NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

AN ASPECT OF LEONIDAS' RECEPTION IN
LATER EPIGRAMMATISTS AND THE ART OF VARIATION:
THE CASE OF FISHERMEN'S EPITAPHS

Dedicatory and funeral epigrams are treated by Leonidas par excellence in his extant oeuvre; the two are indeed closely related, as they are the two genres that originally constituted stone-inscriptions and that actually gave birth to literary epigram. Particularly telling in this respect is the appearance of certain common conventions in both genres. The convention of the speaking object is indicative: the dedication in anathematic epigrams, the tomb or the stone in epitaphs, as well as the dialogue between object (tomb/stone/dead) and god/passer-by.[1] The blending of the two genres is most eloquently expressed in the Leonidean old people's dedications of their tools when they retire.[2] A similar mixture, this time not in an anathematic but in a funeral epigram, is Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 7.726 = *HE* 72, on Platthis, an old weaver, the description of whose toils with the distaff and spindle has the feel of descriptions of poor people's dedications of the tools of a laborious life and echoes, specifically, the weavers' dedication after retirement (Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 6.289 = *HE* 42). Now an interesting small group of epigrams from the *Garland* of Philip is those treating the funerals of fishermen who were burned in their boat. These are Antiphilus *Anth. Pal.* 7.635 = *GPh* 28, *Anth. Pal.* 9.242 = *GPh* 20; Etruscus *Anth. Pal.* 7.381 = *GPh* 1; Addaeus *Anth. Pal.* 7.305 = *GPh* 11; Julian *Anth. Pal.* 7.585. It is interesting that the theme of the fisherman's burial in his boat is treated, in our extant epigrammatic corpus, by poets of the *Garland* of Philip and by a later author, Julian the Prefect of Egypt, while it does not appear in Hellenistic epigrams. Although the possibility cannot be excluded that an earlier author, presumably Leonidas, had dealt with the theme, our extant evidence implies that it is a subject invented and treated by later epigrammatists. Among the various epigrams of Leonidas on old working men's and women's dedications of their tools to the gods, we have an epigram about the dedication of an old fisherman's gear to Poseidon (*Anth. Pal.* 6.4 = *HE* 52), repeatedly

---

1. Cf. Hutchinson 1988, 71–74, with special reference to Callimachus *Anth. Pal.* 6.149 = *HE* 25 (speaking dedicated bronze cock), 6.351 = *HE* 22 (dialogue between the dedicated branch of oak and the god). The English translation of Julian's epigram is that of Paton (1916–18) and of the rest those of Gow and Page (1965, 1968). In the citations of poems, Gow and Page 1965 will be cited as *HE*, and Gow and Page 1968 will be cited as *GPh*.

2. We have dedications of carpenters, huntsmen, weavers, flute players: *Anth. Pal.* 6.204 = *HE* 7, 6.205 = *HE* 8, 6.289 = *HE* 42, 5.206 = *HE* 43, 6.296 = *HE* 50. Gutzwiller (1998, 93) very aptly remarks: "through the motif of retirement, for which Leonidas sometimes specifies old age as the cause (cf. 43 G-P = *AP* 5.206), a dedication comes to function like an epitaph by marking the closure of a person's professional, if not physical, lifetime."

imitated by Philip and other later epigrammatists.[3] We also have an epitaph by Le-
onidas for a fisherman (*Anth. Pal.* 7.295 = *HE* 20), on the death of old Theris, who
did not perish at sea but finished his life peacefully at home. The epigram ends with
the description of the circumstances under which his tomb was set up; this was done
not by any children, or by the old man's wife, but by his fellow fishermen (συνερ-
γατίνης ἰχθυβόλων θίασος). It would not be implausible to suggest that a later epi-
grammatist, probably Antiphilus, inspired by the situation in this epigram, where the
fisherman is buried by his companions,[4] and combining it with the conventional
idea of dedication of the tradesman's tools after retirement and its implicit funeral
connotations, replaced the human companions of Leonidas' epitaph with the inanimate
companion, the boat; Antiphilus composed at least two epitaphs on old fishermen
whose means of living served them also as vehicles for their last journey (*GPh* 20
and 28). The suggestion about the association of Leonidas *HE* 20 with Antiphilus'
fishermen's epitaphs is further supported by certain details: Leonidas' Theris is
τριγέρων (line 1); Antiphilus' Glaucus in *GPh* 20, is μυριέτης (line 5). In addition,
Leonidas used the name of the old fisherman, Theris, for a carpenter who dedicated
his tools when retired from trade (*Anth. Pal.* 6.204 = *HE* 7); this might reinforce
the connection between Leonidas' old workers' epitaphs, especially *HE* 20, and the
dedicatory genre, which, as I suggest, resulted in the composition of this particular
group of epitaphs by Antiphilus (perhaps first) and other later epigrammatists. At this
point it is appropriate to have a closer look at Antiphilus *Anth. Pal.* 7.635 = *GPh* 28:

> ναῦν Ἱεροκλείδης ἔσχεν σύγγηρον, ὁμόπλουν,
>   τὴν αὐτὴν ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου σύνοδον,
> πιστὴν ἰχθυβολεῦντι συνέμπορον. οὔτις ἐκείνης
>   πώποτ᾽ ἐπέπλωσεν κῦμα δικαιοτέρη·
> γήραος ἄχρις ἔβοσκε πονευμένη· εἶτα θανόντα   5
>   ἐκτέρισεν· συνέπλω δ᾽ ἄχρι καὶ Ἀΐδεω.

The boat that Hieroclides had was a shipmate growing old together with him, one and the
same companion in life and in death, a loyal fellow-traveller in his fishing. None truer
than that boat ever sailed over the waves. Her labours fed him till old age, and when he
died she buried him and shared his sailing even to Hades.

The rare ἰχθυβόλος, used by Leonidas (*Anth. Pal.* 7.295 = *HE* 20.10), is echoed here
by Antiphilus in line 3 (ἰχθυβολεῦντι), and elsewhere only in Etruscus' poem on the
same topic;[5] Leonidas' συνεργατίνης . . . θίασος, for the companions of work (line 10),
is transferred by Antiphilus to the boat in *GPh* 28 by σύγγηρον ὁμόπλουν (line 1),
συνέμπορον (line 3), πονευμένη (line 5).

---

3. By Philip *Anth. Pal.* 6.5 and 90; anon. 6.23; Theaetetus Scholasticus 6.27; Julian 6.28–29; Archias
6.192; Flaccus 6.193; and others (see Gow and Page 1965, introductory note on Leonidas 52).

4. The other two Leonidean epitaphs for fishermen, Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 7.506 = *HE* 65 and Leonidas
7.504 = *HE* 66, are irrelevant to the present discussion, as they deal with the violent death at sea of fisher-
men who were killed by marine beasts. For the satirical spirit in these two Leonidean epigrams, see Tarán
1979, p. 135, n. 9; Gutzwiller 1998, 96. They *are* associated, however, with Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 7.295 =
HE 20, as they actually show the dangers at sea that Theris has managed to escape; cf. Gutzwiller 1998,
96. The three poems were discussed together by Reitzenstein (1893, 146–48), who first argued about the
fictitious character of the Theris epitaph, which he regarded as a παίγνιον that teases the reader and belies
his expectations.

5. Cf. LSJ, s.v. ἰχθυβολεύς, which is used also in Leonidas *HE* 66.2; for the rarity of the word see
Geffcken 1897, 116; cf. Gow and Page 1965 on Leonidas *HE* 20.10.

Antiphilus *GPh* 28 and Etruscus *GPh* 1 are about the death of the fisherman Hierocleides and constitute variations of one another. Etruscus' poem is as follows (*Anth. Pal.* 7.381 = *GPh* 1):

ἡ μία καὶ βιότοιο καὶ Ἄϊδος ἤγαγεν εἴσω
   ναῦς Ἱεροκλείδην, κοινὰ λαχοῦσα τέλη.
ἔτρεφεν ἰχθυβολεῦντα, κατέφλεγε τεθνηῶτα,
   σύμπλοος εἰς ἄγρην, σύμπλοος εἰς Ἀΐδην.
ὄλβιος ὁ γριπεύς· ἰδίῃ καὶ πόντον ἐπέπλει   5
   νηῒ καὶ ἐξ ἰδίης ἔδραμεν εἰς Ἀΐδην.

The one ship led Hieroclides into livelihood and into Hades, assigned a double duty. It fed him fishing, it burned him after death, ship-mate to the catch, ship-mate to Hades. Happy that fisherman; in his own ship he sailed the sea, and aided by his own ship he ran his course to Hades.

Etruscus is usually regarded as the model for Antiphilus,[6] as the specific nature of the way in which the boat served as a vehicle for Hierocleides in death is given by the former (κατέφλεγε, line 3); the more vague ἐκτέρισεν of Antiphilus is interpreted as implying that the author takes the specific circumstances described in Etruscus for granted.[7] One could observe, however, that Antiphilus has produced not only one more variation on the same theme (*Anth. Pal.* 9.242 = *GPh* 20), but also another epigram (*Anth. Pal.* 7.634 = *GPh* 19) on a similar theme, mutatis mutandis: the death of Philo, an undertaker. The author closes this epigram with the analogous identification of the man's means of work with his own coffin: the bier Philo was carrying served to carry his dead body in it, just as the fishermen's means of living, their boat, became their vehicle to Hades. If the recurrent handling of this motif in Antiphilus and the obscurity of Etruscus, otherwise unknown in the Greek Anthology, are not sufficient indications that it is Antiphilus (perhaps a more productive author) who served Etruscus as a model, it is at least plausible to suggest that the argument for Etruscus' priority to Antiphilus, who treated the same theme repeatedly, is inadequate. The vagueness of Antiphilus' ἐκτέρισεν is not necessarily explained by a presumption of the exact manner of burial presented in Etruscus (κατέφλεγε); it can be seen as related to the information Antiphilus gave in another poem on the same situation, *Anth. Pal.* 9.242 = *GPh* 20.7 (τοὶ δὲ κέλυφος ἔκαυσαν ἐπ' ἀνέρι), in self-variation.

   The poems of Antiphilus and Etruscus are very close imitations of one another and, although at first glance no important differences can be observed between the two, a closer examination reveals a fine technique of imitation, the main feature of which is subtle opposition. The two poems' opening couplets are reversals of one another. The reference to the fisherman and the boat, in the first line of Antiphilus, appears in Etruscus' second line in grammatical-syntactical variation (change of cases = reversal of subject-object): ναῦν Ἱεροκλείδης (ἔσχεν, Antiphilus), ναῦς Ἱεροκλείδην (ἤγαγεν, Etruscus); the remaining information, κοινὰ λαχοῦσα τέλη in Etruscus,

6. On Etruscus *Anth. Pal.* 7.381 and Antiphilus 7.635, cf. Beckby 1957–58; Waltz 1928–57; Gow and Page 1968. In a discussion of the epigram of Etruscus, Antiphilus 7.635, and the epigrams of Julian and Addaeus, Carugno (1964, p. 158, with n. 2, and p. 160) mainly presents the poets' variations on the same theme, that of the boat, without challenging the traditional view of Etruscus' priority.

7. Cf. the introductory comment of Gow and Page (1968) on Antiphilus *GPh* 28: "we have to turn to one of these [sc. Addaeus, Etruscus] to learn how it happened that the ship here gave funeral-rites to its owner."

corresponds to Antiphilus' more specific σύγγηρον, ὁμόπλουν, which, in its turn, in-
spires or is inspired by Etruscus' *anaphora* in the fourth line, σύμπλοος εἰς ἄγρην,
σύμπλοος εἰς Ἀΐδην. Antiphilus' second line refers to the boat's double task in life
and death (ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου): Etruscus opens his poem with the same idea but using
different words that show the two poets' careful avoidance of each other's vocabulary
(βιότοιο καὶ Ἄϊδος). The first hemistich of the poems' third line, ending in both with
a feminine caesura, conveys the information about Hierocleides' profession with the
same rare participle, second word in both epigrams: ἰχθυβολεῦντι, ἰχθυβολεῦντα. The
remainder of each of the two poems is again a reversal of the other, this time on the
level of emphasis, while the meaning stays very similar; whereas the subject of An-
tiphilus' last distich is the boat, Etruscus lays the stress on the old fisherman and
makes him the subject of the period (γριπεύς). Furthermore, on the one hand we have
the idea of the boat's justice, exploited by Antiphilus in the central couplet (οὔτις . . .
δικαιοτέρη), in combination with its πίστις (line 3); on the other hand Etruscus
attributes happiness to Hierocleides (ὄλβιος); the servant's quality of Antiphilus is
replaced in Etruscus by its natural couple, the master's ὄλβος, or vice-versa.[8]

The three other poems treat the same theme with a greater freedom; the closest
imitation of the Hierocleides pair is *Anth. Pal.* 7.585, by Julian, a prolific sixth-century
epigrammatist from Agathias' cycle, who constantly exploits the traditional topoi and
produces variations of epigrams of earlier authors, both Meleagrian and Philippan.[9]
Anth. Pal. 7.585 is a longer handling of the subject that displays a combination of
elements from the epigrams by Antiphilus and Etruscus as well as from the six-lined
Addaeus *Anth. Pal.* 7.305 = *GPh* 11; in it the reader can discern an effort by Julian
for a careful balance between his models.

> ὁ γριπεὺς Διότιμος, ὁ κύμασιν ὁλκάδα πιστήν
>   κἠν χθονὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οἶκον ἔχων πενίης,
> νήγρετον ὑπνώσας ⟨Ἀΐδην⟩ τὸν ἀμείλιχον ἵκτο
>   αὐτερέτης ἰδίῃ νηὶ κομιζόμενος.
> ἦν γὰρ ἔχε ζωῆς παραμύθιον, ἔσχεν ὁ πρέσβυς   5
>   καὶ φθίμενος πύματον πυρκαϊῆς ὄφελος.
>   (Addaeus *Anth. Pal.* 7.305 = *GPh* 11)

Diotimus the fisherman, whose boat was his trust amid the waves, and the same on land
the abode of his poverty, fell into sleep unwaking and went to Hades the implacable,
conveyed by his own ship, himself his own crew. The boat which he had for comfort of
his life, the old man had also in death for the final service of a funeral pyre.

> Μύγδων τέρμα βίοιο λαχών, αὐτόστολος ἦλθεν
>   εἰς ἀΐδην, νεκύων πορθμίδος οὐ χατέων.
> ἦν γὰρ ἔχε ζώων βιοδώτορα, μάρτυρα μόχθων,
>   ἄγραις εἰναλίαις πολλάκι βριθομένην,

---

8. The remark of Waltz, who takes Antiphilus' imitation for granted, that Antiphilus "n'ajoute (v. 4)
que l'idée de justice étrangère à son modèle" (1928–57, 4:123, n. 1), is not quite precise: Antiphilus treats
the idea of justice, not found in Etruscus, but Etruscus does speak of the master's ὄλβος, not mentioned by
Antiphilus.

9. Julian, an author connected with the imperial court, was probably Praetorian Prefect between spring
530 and February 531; the epithet "Egyptian" refers to his native land and is irrelevant to his office, see
Cameron and Cameron 1966, 12–13; Hartigan 1975, p. 44 with nn. 4 and 5; Cameron 1977, 43–47; Schulte
1990, 13–15. For the publication of Agathias' cycle, probably in 567 or 568, see Cameron and Cameron 1966,
6. For a general survey of Julian's adherence to tradition see Schulte 1990, 18–22.

τήνδε καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ λάχε σύνδρομον, εὖτε τελευτήν   5
    εὕρετο συλλήξας ὁλκάδι καιομένη.
οὕτω πιστὸν ἄνακτι πέλεν σκάφος, οἶκον ἀέξον
    Μύγδονι, καὶ σύμπλουν ἐς βίον, ἐς θάνατον.
                              (Julian *Anth. Pal.* 7.585)

Mygdon, the span of his life finished, went to Hades in his own boat, not requiring the ferry-boat of the dead. For she who was in life his support and the witness of his toil, often loaded with his prey from the sea, was his fellow-traveller in death too, when he came to his end in company with the burning boat; so faithful to her master was she, increasing his substance and travelling with him to life and to death.

Etruscus' opening is echoed in Julian's first couplet with the reference to βίος, Ἀίδης, and the participle λαχών; the use of λαχών is here reversed (as also in line 5), being applied to the fisherman, not the boat, as in Etruscus, because Julian follows Antiphilus' syntax, with the fisherman as the subject of the period. Julian's main deviation from his models lies, together with his relatively different phrasing, in the addition of one more couplet, so that his two central couplets expand the models' presentation of the boat's companionship and importance for the living and dead man. Julian's third line up to the bucolic diaeresis (ἣν γὰρ ἔχε ζώων βιοδώτορα) echoes the similarly divided fifth line of Addaeus' poem (ἣν γὰρ ἔχε ζωῆς παραμύθιον). In the end, Julian's πιστὸν . . . σκάφος is modeled on Antiphilus' πιστὴν . . . συνέμπορον, but can be also a reminiscence of Addaeus line 1 (ὁλκάδα πιστήν); the term ὁλκάς is also used by Julian for the boat in line 6. Julian's final σύμπλουν ἐς βίον, ἐς θάνατον is modeled on Etruscus' fourth line (σύμπλοος εἰς ἄγρην, σύμπλοος εἰς Ἀίδην), but recalls Antiphilus' second line (ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου σύνοδον) as well. Julian's variation of the notion of οἶκος found in Addaeus' poem is interesting. In Addaeus we find the idea that the boat served the poor fisherman as a *house* as well as tool and funeral pyre;[10] Julian again picks up the word, but uses it in a different context and with a different meaning, applying it to the idea that the fisherman made a living and thus increased his οἶκος (his *possessions*) with the help of his boat.[11] The acquaintance

10. This motif is also found in Heliodorus 1.5.10: ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ σκάφος βιοτεύει, πορθμεῖον τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ οἰκητήριον ἔχων; see also Carugno 1964, 160. For the well-attested poverty of the fishermen in Greek society, see Gutzwiller 1998, p. 94, with n. 116.

11. It is again impossible to argue for the priority of Addaeus in relation to Antiphilus, or vice-versa; it should further be noted that Addaeus is also aware of Etruscus' poem (the opposite order cannot of course be excluded), as the use of γριπεύς, a Leonidean term for the fisherman in analogous contexts (dedicatory, *Anth. Pal.* 6.4.7; funeral, *Anth. Pal.* 7.504.12), by both poets implies. The recurrent handling of the topic in Antiphilus might suggest that it is he who grasped the idea and introduced it to the epigrammatic subject matter of his era. The assumption about Antiphilus' priority could be further reinforced by Addaeus' idea that the boat was the fisherman's *house* as well as tool and material for the funeral pyre. This detail looks like an addition by Addaeus, as it does not recur elsewhere; one gets the impression that Addaeus plays with and adds personal touches to a theme the stem of which is found in Antiphilus' corpus of poems, without excluding the possibility that the repeated treatments of Antiphilus were in the first place inspired by Etruscus' epigram. Based on Antiphilus *Anth. Pal.* 9.178 = *GPh* 6, where the reference to "Nero" seems to point to the emperor Nero, dating the epigram shortly after A.D. 53, Cameron (1968, p. 323, n. 2) holds that 53 is a *terminus post quem* for the edition of the *Garland* by Philip, whereas most critics accept A.D. 39–40 as the *Garland's* chronology (Gow and Page [1968, introductory note on Antiphilus 6] suggest that this poem was added to the Anthology later by a route other than the *Garland*). Of course, the fact that Antiphilus has probably written one of the latest datable poems of the *Garland* should not affect our perception of the direction of influence between him and his other contemporary poets; it should not be taken as pointing, in other words, towards the other poets' priority. Philip himself repeatedly imitated Antiphilus and other poets of his *Garland*, as is frequently observed by scholars (see Cameron 1968, p. 341, n. 30).

of Julian with the poets of the *Garland* of Philip is evident beyond doubt. It can be suggested that if this poet did not actually possess a copy of the *Garland* of Philip itself, as seems most probable, he had at least access to a source transmitting (parts of) it, and the particular group of fishermen's epitaphs offered him the stimulus for his own handling of the theme.[12] It goes without saying, of course, that Julian also had a thorough knowledge of the work of Leonidas and the Meleagrian poets (again through a copy of Meleager's *Garland* or perhaps other epigrammatic sources). It is worth noticing that Julian also produced, inter alia, a variation of the very popular topic of the dedication of the three brothers, Damis, Pigris, and Cleitor, to Pan, a theme probably introduced by Leonidas and then repeatedly imitated by later authors, many of them Philippan.[13] Julian's love for Leonidean themes is further demonstrated by his poems on old fishermen's dedications of their work implements (of Kinyras to the Nymphs, *Anth. Pal.* 6.25–26, of Baiton to Hermes, 6.28–29), which recall the analogous epigrams of the Tarantine poet and especially the old fisherman's dedication to Poseidon of his equipment in 6.4.[14]

To sum up: it can be plausibly argued that the latent funereal quality of the old tradesmen's dedications in Leonidas together with his Theris epitaph provided the grounds for the later epigrammatists' treatment of fishermen's boats as serving as the means for their funeral pyre and their vehicle to Hades; this was an imaginative exploitation of the subject of old workers and their tools, which unfolded one more aspect regarding the Leonidean practice (already established in epigrammatic tradition) of mixing epitaph and dedication, and which constituted a starting point for new variations. Antiphilus *GPh* 19, on the undertaker burned in the bier, the implement that played the same roles in his life and death as did the fishermen's boat in theirs, is a highly playful and even ironical experimentation on the potential of the motif drawn to its farthest extreme.[15]

MARIA YPSILANTI
University of Cyprus

12. It is interesting that Antiphilus *Anth. Pal.* 7.634 = *GPh* 19, on the similar subject of the undertaker's burial in his bier, is juxtaposed in the Anthology to Antiphilus *Anth. Pal.* 7.635 = *GPh* 28, in an excerpt from Philip's *Garland*, both poems beginning with ν in this alphabetical section (νεκροδόκον 7.634, ναῦν 7.635). It can be plausibly argued that these poems were also neighbors in Philip's *Garland*, as there was occasionally a thematic connection of the epigrams as well, alongside the external framework of the alphabetical arrangement of the *Garland* by Philip (alphabetical order according to the poems' first letter—not continued *inside* the first word, however, so that νε, in the present case, can stand perfectly well before να); see Cameron 1968, 335–36, 338–39, and 1993, 40–43. Cameron has indeed suggested the juxtaposition of similar, thematically interrelated, pairs of poems in the *Garland* of Philip, based on their present juxtaposition in *Anth. Pal.* and *Anth. Plan.* (1968, 339–49). The rest of the poems of the group *fishermen's epitaphs* (Etruscus' beginning with η, Addaeus' with ο) did not stand together in Philip's *Garland*, as it seems that Philip organized his material in one long alphabetical series comprising all the epigrams he anthologized from beginning to end, regardless of subject matter, a series that Cephalas ran through several times, hence the repeated alphabetical sequences in the books of *Anth. Pal.* as we have it today (see Cameron 1968, 334 and passim).

13. Julian *Anth. Pal.* 6.13; Leonidas 6.13; Antipater Sidonius 6.14; id. (or Zosimus) 6.15; Zosimus 6.183–85; Satyrius 6.11; Archias 6.16 and 179–81; Alexander Magnes 6.182; Alpheius 6.187; Julius Diocles 6.186.

14. This was imitated by numerous later epigrammatists, mainly Philippan and Agathian authors, see n. 3 above. It is noteworthy that Julian 6.28–29, on Baiton's dedication, is preceded, in an Agathian section, by Theaetetus Scholasticus' poem 6.27, about the dedication by an old fisherman of the same name, unique among fishermen's names in the similar dedications inspired by Leonidas *Anth. Pal.* 6.4; this deliberate reference demonstrates a playful dialogue between Julian and Theaetetus, two roughly contemporary poets, as it seems. (For this author, this is the Agathian Theaetetus as distinct from the Meleagrian one; see Gow and Page 1965, 2:520, the preface on Theaetetus.)

15. I would like to thank Alan Griffiths (University College London, Department of Greek and Latin) and the anonymous referee of *Classical Philology* for their useful comments on this paper.

LITERATURE CITED

Beckby, H. 1957–58. *Anthologia Graeca*. 4 vols. Munich.

Cameron, Alan. 1968. The *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip. *GRBS* 9:323–49.

———. 1977. Some Prefects Called Julian. *Byzantion* 47:42–64.

———. 1993. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.

Cameron, Alan, and Averil Cameron. 1966. The Cycle of Agathias. *JHS* 86:6–25.

Carugno, G. 1964. Su un motivo di alcuni epigrammi funerari dell' *Antologia Palatina. GIF* 17:157–61.

Geffcken, J. 1897. *Leonidas von Tarent*. Leipzig.

Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.

———. 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, K. J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London.

Hartigan, K. 1975. Julian the Egyptian. *Eranos* 73:43–54.

Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.

Paton, W. R. 1916–18. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London.

Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion*. Giessen.

Schulte, H. 1990. *Julian von Ägypten*. Trier.

Tarán, S. L. 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Waltz, P. 1928–57. *Anthologie grecque*. 7 vols. Paris.