition as in Asclepiades’ use of Ionic in his erotic epigrams. The project of this final chapter is to access the ancient reception of these literary uses of dialect. To accomplish this, I examine the use of dialect in the imitation of third-century BCE epigrams by the later Hellenistic epigrammatists Antipater of Sidon, Meleager, Archias, and Amyntas.

While imitation was long considered a hallmark of poetic inferiority in modern scholarship, recent work has shown the meaningful contribution that imitation makes to our understanding of the self-conscious poetics of book epigram. Imitation is an art in its own right. The aspects of the model epigram that the imitation adopts, varies, or discards contextualizes the later poet’s reading, allowing the imitator to construct new meaning out of an established generic tradition. Imitation, in other words, is a form of reader-response, providing insight into the imitator’s reception of the model as much as it spurs our own reading. My analysis will show that later Hellenistic imitators were sensitive readers who were keenly aware of the dialect choices in their model texts. Reading literary imitations through the lens of dialect
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695 Fundamental discussions of artistic imitation in Hellenistic book epigram are Ludwig 1968, Tarán 1979, Gutzwiller 1998, 227-322; see also Sens 2007.
696 On literary concept and practice of μίμησις (or imitatio in Latin), see Reiff 1959; the essays in West and Woodman 1979, particularly Russell 1979; Conte 1986; Hinds 1998; and Halliwell 2002.
697 The scholarship on reader-response theory is substantial; fundamental critical discussions are Iser 1976 and 2000 and Fish 1980. For the application of reader-response theory to ancient texts see the introductory essay by Pedrick and Rabinowitz to their 1986 guest edited volume of Arethusa along with the collected articles.
choice offers a significant opportunity to explore how ancient poets understood and responded to the dialect choices of their literary models.

In the following analysis I explore the development of dialect as a literary device in epigram imitations. In the first section I explore the close imitations of Antipater of Sidon. I demonstrate that Antipater reuses the dialect of his model as a literary device, employing the matching or opposed dialect color in key words that draw attention to his reading and variation of the model. In the second section, I look at sequences of imitations. Archias, as well as Amyntas, follows Antipater in his imitations of Leonidas, inserting themselves into the chain of imitations by borrowing language and structure from both poems. I argue that this creative contamination extends to the use of dialect. In the final section, I turn to Meleager, paying attention to his role both as poet and anthologist. In addition to continuing the use of dialect in individual imitations seen in Antipater and Archias, Meleager, I contend, closely reads dialect from an editorial perspective, deploying it as an organization device in the *Garland*.

**Reading Third-Century Epigrams with Antipater of Sidon**

We know more about Antipater of Sidon than we do any other late Hellenistic book epigrammatist. This is somewhat paradoxical, since the surviving epigrams of Antipater do not provide, in themselves, a clear sense of a poetic identity that lays behind the many imitations and epigrams focused on the biography and reception of other poets. Unlike Nossis, Leonidas, or Callimachus before him or his younger contemporary Meleager, Antipater does not speak in *propria persona* in any extant epigrams; rather we get to know the poet through his reading and
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698 On this latter aspect of Antipater’s poetry, which I will not touch upon here, see the discussion of his poet-epigrams in Chirico 1980-81; Barbantani 1993 and Barbantani 2010; and Bolmarcich 2002. Campbell 2014, 121-152 provides a cohesive analysis of Antipater’s treatment of other poets.
refashioning of the epigrammatic canon. Despite this, a quite robust set of testimonia survive. Coupled with internal chronological data from the epigrams, they allow us not only to piece together the span of his life and but also to gain an appreciation for his poetic technique and early reception.

Antipater was a prolific epigrammatist with a long career that spanned most of the second century BCE. There is a strong scholarly consensus that he was born in 180/70 BCE and died close to, if not beyond, the end of the century. The clearest evidence for Antipater’s Phoenician origins, the city of Sidon in particular, comes from the island of Delos in the form of a dedicatory inscribed epigram for the local banker Philostratus (Inscr. de Délos 2549=G-P 42). On the stone, the author’s name appears with the same ethnic we find in the lemmata to his epigrams in the Greek Anthology (Ἀντιπάτρου Σιδωνίου), and the identity with our Antipater has not been seriously challenged.

Antipater was famous in antiquity for his improvisational versification. And indeed his close imitations of earlier epigrams (perhaps recited immediately before his impromptu response), especially the surviving series of self-variations on a topic such as Myron’s Cow (G-P 36-40) or the poet Anacreon (G-P 13-16), do have an air of ex tempore composition in performance. Whatever the extent of Antipater’s improvisational versification, these oral
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700 On Philostratus, see Mancinetti Santamaria 1982.  
701 For reconstructions and discussion of the inscription, see Peek 1941 and Peek 1957. A second dedicatory epigram, by a certain Antisthenes of Paphos who is also known from an authorial ascription to another dedicatory verse inscription on Delos (Inscr. de Délos 1533), follows Antipater’s verses and in some ways acts as a variation of the great imitator; see the treatment of Fantuzzi 2008, 615-22, especially on the “riscrittura integrativa” of Antipater’s epigram by Antisthenes of Paphos. On the language, style, and layout of Antisthenes of Paphos’ two epigrams, see Garulli 2012b.  
702 In his epitaph for Antipater, Meleager states that the poet was a native of Tyre (G-P 122=A.P. 7.428). Gow and Page 1965, 2.32 suggested that Antipater, like Meleager, was born in one city (Tyre) but raised in another (Sidon); Weigand 1840, 24 and Waltz 1906, 12 proposed that Meleager chose Tyre as a metonymy for Phoenicia, based on the preeminence of the city for the region.  
703 See famously the comments of Lucius Licinius Crassus in Cicero’s De oratore (3.194), who, while extolling the benefits of varying the structure and rhythm of clausulae, recalls Antipater of Sidon and his great facility at fashioning verses ex tempore.
compositions were eventually written down, likely by the poet himself (rather than some sort of transcription in performance), where they surely underwent some form of revision and refinement for a presentation in a pamphlet or poetry book. Accordingly, I will be primarily approaching Antipater’s imitation of earlier epigrams and his use of dialect from the perspective of a reader of these epigrams, rather than from the perspective of a listener to any improvisational performance.

Before turning to some of Antipater’s imitations and their use of dialect, I must first address the issue of authorial ascription that is fundamental to any discussion of Antipater of Sidon and his literary style. Two epigrammatists with the name of Antipater survive in the Greek Anthology. In addition to Antipater of Sidon, who was part of Meleager’s Garland, there is also Antipater of Thessalonica, who dates to the first century CE and was included by Philip in his Garland. Noticeable stylistic differences between the two Antipaters are few; however close imitation does appear to be a distinguishing factor for Antipater of Sidon, which makes
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704 The manuscripts transmit 55 epigrams under the name of Antipater of Sidon (including epigrams with double ascriptions) and 40 under the name of Antipater of Thessalonica (again including double ascriptions; to these add another seven ascribed to Antipater of Macedon, where the region which contains Thessalonica has been substituted for the city but the same epigrammatist is almost certainly meant). Another 99 epigrams appear with the ambiguous lemma of Antipater. For discussion of the ascriptions in the manuscripts and charts collecting those ascriptions, see Argentieri 2003, 13-23.

705 In a number of instances the lemmata use ethnics to distinguish between the two authors; however not all of these ascriptions are secure. Those epigrams with the Sidonian ethnic and which appear in Meleagrean sequences within the Greek Anthology and/or have internal chronological provenance to suggest composition in the second-century BCE form the core of the authentic epigrams of Antipater of Sidon (just as those epigrams found in a Philippan sequence or with clear references to events dating to the first century CE are almost certainly by Antipater of Thessalonica). There is another group of epigrams, the majority of which are transmitted outside of Meleagrean or Philippan sequences, which are marked with the ambiguous lemma Ἀντιπάτρου. Argentieri 2003 collects these epigrams (17-21) and offers a detailed analysis of their ascriptions based on stylistic criteria (101-68).

706 Attempts to distinguish between the two Antipaters has been a subject of scholarly inquiry since Weigand’s 1840 work de Antipatris Sidonio et Thessalonicensi. Setti 1890 took up the mantle from Weigand, assigning an author to every epigram transmitted with the name Antipater. A century later Argentieri 2003 returned to the question and remains the essential discussion.

707 Argentieri 2003, 83-91 and 100: “Il dato dell’imitazione è forse il più impressionante…per Antipatro di Sidone si può dimostrare con certezza una dipendenza spesso assai stretta da un modello precedente….per Antipatro di Tessalonica i casi sicuri di imitazione veramente stretta sono solo due…”
ascriptions of these epigrams to either Antipater often quite vexed.\textsuperscript{708} In what follows I treat only epigrams whose ascription to the Sidonian is generally undisputed, whether because the lemma includes the ethnic, the poem appears in a secure Meleagrean sequence, and/or the presence of marked close imitation.

The appeal of Antipater’s imitative technique resides in his ability to vary the diction, structure, or point of his model so that the imitation becomes an intellectually satisfying act of reception. That dialect is a component of this imitative technique is evident from Antipater’s imitation (G-P 7=A.P. 7.146) of Asclepiades G-P 29=A.P. 7.145 on the mourning figure of Virtue likely to be imagined as carved in relief on Ajax’s tomb.

\begin{verbatim}
'Αδ' ἐγὼ ἄ τλάμων Ἀρετᾶ παρὰ τῷ ὁδε κάθημαι
Αἰάντος τόμβῳ κειραμένα πλοκάμους,
θυμὸν ἄχει μεγάλῳ βεβολημένα, εἰ παρ᾽ Ἀχαιῶς
ἄ δολόφρον Ἀπάτα κρέσσον ἐμεῦ δύναται. (Asclepiades G-P 29=A.P. 7.145)
\end{verbatim}

P Pl Pepl. 7 Bergk Tzet. Posthom. 489 Eust. 285.19

I, bold Virtue, sit here by this
Tomb of Ajax, having cropped my hair,
stricken with a great grief in my heart, since among the Achaeans
cunning Deceit is stronger than me.

\begin{verbatim}
σῆμα παρ᾽ Αἰάντειον ἐπὶ Ποιτίσσιν ἀκταῖς
θυμοβαρῆς Ἀρετᾶ μύρομαι ἐξομένα,
ἀπλόκαμος, πινόεσσα, διὰ κρίσιν ὅτι Πελασγῶν
οὐκ ἄρετᾶ νικάν ἔλλαξεν ἄλλα δόλος.
τεύχεα δ᾽ ἄν λέξειν Ἀχιλλέως, "ἄρσενος ἀλκᾶς
οὐ σκολιών μῦθον, ἀμμες ἐφίμεμθα." (Antipater of Sidon G-P 7=A.P. 7.146)
\end{verbatim}

P Pl$ Sud. s.vv. θυμοβαρῆς et πινόεσσα
5 ἀλκᾶς Page: ἀκμᾶς PPl

Sitting alongside the tomb of Ajax on the Rhoiteian promontory

\textsuperscript{708} See the detailed discussion in Argentieri 2003, 48-100.
\textsuperscript{709} I print the simple and plainly correct emendation of Page for the ἀκμᾶς of PPl; despite the error the dialect color found in the manuscript is almost certainly secure.
I, Virtue heavy at heart, weep,
having shorn my hair, unwashed, because of the judgment of the Pelasgians that
not virtue but deceit has obtained victory.
Achilles’ armor would have said, “we long for
manly courage not crooked tales.”

With one exception, the manuscript witnesses to Asclepiades G-P 29 transmit a consistent Doric
color principally consisting of the preservation of inherited *ā as a. Planudes (Pl) transmits ἐμῶ for ἐμῶ in the Palatine Codex (P), which contains a resolution of the εω diphthong prevalent in
contemporary Doric, and should be understood as one of the manuscript’s many
regularizations of Doric forms to their Attic-Ionic equivalent. Asclepiades’ dialect usage likely
takes its inspiration from inscriptive and literary antecedents. Ajax’s homeland of Salamis,
before being turned over to Athenian control following his death, was Megarian; Asclepiades’
use of Doric, as Alexander Sens has argued, can be read as an acknowledgement of the
Telamonian’s imagined native dialect. Sens reading is highly suggestive and, as we have
already discussed, has parallels in other third-century BCE epigrammatists. Most notable are
Posidippus’ two Doric epigrams on Cretan subjects from the Milan papyrus, AB 64 on Cresilas’
bronze statue of the Cretan hero Idomeneus and AB 102 an epitaph for certain Menoetius of
Crete who died abroad. As regards literary influences, scholars have long recognized that
Aristotle’s Hymn to Virtue (PMG 842) likely inspired Asclepiades to write an epitaph for the

---

710 The contraction is widely documented in Aegean Doric inscriptions by the middle of the fourth century BCE (e.g. Thera, Astypalea, Cnidos, Rhodes, and Cos) except on Crete and Heraclea; see Buck 1955, §42.5; Bartoněk 1972, 130-31 and 149; and Bubeník 1989, 102-106 and 194. The diphthong is also a feature of Hellenistic literary Doric; see Bulloch 1985, 209-10 on Callimachus and Molinos Tejada, 1990, 88-96 on Theocritus. This contraction is not, however, unambiguously Doric, since it is also a feature of Ionic from the fourth century BCE, particularly in the East (e.g. Chios, Miletus, and Teos); see Stüber 1996, 60-61. In Hellenistic book epigram, the attribution of a Doric or Ionic color to the contraction should be based on the surrounding dialect composition. In this case the predominant Doric color of Asclepiades’ epigram make it very likely that we should interpret ἐμῶ as Doric.
711 Sens 2011, 196.
712 For further discussion of the dialect as a marker of Cretan identity in these epigrams, see Palumbo Stracca 1993-94, 408-10 (AB 102) and Sens 2004, 75-76 (AB 64) and 79-80 (AB 102).
Homer’s hero that included the figure of Virtue. In the second-half of that song, Aristotle invokes Achilles and Ajax as heroic exempla for the greatness that Virtue can grant to those who follow her. Now ranking among her sacrificial dedicatees is Hermias, Aristotle’s father-in-law and the philosopher tyrant of Atarnaeus, whose murder the song memorializes. For our interests, the *Hymn to Virtue* opens with Doric ἀρετά, a choice that initiates the light Doric coloring present throughout the poem. Asclepiades also features Doric ἀρέτα in the first line of his epitaph and it is quite probable that the similarity in dialect coloring is designed to recall the Aristotelian model and its mournful register.

Antipater’s dialect usage is more varied than his model, incorporating koine and Ionic features alongside the Doric α vocalism. This variance is clear from the opening couplet. Where Asclepiades places Virtue in the hexameter and Ajax’s tomb in the pentameter, Antipater inverts this organization. The hexameter is completely lacking in Doric forms, where they could easily be incorporated; in the pentameter, however, Antipater includes the Doric color that appears consistently throughout Asclepiades. Here Antipater reserves the dialect for two words that signals his reception of Asclepiades. The first doricized word is ἀρετά and its significance is directly related to Antipater’s variation of the structure of his model’s opening couplet. By first stating the tomb’s occupant and location, such information would direct the reader, if one knew the model poem, to expect the introduction of Virtue in the pentameter. And indeed, when Virtue does appear in the pentameter as the subject of the sentence, her naming includes the first Doric form, a dialectal notice of Antipater’s imitative position in relation to Asclepiades. This self-conscious use of Doric color in Ἀρετά is reinforced in line four when personified Virtue admits

---

713 Guichard 2004, 355-57 and Sens 2011, 195. The points of contact with Aristotle’s *Hymn to Virtue* partially explains why this epigram was incorporated into the Aristotelian peplos (Cameron 1993, 393). Aristotle’s hymn has recently received renewed scholarly interest in relationship to its literary, cultural, and intellectual background for which see Ford 2010 and LeVen 2013.
the victory of deceit over virtue (ὡς ἀρετὰ νικᾶν ἔλλαχεν ἄλλα δόλος), recalling the final line in Asclepiades (ἅ δολόφρων Ἀπάτα κρέσσον ἐμεῖ δύναται), where the use of Doric in the abstract conceptualization of virtue (ἀρετά) varies the Doric pronoun ἐμεῖ for the personified Virtue.

The second Doric form in the first pentameter is ἔξομένα. As is common in Antipater’s imitations, the Sidonian varies the syntax of the model. Here Antipater replaces Asclepiades’ main verb κάθημαι (in an unmarked dialect) with ἔξομένα a participial form of a synonym. Whereas, the use of Doric in Ἀρετά communicates an initial point of contact with the model, Antipater uses the doricized ἔξομένα to draw attention to its variation.714

Finally, Antipater adds a further couplet in which Virtue imagines that Achilles’ armor prefers the manly courage of Ajax over the wily machinations of Odysseus. Speeches that envision what people might say are a feature of Homer, and became a game played in epigram, mostly in Book 11 of the Greek Anthology. Inspired by this Homeric practice, Antipater employs some epicizing language in the uncontracted nouns τεύχεα and Ἀχιλλέος within the frame of the speech. In the armor’s imagined speech we find another epicism ἄμμες, but alongside it the doricized ἀλκᾶς, Page’s convincing emendation of the manuscripts’ ἀκμᾶς. As a marker of Virtue’s voice and the identity of Ajax, the Doric color of ἀλκᾶς calls attention to the connection Virtue draws between Ajax and “manly virtue” (ἄρσενος ἀλκᾶς)—in contrast to Odysseus’ deceitful cunning (σκολιῶν μύθων)—which she seeks to inject into the imagined judgment of Achilles’ armor. Altogether, then, in the imitation of Asclepiades we have the hallmarks of Antipater’s use of dialect as a literary device that we shall see repeated in various ways throughout his other imitations.

714 While not dialectally marked, Antipater’s use of the neologism θυμοβαρῆς for στλάμων in the earlier epigram acts as an explanatory gloss to remove the ambiguity of the Homeric term, which can mean both stout-hearted and wretched, and so further reinforces the Sidonian’s reading and interpretation of Asclepiades’ language.
Leonidas of Tarentum is the most commonly imitated poet among Antipater’s extant epigrams. A centerpiece of Leonidean epigram, as we have already seen, is the integration of elevated language into the simple and straightforward structure and subject matter of dedicatory and sepulchral epigram. Epigrams of this sort were also ideally suited to close imitation and likely explain, in part, the many imitators of Leonidas. Constructed out of relatively simple and interchangeable syntactic building blocks, these verses easily accommodated the substitution of adjectives and phrases that are foundational to Antipater’s art of imitation.

Leonidas G-P 41=A.P. 6.288 and G-P 42=A.P. 6.289, two dedicatory epigrams for groups of sisters whose occupation was weaving, exemplify the Tarantine’s trademark combination of an elevated stylistic register with banausic subject matter.

Αἱ Λυκομήδεις παιδεὶς Ἀθηνὼ καὶ Μελίτεια καὶ Φιντό Γλυκῖς θ’, αἱ φυλοεργόταται, ἔργων ἐκ δεκάτας ποτιθόμια τὸν τε πρόσεργον ἄτρακτον καὶ τὰν ἄτρια κριναμέναν κερκίδα, τὰν ἱστὸν μολλάτιδα, καὶ τὰ τροχαία πανία †κερταστάς τοὺσδε ποτιρρόγεας†, καὶ ἵππας εὐβριθεὶς †πολυάργυρα τῶς δἐς† πενιχράι ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγης,718 μοιραν ἀπαρχόμεθα, τὸν χέρας αἰν, Ἀθάνα, ἐπιπλῆσαι μὲν ὀπίσσω,719 θείης δ’ εὐσπυτῶν ἐξ ὀλιγησιπύων. (Leonidas G-P 41=A.P. 6.288)

We the industrious daughters of Lycomedes, Atheno and Meliteia and Phinto and Glenis, destitute, offer as a tithe from our work these welcome gifts, the laborious spindle and the shuttle that passes between the thread of the warp,

---

715 Among those epigrams securely ascribed to Antipater of Sidon, Argentieri 2003, 85-86 lists twelve epigrams which Antipater imitate or vary at least one epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum.
716 On Leonidas’ application of elevated language to low or banausic situation and figures, see Gigante 1971 and Criscuolo 2004.
717 For a survey of the various techniques of imitation and variation of Leonidas by later epigrammatists, see Ypsilanti 2006.
718 Gow and Page print Meineke’s ὀλίγαν (P: ὀλίγην), an attempt to make the dialect usage uniform.
719 I print Stadtmüller’s metrically required emendation of C’s ἰσως.
the songstress of the loom, and the spinning spools.… and wool-laden blades… a little portion from our meager holdings.

Ever after, Athena, fill our hands, and render us rich in bread out of our current poverty.

Αὐτονόμα, Μελίτεια, Βοῖσκιον, αἱ Φιλολάδεω καὶ Νικοῦς Κρήσσαι τρεῖς, ένεν, θυγατέρες, ἀ μὲν τὸν μιτοεργὸν ἀμιδίνητον ἄτρακτον,
ἀ δὲ τὸν ὀρφνίταν εἰροκόμον τάλαρον,
ἀ δ’ άμα τὰν λεπτῶν εὐάτριον ἐργάτιν ἱστῶν κερκίδα, τὰν λεχέων Πανελόπας φύλακα,
δόρον Ἀθαναία Πανίτιδι τοῦδ’ ἐνὶ ναῷ
θηκαν, Ἀθαναίας παυσάμεναι καμάτων. (Leonidas 42 HE=AP 6.289)

As I have already commented, Leonidas’ use of Doric in G-P 42 evokes the native language of the Cretan dedicators. While Leonidas does not supply an ethnic identity for the women in G-P 41, the association between Doric and Cretan identity in G-P 41 likely colored the reading of the same dialect in this variation of the theme, especially since these epigrams may well have sat next to each another in a collection of Leonidas’ epigrams as they did in the Garland where Meleager had possibly excerpted them in a similar arrangement.

In his imitation, Antipater borrows features of diction and phrasing from both models, creating a single new dedication out of the two variations:

Παλλάδι ταὶ τρισσαὶ θέσαν ἄλικες ἵσον ἄραξνα
teúdo lepetaléon staðmon’ èpiastámenai,
As he varies the internal construction and the motivating purpose for the dedication, Antipater retains the general Doric color of his model (again limited to the preservation of inherited *ā), bringing with it the imagined voices of the original dedicators. Antipater’s first line is a summary of the components of the two Leonidas epigrams that allows him to quickly declare his dependence on the models. Line one is also the most doricized of the epigram, containing three forms: ταῖ, ἀλικεῖς, and ἀράχνα, which are distributed evenly throughout the hexameter in feet two, four, and six. Here Antipater has encapsulated the basic content of the epigram through the use of Doric dialect in these three words, all of which recall their original use in his models—three women (ταῖ τρισσαί), of some relation (ἀλικεῖς), making dedications related to weaving (ἀράχνα).

At the same time, the Sidonian introduces variety into his imitation with the substitution of ἀλικεῖς for παῖδες or θυγατέρες. By making the three women age-mates, Antipater essentially rules out that they are sisters like in the model poems. The Sidonian accentuates his rewriting of the relationship between the female dedicators through his choice of dialect. The Doric color that
Antipater gives to ἄλκες integrates the variation within the framework of the imitation, which partially relies on a replication of the model dialect.

An instructive parallel can be found in Antipater’s imitation (G-P 1=A.P. 6.14) of Leonidas G-P 46=A.P. 6.13, a dedication of hunting nets by three brothers. Due to its simple structure and patterning of three brothers and three types of nets, it inspired a number of imitations. We will return to this epigram below, examining it in light of Archias’ series of imitations.

οἱ τρισσοὶ τοι τὰ ἕκατα τὰ δίκτυα θήκαν ὡμαιμοι, ἄγροτα Πάν, ἄλλης ἄλλος ἄπ’ ἄγρεσίς, ὅν ἀπὸ μὲν πτανόν Πύρης τάδε, ταῦτα δὲ Δᾶμις τετραπόδων, Κλεῖτωρ δ’ ὁ τρίτος εἰναλίων.

Ἀνθ’ ὄν τῷ μὲν πέμπε δι’ ἱέρος εὐστόχον ἄγρην, τῷ δὲ διὰ δρυμῶν, τῷ δὲ δὴ ἱέρων. (Leonidas G-P 46=A.P. 6.13)

The three brothers dedicated these nets to you, Pan the Hunter, each from a different chase;
Pigres these from the birds, Damis these from the beasts,
Kleitor, the third one, from the fish.
In return for these send a successful hunt through the air, Through the woods, and through the waters.

Ποιὶ τάδ’ αὐθαμοι τρισσοὶ θέσαν ἄρμενα τέχνας· Δᾶμις μὲν θηρῶν ἄρκνων ὀρεινόμοιων, Κλεῖτωρ δὲ πλωτῶν τάδε δίκτυα, τὸν δὲ πετανόν ἄρρηκτον Πύρης τάνδε δεραιόπεδην. τὸν μὲν γὰρ ξυλόχων, τὸν δὲ ἱέρος, ὅν δ’ ἀπὸ λίμνης

P Pί Sud. s.vv. ὡμαιμος et ἄγρεσία Kaibel Ep. Gr. 1104
3 πτανόν P: πτηνὸν Pl

Leonidas’ epigram was painted below an image depicting the three brothers making the dedication as part of the frescoes in the “House of the Epigrams” at Pompeii; see Dilthey 1976 for the publication of the dipinti of Leonidas’ epigram and three others. The epigram is now poorly preserved, but what does survive presents no differences in dialect from the text transmitted in the manuscripts. For discussion of the relationship between the surviving epigram texts and the accompanying images, see Bergmann 2007, 60-101 and Prioux 2008, 29-64. The incipit to the epigram also survives on an ostrakon that contains a list of thirteen incipits (including another poem from Leonidas, G-P 25=A.P. 9.322) from the second century BCE (SH 976).

Gow and Page follow P and the Suda in printing πετηνὸν.
οὐ ποτὲ σὺν κενεόις ὀίκος ἔδεκτο λίνοις. (Antipater G-P 1=A.P. 6.14)

Three brothers dedicated these tools of the trade to Pan:
Damis a net for mountain-ranging beasts,
Kleitor lattice nets for fish, and Pigres this unbreakable net, a collar for birds.
Not once did their household received them with empty nets,
the one from the thickets, the second from the air, and the third from the sea.

In the Leonidean model the nets are referred to collectively in the first line as τὰ δίκτυα. The first line of Antipater G-P 1=A.P. 6.14 echoes the language of this first line but substitutes τὰ δίκτυα for the circumlocution ἄρµενα τέχνας. The vagueness of ἄρµενα τέχνας (produced partially in a Doric color the significance of which will become apparent shortly) combined with the faithful reproduction of the rest of the first line, points to the imitative position of the epigram—those who recognize the line as an imitation already know the dedicated objects are going to be nets.

The dialectal content of the model poem is mixed, with Leonidas inserting two Doric forms at the halfway point of the epigram (l.3: πτανῶν [P: πτηνῶν Pl]…Δᾶµις) in an epigram that is predominantly Ionic. Given the propensity of epigram to retain native dialect forms in names, it could be argued that the reader is to understand Damis and his brothers are from a Dorian area. On the whole, however, the Ionic color of the epigram lends an elevated or heroicizing tone to the dedication of various hunting implements. Like Leonidas, Antipater appears to mix koine and Ionic forms with Doric, although textual uncertainties complicate our understanding of the Sidonian’s reception of the model poem’s dialect in several places.

723 The EM pg. 247, line 33 (Kallierges) understands the name as formed on analogy from δᾶµις, the Doric form of Attic-Ionic δῆµος.
This is particularly the case with the dialect for of the adjective πετεινός in line three. P, the generally more reliable witness of Doric features, transmits most of the Doric forms in comparison to the Atticized forms in Pl (the Suda is more variable). The one exception is C’s correction of πετηνόν to πετανόν. C did have access to another exemplar, the anthology of Michael Chartophylax, that could have contained the Doric form; however Planudes had similar access to this exemplar, as attested by a significant agreement between C’s corrections and the readings in Pl, but here Pl transmits the koine πετεινόν. Of course, given the tendency for Pl to regularize Doric forms (especially when they appeared in a dialectally mixed context), πετεινόν could mask an original πετανόν, but we cannot also discount C’s own intervention into the text, especially given the position of Antipater’s imitation in the Greek Anthology immediately following after the Leonidean model. Despite the textual uncertainties, given the presence of a similar Doric form in Leonidas G-P 46.3 (πτανόν P: πτηνόν Pl), it is tempting to print the reading of the Corrector, since πετανόν would recall the one Doric form in the model and thus provide tantalizing evidence of Antipater’s reading of Leonidas’ dialect choices. I thus provisionally print the reading of C with the understanding that the koine πετηνόν of P (or the πετεινόν of Pl), which would impart a degree of dialectal variatio to Antipater’s imitation, is also a possible original reading.724

Antipater’s reception of the dialect of his model is most clearly registered in the use of the phrase ἄρμενα τέχνας. As I argued above, ἄρμενα τέχνας is a vague periphrasis for Leonidas’ τὰ δίκτυα that signals Antipater’s imitative position to the model. Within this periphrasis, however, Antipater also embeds information that communicates not only his knowledge of Leonidas’ epigrams for the hunting brothers, but also the Tarantine’s corpus more broadly. The

724 I return to this issue of dialect color and textual transmission in my later re-reading of Leonidas and Antipater in light of Archias’ four epigrams on this imitative sequence.
Doric color in which he renders τέχνας is the linguistic mode through which he communicates this engagement with the corpus of Leonidas. There exists an interesting pattern of dialect usage, to my knowledge previously uncommented upon, in relation to τέχνη in Leonidas. Every use of the noun in the extant epigrams of Leonidas appears in the genitive and in Doric. Including G-P 46, all of the epigrams in which τέχνας appears are dedications of implements by craftspeople (G-P 7 = A.P. 6.204 and G-P 8 = A.P. 6.205 both on carpenters) or hunters (G-P 52 = A.P. 6.4 on a fisherman), often on the occasion of retirement from their laborious livelihood. More significantly, the use of Doric τέχνας appears in dialectally mixed contexts, suggesting that its dialect color is not simply influenced by the predominant dialect of the epigram in which it is used. It is quite plausible, then, that the Doric form of τέχνη functioned as some type of signature of Leonidean aesthetics, especially when we consider his noted fascination with members of the working poor, such as weavers, carpenters, and other craftspeople. Why exactly Leonidas chose Doric is unclear—there is nothing in particular would connect the various dedicatory contexts of its usage with this dialect choice—but what is rather more clear is that Antipater likely recognized this pattern of dialect usage in Leonidas’ dedications of craftspeople and hunters and used it to communicate his interpretation and reception of the model poet’s corpus to his own readers.

725 G-P 7.4 = A.P. 6.204.4; G-P 8.6 and 10 = A.P. 6.205.6 and 10; G-P 52.7 = A.P. 6.4.7. Leaving aside for the moment the use of τέχνας in Archias, there is also Perses G-P 5 = A.P. 7.445, an epitaph for two woodsmen, which contains the phrase μαντουοτε τέχνας (-ης Pl), the only securely attested Doric form in the epigram. Although Gow and Page 1965, 2.447 argued that Perses was “among the very earliest Hellenistic epigrammatists” active at the end of the fourth century, Perses’ dates are still quite uncertain and so that we cannot tell if this epigram was likely to post-date Leonidas, whose dates are equally opaque, but was also possibly active at the turn of the fourth century. Nevertheless, given the rustic context and the use singular use of Doric in τέχνας, we are justified in at least entertaining the possibility that this dialect form was used under the influence of Leonidas.

726 In G-P 52 = A.P. 6.4 τέχνας (1.7) appears alongside Ionic χόρῳμην (1.2) and τρηχόν (1.5); Doric also appears in relation to craft in the final line: ἀρχαίας (C: -αίς Pl, -αία P)…τεχνοσύνας (P: -νης Pl). G-P 7 = A.P. 6.204 (τῷ Πολλάδῳ; ῥωκάνν) and G-P 8 = A.P. 6.205 (Ἀθάνα) both display a limited Doric color.
It was not only Leonidas’ dedicatory epigrams that Antipater used as models for his imitations. Antipater G-P 45=API 178 on Apelles’ Aphrodite Anadyomene takes its inspiration from Leonidas G-P 23=API 182. Again we find Antipater strategically reusing the dialect of his model to guide the reader through his own reading of the epigram.

Having fled from her mother’s bosom, still frothing with foam, Cypris who brings wedded bliss—look how Apelles figured her most lovely beauty not painted but alive. Beautifully does she squeeze out with her hair with her hands, beautifully does gentle desire flash forth from her eyes, and her breast, the prime of her youth, swells. Athena herself and the wife of Zeus will say “O Zeus, we are left wanting in this judgment.”

\[
\text{τἀν ἀναδυομέναν ἀπὸ ματέρος ἀρτι θαλάσσας}
\]

Kύπριν, Ἀπελλείου μόχθον δρα γραφίδος, ώς χερὶ συμμάρφασα διάμροσον ὑδατι χαίταν ἐκθήμενοι ἀφρόν ἀπὸ πλοκάμων.

\[
\text{ἀυτὶ νῦν ἐρώτουσιν Ἀθηναῖή τε καὶ Ἡρη}
\]

“οὐκέτι σοι μορφὰς εἰς ἔριν ἐρχόμεθα.” (Antipater of Sidon G-P 45=API 178)

While epic-Ionic μαζός is most likely present for metrical reasons (Attic-Ionic μαστός and Doric μασδός would not allow an opening dactyl), the presence of ἀκμής rather than Doric ἀκΜας (if, as always, the manuscripts are to be trusted here) does, I believe, have a literary purpose. ἀκμή, as an art-historical term, was a core aspect of Apelles aesthetic mode. A mosaic from Byblos, which Moreno 2001, 118-20 identifies as deriving from a painting of Apelles, contains the personifications of καιρός, ἀκμή, and χάρις, the essential qualities of Apelles’ art. The ἀκμή in line seven, then, refers not only to the developmental stage of Aphrodite’s body but to a “flowering” intrinsic to Apelles’ aesthetic. Consideration of the word in art-historical terms relies, in part, on the retention of the Attic-Ionic form; the Doric, while perhaps more fitting to the dialect composition of the epigram, would obscure.
Cypris rising just now from her mother, the sea
Behold the labor of Apelles’ pencil,
how having grasped her mane dripping with water in her hand
she squeezes out the foam from her wet locks.
Athena and Hera themselves will now say,
“No longer will we enter into a contest of beauty with you.”

I discussed Leonidas’ epigram in an earlier chapter and there argued that the use of Doric was designed to reproduce the painting’s original display context on the Doric-speaking island of Cos;²²⁸ the reader is asked to imagine viewing the work of art through a local Coan perspective. In a condensed elegiac version of the original, Antipater retains the general Doric color of the model. Before discussing its relationship to the imagined focalization of the painting, I wish to make a few smaller observations on Antipater’s dialect usage. First, Antipater reproduces the opening Doric feminine accusative article and participle combination present in Leonidas. Here, however, in usual Antipaterian fashion, his variation of ἐκφυγοῦσαν for ἀναδυομέναν likely echoes the title of the painting, thus rendering the subject matter of the epigram identifiable from the start.²²⁹ Second, while Leonidas does not explicitly name Aphrodite’s mother as the sea, likely assuming his readers will find some intellectual pleasure in identifying the μάτηρ as they decode the scene, Antipater, as he does with τὰν ἀναδυομέναν, makes the recognition of the scene and its characters explicit with θαλάσσας. Finally, in line three Antipater inserts the close synonym χαίταν in Doric for Leonidas’ similarly colored κόμαν, making the dialectal variatio a piece of his deliberate dialogue with Leonidas. In each instance, then, Antipater highlights his

²²⁸ See above at 238-40.
²²⁹ The painting is so called by Pliny at NH 35.91 (Anadyomene vocatur, versibus Graecis tantopere dum laudatur, aevis victa sed inlustrata), and we can plausibly assume it was known by the title in the later Hellenistic period.
reading and explication of the model epigram by inserting a Doric feature drawn from its base dialect coloring.

In the final couplet, the “judgment” of Athena and Hera, Antipater inverts the distribution of dialect features. Leonidas wrote the name of Athena in Doric, used a dialectally unmarked periphrasis for Hera, and described the deities’ act of speech in a Doric future form of φηµί. In their short declaration the dialect coloring of the manuscripts is koine, perhaps because Athena and Hera as gods would have been assumed not to speak Doric, the one feature notably absent from epic. Conversely, Antipater employed the ionicized forms of Athena and Hera, reapplying an epicizing luster to their names, and replaced Leonidas’ Doric future φάσουσιν with Ionic ἔρεουσιν. In the speech of Athena and Hera Antipater incorporates Doric μορφᾶς, which stands in contrast to the dialect used in the brief narrative that frames it. Like the imagined viewer of the painting, Athena and Hera are stunned by Apelles’ masterpiece and its life-like beauty. In the beauty contest they concede not to Aphrodite herself but to Apelles’ version—they admit, in other words, that they are no match for the μορφᾶ on display in Cos. Antipater’s subtle application of Doric also focalizes the deities’ view of the painting, inviting the reader to imagine Athena and Hera standing in awe before the masterpiece.

Finally, we might consider Antipater’s choice to make Athena and Hera use μορφᾶς within the context of his imitative position. The epigram is itself also a reproduction of Leonidas’ reproduction of Apelles’ painting. The epigram’s meaning, in other words, is intrinsically linked to its writteness on the landscape of the bookroll, since a reader’s interpretation of the epigram is keyed to Antipater’s handling of Leonidas. While Leonidas primarily uses dialect to capture the aural realism of the painting’s location of display, Antipater uses dialect to reproduce the mental act of reading Leonidas’ epigram on the page of the bookroll. On this model, Antipater’s
Athena and Hera comment could be taken to not only address their appreciation of Apelles’ beautiful painting of Aphrodite, but also Antipater’s imitation of Leonidas’ epigram on Apelles’ beautiful painting of Aphrodite. The use of Doric μορφῆς, then, is doubly significant. The Doric color not only recalls the “beauty” of Apelles’ Coan Aphrodite, but also the “form” of Antipater’s imitation, which both engages with the Doric color found in its original and, more noticeably, transforms the model epigram’s metrical shape from trimeters to elegaics. In this context, Athena’s and Hera’s declaration that they will no longer enter into a competition regarding μορφή can also be read as a boastful declaration that Antipater’s imitation cannot be matched.

**Coming After I: Archias**

Antipater’s imitations inspired several younger contemporaries in the late second and early part of the first century BCE. To a certain Archias, possibly to be identified with the poet and improvisational versifier Archias of Antioch defended by Cicero, have been ascribed several poems that imitate Leonidas and Antipater of Sidon. Previous treatments of these imitations have noted Archias’ practice of borrowing diction and structural features from both models and

---

730 For this final point, I owe a debt of gratitude to the comments of Peter Bing.

731 The Greek Anthology transmits epigrams ascribed to five different poets that share the name of Archias: Archias of Mytilene, Archias of Byzantium, Archias of Macedonia, Archias the Younger, and Archias the Grammariian. It is almost certain, however, that some of these poets did not exist (such as Archias of Macedonia, see Stadtmüller and Law 1936, 228) or are an alternative names for another of the Archiai (Law 1936, 228 proposed Archias the Younger and Archias the Grammariian). In addition to these poems, there are another twenty-one simply ascribed to an Archias. Law 1936 and Gow and Page 1968, 2.432-35 have both attempted to distribute the epigrams transmitted under the name of Archias among the various poets. Law 1936, 236-37 argues that these imitations of Leonidas and Antipater of Sidon be ascribed to Archias of Byzantium, since the Corrector has ascribed one of these poems to the Byzantine (the lemma to Planudes has only Ἄρχιος). Gow and Page 1968, 2.435 and Gutzwiller 1998, 232 and n. 8 claim these epigrams are the work of Archias of Antioch, although Gutzwiller departs from the Gow and Page’s assumption that these these epigrams were included in Meleager’s Garland, since not one imitation can be securely placed in a Meleagrean sequence.
then combining them in the creation of his epigram.\footnote{For discussion of Archias’ method of imitation, see Law 1936, 233-35 and Gutzwiller 1989, 243-45, who describes the author as a “new stage in the art of variation”. Recently in an oral paper given at a conference on the language of Greek epigram in Thessaloniki, Giulio Massimilla examined the variation of ἀπὸ κοινὸς constructions begun by Leonidas in Archias’ sequence of imitations and later versions on the same theme.} In his contamination of earlier models, Archias also reveals a sensitivity to the use of dialect as a mode of reading that rivals that found in Antipater, who very likely inspired his younger contemporary from the East.\footnote{If we should identify this Archias with Archias of Antioch, Cicero speaks of the latter in similar terms to Antipater of Sidon (Pro Archia 18): Quoties ego hunc vidi, cum litteram scrisisset nullam, magnum numerum optimorum versuum de eis ipsius rebus, quae tum agrerentur, dicere ex tempore! Quoties revocatum eandem rem commutatis verbis atque sententias! Likely influenced by Cicero, Quintilian, in a discussion of improvisational versifiers, mentions Antipater and Archias in the same breath (10.7.19).} In Archias’ hands, as we shall see, dialect becomes a means of signaling from which model he adopted a certain word or phrase and, more broadly, how he understood his own position in the imitative series.\footnote{Law 1936, 233-35 and Gutzwiller 1998, 243-45 do not comment on dialect in their discussion of Archian imitations. The former (243) does, however, note the dialect mixture in a number of poems as another roadblock in establishing criteria to distinguish authorship between the various Archiai. Gow and Page 1968, 2.442 briefly note the mixture of Doric and Ionic forms transmitted by P in Archias GP 17=A.P. 7.147, another epitaph for Ajax.}

Archias’ four variations of the hunting-net dedications of Leonidas and Antipater of Sidon, perhaps inspired by Antipater’s own sequence of self-variations on Leonidas’ epigram on Myron’s Cow (G-P 88=A.P. 9.719), are exemplative of his creative combination of dialect in the close-reading of multiple models. I print the poems of Leonidas and Antipater, already discussed above, followed by the imitations of Archias.

οἱ τρισσοί τοι ταῦτα τὰ δίκτυα θήκαν ὁμαίμοι,
ἀγρότα Πάν, ἄλλης ἄλλος ἄπ’ ἀγρεσίας,
ὡν ἀπὸ μὲν πτανὸν Πήρης τάδε, ταῦτα δὲ Δᾶμις
tετραπόδων, Κλείτωρ δ’ ὁ τρίτος εἰναλίων.
ἀνθ’ ὄν τὸ μὲν πέμπει δἰ ἱέρος εὐστοχον ὄψην,
tὸ δὲ διὰ δρυμών, τὸ δὲ δἰ ἱέρων. (Leonidas G-P 46=A.P. 6.13)

P Pl° Sud. s.vv. ὁμαίμος et ἀγρεσία Kaibel Ep. Gr. 1104
3 πτανόν P: πτηνόν Pl

The three brothers dedicated these nets to you,
Pan the Hunter, each from a different chase;
Pigres these from the birds, Damis these from the beasts,
Kleitor, the third one, from the fish.
In return for these send a successful hunt through the air,
Through the woods, and through the waters.

Πανὶ τάδ’ αὖθαμοι τρισσοὶ θέσαν ἄρμενα τέχνας·
Δάμις μὲν θηρῶν ἄρκνον ὅρειονόμοιον,
Κλείτωρ δὲ πλωτῶν τάδε δίκτυα, τόν δὲ πετανόν
ἀρηκτὸν Πύρης τάνδε δεραιοσέδην.
τὸν μὲν γὰρ ξυλόχον, τὸν δ’ ἧρος, δὴ ἀπὸ λίμνης
οὐ ποτὲ σὺν κενείς οἰκὸς ἔδεκτο λίνοις. (Antipater 1 G-P=AP 6.14)

Three brothers dedicated these tools of the trade to Pan:
Damis a net for mountain-ranging beasts,
Kleitor lattice nets for fish, and Pigres this unbreakable
net, a collar for birds.
Not once did their household received them with empty nets,
the one from the thickets, the second from the air, and the third from the sea.

Σοὶ τάδε, Πάνε σκοπήτα, παναίλα δῶρα σύναιμοι
τρίζυγες ἐκ τρισσῆς θέντο λινοστασίης,
δίκτυα μὲν Δάμις θηρῶν, Πύρης δὲ πετηνῶν
λαμιστάδες, Κλείτωρ δ’ εἰναλίφοιτα λίνα.
όν τὸν μὲν καὶ ἐσαύδης ἐν ἡρόν, τὸν δ’ ἐπὶ θείης
εὐστοχον ἐν πόντῳ, τὸν δὲ κατὰ δρυόχους. (Archias GP 4=A.P. 6.16)

To you, uplands Pan, these manifold gifts did the kinsmen
dedicate, three from three types of net hunt,
Damis nets for catching beasts, Pigres nooses for fowl,
Kleitor cast-nets that roam over the sea.
Grant again that the one be successful in the air,
another on the sea, and the third among the underbrush.

Ἀγραῦλῳ τάδε Πανὶ βιορκέος ἄλλος ἀπ’ ἄλλης
αὖθαμοι τρισσοὶ δῶρα λινοστασίης.
Πύρης μὲν δειραξές εὐβροχον ἄμμα πετανόν,735
Δάμις δ’ ὕλονόμοιον δίκτυα τετραπόδων,
ἄρκνον δ’ εἰναλίων Κλείτωρ πόρεν· οἷς σὺ δ’ αἱθράς

735 Gow and Page print πετηνῶν (Pl=Sud Ἐμακ).
καὶ πελάγες καὶ γᾶς εὐστοχα πέμπε λίνα. (Archias GP 5 = A.P. 6.179)

To rustic Pan, these gifts three kinsmen dedicated, each one from a different life-giving net-hunting, Pigres the heavy, neatly knotted noose for birds, Damis the nets for wood-dwelling beasts, Kleitor the reticulated net for the fish; to them deliver successful hunts through the air, sea, and land.

Ταῦτα σοι ἐκ τ' ὄρεων ἐκ τ' αἰθέρος ἐκ τε θαλάσσας τρεῖς γνωτοὶ τέχνας σύμβολα, Πάν, ἔθεσαν ταῦτα μὲν εἰναλίων Κλείτωρ λίνα, κεῖνα δὲ Πήγρης οἰκονόμον. Δάμις τὰ τρίτα τετραπόδων οἰς ἀμα χερσαισιν, ἂμ' ἡρήσισαι ἐν ἀγραῖς, ἀγρεῦ, ἂμ' ἐν πλωταῖς, ὡς πρὶν, ἄρωγος ἤθε. (Archias GP 6 = A.P. 6.180)

From the mountains, sky, and sea, these tokens of their skill three brothers, Pan, dedicated to you; Kleitor these nets for fish, Pigres those for birds Damis a third type for beasts; Be, as you were before, their guide, Hunter, in hunts on land, air, and sea.

Τρίζυγες, οὐρεσίωτε, κασίγνητοι τάδε τέχνας ἀλλος ἄπ' ἀλλοίας σοι ταῦτα, Πάν, ἔθεσαν καὶ τὰ μὲν ὄρνυθων Πήγρης, τὰ δὲ δίκτυα θηρῶν Δάμις, ὃ δὲ Κλείτωρ εἰναλίων ἔπορεν. τῶν ὁ μὲν ἐν εὐλόγοις, ὁ δὲ ἡρήσις ἐν ἀγραῖς αἰέν, ὁ δ' ἐν πελάγει εἰστοχον ἄρκον ἔχοι. (Archias GP 7 = A.P. 6.181)

Three brothers dedicated to you, mountain-dwelling Pan, these gifts, each one from a different skill Pigres nets for birds, Damis nets for beasts, Kleitor nets for fish; Of the three, may the one gain success at the hunt in the brambles, the other in the air, and the third on the sea.

736 Page prints πελάγεσσ'.

313
In this series of epigrams, Archias displays a studied ability to balance internal variation of his own versions of the dedication with the reuse of diction and phrasing from his two models. It has been observed, for example, that Antipater achieves variety in his sequence by using four different words for brother (αὐθαίμοι, σύναμοι, γνωτοί, and κασίγνητοι) and shuffling the order of the dedications. In *GP* 7 Archias retains the order found in Leonidas, the original model, and elsewhere he appropriates the language of Leonidas and Antipater, e.g. ἀλλος ἄπ’ ἄλλης (*GP* 5.1=A.P. 6.179.1)≈ ἄλλης ἀλλος ἄπ’ (Leonidas G-P 46.2=A.P. 6.13.2) or εὐστοχα...λίνα (*GP* 5.6=A.P. 6.179.6) from εὐστοχον (Leonidas G-P 46.5=A.P. 6.13.5) and λίνος (Antipater G-P 1.6=A.P. 6.14.6).

These patterns of variation also reveal themselves in Archias’ dialect choice. In terms of internal repetition and variation, note the repetition of Ionic λινοστασίης in the same pentameter-end position in *GP* 4.2=A.P. 6.16.2 and *GP* 5.2=A.P. 6.179.2. λινοστασία is a rare word and appears in previous literature only at Leonidas G-P 12=A.P. 7.448 and Antipater of Thessalonica *GP* 30=A.P. 9.76, a poem that should be assigned to the Sidonian. In addition to possibly evoking its use in other epigrams of Archias’ two models, λινοστασίς adds further precision, almost akin to a gloss, to Ionic ἄγρεσίς in Leonidas G-P 46.2=A.P. 6.13.2 in whose metrical sedes it stands in the imitations. Similarly, *GP* 4.5=A.P. 6.16.5 (ἡέρι), *GP* 6.5=A.P. 6.180.6 (ἡερίησιν) and *GP* 7.5=A.P. 6.181.5 (ἡερίησιν) each contain a form of the epic-Ionic ἴερ present

---

737 Gutzwiller 1998, 244:
*GP* 4: Damis—Pigres—Kleitor
*GP* 5: Pigres—Damis—Kleitor
*GP* 6: Kleitor—Pigres—Damis
*GP* 7: Pigres—Damis—Kleitor

738 Gutzwiller 1998, 243-45 with further examples and discussion.

739 On the ascription of this epigram to Antipater of Sidon, see Argentieri 2003, 128-29.
in the poems of Leonidas (Ἡρός) and Antipater (Ἀρμένα), and in each instance the form appears in roughly the same metrical position in the final hexameter of the epigram.\footnote{There are other significant dialect variations possibly present in Archias, but disagreements between the manuscripts hinder our certainty about the exact distribution of dialect forms. In one instance a pattern of dialect variance can be glimpsed, namely the forms of τηνός in Leonidas G-P 46.3=A.P. 6.13.3, Antipater G-P 1.3=A.P. 6.14.3, and Archias GP 4.3=A.P. 6.16 and GP 5.3=A.P. 6.179.3. Above I discussed the Doric πτανον (πηνόν Pl) in Leonidas G-P 46, which as the only Doric form transmitted by either witness in the epigram is the lectio difficilior and thus slightly more likely to be original to the text, in relation to the mixed tradition of Antipater G-P 1 (πτανον C: πτηνάν PSud, πετεινάν PI). I provisionally printed the reading of C. In Archias GP 4 (πτηνόν Pl: πτηνόν PlSud) and GP 5 (πτανον Pl: πτηνάν PlSud) we find a similar variance in the readings of P to the poems of Leonidas and Antipater, except in this instance the Attic-Ionic and Doric forms appear in dialect contexts that better accommodate these forms. Although an exact picture of the dialect color of the word in each imitation is not available, it is apparent that the variance is part of the imitative project of at least some of the epigrammatists.}

In GP 6.2 (τέχνας σύμβολα) Archias guides the reader to the poem of Antipater, in particular, and in doing so engages with the epigonal position of his epigrams. The introduction of Doric τέχνας (G-P 1.1: ἄρμενα τέχνας) was an innovation of Antipater and one that, I argued, was meant to recall a quirk of Leonidean diction. With τέχνας σύμβολα Archias almost certainly takes up Antipater’s periphrasis for Leonidas’ τὰ δίκτυα, here achieving further variety through the substitution of σύμβολα for ἄρμενα and the reversal of the structure of the phrase.\footnote{I print, along with Gow and Page, P’s reading of τέχνας (τέχνης Pl). The repetition of the dialect form lends further support to retaining τέχνας in Antipater G-P 1. While the reading of Pl is almost certainly a regularization, such a reversal of the dialect of Antipater coupled with Archias’ substitution of σύμβολα for ἄρμενα would not significantly detract from my overall point in this reading.} The choice of σύμβολα is significant in its own right, since it demonstrates an understanding on the part of Archias of his position in the process of replication. As I noted above, Antipater’s use of the less precise ἄρμενα for δίκτυα pointed to the imitative position of the epigram, since those who recognize the line as an imitation already know the dedicated objects are going to be nets. Archias takes this acknowledgement of the distance between model and imitation a step further in his substitution of σύμβολα (“token”—in other words a (linguistic) placeholder for another item, in this case Antipater’s ἄρμενα (“implements”), which is more contextually appropriate.

Archias wrote himself into another imitative sequence of Leonidas and Antipater of Sidon, this time combining the original poems and the earlier imitation into a single epigram.
Through his imitation of the dedications to Athena of weaving implements by groups of women, Archias again offers us a clue to his reception of dialectal usage in his models, especially as it relates to the convention of dialect as a marker of ethnic identity. I reprint the poems of Leonidas and Antipater and then the imitation of Archias.

Aí Λυκομήδεως παῖδες Ἀθηνώ καὶ Μελίτεια
καὶ Φιντὸ Γληνίς θ’, αἱ φιλοεργόταται,
ἐργαν ἐκ δεκάταις πολυτώμας τοῦ τε πρόσεργον
ἀτρακτὸν καὶ τὰν ἀτρία κρίναμέναν
κερκίδα, τὰν ἵδιον μολτάτιδα, καὶ τὰ τροχαία
πανία ἱκερταστάς τούσδε ποτηράγεας‡,
καὶ σπάθας εὐβρήθεις ἵππολυγύρα τῶς δῆ‡ πενιχραὶ
εἰς ὀλίγων ὀλίγην, ἑοίραν ἀπαρχόμεθα.
τῶν χέρας αἰέν, Ἀθάνα, ἐπιπλῆσαις μὲν ὀπίσσων,
θείς δ’ εὐσπύωις ἐξ ὀλιγισπύων. (Leonidas G-P 41=AP 6.288)

We the industrious daughters of Lycomedes, Atheno and Meliteia and Phinto and Glenis, destitute, offer as a tithe from our work these welcome gifts, the laborious spindle and the shuttle that passes between the thread of the warp, the songstress of the loom, and the spinning spools…..and wool-laden blades…a little portion from our meager holdings.

Ever after, Athena, fill our hands, and render us rich in bread out of our current poverty.

Ἀὐτονόμια, Μελίτεια, Βοΐσκιον, αἱ Φιλολάδεω
καὶ Νικοῦς Κρήσσαι τρεῖς, ἐξεν, θυγατέρες,
ἀ μὲν τὸν μιτοεργὸν ἀξιολίνητον ἄτρακτον,
ἀ δὲ τὸν ὀρφνίταν ἐφροκόμου τάλαρον,
ἀ δ’ ἁμὰ τὰν λεπτὸν εὐάρητα ἐργάτιν ἵδιον
κερκίδα, τὰν λεχέων Πανελόπας φύλακα,
δῶρον Ἀθαναία Πανίτιδι τῷ ἐνὶ ναῷ
θῆκαν, Ἀθαναίας παυσάμεναι καμάτων. (Leonidas G-P 42=AP 6.289)

Gow and Page print Meineke’s ὀλίγην (P: ὀλίγην), an attempt to make the dialect usage uniform.

I print Stadtmüller’s metrically required emendation of C’s ἴσος.
Autonoma, Meliteia, Boiskion, the three Cretan daughters of Philolaides and Nico, stranger,—the first the thread making, ever whirling spindle, the second the dark wool basket, the third the shuttle of the loom, the well weaving worker of the delicate warp, the guard of Penelope’s marriage bed—dedicated these things as gifts to Weaver Athena in her temple, having retired from the labors of Athena.

Pallas Athena received as dedications from three age-mates, who knew how to fashion a delicate web as well as a spider, Demo a well-plaited basket, Arsinoe a distaff, the workwoman of well-spun thread, and Bachulis a well-made shuttle, the nightingale among weavers, with which she parted the finely woven threads. For each of them wished to live free from every reproach, stranger, gaining their livelihood from their hands.

Satyre, Heracleia, and Euphro, the three daughters of Xouthos and Melite, Samians—the first a spindle, ever-whirling handmaid of spider web’s thread, not without a long distaff,
the second a loud-sounding shuttle, conscious of the close-woven cloth,  
the third a basket that delights in wool—  
your laborers dedicated these items to you, queen.

On the whole Archias, who echoes the diction and structural elements found in Leonidas and Antipater, follows the dialect of his models. Doric Ἀθάνα in line 7 echoes the color of the deity’s name in the two poems of Leonidas (cf. G-P 41.9= A.P. 6.288.9: Ἀθάνα; G-P 42.7-8= A.P. 6.289.7-8: Ἀθαναία...Ἀθαναίας) and ἀλακάτας in line four recalls ἣλακάταν in the same line and metrical sedes in Antipater. Particularly notable is Archias’ adoption, with a slight variation in position, of the repeated use of the Doric feminine nominative article to reference the three sisters. Yet what is most striking about Archias’ reading of the dialect practices of his two models has to do with the ethnic he uses for his sister-weavers. Instead of borrowing the Cretan designation of Leonidas, Archias apparently innovates in making his dedicators Samian. As we noted in our discussion of Asclepiades, Samians traditionally spoke a version of Ionic, and so a Doric tinged dedication would not be in accord with any linguistic reality. It is possible that Archias may not have interpreted the use of Doric in Leonidas as an evocation of epigraphic convention and the dedicators’ Cretan identity. Perhaps by the first century BCE the association between dialect and place was beginning to weaken and the dialect was used purely to reference his chain of models. The decline in dialect inscriptions Bubeník has found in most parts of the Doric-speaking Greek world, for example, support a general reduction of dialect use by this period. Despite this observable socio-linguistic trend, Meleager’s use of Doric to signal the Coan context of his self-epitaphs and a sequence of erotic epigrams on likely Coan lovers and the

744 Perhaps we should entertain an emendation to ἠλακάταν.
745 See Bubenik 1989, 73-134 with statistics for linguistic change from Doric to koine from the Hellenistic to Roman periods.
continued use of dialect to mark certain ethnicities, especially Spartan, into the imperial period are evidence for the continued association between dialect and place in a poetic sphere.\footnote{On the association between Doric and Coan setting/identity, see Gutzwiller 2014, 77-90. For evidence of the continued use of dialect as a marker of ethnic identity in imperial Greek epigram, see my discussion of the phenomenon in my afterword to the dissertation (348-57).}

A more likely scenario, in my opinion, is that Archias recognized the association between dialect and place in the Leonidean model. Note how the first couplet, whose content most closely recalls its models, contains dialectal features that make retrospective sense when we learn at the end of the pentameter of the sisters’ Samian origins. To follow Σάµιαι immediately with a Doric article, which again recalls the Leonidean model, would draw further attention to the dialect as a marker of the literary tradition in which Archias operates. On a broader level, the contrast between the identity of the sister-weavers and dialect may offer comment on the fictionality of book epigram, especially in a sequence of artistic imitations, in contrast to the reality of inscriptive practice.

**Coming After II: Amyntas and Archias on Prexo**

Archias was not, of course, the only epigrammatist to place himself in relation to the imitative process of Antipater. \textit{P.Oxy.} 662, a papyrus dated by Grenfell and Hunt to the reign of Augustus,\footnote{Grenfell and Hunt 1904, 64.} contains a sequence of epigrams that is organized, in part, on the variation of a theme. The papyrus, comprising three columns, preserves parts of seven epigrams.\footnote{In addition to the three epigrams on Samian Prexo, there then follows another epigram by Amyntas on Philopoemen and two dedicatory epigrams for a certain Glenis by Leonidas (G-P 51) and Antipater (G-P 48), both of which are not transmitted in the \textit{Greek Anthology}.} Out of these epigrams two are known from the \textit{Greek Anthology}. They are Leonidas G-P 70=A.P. 7.163
and Antipater of Sidon G-P 21=A.P. 7.164,\textsuperscript{749} both epitaphs for Prexo of Samos.\textsuperscript{750} The imitation of Antipater follows Leonidas’ model epigram. Immediately following Antipater is a third version of the epigram by a certain Amyntas, who may have been included in Meleager’s \textit{Garland}, thus dating his floruit to the early first century at the latest, if we adopt C’s correction to the ascription of Samius G-P 2=A.P. 6.114 a poem which is solidly in a Meleagrean sequence.\textsuperscript{751}

Whatever Amyntas’ exact dates, the positioning of the epigram in the sequence and its variation of Antipater, most noticeably in the age of the deceased from Antipater’s δισσάκις ἑδεκέτις (“twice-eleven”)—which varies Leonidas’ simple δύο κεῖκοσιν—to ἐπταέτις τρις ἕνος (“three times seven plus one”), demonstrates Amyntas’ imitative position.\textsuperscript{752} In addition to the imitations of Antipater and Amyntas preserved in sequence on the papyrus, a third version of the epigram exists, transmitted in the \textit{Greek Anthology} under the name of Archias (\textit{GP} 13=A.P. 7.165), who is almost certainly to be identified with Archias of Antioch.\textsuperscript{753}

Our understanding of the use of dialect in the imitative sequence of Leonidas’ epitaph is complicated by disagreements between the textual witnesses to Antipater’s version, which then acted as a partial model for both Amyntas and Archias. \textit{P.Oxy}. 662 preserves only the right third of the epigram, leaving between five and eighteen letters visible. Despite the incomplete state of

\textsuperscript{749} Stadtmüller has assigned the authorship of \textit{A.P.} 7.164 to Archias to whom the following epigram (\textit{A.P.} 7.165: τοῖο ὁμοῦ οἱ δὲ Ἀρχίου) is ascribed and made Antipater the author of \textit{A.P.} 7.165 instead. The argument for authorial reassignment is based, in part, on the use of a trochaic hiatus (l.9: ἔλθοι ἐς), which Antipater generally avoids (cf. Susemihl 1892, 559). Law 1936, 235 endorses the reassignment of \textit{A.P.} 7.164 and 165 to Archias and Antipater, claiming that 7.164 “shows a much closer dependence on 165 [now Antipater] than on 163 [Leonidas G-P 70].” I do not find the metrical or stylistic arguments very convincing and follow the ascriptions given in the lemmata of the \textit{Greek Anthology}. Gow and Page 1968, 2.441 correctly retain the ascription to Archias, commenting that the “epigram is very closely related to Antipater of Sidon 7.164=XXI and Leonidas 7.163=LXX.”

\textsuperscript{750} The papyrus only preserves the line ends of Leonidas G-P 70 and presents no dialectal differences between the text transmitted in the manuscript tradition. On the dialect of Antipater’s imitation, which is similarly only partially preserved, see the discussion below.


\textsuperscript{752} Gutzwiller 1998, 35.

\textsuperscript{753} Garulli 2012a, 130 offers a helpful chart to compare the imitations and variations of diction and phrasing across the four poems with discussion on 131-32.
Where P transmits Ionic and Attic-Ionic forms, we find Doric in the papyri. For ease of comparison I print the version of Antipater’s text preserved in P and then the fragments of

*P.Oxy. 662*

Tell, woman, your family, name, and land—My father is Kalliteles, Prexo the name, and Samos my homeland—Who set up this tomb?—Theocritos the one who loosened the knot of our maidenhood (FIX)—How did you die?—In painful childbirth.—Tell me how old were you.—Twice eleven.—No children?—No, stranger: I’ve left behind the toddler Kalliteles, three years old and still helpless.—May he, blessed, grow old and grey.—And so, passerby, may Fate guide straight, in every way, your life.

[Φράξε, γυναι, γενεήν, ὄνομα, χθόνα.—Καλλιτέλης μὲν ὁ σπείρας, Πρηξῶ δ’ ὄνυμα, γῆ δὲ Σάμος.—σάμα δὲ τὸ τόδ’ ἐχωςε;—Θεόκριτος ὁ πρὶν ἄθικτα ἀμετέρας λύσας ἁμματα παρθενίς.—πῶς δὲ θάνες;—λοχίοισιν ἐν ἄγγεσιν.—εἶπε δὲ ποίην ἦλθες εἰς ἡλικίην.—δισσάκεις ἐνδεκέτις.—ἡ καὶ ἀπαίς;—οὖ, ξείνε· λέλουτα γὰρ ἐν νεότητι Καλλιτέλῃ, τριετὶ παιδ’ ἔτι νηπίαχον.—ἔλθοι εἰς ὁβλιστὴν πολιήν τρίχα.—καὶ σόν, οὐδίτα, οὐριον ἵθυνοι πάντα Τύχη βιότον. (Antipater G-P 21=A.P. 7.164)
While παρθενία and ποίαν are dialectally ambiguous between Doric and Attic, νεώτατι can only be Doric. Coupled with the presence of further Doric forms in the P’s version of the text, we are justified, in my view, in treating these two forms as Doric rather than Attic. παρθενία is not compatible with the syntax of the line and the accusative ending was likely influenced by the presence of ποίαν directly below. It is impossible to say whether παρθενίας (P) or παρθενίας was the form before the eye of the copyist, whom Grenfell and Hunt described as a “careless and unintelligent person,” although a shared alpha between the endings of this word and ποίαν may better explain the copying error. Additional support for a reading of παρθενίας may be found in Meleager’s παρθενίας ἀμματα in G-P 123=A.P. 7.182, on a certain Clearista who died on her bridal night, which plainly echoes this line.

On the other hand, there also exists some support for possibly suspecting an increased level of Ionic color in Antipater’s imitation. An undated inscribed epitaph for a certain Elate from Philomelion in Phrygia (SGO III 16/55/03=CIG III 3982) is a witness to the later reception and reuse of the Antipater’s poem. The sixteen-line epitaph draws heavily from Antipater, copying, most notably, its incipit. The inscription also reuses other phrases involved in our question of dialect color. It preserves σῆμα δὲ [τίς] τὸ[δ᾽ ἐκοσ]εν, ἡμιτέρης λύσας{ας} ἀμματα παρθενίας, and λέλοιπα γὰρ ἐν νεώτητι. We do not know how the composer of this epitaph came to know the text of Antipater, if indeed he knew the text as the work of Antipater in the first place. Subsequently it is impossible to say if the dialect color was a choice of the composer of the inscribed epigram or represented, for example, the form of the phrases as they appeared in

754 Grenfell and Hunt 1904, 64.
755 Merkelbach and Stauer 1998–2004, the most recent editors of the epigram, present a marked up version of Antipater’s epigram that helpfully displays all of the language borrowed by the composer of Elate’s epitaph.
a copybook. It is too speculative to emend the text of Antipater on the basis of an inscriptionsal imitation, and I am very hesitant to correct the Doric in P since (among several reasons) it is more difficult to explain how such a variance would have entered the manuscript tradition than to explain a process of Ionic regularization of Doric forms in the context of inscriptionsal reuse. Whatever the case, Elate’s epitaph is a fascinating witness to the exchange between book and inscribed epigram.

The differences between P and the papyrus led Page to suggest in the apparatus criticus to his later OCT edition of the epigram that the entirety might have been originally Doric. Yet P and the papyrus both transmit Attic-Ionic γη in line two. While the poem is not included in Pl, C does not anywhere intervene into the mixed dialect color of the poem. This fact does not, of course, mean the copy of P is without error; indeed the witness of the papyrus, especially with νεότατι, suggests a variance in the textual tradition, although it is unclear whether that variance is a result of scribal error on the part of P or the copyist of P.Oxy. 662 or the circulation of different versions of the same epigram (a possibility also raised by SGO III 16/55/03). With that said, I take the conservative approach and follow the version of P, while recognizing there may have been several more Doric forms present in the original. I do not think, however, that there is any suggestive evidence that the whole epigram was in Doric; rather I believe that dialect mixture was a purposeful part of Antipater’s imitation, and the variations of Archias and Amyntas will bear this supposition out.

Leonidas’ epitaph for Prexo, as I have already argued, used its Ionic coloring, including the use of phonological features drawn from contemporary speech and inscriptions, to evoke the

---

756 On the relationship between dialect transmission in inscribed and book versions of epigrams, see Kazcko 2009, who has demonstrated the incorporation of dialectal variance in book epigram versions of Archaic and Classical epigrams also attested on stone. Is it possible here we an antipode with a dialectally mixed epigram becoming more regularized when reused for inscription?

757 On this topic, see Bettenworth 2007 and the recent work of Valentina Garulli, especially Garulli 2012a, 221-388.
native speech of the deceased, thus increasing the pathos for the loss of a young mother and wife. The opening couplet of Antipater’s imitation, as transmitted in both P and the papyrus, retains the ionicizing color of the original. The unidentified passerby uses the Ionic γενεήν in his opening address to the deceased to provide him with the standard information—family, name, and city—communicated by an epitaph, thus condensing the entire first couplet of his model. Prexo’s response takes up the rest of the couplet and includes dialect features appropriate to her origins in Samos (Πρηξώ; οὖνομα; γῆ). So far Antipater has used phrasing and dialect to make his reliance on Leonidas plain. In the next couplet, however, the dialect shifts to Doric beginning with hexameter-initial σάμα. Doric forms appear in the speech of both the passerby and Samian Prexo and, if we follow P over the papyrus, are intermixed with some Ionic features (παρθενίης; ποίην; ἥλικήν; νεότητι). As the text currently stands, there is no discernable pattern to the variation, such as between different speakers, like we find in Meleager’s dialogic epitaph for Heraclitus (G-P 121=A.P. 7.79). Nevertheless, despite the absence of a simple division of dialect variance, the shift in dialect is striking, especially for a reader familiar with the poem of Leonidas. Accordingly, I do not believe the state of the text’s transmission is a complete interpretive morass.

Indeed, I want to consider one possible literary effect that may be present among the noise of the dialectal variance. Antipater does write the majority of his epigrams in Doric and so his decision to switch from the Ionic of the first couplet, where he signals his relationship to Leonidas, could be read as a linguistic marker of the variety he brings to his imitation. Such variety is found in his studied substitution of synonyms, such as ἄπαις for ἄτεκνος or the periphrasis σάμα...τόδ᾽ ἔχοσε for κτερέιξε. The absence of the contraction of the diphthong εο to ευ, a hallmark of Leonidas’ epigram and form that is ambiguously Ionic or Doric, may well
further demonstrate that Antipater chose to switch dialect as means of declaring his independence from his model. Ultimately, however, the full expressive power of the epigram’s use of dialect is likely lost to the vagaries of its textual transmission.

Although it remains unclear precisely how the dialect mixture in the imitation of Antipater operated in relation to his reading of the model text, the imitations of Archias and Amyntas, which combine aspects from the two previous versions, offer evidence that dialect variance did exist between the poems of Leonidas and Antipater and that this variance was a significant feature in these two authors’ later reading and reception of their model texts.

Tell, woman, who you are and where you are from, and report the name of your father and from what terrible illness you died.—

My name is Prexo from Samos, stranger, and I was the offspring of Kalliteles, but I died in childbirth.—

Who erected your grave?—Theocritos, to whom my parents gave me as a bed-mate.—How old were you?—

I was three times seven plus one—No children, then?—

No, I’ve left behind a three year-old at home.

Speak, woman, who you are.—Prexo.—Who is your father?—
Kalliteles.—From what land do you hail?—Samos.—
Who erected your tomb?—Theocritos, who took me in marriage.—
How were you overcome? In the pains of childbirth.—
How old were you?—Twice eleven.—Did you leave behind a child?—
Kalliteles, a toddler of three years.—
May he reach the end of life in adulthood.—And may Fate grant
a pleasant end, passerby, to your life.

While Amyntas and Archias, as we shall see, knew the poems of Leonidas and Anti­pater, there is
little evidence to suggest that either knew or directly imitated the poem of the other. The only
intimation is the close correspondence between Amyntas’ Θεόκριτος, ὧ με σύνευνον | ἀνδρὶ
δόσαν and Archias’ Θεόκριτος, ὡς με σύνευνον | ἡγετο, both of which have their inspiration in
Leonidas’ Θεόκριτος, ὧ με γοηνες ἔξεδοσαν, and here it is difficult to ascertain which would be
the imitation. Amyntas presents a higher degree of variance between Doric forms (restricted to
α/η interchanges) and Ionic forms with diagnostically Ionic forms outnumbering their Doric
counterparts by a 9-5 margin. Archias presents two Doric forms to one Ionic form. Another form,
the feminine present active participle εὐσα, could be evaluated as either Ionic or Doric in this
mixed context.

Amyntas and Archias look both to Leonidas and Anti­pater for their dialect. Amyntas
replicates the οὖνομα and ἡλικίην in Anti­pater, and possibly ποίην (and so the entire phrase
ποίην δ’ ἡλθες ἐς ἡλικίην) if we follow the reading of P. The Ionic color of Amyntas’ epigram
also derives from Leonidas, namely in γονηος imitating Leonidas’ γονής (G-P 70.3-4:
Θεόκριτος, ὧ με γοηνες | ἔξεδοσαν). His use of Doric, however, does not have a precedent in the
surviving examples, beyond generally echoing the dialect variance within Anti­pater’s poem or
between the two models. Archias takes inspiration for the Doric color of specific words from
both models. μνάμα plainly substitutes for Anti­pater’s σάμα, appearing in the same line and
metrical sedes. πάτρας, however, does not have a clear dialectal antecedent. In the case of the
dialectally ambiguous εὑσα (Ionic/Doric), its appearance at line five in εἶν ἓτεσιν τίσιν εὑσα, whatever the exact interpretation of the dialect (see below), clearly evokes Leonidas’ εὑσα πόσων ἓτεων (1.5) in the same position in both poems.

In both epigrams we can discern a possible pattern to the distribution of the various dialect forms. As transmitted, the Doric forms in Archias’ epigram appear only in the speech of the unidentified passerby. The use of Doric in the speech of the passerby may have been designed to highlight Prexo’s burial abroad, a suggestion raised in Leonidas. By making the passerby speak in the dialect foreign to the Samian Prexo, Archias may well use dialect to direct a reader to his reception of the imagined context of the Leonidean model. And yet, the use of Doric does not persist in the voice of the passerby through the entirety of the epigram. The distribution of (possibly) Doric forms is limited to the first-half of the epigram, although the word choice in the poem’s second-half reduces the opportunity for Doricisms. It could be that as the passerby comes to know more about Prexo and to feel a sense of empathy for her passing, he expresses his identity with her plight by slowly adopting the color of her speech, first with the ambiguous Doric/Ionic εὑσα, which Leonidas prominently employed as a marker of Prexo’s Samian speech, and then again with ξωῆς at line seven. Such meaningful shifts in the dialect color of an unidentified passerby are not unheard of: in Meleager’s epitaph for the Ephesian philosopher Heraclitus (Meleager G-P 121=A.P. 7.79) it has been observed that the passerby

758 μνάμα in line three is the only unambiguous Doric form, but given the distribution a number of ambiguously Doric forms in of the passerby’s lines it is plausible that a reader could have understood them as Doric as well: πάτρας (2); ἐσσί (2); εὑσα (5).

759 Should the pattern have continued in the second-half of the epigram, one might expect to find ξωῆς at line seven rather than ζωῆς.

760 ἀνδρας. Ἡράκλειτος ἐγὼ σοφὰ μοῦνος ἄνεφρον. —φομί. τὰ δ ἐς πάτραν κρέσσον καὶ σοφῆς. λάξ γάρ καὶ τοκέωνας—,—ιδ ἐξένε, δόξαίρες αὐτός
λόκτενος,—χαῖρε. ἀνθρώπινα ἑρεσμένοις χάρις.
—οὐκ ἂπ ἐμὲ;—μὴ τρηγύς. ἐπει τάχα καὶ σφί τι πεύση
τρηγύτερον πάτρας. χάρις.—σῦ δ ἐς Ἐφέσου.
slowly shifts from Doric (l. 2: φάµι and πάτραν) to Ionic (l.5-6: τρηχύς and τρηχύτερον) over the course of his taunting exchange with the dead philosopher, ultimately revealing—to both Heraclitus and the reader—his identity as a rabble-rousing Ephesian. On this reading, then, the ambiguity of εὗσα could be part of the form’s appeal. The form appears in portion of the dialogue immediately following the revelation that Prexo died in childbirth, a most mournful event, and from this point forward no other Doric features appear.

In Amyntas’ version of the epitaph, the majority of Doric forms appear in the voice of Prexo, a choice, if original to the epigram, that runs counter to dialectal conventions. When Prexo first speaks at line three she gives her name with its Doric vocalism (Πράξω) while at the same time bracketing it with two Ionic forms (οὔνοµα and Σαµή) fitting to her linguistic origins. This contrastive pattern continues from the end of line three into line four, where Prexo relates the identity of her father: ἐκ δὲ γονής | Καλλιτέλευς γενόµαν. Here Ionic shades slowly into Doric. Amyntas begins the line with Ionic reminiscence from Leonidas (γονῆς), continues with Καλλιτέλευς, whose genitive contract is shared by both Ionic and Doric, and concludes with the Doric γενόµαν (repeated again at l.7; cf. l.8 λιπόµαν). In the remainder of the exchange, Prexo continues with Doric color where possible in the first-person verbs γενόµαν and λιπόµαν.

While the dialect mixture in the speech of Prexo, as well as the passerby (e.g. l.1-2: Φράζε, γύναι, τίς ἐσάκα κ[α]ί ἐκ τίνος, εἰπὲ τε πάτρην, | καὶ ποίας ἔθανες νοῦσου ὑπ᾽ ἁγαλέης), may well be the product of the epigram’s transmission and transcription on to the papyrus, I believe that the patterns of dialect variance present justify approaching the dialect as part of

---

1 Ἡράκλειτος Gutzwiller: Ἡράκλειτος P 2 κρέσσωνα C: κρέςσωνα P 3 τοκέωνας, ιδ Headlam: τοκέων ἄσιοι P 5 ἀπ᾽ ἐµέδ C: ἀτοµεῦ P
("O man, I am Heraclitus who alone discovered precepts. —I agree, but those things regarding the fatherland are better even than wisdom, for since kicking your parents—. Now stranger, I barked at malignant men.—the favor given to the ones who nurtured you is clear.—You'll get none from me!—Don't be rough, since soon you may learn something rougher than your fatherland. Farewell.—You are from Ephesus, afterall.")

761 Gutzwiller 2014, 92-94.
Amyntas’ presentation of his imitation. The Doric-Ionic variance in the initial quatrain is confounding at first, where strings of Ionic forms are interrupted by a flash of Doric, most noticeably in the unexpected doricization of Samian Prexo’s name at line three. As if in recognition of this striking pattern of variance, Amyntas draws the process of mixture out in the slower shading from γονήος to Καλλίτελευς and then γενόμαν pointed out above. With Doric γενόμαν—Prexo’s expression of her being and lineage—the Doric-Ionic variance in her voice (and that of the passerby) comes to an abrupt halt. In the second-half of the epigram Prexo speaks only in Doric (γενόμαν…ληπόμαν). It is tempting to read Prexo as undergoing some sort of identity transformation over the course of the dialogue with the passerby. We know nothing of Amyntas beyond the scraps of a few epigrams surviving on this papyrus, so it is difficult to say with any certainty if Prexo’s switching from Ionic to Doric speech is related to the identity of the poet behind the epigram—some sort of channeling of Samian Prexo by a Doric-speaking author. Indeed, I rather believe the choice of dialect had little to do with the identity of Amyntas. As we have already seen with Antipater and Archias dialect adoption and inversion is a means of expressing reception of a model poem.

Reception is also at play in the dialect variance present here. By the time Amyntas wrote this epigram, Leonidas’ Prexo epigram had become a sort of epitaphic archetype, engendering a slew of close imitations and influencing the structure and language of inscribed epitaphs for other, real deceased women. Through the explicit contrasting of Doric and Ionic in the speech of both the passerby and Prexo in the first quatrain, Amyntas could be plausibly referencing the dialect change which the epigram had already undergone in its previous imitations (Leonidas, Antipater, and possibly Archias)—indeed the dialect shading in lines three to four is a sort of guide to the process. That Prexo, then, “emerges” as a Doric speaker in the second half of the
epigram is Amyntas’ contribution to the chain of imitations: where Prexo began as a proper Ionic-speaking Samian in Leonidas she is now, after a chain of inventive imitative experiments with dialect, now completely transformed into a Doric-speaking Samian, laying bare her development into a cypher for literary commentary. Amyntas’ dialect choices, in other words, chart the reception and recreation of Leonidas’ epigram across the centuries.

Poetic and Editorial Receptions of Dialect in Meleager

In both his role as poet and editor, Meleager offers a final example that allows us to examine the way in which dialect is used as a device to express one’s reading and reception of a model poem. Given what we know of Meleager’s engagement with and management of the epigrammatic tradition, it is natural to explore how the poet uses dialect in his capacity as reader, imitator, and editor. Meleager’s use of dialect as a literary device in his own poetry has recently been examined by Gutzwiller, but she limited her discussion to the Gadaran poet’s use of dialect to evoke notions of place and identity. No one has offered a cohesive study of dialect in Meleager’s own corpus and his Garland. Here I make a contribution to this larger project. First, I will examine how Meleager uses dialect to recall specific models in his own epigrams that he incorporated into the Garland. The patterns of practice I shall trace will have many points of contact with what we have already seen in earlier contemporaries such as Antipater of Sidon. Second, I will explore how Meleager deployed dialect in the organization of epigram sequences from his Garland.

Meleager is not known for his close imitation of model texts; rather he often situates an individual poem within a tradition of epigrammatic composition through a bricolage of diction,
phrases, and motifs drawn from a string of earlier models, most commonly Asclepiades, Posidippus, and Callimachus, and conventional poetic themes.\(^{763}\) Although Meleager does not often follow the type of close imitation present in his older contemporary Antipater of Sidon, he occasionally practices the Sidonian’s use of dialect to recall a key word or phrase in a model epigram.

Indeed, Meleager recalls Antipater’s reading of model texts through the dialect he uses in his epitaph for his fellow epigrammatist. In G-P 122=AP 7.428, Meleager commemorates the fellow epigrammatist in a masterful variation of the Sidonian’s own sequence riddle epitaphs, incorporating epitaphic imagery (such as the rooster, eagle, and scepter) from his model while also expanding the riddles by using three rather than a single rejected interpretation of said imagery as a guide to the deceased’s identity.\(^{764}\) Meleager composed his homage to Antipater’s imitative practice in a predominant Doric color, a choice which makes little sense in the context of Antipater’s ethnic identity, since as a Hellenized Syrian Antipater’s native dialect would almost certainly have been the koine. The use of Doric becomes readily apparent, however, when read in the context of Meleager’s imitation and variation of Antipater’s riddling epitaphs. It has been recognized that the opening words of Meleager’s epitaph (ἀ στάλα) copy those in Antipater of Sidon G-P 32=AP 7.427 (ἀ στάλα), one of Antipater’s riddling epitaphs that forms the source material for Meleager’s variation, and which also directly precedes Meleager’s epigram in the Palatine Anthology.\(^{765}\) No one has commented, however, on the fact that Meleager also adopts the dialect of his model, which he then carries through the rest of his

\(^{763}\) On Meleager’s reuse and variation of his epigrammatic predecessors, see commentary on individual epigrams of Meleager in Gow and Page 1965 and epigrams of Asclepiades in Sens 2011; Tarán 1979, especially 28-39 and 92-114.

\(^{764}\) For a detailed treatment of Meleager various reworkings of Antipater’s riddle epitaphs, see Gutzwiller 1998, 274-75 as well as Goldhill 1994, 203-204.

\(^{765}\) Gutzwiller 1998, 274-75.
inventive variation. Meleager’s dialect choice is, then, its own marker of identity, just of poetic rather than ethnic identity. Like Antipater, Meleager contextualizes his close-reading of his model through the lens of dialect choice.

Also like Antipater, Meleager extended his dialect readings to third-century epigrammatists, using targeted dialect choices to recall a key word or phrase. One example is Meleager G-P 113=A.P. 12.49, an exhortation to drink as a remedy for the ills and pains of love:

ζωροπότει, δύσερως, καί σου φιλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα
κοιμάσει λάθας δωροδότας Βρόμιος.
ζωροπότει, καί πλήρες ἀφυσσάμενος σκύφος οἶνας
ἐκκρουσον στυγερὰν ἐκ κραδίας ὀδύναν. (Meleager G-P 113=A.P. 12.49)

P

Drink pure wine, love-wracked man, and Bromios, the provider of of forgetfulness, will calm your boy-loving flame.
Drink pure wine, and helping yourself to a cup filled to the brim with wine sweep away the hateful pain from your heart.

Linguistically the epigram is marked by its use of Doric and rare or unique compounds. One of these compounds, in particular, holds the interpretive key to understanding the literary purpose behind Meleager’s use of Doric. The adjective φιλόπαιδα in line one is uncommon and almost certainly borrowed here from Callimachus G-P 3=A.P. 12.150. In this epigram Callimachus claims to a certain Philip, his addressee, that there are two remedies for love: to the curative powers of song, as discovered by the Cyclops Polyphemus (Πολύφαμος ἀνεώρατο τὰν ἔπαιδαν | τῷραμένῳ), should be added hunger (χά λιμός ἔχει μόνον ἐς τὰ πονηρά | τὸγαθόν); for hunger has the potential to bring an end to the “boy-loving sickness” (ἔκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον).

As we can see from the quoted portions of Callimachus G-P 3=A.P. 12.150, Callimachus’ epigram is also composed in a marked and consistent Doric color. Although chronological
uncertainties remain, it is quite likely that the Doric has its basis in the verses’ engagement with Theocritus *Idyll* 11, a bucolic idyll whose dialect is clearly influenced by generic and regional (Polyphemus is a native of Sicily) associations. In addition to the dialect, Callimachus has also borrowed from Theocritus the image of Polyphemus, the use of an abundance of medical language, and the inclusion of an addressee (Theocritus frames his *Idyll* with an address to the doctor Nicias, whom he may have met on Cos). In his use of Doric and (τὰν) φιλόπαιδα Meleager guides the reader to the context in which they should read his own epigram on the remedies of love, whose recommendation of drink over song or hunger is a riposte to Callimachus and, through his epigram, ultimately Theocritus.

Ever fond of self-variation, Meleager reuses φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα in another of his epigrams:

> ψυχαπάται δυσέρωτες, ὅσιοι φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα
> οἴδατε τοῦ πικροῦ γεωσάμενοι μέλιτος,
> ψυχρὸν ὁδὸν ἔντασαν ψυχρὸν τάχος ἄρτι τακείσης
> ἐκ χιόνος τῇ μή ἱπτε περὶ κραδίη.
> ἦ γὰρ ἴδειν ἔτηλην Διονύσιον. ἀλλ', ὁμόδουλοι,
> πρὶν ψαίσαι σπλάγχνων πῦρ ἀπ' ἐμεό σβέσατε. (Meleager G-P 86=A.P. 12.81)

P

Love-wracked soul-deceivers, you who know the boy-loving flame
and have tasted its bitter-sweet honey,
ice-cold water...ice-cold from melted snow
swiftly now pour about my heart.
For I have dared to look upon Dionysios; but, fellow-slaves,
quench the fire in me before it reaches my innards.

That G-P 113=A.P. 12.49 and not G-P 86=A.P. 12.81 is the model example of this phrase is plain from the context. Here φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα is the only Doric color present in the manuscript witnesses of the epigram. It is surrounded by koine with the admixture of Ionic forms.

---

766 See Hunter 1999, 223 and Hordern 2006, 290. For a recent and original treatment of Callimachus G-P 3, see Faulkner 2011.
(cf. κραδί and ἐμεῦ, which could also potentially be categorized as Doric). Such a dialect context points to a borrowing of the phrase from its original context, which as we saw was entirely Doric. Highlighted by its dialectal difference from the rest of the epigram φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα is present to direct the reader to G-P 113, on the curative powers of drink, to which the conceit of this epigram is in direct opposition: Dionysius only exacerbates love rather than soothes it.  

Again, dialect paired with diction takes up a model to which the epigram responds.

The editorial techniques Meleager used in his Garland, their literary purposes, and their reception and reuse in later poems and poetry collections have received a good deal of scholarly attention; however the organizational structure of these sequences have not been subjected to an analysis that takes continuities or shifts in dialect into account. In what follows, I offer two examples that demonstrate, I believe, that future work on Garland sequences should consider dialect as contributing factor to their organization and interpretation.

I begin with a sequence of four epigrams in the twelfth book of the Greek Anthology whose topic is homoerotic love. As has long been recognized, the division of erotic epigrams between heterosexual and homosexual subjects—books five and twelve respectively—is the

---

767 Indeed the entire first line of the epigram recalls G-P 113.1= A.P. 12.49.1 (ζωροπότει, δύσερως, καὶ σου φλόγα τὰν φιλόπαιδα) with δυσέρωτες for δύσερως and ψυχαπάται approximating the sound patterns of ζωροπότει in the same metrical sedes.

768 G-P 86= A.P. 12.81 is part of a sequence from the erotic book of the Garland on the motif of the flames of love. The two epigrams that immediately follow are also both by Meleager and borrow language and phrases from the epigram (G-P 67= A.P. 12.82 and G-P 68= A.P. 12.83). Both poems are on a certain Coan Phanion who has rekindled desire in the heart of the speaker. G-P 68 is Doric, matching the dialect of Phanion’s native city, except for τῇ ῥῇ in the concluding line (τῷ ψυχῆς τῇ μῇ καίμεινον κραδίῃ) reused from G-P 86 (ἐκ χαίνος τῇ μῇ χείτε παρί κραδίῃ). G-P 67 is koine with a light admixture of Ionic (τέφρης) with the exception of the Doric ἐν κραδίῳ in the final line (perhaps designed to underscore the depth of Phanion’s effect on Meleager—his “heart” is tinged the color of her native speech), which is possibly picked up in the κραδίῳ in G-P 68 that appears in the same metrical sedes and contrasts with the dialect of the borrowed phrase.

769 Important discussions include: Wifstrand 1923; Cameron 1993, 19-33; Gutzwiller 1997; Gutzwiller 1998, 276-322; and Höschele 2010, 171-229.
work of Cephalas. In the *Garland*, all the erotic epigrams were found mixed together in one book into which Meleager incorporated a number of his own epigrams. *A.P.* 12.75-78 are variations on a theme, in which the poet compares the beauty of his male subject to that of the god Eros; they almost certainly derive intact from the *Garland*. Meleager alternates third-century model epigram with one of his own variations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Εἰ πτερά σοι προσέκειτο καὶ ἐν χερὶ τόξα καὶ ἱόν,} \\
oὐκ ἀν Ἕρως ἐγράφη Κύπριδος, ἀλλὰ σὺ, παῖς. (Asclepiades G-P 21=A.P. 12.75) \\
P ABV
\end{align*}
\]

If wings were applied to you and there was a bow and arrows in your hand, Eros would not have been written down as the child of Cypris, but you.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Εἰ μὴ τόξον Ἕρως μηδὲ πτερὰ μηδὲ φαρέτραν} \\
\text{μηδὲ πυριβλήτως εἴχε πόθον ἁκίδας,} \\
oὐκ, αὐτὸν τὸν πτανόν ἑπόμυνμαι, οὐποτ’ ἄν ἐγνως} \\
\text{ἐκ μορφᾶς, τίς ἐρφ Ζοῖλος ἢ τίς Ἕρως. (Meleager G-P 89=A.P. 12.76) } \\
P ABV P.Berol. 10571 \\
1 φαρέτραν P: φαρέτρην ABV
\end{align*}
\]

If Eros did not have a bow and wings and a quiver and fevered arrows of desire, I would not in anyway have known, and I swear by the winged boy himself, from shape, who was Zoilos or who was Eros.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Εἰ καθύπερθε λάβοις χρύσεα πτερὰ καὶ σεν ἀπ’ ὁμόι} \\
\text{τείνοιτ’ ἄργυρεως ἰοδόκος φαρέτρη} \\
\text{καὶ σταῖς παρ’ Ἐρωτα, φίλ’ Ἄγλαυν, οὐ μὰ τὸν Ἐρμήν. } \\
\end{align*}
\]

For discussion, see Wifstrand 1923, 8; Gow 1958b, 24; Lenzinger 1965, 25-26; and Cameron 1993, 239-42. Cephalas’ division is hardly systematic with homosexual poems appearing in Book 5 and, to a greater degree, heterosexual poems in Book 12, from which Gutzwiller 1998, 282 surmises that “Cephalas evidently did not understand that names, or nicknames, ending in –ιον were given to women.”

*A.P.* 12.76-78 are preserved in sequence on *BKT* 5.1.75, dating to the first century CE (Wifstrand 1923, 10-13), that represents a sequence copied from Meleager’s *Garland*. The remainder of the sequence contains a run of erotic epigrams on heterosexual and homosexual topics, supporting the inference that the division of the two types of erotic epigrams into two books was not Meleagrean in origin; see Wifstrand 1923, 11 and Cameron 1993, 27.

There is great difficulty in knowing the best text between the Attic-Ionic Ἐρμήν in the manuscripts (P and ABV) and the Doric in the papyrus. Following my general principles of giving more weight both to papyrus readings over manuscript readings (in the small number of instances where such a comparison fruitfully exists) and to transmission of Doric forms non-Doric or dialectally mixed contexts, Doric Ἐρμήν would be the preferred form. That said, it is
If you should have golden wings above, and from your silver shoulders an arrow-bearing quiver should hang and you should stand alongside resplendent Eros, by Hermes, not even Cypris herself will know whom she bore.

Εἰ χλαμύδ’ εἶχεν Ἐρως καὶ μὴ πτερὰ μηδ’ ἐπὶ νότον τόξα τε καὶ φαρέτραν, ἀλλ’ ἐφόρει πέτασον, ναξὶ τὸν ὄβρον ἐφηβὸν ἐπόμυμα, Ἀντίοχος774 μὲν ἦν ὃν Ὕρως, δ’ Ἐρως τὰμπαλίν Ἀντίοχος. (Meleager G-P 83=A.P. 12.78)

If Eros had a cloak and did not have wings or on his back a bow and quiver, but was wearing a broad-brimed hat, indeed I swear by the graceful youth, Antiochos would be Eros, and Eros in turn would be Antiochos.

Meleager’s imitations hew closely to the structure and diction of his models (cf. πτερὰ in 12.75.1, 12.76.1, 12.77.1 and 12.78.1), but they differ in their dialect color (cf. Doric φαρέτραν in 12.76.1 and likely the same in 12.78.2, but the absence of any other Doric features here does not allow for a certain identification, whereas Ionic φαρέτρη in 12.77.2). So while this sequence is a cohesive whole in terms of subject matter, Meleager demarcates for his readers the boundaries between model and imitation through the alternation of dialects. If Meleager

difficult to understand why Asclepiades would insert a Doric form of the god’s name here, although such a practice is not without parallel, cf. Theodorus G-P 1=A.P. 6.282 and Leonidas of Tarentum G-P 3=A.P. 6.334.

773 The lemmata to P and the ABV both ascribed authorship alternatively to Asclepiades and Posidippus, while BKT 5.1.75 does not preserve its lemma. There is nothing on stylistic or metrical grounds to favor the authorship of one poet over another. Decisions of ascription come down to the belief one holds whether Asclepiades would have composed a self-variation (cf. G-P 21=A.P. 12.75) or whether such a variation is likely to be taken as a sign of Posidippean authorship, who is known to imitate and vary other poems by Asclepiades. Guichard 2004, 407-408, who collects the previous bibliography on the question, and Sens 2011, 259 each conclude that Posidippus is more likely to be the author of this epigram.

774 Here and again in the following line P and P.Berol. 10571 disagree on the name of the epigram’s erotic subject with the former transmitting Ἀντίοχος and the latter transmitting Ἀντιγένης. On the one hand, P’s Ἀντίοχος has strong Syrian associations through its connection to the name of Selucid dynasts, which would make sense for a poem by the Syrian Meleager. On the other hand, Ἀντιγένης in P.Berol. 10571 is the name of a Coan aristocrat in Theocritus Id. 7, and if Ἀντιγένης is original to the poem its presence may help the reader to understand the φαρέτραν in line two as Doric.
identified the authorship of *A.P.* 12.77 with Asclepiades, and this is uncertain given arguments that the double ascriptions of Asclepiadean and Posidippan authorship goes back to the *Garland*,\(^{775}\) this alternation would also bring the voices of the two poets into contrast. The two examples of Asclepiades capture the dialect color of the majority of his erotic epigrams as well as approximating the native speech of the Samian poet, while Meleager, we have seen, adopted a Doric tinged language to evoke his adopted city of Cos. On the same model, Posidippus also wrote the majority of his surviving erotic epigrams in koine with Ionic admixture (indeed he was likely influenced by the Samian in his dialect choice as he was in the subject matter and style of his erotic epigrams). In this case, then, Meleager, chose to imitate a model poem and its own earlier imitation. Collectively, Meleager’s decision to write his imitations in a dialect that approximates Coan grounds the reading of the sequence in the location where he likely arranged and edited the *Garland*.\(^{776}\)

In another sequence of erotic epigrams from the fifth book of the *Greek Anthology*, Meleager intertwines two conventional amatory motifs, namely that of the garland and the Graces (*A.P.* 5.142-49).\(^{777}\) *A.P.* 5.142-45 are all on garlands and share, with several notable exceptions, a similar koine color.

\[
\text{Tîς—ῥόδον ὁ στέφανος Διονυσίου ἢ ῥόδον αὐτός τοῦ στεφάνου; δοκέω, λείπεται ὁ στέφανος. (Anon. G-P 23=A.P. 5.142)}
\]

P Pl

Who—is the rose the garland of Dionysios or is he the rose of the garland? I believe that the garland is lacking.

---

\(^{775}\) See Gow 1958b, 31-33 and Gow and Page 1965, 1.xxx.

\(^{776}\) This isn’t to say that the Doric color did not have other intended effects in Meleager’s poems; rather here I am focused on dialect choice as a literary device in the artistic organization of epigram sequences.

\(^{777}\) Gutzwiller 1998, 285 considers this sequence as the third part of the opening of Meleager’s book of erotic epigrams. Gutzwiller 1997, 179-188 treats this sequence in detail, paying particular attention to its organization and programmatic importance in Meleager’s erotic book; for further discussion see Höschele 2010, 208-214. For one possible reconstruction of Meleager’s book of erotic epigrams see Gutzwiller 1998, 283-301 and table II.
The garland withers on Heliodora’s head; but she shines forth as the garland’s garland.

"Ἡδη λευκόιον θάλλει, θάλλει δὲ φιλομβρος νάρκισσος, θάλλει δ᾿ ούρεσίφοιτα κρίνα. ἥδη δ᾿ ἃ φιλέραστος, ἐν ἀνθέθιν ἔριμον ἄνθος, Ζηνοφίλα Πειθοῦς ἥδυ τέθηλε ρόδον. λεμώνες, τί μάταια κόμιας ἐπι φαιδρὰ γελάτε; ἃ γάρ παῖς κρέσσων ἄδυπνόων στεφάνων. (Meleager G-P 31=A.P. 5.144)

The snowdrop is already in bloom, so is the rain-loving narcissus, and the mountain-roaming lilies. Already dear to lovers, the flower timely among flowers, Zenopilia, the sweet rose of Persuasion, has bloomed. Meadows, why do you foolishly smile at the horse-tail in your hair? For the girl is better than sweetly-smelling garlands.

Αὐτοῦ μοι, στέφανοι, παρὰ δικλίσι ταῖοδε κρεμαστοί μίμνετε, μὴ προπετῶς φύλλα τινασόμενοι, οὗς δακρύως κατέβρεξα· κάτομβρα γάρ ὃματ᾽ ἐρωτων. ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν ὀιγομένης αὐτὸν ἵππηθε θύρης, στάξαθ᾽ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐμὸν ὑποῦν, ὥς ἄν ἀμείνον ἥ ἔσενθῃ γε κόμη τάμα πή δάκρυο. (Asclepiades G-P 12=A.P. 5.145)

For my sake, garlands, stay here hung up by these doors, don’t hastily shake off your petals, you that I drench with my tears; for the eyes of lovers are rainclouds. But whenever the doors open and should should see him, drip my rain over his his head, so that his yellow hair may better drink my tears.

The sequence begins with two distichs, one by an unknown poet and the other by Meleager, whose conceit is that the garlanded beloved (Dionysios and Heliodora, respectively) surpasses that garland in beauty. The topic is expanded upon in Meleager G-P 31=A.P. 5.144; this time the
enchanting bloom of Zenophila’s beauty, another of the poet’s female lovers. Asclepiades G-P 12=A.P. 5.145, Asclepiades’ epigram on the tear-drenched wreaths hung by a lover over the closed door of the object of attention, shares with the preceding poem by Meleager an identical length and the personification of natural phenomena (smiling meadows in Meleager and a weeping garland in Asclepiades), but it also functions as a bridge epigram to the next half of the sequence and we shall return to it shortly. Doric color is limited to the two epigrams by Meleager, whose subjects—Heliodora and Zenophila—are Coan women featured in erotic cycles from the Gadaran’s poetry. Besides fittingly using Doric color in the name of Zenophila (Zηνοφίλα and the nominative feminine articles ἁ at lines three and six) and quite likely also in the name of Heliodora (Ἡλιοδώρας), although the form is ambiguously Doric or Attic, Meleager reserves the use of Doric to the final line of A.P. 5.144 in ἀδυπνόων (P: ἡδυπνόων). The phrase ἀδυπνόων στέφανων echoes the final line of Meleager’s proem to the Garland (ἡδυπνής στέφανος) and appears in the same metrical position at the end of the pentameter.

Intratextual reminiscences of the proem to the Garland are not limited to this phrase. This listing of flowers echoes Meleager’s catalogue of plants representing various poets that comprises the majority of the proem to his anthology. In particular, it has been observed that by placing the snowdrop first in G-P 31=A.P. 5.144, Meleager reverses its position from the proem (Meleager G-P 1.56=A.P. 4.1.56), where it is used to represent the Gadaran’s own poetry. Through this positioning of λευκόιον, Meleager further draws attention to his allusion to the very end of his proem at the conclusion of A.P. 5.144. By interweaving this epigram on Zenophila

---

778 Gutzwiller 1997, 182 on the “confounding of nature’s phenomena with human emotion” as the connection between 5.144 and 5.145; she does not note how the sequence also divides into two pairs of epigrams of identical length.
779 On the interpretation of Meleager’s epigrams on Heliodora as “ein fragmentierter Liebesroman,” see Höschele 2010, 194-229.
780 As observed by Gutzwiller 1997, 182, who does not comment on the contrast in dialect between the two appearances.
781 Gutzwiller 1997, 182.
with echoes of the proem to the *Garland*, Meleager constructs, as Gutzwiller has noted, an
“association between the ‘sweet-smelling garlands’ surpassed by Zenophila and the ‘sweet-
speaking garland’ that is Meleager’s epigram anthology.” The surpassing allure of Zenophila
finds expression in the doricization of ἀδυνπάον στεφάνων: in this eroticized miniaturization of
the *Garland* proem, this Coan’s beauty is so overwhelming that it can outshine the *Garland* into
which it is interwoven.

At *A.P. 5.146*=Callimachus G-P 15 the motif shifts from garlands to Graces and with it
so does the predominant dialect color of the first epigram on the topic.  

\[ \text{τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες, ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ κείναις} \]
\[ \text{ἀρτι ποτεπλάσθη, κῆτι μύρωσι νοτεί,} \]
\[ \text{ἐνοίκον ἐν πάσιν ἄρτίμηδος Βερεωίκα,} \]
\[ \text{ἄς ἀτερ οὐδ’ αὐταὶ ταὶ Χάριτες Χάριτες. (Callimachus G-P 15= \textit{A.P. 5.146})} \]

Four are the Graces, for in addition to those three one
has just now been modeled, and is still moist with perfume.
Berenike is fortunate and envied among everyone,
without whom the Graces are not themselves Graces.

Since the sequences of Meleager’s *Garland* were excerpted by Cephalas, a process that could
lead to the corruption of individual epigrams and the rearrangement or significant dismantling of
sequences, it is possible that one or more epigrams may have fallen out at this point in our
sequence. As we shall see, however, there are thematic points of contact (garlands and Graces)
between Asclepiades G-P 12= *A.P. 5.145* and Callimachus G-P 15= *A.P. 5.146*, where one might
plausibly posit missing epigrams or rearrangement, and the epigrams that follow (*A.P. 5.147-49*)

---

\[ ^{782} \text{Gutzwiller 1997, 182.} \]
\[ ^{783} \text{The identity of this Berenike is uncertain. Based on Callimachus’ dates the queen could be Berenike I, Berenike} \]
\[ \text{Syria (the daughter of Ptolemy II), or Berenike II. In this volume and elsewhere (Clayman 2014, 58) Clayman has} \]
\[ \text{argued persuasively on historical and dialectal grounds that we should identify the subject of Callimachus’ epigram} \]
\[ \text{with Berenike II and I adopt this identification in my discussion.} \]
as well as a studied contrast of dialect related to the interlocking of the two themes, which
together supports the proposition that the epigrams, particularly *A.P.* 5.146, are not completely
out of place.

As transmitted, Callimachus’ Doric epigram on Berenike and the Graces stands separated
here from the other epigrams on the same topic that follow, since Meleager immediatly returns to
the previous motif of garlands in *G-P 46=A.P.* 5.147 with another of his own epigrams on
Heliodora. With the return of garlands the reader once again encounters an epigram with a
koine/Ionic color:

Πλέξω λευκόϊον, πλέξω δ’ ἀπαλήν ἀμα μύρτους
νάρκισσον, πλέξω καὶ τὰ γελώντα κρίνα,
πλέξω καὶ κρόκον ἡδύν· ἐπιπλέξω δ’ ὑάκινθον
πορφυρέην, πλέξω καὶ φιλέραστα ρόδα,
ὡς ἄν ἐπὶ κροτάφοις μυροβοστρύχῳ Ἡλιοδώρας
εὐπλόκαμον χαίτην ἀνθοβολῇ στέφανος. (*Meleager G-P 46=A.P. 5.147)*

I will pluck the snow-drop, I will pluck the narcissus
tender for the myrtle, I will pluck the smiling lilies,
and I will pluck the sweet crocus; I will weave purple
hyacinth, and I will pluck roses that are dear to lovers,
so that the garland may wreath the well-tressed
hair on perfumed Heliodora’s temples.

This epigram has many points of contact with the language of Meleager *G-P 31=A.P.* 5.144 (cf.
*A.P.* 5.144.1: ἡδη λευκόϊον θάλλει and *A.P.* 5.147.1: πλέξω λευκόϊον)\(^784\) and so instantly recalls
the preceding sequence of epigrams. On a more thematic level, the falling petals of the garland in
*A.P.* 5.145=Asclepiades *G-P 12* anticipate the image of the plucked and falling petals in
Meleager *G-P 46=A.P.* 5.147. The return of Heliodora also acts as bridge to the next epigram in

\(^784\) Gutzwiller 1997, 185-186 and Hö schele 2010, 210-11.
which Meleager makes the bold claim that she surpasses the Graces in innate and natural quality from which their names derive:

Φαμί ποτ’ ἐν μύθοις ταν εὕλαλον Ἡλιοδόραν νικάσειν αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν. (Meleager G-P 47=A.P. 5.148)

P Pl
1 τὰν CP: τὴν P

I say that Heliodora sweet-chatting in conversations will conquer the Graces themselves with grace.

While the likely doricized Ἡλιοδόραν connects Heliodora’s two garland poems to this epigram on the graces, the consistent Doric color of the epigram evokes the dialect of Callimachus G-P 15=A.P. 5.146, the first of the epigrams on the topic, and whose concluding αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν plainly echoes in Meleager’s αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν. Altogether A.P. 5.145-48 present an interlocking sequence of epigrams, whose organization is reinforced by dialect variance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.P. Number</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.145=Asclepiades G-P 12</td>
<td>Tear-sodden garland</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.146=Callimachus G-P 15</td>
<td>Berenike II likened to a Grace</td>
<td>Doric with one Attic-Ionic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.147=Meleager G-P 46</td>
<td>A garland for Heliodora</td>
<td>Attic-Ionic with light Ionic and Doric color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.148=Meleager G-P 47</td>
<td>Heliodora likened to a Grace</td>
<td>Doric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thematically and linguistically, then, 5.145 and 5.146 together provide models for the Meleager’s own epigrams that follow.
The importance of *A.P. 5.146* on Berenike II to the sequence as a whole is reinforced in the following and final epigram, which is again by Meleager and also has Doric coloring (G-P 32=*A.P. 5.149*):⁷⁸⁵

Τίς μοι Ζηνοφίλαν λαλιάν παρέδειξεν ἑταίρην;⁷⁸⁶
tίς μίαν ἥ τρισσόν ἠγαγέ μοι Χάριτα;
ἀρ’ ἑτύμως ἄνηρ κεχαρισμένον ἄνουσεν ἔργον
δῶρα διόδους καύταν τὰν Χάριν ἐν χάριτι. (Meleager G-P 32=A.P. 5.149)

1 λαλιάν P: λαλῆν Pl 2 ἑταίρην Brunck: ἑταίρην Ppl 4 καύταν τὰν P: καὐτήν τὴν Pl

Who has represented in painting my chatty mistress Zenopila?
Who has led one Grace to me out of the three?
Yes, truly that man has accomplished a graceful work,
having granted a gift of the Grace herself with grace.

As we saw in the sequence of garland epigrams (*A.P. 5.142-45*), Meleager alternates a poem on Heliodora (G-P 47=A.P. 5.148) with one on Zenophila (G-P 32=A.P. 5.149) and here as well the variation includes an expansion of the model. Zenophila (λαλιάν) is equally as chatty as Heliodora (εὐλαλοῦν). And in the final pentameter he reworks again the final line of his two models (καύταν τὰν Χάριν ἐν χάριτι). Meleager also caps Callimachus with whom he began the sequence. In his presentation of Zenophila Meleager echoes the language of epigrams on works

---

⁷⁸⁵ From a manuscript tradition perspective, it is worth noting here that unlike in Meleager G-P 47=A.P. 5.148, PI transmits Attic-Ionic regularizations of the Doric forms present in P. Literary and organizational reasons make the Doric color of P quite certain, but I am unsure what significance (if any) to give to the difference in PI’s dialect transmission of these two clearly related epigrams. At Meleager G-P 47=A.P. 5.148.1 C and PI, who shared a common exemplar, both transmit Doric τῶν (it is unclear what exactly P had, but based on autopsy of Preisidanz’s facsimile it appears that it is unlikely to have been τῆν as reported by Gow and Page). It might reason, then, that C would have corrected the Doric forms of P in Meleager G-P 32=A.P. 5.149 if they were present in the exemplar, although C could have, of his own accord, noted the similarity between *A.P. 5.148* and *A.P. 5.149* and chosen to have left the dialect of P untouched despite what was present in his exemplar (but on this line of reasoning we are still left with no correction of P’s ἑταίρην). The non-intervention of C might suggest that the Doric forms were in his exemplar and thus in PI’s exemplar, which would raise the possibility, in turn, that PI chose to regularize the Doric forms for some unknown reason, that had not exercised him in *A.P. 5.148*.

⁷⁸⁶ I print the reading of the manuscript witnesses, but Brunk’s emendation ἑταίρην is a strong possibility given the other Doricisms transmitted by P.
of art, making his beloved into a statue. But whereas Callimachus imagines a portrait of Berenike added to a statue group of the Graces in order to complete gracefulness of the Graces (Callimachus G-P 15.4=A.P. 5.146.4: ὃς ἄτερ οὐδ’ αὐταὶ ταῖς Χάριτες Χάριτες), Meleager’s artistic likeness of Zenophilia has enough grace to replace all three of the Graces imagined in Callimachus’ epigram (Meleager G-P 32.2=A.P. 5.149.2: τίς μίαν ἐκ τρισσὸν ἂγαγε μοι Χάριτα).

All of these variations are couched in the same dialect color as the model, linguistically uniting the sequence. The unity of this sequence is made all the more apparent when read within the wider context of its integration with the epigrams on garlands. The two sequences make a cohesive whole, sharing in similar language and subjects, but their cohesiveness is partially a product of their studied variation. And Meleager, in his general division of garland and Graces epigrams by a juxtaposition of Doric and koine/Ionic dialect color, highlights for his reader his own reading of the model epigrams and the structure and movement of his editorial decisions that brings together the old and new. This is especially apposite considering that this sequence of epigrams, as we have noted, has been recognized to consistently engage with the image of the garland, and thus the process of epigram selection and anthologization, and the motif of grace, both of which are intertwined in the opening quatrain of the proem of the Garland (G-P 1=A.P. 4.1). This evocation of the proem also finds expression in the interlaced dialect present in the

---

787 Gow and Page 1965, 2.626 on παρέδειξεν “‘represent, of a painter’ LSJ; unique but easy extension of the common meaning exhibit” and ἄνυσεν ἔργον “the phrase strongly suggests the work of art.” See translation and discussion of the epigram in Gutzwiller 1997, 188.


789 Μοῦσα φίλα, τίνι τάνδε φέρεις πάγκαρσιν ἄοιδάν ἥ τίς ὁ καὶ τεύξας ὑμνοθέταν στέφανον; ἄνυσε μὲν Μελέαγρος, ἄριζάλῳ δὲ Διοκλεί μναμόσυνον ταύταν ἐξεπόνησε χάριν.
sequence, for we find a similar mixture of Doric and Ionic features there. This sequence of erotic epigrams, which possibly held an introductory and programmatic position in Meleager’s book of erotic epigrams, replicates the dialect practice originally put on display by Meleager in his general introduction to the anthology.

Conclusions

This chapter has ventured to establish dialect choice as a literary device used by epigrammatists when they sought to imitate an earlier epigram. Third-century book epigrammatists such as Asclepiades and Leonidas, whose dedications and epitaphs often provided the raw material for the development of a poetics of imitation, employed dialect in order to enrich the poetic meaning of their works. Having recognized the literary quality of these authors’ dialect practice from distant millennia, it raises the question of how did the readers and fellow epigrammatists, who studied and interpreted these epigrams, understand and receive the dialect of their models. Imitations, in other words, can offer an early history of reader-response to dialect. I have shown patterns of dialectal engagement in the imitations of Antipater of Sidon, Meleager, Archias, and Amyntas, which demonstrate that dialect served two main purposes in the process of imitation. First, dialect choice allows these poets to guide a reader through their own reading of a model text, both by highlighting points of similarity and points of departure. Second, it also acts as an organizational device for Meleager as he creates sequences of epigram

("Dear Muse, to whom do you bring this song rich in every type of fruit or who has fashioned a garland of poets? Meleager accomplished this, and for magnificent Diokles he fashioned this favorable memento.")

Additionally note these presence of Doric ἄριζάλῳ which echoes ἄριζηλος in Callimachus G-P 15=A.P. 5.146; should the Doric color here give us pause about the transmission of the Attic-Ionic form by P in Callimachus?

On the dialect of the proem to the Garland, see Gutzwiller 2014, 78-83.

See the comments of Gutzwiller 2014, 83 that this reading, in part, bears out: “The proem surely sets as template for the use of dialect in Meleager’s own epigrams as in the epigrams of other anthologized poets, where a dialectal mixture occurs within epigrams and sequentially from one epigram to the next.”
variations and/or sequences of motifs, contrasting model with variation or one motif with another. The imitation of earlier epigrams and their collection into artfully organized anthologies has rightly been taken as evidence for the canonization of the genre of book epigram at the end of the Hellenistic period. That authors such as Antipater of Sidon and Meleager, who were so integral to this process of canonization, time and again turned to the dialect of the epigrams that they imitated or interweaved with their own in order to signal their relationship to and reading of the model epigrams only underscores the dynamic role of dialect choice in Hellenistic book epigram, which this entire project has undertaken to demonstrate.
Afterword

In this dissertation I have argued that dialect was an integral part of a Hellenistic book epigrammatist’s presentation of his or her poem and have set out to examine in the previous three chapters some of the ways in which epigrammatists put dialect choice and mixture to use as literary devices. Dialect was used by these Hellenistic poets as markers of ethnic and poetic identity, imagined place of display, and literary allusion; dialect also played a significant role in the organization of poetry collections and the reception of earlier epigrammatic models. By treating dialect variety as a dynamic element of epigram and not necessarily evidence of intractable errors in the textual transmission, the results of my research offer several important implications for the study of Hellenistic poetry, the language of Greek literature more broadly, and the transmission of these texts into the Byzantine period.

First, the results of my dissertation underscore the need for continued research into the literary use of dialects in Hellenistic book epigram and other genres from the Hellenistic period, where relatively little to no sustained discussion exist. This study has presented several models for how to read and interpret dialect in Hellenistic poetry, but our understanding of dialect as an active component in the creation of literary meaning during this period requires further critical and careful treatment. Future topics of inquiry that would quite likely shed significant amounts of light on our understanding of dialect choice and poetic meaning include: a systematic study of the linguistic composition of Hellenistic inscribed epigram, including their interaction with book epigram, a study of the use of dialect words and dialect forms as part of Callimachus’ aetiological project in the Aetia, and a more cohesive and fine-grained exploration of literary-critical approaches to language choice than I could provide in chapter two.
Second, I have argued that the meaningful application of dialect choice and dialect mixture was not a new development of Hellenistic literary culture. Chapter one reexamined the traditional approach to dialect choice in Archaic and Classical poetry as principally delimited by generic conventions. Here I offered several case studies of dialect mixture in the poetry of these periods that anticipated the types of usage present in Hellenistic book epigram. The heterogeneity of Archaic and Classical poetic language is in need of a sustained reappraisal. Previous generations of scholars have carefully collected the evidence for dialect use and mixture in a number of authors, but the aims of these studies were primarily linguistic in orientation and so did not set out to interpret the dialect forms they collect in their literary and cultural contexts. On this account, an exploration of the use of dialect forms in the non-choral sections of Greek tragedy would be especially welcome, since the genre contains characters and settings drawn from a variety of linguistic backgrounds.

Third, my study has demonstrated the need for a more detailed and systematic accounting of the transmission of dialect in the manuscripts to the Greek Anthology. Although the linguistic composition of Hellenistic book epigram has been irreparably compromised by ancient editorial intervention and textual corruption the manuscripts do not present a “tedious and insoluble problem,” as Gow and Page have described the situation, when it comes to dialect; rather than imposing uniform usage within individual epigram by changing attested variants, we must continue to engage thoughtfully with the paradosis, allowing mixture and juxtaposition of dialect forms to stand where manuscript evidence and the possibility for poetic meaning intersect. While recognizing the fallibility of the manuscript tradition, the dissertation has attempted to make a meaningful contribution to this discourse by seeking out patterns of dialect transmission between the various manuscript witnesses that would allow editors and scholars to make informed
decisions between dialect variants. In addition to a systematic study of dialect transmission in P and Pl, including the editorial activities of C and the duplicate epigrams in P, subsequent research in this area should center on the collation of the independent sylloges, the majority of which currently lack an authoritative edition, for these collections likely contain significant evidence for the mechanisms of dialect transmission in the texts of the *Greek Anthology*.

Fourth, and finally, the results of this project raise questions about the afterlife of dialect usage in Greek imperial and Byzantine epigram. As a genre, Greek book epigram had a long and robust post-Hellenistic life from the first century CE into the Byzantine period when Constantine Cephalas collected together epigrams spanning well over a millennium. Through all of this time, the Hellenistic book epigrammatists, who first developed and then canonized the genre, remained a creative touchstone. Given the linguistic variety of Hellenistic book epigram, we may well wonder how later Greek epigrammatists engaged with and adopted this essential aspect of their models in a period when dialect was fading as a self-conscious product of literary meaning under the influence of a flourishing Atticism. In what follows, I briefly explore the survival of dialect use in imperial Greek epigram and suggest possible future avenues of research.

By the time Meleager collected the epigrams that would form the basis for his *Garland*, the range of dialect forms he found in his exemplars had already become heirlooms of a now lost linguistic past. The inscriptive record charts a generally unimpeded march of koine from the second century BCE onwards, displacing local dialects in its wake. While pockets of

---

792 Important treatments of imperial, late antique, and Byzantine book epigram include Viansino 1963 (Paulus Silentarius); Cameron and Cameron 1966 (Agathias); Viansino 1967 (Agathias); Cameron 1970 (Agathias); Page 1978 (Rufinus); Cameron 1993; Lauxtermann 1994; Agosti 2001 (Palladas); Nisbet 2003 (imperial skoptic epigram); Höschle 2006 (Rufinus); Floridi 2007 (Strato); Henderson 2008 (Palladas); Wilkinson 2012 (Palladas); and Floridi 2014 (Lucillios).

793 The bibliography on Atticism is vast, fundamental and useful discussions are Schmid 1887-97; Willamowitz 1900; Dihle 1977; Wisse 1995; and Horrocks 2010, 99-100 and 133-41.

794 Bubeník 1989 is the fundamental treatment, collecting the inscriptive data for the rise and spread of koine across Greece and Asia Minor.
resistance existed, often as a response to external hegemony, and certain dialects had brief, nostalgia-tinged revivals,\textsuperscript{795} the koine—\textit{with} its own variety of registers and sociolects—predominated already by the first years of the new millennium.

Based on my own survey of the material, dialect use in Greek book epigram from the first two centuries CE maps on to what we find reported in the inscriptive record by Bubeník: a slow diminution of dialect usage punctuated by flashes of revival in certain, increasingly circumscribed contexts.\textsuperscript{796} Inscriptional practice alone, however, cannot account for the distribution of dialect usage in imperial book epigram. We must look as well to imperial epigram’s relationship with its Hellenistic predecessors in order to begin to gain a holistic understanding of dialect use in these centuries.

At its core, dialect has served as a marker of ethnic identity and imagined landscapes in Greek literature since the Archaic period. Hellenistic book epigrammatists, as we have seen, made much literary hay out of this primary association of dialect in the Greek mind. In those instances when an imperial epigrammatist does incorporate an ethnic identity or an imagined place, parallels with Hellenistic practice do continue to exist. As we have already seen in our discussion of Leonidas G-P 24=\textit{A.P.} 9.320, on the Spartan cult of Aphrodite Enoplos, Doric was commonly employed to mimic the linguistic landscape and community of Laconia.\textsuperscript{797} In an epitaph for the Spartan king Leonidas, the first-century CE epigrammatist Antiphilus consistently renders *ā in its Doric α (Antiphilus \textit{GP} 38=\textit{A.P.} 9.294) in the speech of the deceased Spartan commander:

\textsuperscript{795} For example, the revival of Doric in the inscriptions of Laconia (see Bourguet 1927, 23-29); pace arguments for the same process involving Aeolic in Asia (cf. Buck 1955, §149 and Debrunner and Scherer 1969, 40) Cassio 1986 has argued against the narrative of a fracture and then revival of Aeolic in the inscriptions of Asia, seeing instead a continuity in the retention of some Aeolic forms from the Hellenistic to imperial periods.

\textsuperscript{796} Just as with Hellenistic book epigram, the correlation of linguistic practice between inscribed and book epigram in the imperial period requires further research.

\textsuperscript{797} See the reading of this epigram at 154-55.
—πορφυρέαν τοι τάνδε, Λεωνίδα, ὅπασε χλαίναν
Ξέρξης ταρβήσας ἔργα τεάς ἀρετάς.
—οὐ δέχομαι. προδόταις αὖτα χάρις, ἂπλὰς ἔχοι με
καὶ νέκυν. ὁ πλούτος δ᾽ οὐκ ἐμὸν ἐντάφιον.
—ἄλλ᾽ ἔθανες; τί τοσόνδε καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσιν ἀπεχθῆς
Πέρσαις;—οὐ θνάσκει ζάλος ἐλευθερίας. (Antiphilus GP 38=A.P. 9.294)

P P1
1 Λεωνίδα Lascaris: Λεωνίδη PPl 6 ἐλευθερίας Pl: ἐλευθερίας P

—To you, Leonidas, Xerxes has made a gift of this purple cloak standing in awe of your virtue.
—I do not accept. This is an offering fit for a traitor. Let my shield cover me even in death. Wealth is not my burial shroud.
—But you have perished; why are you hostile to the Persians while among the dead?—The zeal for freedom does not perish.

Indeed imperial epigrams on Spartan subjects regularly feature Doric color, which could possibly be a reflection of the brief revival of the dialect in inscriptions from Sparta or a broader association of the region with dialect speech. Philip of Thessalonica, for example, peppers his epigram on a bronze statue of the Spartan river Eurotas with Doric forms (GP 63=A.P. 9.709), just as Leonidas imbued the conversation between the Eurotas and an unarmed Aphrodite with a Doric color (G-P 24=A.P. 9.320).798 Fictional epitaphs for poets offered Hellenistic poets an especially fertile ground for the use of dialect, since it could be used to recall or contrast with the regional identity and style of the deceased. In Antipater of Thessalonica GP 74=A.P. 7.74 on Stesichorus, we find a Doric color that evokes the unique language that Stesichorus applied to his colonial choral-epic, perhaps pointedly reinforced in the dialect’s presence in the phrase ἁ πρὶν Ὄμήρου | ψυχὰ ἐνὶ στέρνοις δεύτερον ὁμικάσατο, where the Pythagorean rebirth of Homer’s epic

798 For other imperial epigrams on Spartan subjects that feature Doricisms, see Bassus GP 2=A.P. 7.534; Antiphilus GP 13=A.P. 5.307; Philip GP 49=A.P. 9.293; Erucius GP 12=A.P. 7.230; Antipater of Thessalonica GP 23=A.P. 7.531.
spirit in the Sicilian Stesichorus is underscored by its transmutation into a Doric soul
(ἁ...ψυχά). 799

Even a cursory reading of imperial Greek epigram, however, reveals a general decrease in the attribution of identities to epigrammatic subjects and the suggestion of an imagined setting for sepulchral or dedicatory epigrams. This development may well constitute a reflection of the changed politics of the period: where previously local identity was endangered by the fragmentation of the Hellenistic world, by the imperial period the classification had become more binary—Greek and Roman. Consequently, in place of ethnic identities, we find an increased use of stock characters, most regularly in scoptic epigram, commonly differentiated by class or occupation. Doctors, grammarians, and athletes come from throughout the Greek-speaking world, so epigrammatists fashion these class differentiations through variations in dictional rather than dialectal register. 800

At the same time, book epigram had become an established genre with its own distinct practices, topics, and structures different from inscribed epigram. Consequently, poet and reader knowingly meet on the placeless landscape of the bookroll. Just as I have sought in chapter four to provide a careful and detailed treatment of dialect as a marker of identity in Hellenistic poetry, imperial epigram would benefit from a similar analysis, which would help clarify what peoples, places, and contexts received the use of dialect, while others were treated in a poeticized koine. As a starting point one might consider the relationship between dialect and intended audience; in other words, do epigrammatists who were known to write for Roman patrons or in Roman circles

799 Some other notable examples of dialect as a marker of identity in imperial epigram are: Antiphilus GP 6=A.P. 9.178 on the island of Rhodes’ celebration of Nero (Doric); Philip GP 23=A.P. 6.250 a dialogue between a statue of Hermes and a certain Hermogenes of Antioch contains Ionic resolutions of genitive singulars; Philip GP 64=A.P. 9.777 on Lysippus’ statue of a horse (Doric), cf. Asclepiades G-P 43=A.P. 16.120 and Posidippus AB 65=A.P. 16.119.
800 The discussion of the language of Lucillios in Floridi 2014, 34-39 exemplifies the breadth of stylistic registers employed in epigrams of this period.
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or about Roman topics use more or less dialect? This raises, of course, the question of the Roman understanding and reception of dialect, which is a complex issue in its own right.

Literary allusion and the imitation of earlier epigrammatic models, as I have shown in chapters five and six, were two other contexts in which Hellenistic book epigrammatists put dialect to a significant poetic effect. In the case of the latter, Asclepiades used Ionic forms to evoke the sympotic-erotic elements of Archaic elegy which he integrated into the world of inscribed epigram;\textsuperscript{801} while Callimachus, most notably in G-P 3=A.P. 12.150 on the cures of lovesickness, and others similarly employed Doric to recall Theocritean pastoral. Dialect as a marker of literary allusions continued into the imperial period, notably in the Sapphic Aeolicisms of Julia Balbilla’s inscribed elegiacs engraved on the Memnon colossus and the Ionic timber of Herodotean ethnographic narratives in Lucian’s \textit{De Dea Syria} and Arrian’s \textit{Indika}.\textsuperscript{802} In imperial epigram, the entrenched post-Theocritean association between pastoral imagery and Doric apparently guides dialect choice in some contexts, such as the rustic dedication by a certain Crethon in Adaueus \textit{GP} 2=A.P. 6.258 or the Philip of Thessalonica’s epitaph for a miller whose tomb is his now disused threshing stone (\textit{GP} 26=A.P. 7.394), but, again, a detailed analysis of extra-epigrammatic allusion in imperial epigram that was attentive to dialect would likely expose many more complex patterns of use.\textsuperscript{803}

In chapter six, I demonstrated that dialect was a powerful tool in the reception and close-reading of early epigrammatic models among late Hellenistic book epigrammatists. A similar study for imperial epigram would almost certainly expand our understanding how these new

\textsuperscript{801} See Honestus \textit{GP} 9=A.P. 11.45, on moderation in drinking, as a possible parallel to Asclepiades’ uses of Ionic in sympotic settings.
\textsuperscript{802} On the dialect of Julia Balbilla, see Bernand and Bernand 1960, 80-98 (on numbers 28-31); Ippolito 1996; and Rosenmeyer 2008. On the revival of Ionic in certain imperial prose texts, and the language of Lucian’s \textit{De Dea Syria} in particular, see Lightfoot 2003, 91-122.
\textsuperscript{803} Zonas also incorporates Doric color into several of his rustic dedications (\textit{GP} 2=A.P. 6.98 to Demeter by a farmer and \textit{GP} 3=A.P. 6.106 to Pan by a hunter; on the latter cf. the likely influence of the Doric Leonidas G-P 47=A.P. 6.35).
generations of poets, who had a great familiarity with their Hellenistic predecessors, read or did not read the poetic use of dialect as Greek linguistic and literary culture became further removed from such language variety. From even a brief survey of the material, it becomes clear that some imperial epigrammatists were sensitive to the dialect of their models. One example is Erucius’ expanded variation (GP 2 = A.P. 9.237) of Callimachus G-P 22 = A.P. 6.351, the dedication of an oak club to Heracles by a certain Cretan Archinos. In Callimachus, the epigram’s initial τίν hinted at the dedicator’s ethnic identity, which was only to be revealed over the course of the conversation between Archinos and Heracles in the following line. In his version, Erucius composes a dialogue between a passerby and an oxherd on the oaken statue of Heracles in a marked Doric color, which is first signaled by the genitive article τὸ (PPl: τοῦ C) in the opening line possibly echoing the more subtle use of τίν in the Callimachean model.

A highly instructive example of the reception of dialect in imperial epigram is Lucillios A.P. 11.174 on the art thief Dion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>τὰν ἀναδυομέναν ἀπὸ ματέρος ἅρτι θαλάσσας</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κύπριν ὄλην χρυσὴν ἔχθες ἐκλεγεὶ Διὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ χερὶ προσκατέσυρεν ὀλοσφύρητον Ἀδώνιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὸ παρεστηκὸς μικρὸν Ἐρωτάριον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτοὶ νῦν ἐρέσιν ὡς ὑδατὶ φῶρες ἄριστοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “οὖκέτι σοί χειρὸν εἰς ἄριν ἐρχόμεθα.” | (Lucillios A.P. 11.174)

Rising up just now from her mother, the sea,
Aphrodite, completely golden, Dion yesterday stole
and with his hand he also pulled down Adonis made of solid beaten metal
and the little Eros set alongside.
Now the thieves who were once the best will say:
“no longer can we enter into a competition of hands with you.”

---

804 See discussion at 176-78.
The opening of the epigram should be familiar since it copies exactly the first line of Antipater of Sidon’s ecphrastic epigram on Apelles’ *Aphrodite Anadyomene* (G-P 45=APi 178), which is itself an imitation of Leonidas G-P 23=APi 182 (τὰν ἐκφυγοῦσαν ματρός ἐκ κόλπων). As we have already discussed, Antipater adopted the dialect of his model in his own inventive reworking of the ecphrastic conceit. Lucillios also acknowledges his model by retaining the dialect of Antipater’s first line. It is only in the pentameter to the first couplet, however, that the reader finds that this is not another ecphrastic epigram but rather a humorous reworking of the genre for a treatment of a thief’s skillfully sticky fingers. In place of Hera and Athena, our Dion receives the praise of other thieves (cf. *A.P.* 11.174.6 οὖκέτι σοί χειρῶν εἰς ἑριν ἐρχόμεθα with Antipater G-P 45.6 οὖκέτι σοι μορφᾶς εἰς ἑριν ἐρχόμεθα). It is almost certainly purposeful that Lucillios, just at the point of departure from his model, switches dialect from Doric to the Ionic that defines the majority of his epigrams, thus signaling to his readers that he has moved from imitator and reader of Hellenistic epigram to playful creator of poems for his contemporary audience. Whether every reader would have recognized the switch in dialect or its relation to Lucillios’ model is beside the point; what is clear, however, is that the reproduction of Antipater’s dialect added a further texture to the epigram’s variation that would not have existed if Lucillios had simply reproduced the line in Ionic. Dialect, in short, appears to remain a vital component of an imperial epigrammatist’s understanding and reception of his genre.

The longevity of some awareness of dialectal variance in the genre of book epigram is testified to by perhaps the most famous example of epigrammatic imitation and variation: the

---

805 See discussion at 305-308.
806 Floridi 2014, 325; Lucillios rarely uses Doric elsewhere in his surviving corpus with the notable exception being *A.P.* 11.81 in which a certain Androles celebrates his multiple but ultimately harmful athletic victories. Floridi 2014, 36 and 151, the most recent editor of Lucillios, understands the use of dialect as an attempt to evoke “il clima della celebrazione atletica” (36) on the model of Pindaric epinician within the context of a parody of inscriptions appended to athletic victory monuments, although we should not discount the ability of the Doric to suggest an imagined identity for Androles.
thirty-five poems on the life-like quality of Myron’s bronze sculpture of a cow. This series of imitations spans more than a thousand years from Leonidas of Tarentum and Posidippus to Julian the Prefect of Egypt in the sixth century CE. While it is quite likely that Leonidas was himself inspired by an already existing practice of writing poems on Myron’s cow, his couplet, rendered in a light Doric, served as an important model for later Hellenistic imitators, most notably Antipater of Sidon who composed a group of interrelated variations. While I have been unable to reconstruct a plausible poetic motivation for Leonidas’ use of Doric, this dialect choice still became a defining feature of the model for the vast majority of later imitators. In the chart below I collect all thirty-six epigrams and note their predominant dialect color:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.P. Number (authorial ascription)</th>
<th>Dialect (AI=Attic-Ionic; D=predominant Doric; d=some Doric; I=Ionic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.713 (Anon.)</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.714 (Anon.)</td>
<td>d (εἰσαγέμεν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.715 (“Anacreon” FGE 17)</td>
<td>D (τάν⁸⁰⁹; αγέλαν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.716 (“Anacreon FGE 18”)</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.717 (Evenus GP 8)</td>
<td>D (τάδε; ψυχάν [Pl¹⁰⁵: ψυχήν PP¹⁰⁵])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.718 (Evenus GP 9)</td>
<td>D (ταύταν; τάν⁸¹⁰; ταύτας; fort. ἀνεπλασάμαν Page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.719 (Leonidas G-P 88)</td>
<td>D (βοσκομέναν; ἀγέλας)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.720 (Antipater of Sidon G-P 36)</td>
<td>D (ποτί; τὔδε; πέτρα; νεμόμαν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.721 (Antipater of Sidon G-P 37)</td>
<td>D (ἀ τέχνα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.722 (Antipater of Sidon G-P 38)</td>
<td>d (τάν δάμαλιν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.723 (Antipater of Sidon G-P 39)</td>
<td>D (ἀ μόλυβος; ἄ λίθος; σεῦ; πλάστα; ἐ δρεπόμαν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.724 (Antipater of Sidon G-P 40)</td>
<td>d (ἀ δάμαλις)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.725 (Anon.)</td>
<td>AI/d (βοῦν ἱδίαν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


⁸⁰⁸ The influence of Leonidas is not felt one of the earliest poems of the series, Posidippus AB 66, whose fragmentary state does not preserve any Doric color, but is instead rendered in Attic-Ionic, including the Attic ἐπόει (for ἐποίη) in the final line of the poem. The subject of the verb is Myron, who hailed from Athens where the sculpture was also originally displayed on the Acropolis, and it is possible, as Bastianini and Gallazzi 2001, 193 observe, that the form, in addition to being metrically required, could possibly recall the origins of the sculptor and sculpture. If this is reason for the form, which I think is not entirely implausible, it is the only qualifiedly marked use of Attic to recall the native language of Myron in the entire series; indeed recognizably Attic forms are generally absent from Hellenistic book epigram.

⁸⁰⁹ Beckby erroneously ascribes the dialect variant τήν to Pl, which autopsy of the manuscript does not support.

⁸¹⁰ Beckby reports the τάν is correction for an original τήν; autopsy of a high-res photo cannot confirm nor completely contradict this reading.
Among the epigrams for which an authorial ascription survives, there exists a clear pattern of Doric usage. Particularly interesting is the continuation of this pattern of doricization down to the epigrams of Julian the Prefect of Egypt. Out of the seven surviving variations, Julian incorporates Doricisms into three epigrams, and it is possible that Doricisms in the other epigrams have undergone regularization, especially given their late date of composition. It is important to note that some degree of dialect variance exists still in at least one of the poets of

---

811 Again, Beckby erroneously ascribes the dialect variant τὴν to Pl, which autopsy of the manuscript does not support.

812 Gow 1954, 4-5 has excised the first four words of the hexameter ἀ δάμαλις δοκέω μυκέσται on the grounds that they are accidentally transcribed from A.P. 9.724
the *Cycle* of Agathias. Julian’s use of Doric speaks to the enduring influence of and learned reverence for the early originators of the genre of book epigram and thus highlights the need for further collaborative research between Classicists and Byzantinists into the reception of the Greek literary epigrammatic tradition in this late period.

Despite the general decline of dialect in book epigram from the Hellenistic to imperial periods, dialect variance and the layering of different linguistic registers never ceased to be an important feature of Greek literature. Commenting on the language of another Alexandrian Greek poet, who wrote over a millennium after Callimachus, George Seferis notes that “Cavafy’s world exists in the twilight zones…[in] an area marked by blending, amalgamation, transition, alteration, exception…a hermaphrodite world where even the language spoken is an alloy.” Seferis might as well have been speaking of the language of Hellenistic book epigram. And, indeed, for when Cavafy alternates *katharevousa*, the archaicizing and purist strain of Modern Greek modeled on Alexander the Great’s koine, with the local registers of demotic in the first two stanza’s of “To Jerusalem”, the pattern of mixture may well remind us the inscriptional epitaph for Atthis, or on a smaller scale, Meleager’s dialogic epitaph for Heraclitus of Ephesus; or when he closes “Caesarion”, a meditation on the son of Julius Caesar and Cleopatra, with *πολυκαισαρίη* (“too many Caesars”) an ancient Greek *hapax* borrowed from Plutarch (*Ant.* 81), which contrasts with the demotic register of the rest of the poem and is itself a learned reworking of the Homeric *unica* *πολυκοιρανή* (*Il.* 2.204, “rule of many”), we may recognize the studied evocation of literary models present in Asclepiades’ targeted use of Ionic in sympotic-erotic epigrams. In the modern Greek poetry of Cavafy, then, we hear echoes of the lustrous vibrancy of dialect mixture that defines the language of Hellenistic book epigram.

---

813 Seferis 1966, 152.
Appendix: Dialect in the Manuscripts of the Greek Anthology

Note: In the creation of these charts I consulted the editions of Stadtmüller, Waltz, and Gow and Page for the Greek Anthology in consultation with autoscopy of images of P and Pl. The edition consulted for any other text are cited within the individual sigla.

Table A: Doric/Attic-Ionic variance in the vocalism of *ā

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2r-76v=Pla
foll. 81r-100v=Plb


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.139.1</td>
<td>ἀδό</td>
<td>ἰδό (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.139.5</td>
<td>μορφά</td>
<td>μορφή (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.144.6</td>
<td>ἀ</td>
<td>ἰ (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.144.6</td>
<td>ἀδυπνόων</td>
<td>ἰδυπνόων (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.148.1</td>
<td>τήν (τάν C)</td>
<td>τάν (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.149.4</td>
<td>καύταν τάν</td>
<td>καύτην τήν (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.178.6</td>
<td>αύτή</td>
<td>αύτά (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.178.6</td>
<td>μητρί</td>
<td>μητρί (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.178.6</td>
<td>φίλη</td>
<td>φίλα (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.3</td>
<td>μάτηρ</td>
<td>μήτηρ (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.4</td>
<td>Ἀφαίστου</td>
<td>Ἑφαίστου (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.4</td>
<td>κοινά</td>
<td>κοινή (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.5</td>
<td>ματρός</td>
<td>μητρός (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.5</td>
<td>μάτηρ</td>
<td>μήτηρ (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.6</td>
<td>τραχύ</td>
<td>τρηχύ (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.7</td>
<td>ὄργαν</td>
<td>ὄργην (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.8</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ἱσην (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.307.2</td>
<td>κρονίδης (-ας C)</td>
<td>κρονίδας (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.113.2</td>
<td>ἐστεφόμαν</td>
<td>ἐστεφόμην (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.125.4</td>
<td>δεξαμένη</td>
<td>δεξαμένα (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.125.5</td>
<td>πάχυν 815</td>
<td>πᾶχυν (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.125.6</td>
<td>φαμί</td>
<td>φημί (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.134.1</td>
<td>ἦ τε</td>
<td>ἦ δή (B) (ἡ δή Pl8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

814 I exclude here examples with variants between Pb and Pb or Pla and Plb. I have collected some of these examples in the introduction to the dissertation (24-25).
815 circumflex add. C.
| 6.134.1 | αὐτήν | αὐτάν (B) (Αὐτήν Π[PC]) |
| 6.154.3 | ματρός | μητρός (A) |
| 6.163.5 | σιδάρφω | σιδήρφω (A) |
| 6.167.3 | αἰχμή | αἰγμά (A) |
| 6.179.3 | πετανών | πετανών (A) (πετεινών Π[PC]) |
| 6.180.1 | θαλάσσης (-ας C) | θαλάσσας (A) |
| 6.180.2 | τέχνας | τέχνης (A) |
| 6.183.2 | κυναγεσίης | κυνηγεσίης (A) |
| 6.183.3 | πτανών | πτηνών (A) |
| 6.184.2 | τέχνας | τέχνης (A) |
| 6.184.3 | πτανοῖσιν | πτηνοῖσιν (A) |
| 6.304.6 | ἀπάταν | ἀπάτην (B) |
| 7.2.2 | φθεγξαµένην | φθεγξαµέναν (A) |
| 7.6.1 | προφήτην (-ταν C) | προφήταν (A) |
| 7.12.4 | ἡλακάτης (-τας C) | ἡλακάτας (A) |
| 7.13.2 | δρεπτοµέναν (-ην C) | δρεπτοµένην (A) |
| 7.13.3 | Ἅιδαις | Ἅιδης (A) |
| 7.13.4 | Ἅιδα | Ἅιδη (A) |
| 7.19.4 | Ἅιδαν (A- C) | Ἅιδην (A) |
| 7.23.6 | εὐφροσύνα | εὐφροσύνη (A) |
| 7.49.4 | θνατήν | θνητήν (B) |
| 7.65.4 | σαυρογένας | σαυρογένης (A) |
| 7.81.3 | Μιτυλάνα | Μιτυλήνα (A) |
| 7.147.8 | ἀρετάς | ἀρετής (A) |
| 7.147.9 | ἅμπλακεν | ἅμπλακεν (A) |
| 7.182.3 | νόµφας (-ης C) | νόµφης (A) |
| 7.182.3 | ἄχευν | ἄχευν (A) (ἄχευν Π[PC]) |
| 7.185.4 | κλαυσαµένα | κλαυσαµένη (A) |
| 7.185.6 | ἀμετέραν | ἀμετέρην (A) |
| 7.189.2 | μελιζοµένης (-αν C) | μελιζοµέναν (B) |
| 7.198.8 | σάµα | σᾶµα (B) |
| 7.217.2 | τάν | τήν (B) |
| 7.217.4 | δισσάς (δι᾽ ὀσὶς C) | δισσῆς (B) |
| 7.221.3 | ἀοιδῆς (-ας C) | ἀοιδᾶς (A) |
| 7.222.6 | ἀγαµένα (-η C) | ἀγαµένη (A) |
| 7.233.5 | θνήσκον | θνήσκον (A) |
| 7.241.10 | σκάπτρον (σκάπρτον C) | σκάπτρον (A) |
| 7.243.2816 | μνάµα | μνήµα (B) |
| 7.414.2 | Συρικόσιος (Συρηκόσις C) | Συρηκόσιος (A) |
| 7.429.7 | ἀ | ἦ (A) |

816 N.B. at l. 6: µνάµα (ΠΠ).
7.438.1 | Μαχατά | Μαχητά (A)
7.439.2 | ἰβας | ἰβης (B)
7.440.10 | ἐρατή (ἐρατή C) | ἐρατά (B)
7.445.2 | Μαντιάδας | Μαντιάδης (B)
7.445.4 | τέχνας | τέχνης (B)
7.451.2 | θνησκείν | θνησκεῖν (A)
7.455.4 | τέχνας | τέχνης (B)
7.451.2 | θνῃσκεῖν | θνῃσκεῖν (A)
7.464.2 | θεμένην (-αν C) | θεμέναν (B)
7.464.2 | αίον | ἰόνι (B)
7.465.8 | μνημόσυνον | μνημόσυνον (B)
7.468.2 | ὀκτωκαίδεκάταν | ὀκτωκαίδεκάτην (A)
7.468.4 | οἷμογη | οἷμογα (A)
7.471.1 | ὶμβρακιώτας | ὶμβρακιώτης (B)
7.471.2 | Ἀίδαν | Ἀίδην (B)
7.476.2 | Ἀϊδαν | Ἀϊδην (A)
7.476.2 | Ἀϊδαν | Ἀϊδην (A)
7.471.2 | Ἀϊδαν | Ἀϊδήν (B)
7.476.2 | Ἀϊδαν | Ἀϊδήν (A)
7.471.2 | Ἀϊδαν | Ἀϊδήν (B)
7.487.1 (A) | νεοθάγι (νεοθάγι CR. Saumaise) | νεόθηγι (A)
7.490.1 | ἄς | ἄς (B)
7.490.3 | πινυτατος (-ήτος C) | πινυτήτος (B)
7.490.4 | οὐλομένα | οὐλομένη (B)
7.504.6 | ὀλοαν | ὀλοὴν (A)
7.504.8 | παλλομένα | παλλομένη (A)
7.519.1 | ἰνίκα | ἰνίκα (B)
7.519.2 | ἰμετέροις | ἰμετέροις (B)
7.551.8 | ὶμοφροσύνης | ὶμοφροσύνας (A)
7.568.8 | τακομένων | τακομένων (B)
7.568.8 | φθυμένας | φθυμένας (B)
7.647.1 | φύλην | φύλαν (A)
7.647.1 | μητέρα | ματέρα (A)
7.703.3 | τάν | τήν (A)

Total instances of variance: 97

Doric form in P: 74/97=76%  Rate of transmission of Doric in P v. Pl$: 50/66=76%
Doric form in Pl: 23/97=24%  Rate of transmission of Doric in P v. Pl$^b$: 24/30=80%

$^{817}$ C corrected accent (Μαχάτα).
$^{818}$ P and Pl jointly transmit Doric forms elsewhere in epigram: ἄ (1); στάλας (1); Ἀρετημάς (5); πάτρα (5); γενόμαι (6).
$^{819}$ 7.486 duplicated in the margin after 7.477 by C, see below.
**Table B: Reflex of *ā following ε, ι, or ρ**

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2r–76v=Pla
foll. 81r–100v=Plb


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4</td>
<td>θύρην</td>
<td>θύραν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.105.2</td>
<td>ἀκρασίας</td>
<td>ἀκρασίης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.212.4</td>
<td>κραδία</td>
<td>κραδίη (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.238.1</td>
<td>κούρα</td>
<td>κούρη (A) (-ρα Plac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.287.3</td>
<td>κούρα</td>
<td>κούρη (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.179.5</td>
<td>αἰθρας</td>
<td>αἰθρης (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.180.5</td>
<td>χερσαίοις</td>
<td>χερσαίης (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.219.1</td>
<td>θεάς</td>
<td>θεής (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24.1</td>
<td>ὀπώρας</td>
<td>ὀπώρης (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.49.4</td>
<td>ἱστορίαν</td>
<td>ἱστορίη (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.73.2</td>
<td>ναυφθορίας (-ας C)</td>
<td>ναυφθορίας (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.192.3</td>
<td>σκιερής</td>
<td>σκιερήν (A) (-ήν Plac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.196.4</td>
<td>λύρας</td>
<td>λύρης (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.212.1</td>
<td>αἰθυίας</td>
<td>αἰθυίης (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.413.8</td>
<td>σοφία</td>
<td>σοφία (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.413.8</td>
<td>ὀρεδρομίης</td>
<td>ὀρεδρομίης (B) (Stadtmüller cf. ὄρε-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.419.5</td>
<td>ἱερά</td>
<td>ἱερή (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.440.2</td>
<td>οἶην</td>
<td>οἶαν (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.470.7</td>
<td>ἐλαφρας</td>
<td>ἐλαφρά (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.490.1</td>
<td>Ἀντιβιάν</td>
<td>Ἀντιβίην (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.491.2</td>
<td>ἀλκίαν (ἡλ- C) 820</td>
<td>ἀλκίην (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.503.1</td>
<td>ἄρχαίας</td>
<td>ἄρχαίης (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.519.3</td>
<td>ἐτέρα</td>
<td>ἐτέρη (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.529.2</td>
<td>πυρῆς</td>
<td>πυρᾶς (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total instances of variance: 24821
Doric/Attic in P to Ionic in Pl: 15/24 (63%); Ionic in P to Doric/Attic in Pl: 9/24 (37%)

820 Beckby erroneously reverses the forms for P and C.
821 I chose not to include 6.243.2 (θησαλιάς Pl: θησαλίας P) on the grounds that the noun is plainly meant to be accusative plural in the context (δέξο γενεθλιδίου...θησαλίας). Still the variant transmitted in P is interesting in that it possibly represents a scribal intervention to eliminate what was considered to be an erroneous Attic/Doric form or introduce an “Ionic” color to an epigram associated with Samos.
Table C: Other Dialectal Variances in P and Pl

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codicis P corrector=C
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2r'-76v'=Pla
foll. 81r'-100v'=Plb


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.144.6</td>
<td>κρέσσων</td>
<td>κρέσσων (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.118.6</td>
<td>πρατά</td>
<td>πρότα (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.121.1</td>
<td>Ἐχέμμα</td>
<td>Ἐχέμμα (A)</td>
<td>Ἐχέμμου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.413.7</td>
<td>κάρρον</td>
<td>κρέσσων (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.427.3</td>
<td>πεπτητός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.431.3</td>
<td>πράτον</td>
<td>πρότον (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.437.1</td>
<td>αὐθίς</td>
<td>αὐτίς (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.448.1</td>
<td>Λυκάστω</td>
<td></td>
<td>Λυκάστω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.467.2</td>
<td>γοίωσα</td>
<td>γοίωσα (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.472b.2</td>
<td>κήγω</td>
<td>κάγω (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D: Dialect Variance P and PlC

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codicis P corrector=C
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2r'-76v'=Pla
foll. 81r'-100v'=Plb


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PlC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.148.1</td>
<td>τίν</td>
<td>τίν (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.307.2</td>
<td>κρονίδης</td>
<td>κρονίδας (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.118.6</td>
<td>πρατά (scil. πράτα)</td>
<td>πρότα (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.180.1</td>
<td>θαλάσσις</td>
<td>θαλάσσις (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.1</td>
<td>προφήτην</td>
<td>προφήταν (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.2</td>
<td>δρεπτομέναν</td>
<td>δρεπτομένην (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

822 C corrects ἀπρατόν to ἀ πρατόν and adds a marginal notation “δωρικῶς ἀντί τίον πρόταν.”
823 It was difficult to differentiate from autopsy of the image of P between the hand of scribe A and C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.182.3</td>
<td>νύμφας</td>
<td>νύμφης (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.189.2</td>
<td>μελιζομένης</td>
<td>μελιζομέναν (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.221.3</td>
<td>ἀοιδῆς</td>
<td>ἀοιδᾶς (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.222.6</td>
<td>ἀγαμένα</td>
<td>ἀγαμένη (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.241.5</td>
<td>χαίτην</td>
<td>χαίταν (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.241.10</td>
<td>σκήπτρον</td>
<td>σκῆπτρον (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.414.2</td>
<td>Συρακόσιος</td>
<td>Συρηκόσιος (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.464.2</td>
<td>θεμένην</td>
<td>θεμέναν (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.490.3</td>
<td>πινυτάτος</td>
<td>πινυτήτος (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E: Dialect Variance in PPl and C

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codicis P corrector=C
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2r-76v=Pla
foll. 81v-100v=Plb


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>PPl</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.154.2</td>
<td>μορφάς (A)</td>
<td>μορφής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180.6</td>
<td>γενέτης (A)</td>
<td>γενέτας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.254.1</td>
<td>κούρη (A)</td>
<td>κούρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.121.1</td>
<td>Ἑχέμα (A)</td>
<td>Ἑχέμου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.171.7</td>
<td>γενέθλης (A)</td>
<td>γενέθλας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.219.5</td>
<td>πέτρην (A)</td>
<td>πέτραν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.219.6</td>
<td>Ζηήν (A)</td>
<td>Ζανός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33.2</td>
<td>Ἀἰόδη (A)</td>
<td>Ἀίδαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.46.2</td>
<td>μνήμα (A)</td>
<td>μνάμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.185.1</td>
<td>Ἄρωμος (A)</td>
<td>Ἄρωμας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.189.2</td>
<td>ἡέλιος (B)</td>
<td>ἡέλιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.217.1</td>
<td>ἐταίραν (B)</td>
<td>ἐταίρην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.232.2</td>
<td>μάχης (B)</td>
<td>μάχας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.413.2</td>
<td>ἐλόμαν (B)</td>
<td>ἐλόμην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.429.8</td>
<td>ἑφρασάμην (A)</td>
<td>ἑφρασάμαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.489.3</td>
<td>σιδήρῳ (A)</td>
<td>σιδάρῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.493.1</td>
<td>Ἑρώδοπα (B)</td>
<td>Ἑρώδηπ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.536.2</td>
<td>οἰνάθης (A)</td>
<td>οἰνάθας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.647.4</td>
<td>καδομέναν</td>
<td>κηδομένην824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total instances: 19
Doric in PPl to Attic-Ionic in C: 5 (6 should one understand 7.217.1 ἐταίραν as Doric)
Attic-Ionic in PPl to Doric in C: 12 (13 should one understand 6.219.5 πέτραν as Doric)

---

824 Salmasius emends to καδεμώνα.
Table F: Total Dialect Variances between P and C (α/η interchange and other dialect forms)

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codicis P corrector=C

Dialect color:
D: predominant Doric
d: some Doric
I: predominant Ionic
i: some Ionic
AI: predominant Attic-Ionic


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Dialect Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.148.1</td>
<td>τήν</td>
<td>τάν</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.154.2</td>
<td>μορφᾶς</td>
<td>μορφῆς</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.191.8</td>
<td>στοργάς</td>
<td>στοργῆς</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.195.3</td>
<td>ἄ</td>
<td>ἡ</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.195.3</td>
<td>μορφῆς</td>
<td>μορφᾶς</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.214.2</td>
<td>παλλιμένην</td>
<td>παλλιμέναν</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.118.6</td>
<td>πρατά</td>
<td>πρώτα</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.121.1</td>
<td>Ἐχέμμα</td>
<td>Ἐχέμμου</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.123.4</td>
<td>Κρατός</td>
<td>Κρητός</td>
<td>D/AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.169.3</td>
<td>φιλακρήτῳ</td>
<td>φιλακράτῳ</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.171.7</td>
<td>γενέθλις</td>
<td>γενέθλας</td>
<td>D/i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.180.1</td>
<td>θαλάσσης</td>
<td>θαλάσσας</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.219.6</td>
<td>Ζηνός</td>
<td>Ζανός</td>
<td>D/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.1</td>
<td>προφήτην</td>
<td>προφήταν</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13.2</td>
<td>δρεπτομέναν</td>
<td>δρεπτομένην</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33.2</td>
<td>Ἀίδην</td>
<td>Ἀίδαν</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.46.2</td>
<td>μνήμα</td>
<td>μνάμα</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.163.1</td>
<td>εὕσα</td>
<td>οὕσα</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.163.2</td>
<td>Καλλιτέλους</td>
<td>Καλλιτέλευς</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.182.3</td>
<td>νύμφας</td>
<td>νύμφης</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.185.1</td>
<td>Ἄρῶμης</td>
<td>Ἄρωμας</td>
<td>AI/i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.189.2</td>
<td>μελιζομένης</td>
<td>μελιζομέναν</td>
<td>D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.189.2</td>
<td>ἰέλιος (B)</td>
<td>ἰέλιος</td>
<td>D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.221.3</td>
<td>ἀοιδῆς</td>
<td>ἀοιδᾶς</td>
<td>i/d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

825 P transmits dialect variance: τάν...παλλιμένην καρδίην (-ίαν C).
826 Stadtmüller, Beckby, and Gow and Page report a correction, however I found it very difficult to see any underlying traces of ink on the facsimile.
| 7.222.6 | ἁψαμένα | ἁψαμένη | I |
| 7.232.2 | μάχης | μάχας | Al/i |
| 7.241.5 | χαίτην | χαίταν | d |
| 7.241.10 | σκάπρτον | σκάπρτον | d |
| 7.413.2 | ἐλόμαν | ἐλόμην | D? |
| 7.414.2 | Συρακόσιος | Συρηκόσιος | d |
| 7.418.2 | δεξαμένη | δεξαμένα | D |
| 7.418.3 | θρεψαμένη | θρεψαμένα | D |
| 7.429.1 | παροδίτας | παροδήτης | D |
| 7.429.8 | ἐφρασάμην | ἐφρασάμαν | D |
| 7.430.1 | καθάψεν | καθήψεν | D |
| 7.464.2 | θεμένην | θεμέναν | D |
| 7.489.3 | σιδήρφο | σιδάρφο | D |
| 7.490.3 | πινυτάτος | πινυτήτος | D |
| 7.491.2 | ἡλικίαν | ἡλικιαν | D |
| 7.493.1 | Ἄροδόπα | Ἄροδόπη | D |
| 7.536.2 | οἰνάνθης | οἰνάνθας | Al |
| 7.647.4 | καδομέναν | κηδομένην | Al |

**Table G: Dialect Variance in P, Pl, and Appendix Barbarino-Vaticana (ABV)**

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codicis P corrector=C
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2–76°=Pl^a
foll. 81°–100°=Pl^b
Vat. Barb. gr. 123=ABV^M
Vat. gr. 240=ABV^V
Par. suppl. gr. 1199=ABV^p (absent from Sternbach 1896; only reported for Book 12 epigrams from Aubreton, Irigoin, and Buffière 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABV=AP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
<th>ABV^M</th>
<th>ABV^V</th>
<th>ABV^p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.2=5.172.2</td>
<td>φίλας</td>
<td>φίλης</td>
<td>φίλης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4=5.172.4</td>
<td>φῶς</td>
<td>φάες</td>
<td>φάος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6=5.172.6</td>
<td>ἐσσι</td>
<td>ἐσσι</td>
<td>ἐσσί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9=5.35.9</td>
<td>ἐθείσατο</td>
<td>ἐθείσατω (A)</td>
<td>ἐθείσατο</td>
<td>ἐθείσατο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.1=5.37.1</td>
<td>παχείαν</td>
<td>παχήν</td>
<td>παχείν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4=5.37.4</td>
<td>κέκτηται</td>
<td>κέκταται</td>
<td>κέκτηται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1=5.285.1</td>
<td>δία</td>
<td>δί’ ἀ</td>
<td>δία</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table H: Dialect Variance in P, Pl, and the *Sylloge Parisinia* (S)

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codices P corrector=C
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2r–76v=Pla
foll. 81v–100v=Plb
Par. suppl. gr. 352=S
Par. gr. 1630=B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S=AP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
<th>S (Sa + B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4=9.360.4</td>
<td>ξείνης</td>
<td>ξείνης</td>
<td>ξένης (Sa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4=9.564.4</td>
<td>τεός</td>
<td>τεός</td>
<td>τούς (Sa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3=16.159.3</td>
<td>ποι</td>
<td>ποι (Sa)</td>
<td>ποι (Sa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1832=16.201.1</td>
<td>σοι</td>
<td>σοι</td>
<td>σοι (Sa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

827 A correction appears to have been made by C, as reported in Sternbach, but I was unable to tell with any degree of certainty from autopsy of the facsimile that the form was παρθενικάν. Stadtmüller denies the ever was a presence of παρθενικάν, proposing instead that C overwrote A’s παρθενικήν to make the ending “clarius.”

828 Correction reported in Stadtmüller, but autopsy of facsimile could not readily confirm the presence of a correction; however there did appear to be a small addition of ink in the ligature of o to μ, which could conceivably be construed as a correction of o to α.

829 12.76.4=31.4: ἐκ μορφᾶς: PMV
830 12.86.1=32.1: ἀ Κύρις: PMV
15.2=16.132.2 | τάς | τής (S')
15.2=16.132.2 | Νιώβας | Νιώβης (S')
15.3=16.132.3 | ἂς | ἦς (S')
15.7=16.132.7 | γλώσσα | γλώσσή (S')
16.3=16.89.3 | θνητής | θνητάς (S')
19.1=16.109.1 | γρήγος | γραδός (S')
25.1=9.333.1 | χθαμαλόν | χθαμαλᾶν (Pl'Pl') | χθαμαλάν (S')
25.3=9.333.3 | ὅς (Pl') | ἂς (Pl') | ἦς (S')
26.2=9.637.2 | ἄέθλιον | ἄέθλιον | ἄθλιον (S')
35.3=9.626.3 | ἄμβροσίος | ἄμβροσίος | ἄμβροσίον (S')
35.4=9.626.4 | ὀσσον | ὀσσόν | ὀσσόν (S')
43.7=10.1.7 | λιμενίτας | λιμενίτης | λιμενίτης (S')
43.8=10.1.8 | ἄνθρωπ' ὄς | ἄνθρωπ' ὃς | ἄνθρωπ' ὃς (S')
47.1=10.42.1 | σφραγίς | σφραγίς | σφραγίς (S'Β)
60.1=11.47.1 | Γὔγεω | Γύγαος | Γύγεω (S'Β)
60.4=11.47.4 | οὖν ἄρνεω (Pεγ. οὐκ αἰνεώ) | οὖ δὲ φθονώ | οὖ φθονέω (S'Β)
71.3=11.390.3 | κρέσσονα | κρέσσονα | κρέσσονα (S'Β)
71.4=11.390.4 | φιλίας | φιλίης | φιλίης (S'Β)
78.3=16.197.3 | προσόπου | προσόπου (S'Β)
82.4=16.213.4 | σάν | σήν (B: σάν S') | σήν (B: σάν S')
82.4=16.213.4 | ῥόμαν | ῥόμην (B: ῥόμην S') | ῥόμην (B: ῥόμην S')
82.4=16.213.4 | Ἀίδας | Ἀίδης (S'Β) | Ἀίδης (S'Β)
100.1=12.241.1 | πεπόηκας | πεποίηκας (S')
112.2=12.224.2 | φράξεο πῶς | φράξεω ὡπός (S')
114.3=12.50.3 | μοῦνο | μουνό | μοῦνο (B: μουνό S') | μοῦνο (B: μουνό S')
114.5=12.50.5 | ἄως | ἄως | ἄως (S'Β)
114.6=12.50.6 | κοιμιστάν | κοιμιστήν | κοιμιστάν (S'Β)

832 Elsewhere Pl and S agree on Doric forms: 1.1: στάθι; 1.3: γας; 1.5: ἄ; 1.7: θνατος and δολία; 1.8: ἄφροσύνα and ὄστυμαν.
833 Beckby reports “Γύγαο [α in ras.]” (Waltz is silent on the issue), but it was very difficult to confirm the reported reading from the images of the folio. I could detect from autopsy the possible presence of ink that would extraneous to the formation of an alpha, but evidence that this is the product of erasure or over writing (of an ε') cannot be confirmed with any degree of certainty. The Anacreonta codice A transmits Γύγου (Γύγεο γρ. Λ mpg).
834 Beckby erroneously reports C corrected Α's ἄρνεω to οἰνεώ in suprascript; rather the fascsimile makes clear that ἄρνεω was corrected in rasura to οἰνεώ “in eadem manu” (Waltz).
**Table I: Dialect Variance in P, Pl, and the *Sylloge Euphemiana* (E\textsuperscript{RFP})**

Sigla:
- Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
- codicis P corrector=C
- Marc. gr. 481=Pl
- foll. 2\textsuperscript{r}-76\textsuperscript{v}=Pl\textsuperscript{a}
- foll. 81\textsuperscript{r}-100\textsuperscript{v}=Pl\textsuperscript{b}
- Par. gr. 2720=R
- Laur. 57.29=F
- Par. gr. 1773=P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.52.2=1.2</td>
<td>ναυαγοῦ</td>
<td>ναυηγοῦ</td>
<td>ναυηγοῦ (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.68.2=7.2</td>
<td>φαίδρην</td>
<td>φαίδραν</td>
<td>φαίδρην (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.54.2=13.2</td>
<td>κρείσσον</td>
<td>κρείσσον</td>
<td>κρέσσον (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.309.2=14.2</td>
<td>αίθε</td>
<td>αίθε</td>
<td>αίθε (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.62.1=15.1</td>
<td>περίβωτον</td>
<td>περίβοητον</td>
<td>περίβοητον (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.62.1=15.1</td>
<td>πτόλιν</td>
<td>πτόλιν</td>
<td>πτόλιν (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.62.2=15.2</td>
<td>τάν</td>
<td>τήν</td>
<td>τήν (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.62.2=15.2</td>
<td>κληξομέναν</td>
<td>κληξομένην</td>
<td>κληξομέναν (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.210.4=22.4</td>
<td>δένδρεσιν</td>
<td>δένδρεσιν</td>
<td>δένδρεσιν (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.213.4=23.4</td>
<td>Άίδας</td>
<td>Άίδης</td>
<td>Άίδης (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.1=26.1</td>
<td>ἔχρευ (Pl\textsuperscript{a}: ἔχρεο Pl\textsuperscript{b})</td>
<td>ἔχρεο (R: ἐρκεο P)</td>
<td>ἔχρεο (R: ἐρκεο P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.1=26.1</td>
<td>ἰ (Pl\textsuperscript{b}: ἰ Pl\textsuperscript{a})</td>
<td>ἰ (RFP)</td>
<td>ἰ (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.2=26.2</td>
<td>κεκλιζένα</td>
<td>κεκλιζένη</td>
<td>κεκλιζένη (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.227.5=28.5</td>
<td>μεσαβρινόν</td>
<td>μεσαβρινόν</td>
<td>μεσαβρινόν (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.227.5=28.5</td>
<td>παγάς</td>
<td>πηγής</td>
<td>πηγής (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.824.1=30.1</td>
<td>ταῦτην</td>
<td>ταῦταν</td>
<td>ταῦτην (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.824.3=30.3 (bis)</td>
<td>αίτε</td>
<td>ο’ τε</td>
<td>αίτε (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.824.4=30.4</td>
<td>αίτε</td>
<td>ο’ τε</td>
<td>αίτε (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.823.2=31.2</td>
<td>βληχή</td>
<td>βληχά</td>
<td>βληχά (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.823.3=31.3</td>
<td>μελισδέται</td>
<td>μελισδέται</td>
<td>μελισδέται (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.826.1=33.1</td>
<td>τεχνήσατο</td>
<td>τεχνάσατο</td>
<td>τεχνάσατο (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.826.1=33.1</td>
<td>δαιδαλέη</td>
<td>δαιδαλέα</td>
<td>δαιδαλέα (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.932.2=36.2</td>
<td>κρυφίασιν</td>
<td>κρυφίασιν</td>
<td>κρυφίασιν (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.108.1=39.1\textsuperscript{835}</td>
<td>τεττέρων</td>
<td>τεσσάρων</td>
<td>τεσσάρων (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.106.3=40.3</td>
<td>ἔρρυζητο (C: ἔρρυζητο)</td>
<td>ἔρρυζητο</td>
<td>ἔρρυζητο (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.293.1=44.1</td>
<td>οὐράν</td>
<td>οὐράν</td>
<td>οὐράν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.748.1=48.1</td>
<td>ἀ (P\textsuperscript{a}: ἀ Pl\textsuperscript{b})</td>
<td>ἀ (Pl)</td>
<td>ἀ (RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3=50.3</td>
<td>τεχνασθέντα</td>
<td>τεχνησθέντα</td>
<td>τεχνησθέντα (RFP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{835} Epigram also transmitted in ABV: cf. τεττέρων
Table J: Dialect Variance in P, Pl, and the *Sylloge* Σα

Sigla:
Palatinus gr. 23 + Paris. suppl. gr. 384=P
codicis P corrector=C
Marc. gr. 481=Pl
foll. 2'-76'=Pla
foll. 81v-100v=Plb
Heid. Pal. gr. 23 + Par. suppl. gr. 384=Σα

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Number=Σα</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pl</th>
<th>Σα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.12.1=7.1</td>
<td>ἄρχευ</td>
<td>ἄρχεο (Πλb: ἄρχεο Πλb)</td>
<td>ἄρχευ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.1=7.1</td>
<td>ἥ</td>
<td>(Πλa: ἥ Πλb)</td>
<td>ἥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.2=7.2</td>
<td>κεκλιµένα (Πλa: -µένη Πλb)</td>
<td>κεκλιµένη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.326.1=21.1</td>
<td>Πυθαγόρην</td>
<td>Πυθαγόραν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.326.2=21.2</td>
<td>Πυθαγόρης</td>
<td>Πυθαγόρας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.275.11=22.11</td>
<td>τεχνίτης</td>
<td>τεχνίτας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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