

**Demetrius Laco, *On Poems* II (P.Herc. 1014):
A New Ordering of the Fragments and New Light on Alcaeus**

Michael McOsker
Universität zu Köln
mmcosker@umich.edu

Abstract

P.Herc. 1014 contains Demetrius Laco's *On Poems* II. In the 19th century, the order of the pieces was disturbed and consequently, editions have published a disordered text. The recovery of the original numeration of the papyri via Hayter's numeration allows a clearly understanding of the topics discussed in the treatise. In addition, I provide some new readings of columns near the end that contain a fragment of Alcaeus (358 Voigt = Libermann).

Keywords

Demetrius Laco, On Poems, Herculaneum papyri

This is simply an interim update on my work on Demetrius Laco's *On Poems* book II, which I hope will be useful for everyone who wants to use this text until I can finish my edition. The currently available edition was published well before the infrared images were available and has pieces of the papyrus out of order, causing substantial portions of the discussion to be misunderstood.¹ Once the pieces of papyrus are read in the correct order, we can more easily see the topics of Demetrius' discussions.

Reordering the *cornici*

The sixteen *cornici* that contain the text are clearly out of order: the subscription along with an ample final *agraphon* is in the *cornice* numbered four. The wrong ordering is probably attributable,

¹ Cf. Romeo 1988a, and her previous attempt to reorder the pieces Romeo 1978. For details of the unrolling, *disegni*, and paleography, see Romeo's edition. All quotations and translations of Demetrius' Greek are from my edition, currently in-progress.

as Essler has indicated, to carelessness in remounting and renumbering them when they were taken from the walls of the Officina in the mid nineteenth-century.²

Restoring them to the correct order was a relatively simple task; all it required was awareness of Hayter's numeration system, which Essler described, and then observation of the physical features of the papyrus to solve the last remaining problem. In what follows, numerals (1-16) are used for the current numeration of the *cornici*, and Hayter's letters (A-Q without J) are used for the correct order.

The Oxford *disegni* provide the following equivalences in the usual manner: *cornice* 4 = Q, the final one. *Cornici* 8-16 remain in the original order, i.e. G-P. *Cornice* 5 was F. Therefore, in *cornici* 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7, we must find Hayter's A-E.

The Oxford *disegni* tell us more. The first Oxford *disegno* (p. 627 of the first bound MS) contains four fragments, two which are labelled «sovrapposto che appartiene alla tavola A» with a minuscule «a» underneath them. This implies that the *disegnatore* thought they belonged together. Their shapes do not match however and the text is not continuous across them. The left fragment is no longer extant; the right one is *in situ* on the papyrus. In a second row are two fragments, both labelled with mysterious signs, but then «1014 C» and «1014 D». It is clear enough that they were drawn from Hayter's *tavole* C and D, which correspond to the current *cornici* 2 and 6 respectively. So cr. 1 = A, 2 = C, and 6 = D.

Cornici B and E were apparently left completely undrawn, and they must be *cornici* 3 and 7. But which is which? Here, the physical state of the papyrus comes into play. When the papyrus was still rolled up, the top of its cylinder was smashed down at an angle, so that the papyrus, after unrolling, shows a repeating scallop pattern. The measurement from "peak" to "peak" is a circumference, but this is only a rough indication, because of how easily damaged the top of the papyrus was. In cr. 3 there are two such pairs, around 50 mm and 54 mm apart. In cr. 7 there is only one valley, more heavily damaged, but also clearly much wider, around 70 mm. This indicates that the pattern of damage as a whole was wider in cr. 7 than in cr. 3 and that therefore it originally stood closer to the outside, or beginning, of the roll. So we can assign the following equivalences: 3 = B and 7 = E.

The whole arrangement, then, can be found in the following chart. Until I finish my edition, Romeo's edition, as rearranged here, can still be used. The asterisk marks the tentative nature of my numeration, and sorting out the initial fragments will add dozens of extremely poorly preserved columns. This new order makes a difference in our understanding of the contents of the roll, as will be discussed below. In the chart, the current number of the cornice is given with its equivalent in Hayter's numeration (e.g. 1 in the current numeration = A in Hayter's). Then the column number in Romeo's edition is given, then my temporary column number marked with an asterisk.³ N.b. columns

² Essler 2006.

³ Given the lack of a note giving a total number of columns and of any intercolumnar *stichos* notations, it will probably be impossible to restore an absolute numeration (see par. 2 for discussion of some of these difficulties). But I hope to achieve a numeration that more accurately reflects the amount of preserved and missing text.

are not sequential at the beginning of work, and because of complicated stratigraphy, the real number of partially preserved columns is much higher (by perhaps twenty?), though most of these preserve only a few letters.

1. Table of Equivalences between *cornici* and columns.

cr.	Rom.	McO.	XVI	30*	8=G	XXVII	31*
1=A	I	1*				XXVIII	32*
	II	2*	6=D	XVII	19*	XXIX	33*
	III	3*		XVIII	20*	XXX	34*
	IV	4*		XIX	21*	XXXI	35*
	V	5*		XX	22*		
	VI	6*				9=H	XXXII- 36*-39*
			7=B	XXI	7*		XXXV
2=C	VII	13*		XXII	8*	10=I	XXXVI- 40*-43*
	VIII	14*		XXIII	9*		XXXIX
	IX	15*		XXIV	10*		From the beginning of cr. 11,
	X	16*		XXV	11*		i.e. LXIV = *44 until the end of
	XI	17*		XXVI	12*		the treatise, the numerations
	XII	18*					coincide.
			3=E	XL	23*		
5=F	XIII	27*		XLI	24*		
	XIV	28*		XLII	25*		
	XV	29*		XLIII	26*		

The Missing Parts of the Roll

As mentioned above, the unrolling of P.Herc. 1014 was not a simple matter. The early *cornici* are very heavily stratified, with each piece containing at least two visible layers. This situation continues nearly the end of the text: for example, cr. 13, edited as four columns, actually contains seven. For practical reasons, the heavy stratification at the beginning of the roll reduces our confidence that we are counting layers correctly, and the placement of fragments is consequently less secure. Then, after fragments are placed, there is hardly any way to check their placement, since they are often just groups of letters without context in the roll or text. Beyond the stratification, there are other barriers

to reconstruction. There are no certain traces of marginal stichometric signs nor an indication of the total *stichoi*. Thus we are deprived of important controls.

The roll, like very many or perhaps all, of Demetrius' rolls, is missing its lower portion. As Antonio Parisi once observed (*per litt.*), this may be a sign that they were stored together and identically damaged in the eruption or excavation. Romeo had suggested that the *συμμετρία* mentioned at the end of the book was the "standard" roll-length of ten meters; on this basis, she thought that we have about half of the roll. Demetrius wrote, «But so that we don't make this treatise out of measure as well, as we did the first one, I will stop writing here» (ἀλλὰ γάρ, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τοῦτο | ἀσύμμετρον ποιήσω|μεν τὸ ὑπόμνημα καθάπερ τὸ πρῶτον', αὐτοῦ | καταπαύσω {ι} τὴν γραφὴν. col. LXVI Romeo = *66 McOsker, ll. 5-11, note the scribe's punctuation after *πρῶτον*). But ἀσύμμετρον need not mean that the book is longer than the Herculaneum standard; a more general meaning of «due proportion» or «aesthetically pleasing size and shape» is possible, in which case Demetrius may simply mean «I do not want this book to be overlong, like book I is». If this is the correct interpretation, then we are missing quite a lot of book I, since it was apparently longer than book II and much less of it is preserved.⁴ If ἀσύμμετρον is understood in this way, we have no indication of how long the roll originally was.

“New Chapters”

Lastly, I'll give a few examples of what we can gain from the new technologies for reading the papyrus and from the correct reorganization of its physical pieces. I want to emphasize here at the outset that much of this material is more conjectural than usual. A preliminary summary of the newly arranged first three chapters follows, with the words and phrases that indicate why I gave each chapter its ersatz “title.” I give my temporary numeration with the equivalent in Romeo's edition.

Chapter 1: The Definition of Comedy

2* McOsker = II 1.2 Romeo: mention of *κωμῳδία vel sim.*

10* McOsker = XXIV Romeo: ἴδιον, ποι[η-, ποιημ-, κρειν-, περὶ φω[νῆς and κατ]ασκευ[- or παρ]ασκευ[-.⁵

11* McOsker = XXV.3 Romeo: ἴδιον and τὰ ποιήματα.

14* McOsker = VIII.8 Romeo: mention of *κωμῳδία vel sim.*

17* McOsker = XI Romeo: δι[αι]ρετικὸν [and perhaps πραγματικῆ]ς τῆς ζη[τή]σεως.

⁴ It is also generally in worse condition. See McOsker 2014 for details and an edition.

⁵ This is actually several columns; Romeo did not recognize its disastrous stratigraphy.

Chapter 2: Style

20* McOsker = XVIII Romeo: «we could use as witnesses those who (?) depart from common usage in many respects» (see below).

21* McOsker = XIX Romeo: mention of Metrodorus, reference to the *On Poems*?

23* McOsker = XL Romeo: discussion of metaphor and role of *syndesmoi*

24* McOsker = XLI Romeo: a methodological note, with ζητέω (twice), ἐπιζήτησιν, and ζητή[σε]ως.

28* McOsker = XIV Romeo: language (?) that has fled elaboration (?), τὴν βαρβάραν [(style or language, perhaps sc. γλῶτταν (see below).

29* McOsker = XV Romeo: more methodological discussion, as it seems: πραγματικ[ῆς ζητή]σεως and παρὰ...[τῆ]ν ἐπιβλησίαν.

Chapter 3: Reflections about the relationship between language and poetry generally?

30* McOsker = XVI Romeo: a mention of Priam, picked up by Πέρραμον βαγάταν in 35* McOsker = XXXI Romeo (see below).

41* McOsker = XXXVII Romeo: discussion of the signifying function of language, mention of tragic poets.

45* McOsker = LXV Romeo: *anhypotakta* (unintelligible) poems.

(At this point, the order of columns in Romeo's edition is correct.)

One major gain of the new order of *cornici* is that all the mentions of comedy are now in the same vicinity; they must have originally formed a single continuous discussion, which was notably long, extending over perhaps a dozen columns. This more or less constitutes the “first chapter” of the work as it currently survives. Such a lengthy and wide-ranging treatment is very suggestive, but the data are quite limited. It is possible that the second book of Aristotle's *Poetics* (or any parallel treatment in the exoteric works) is in question, but nothing particular detail of Demetrius' treatment suggests this, except perhaps the sequence of letters περιφε[, which could be from περιφέρειν and so conceivably refer to comedy's origin in travelling religious actors or carrying around *phalloi*, as Aristotle thought. The discussion in Philodemus' *On Poems* IV (which continued into book V) is comparable, and if Demetrius does have Aristotle in his sights here, it is interesting that Philodemus discussed him again later.⁶

⁶ In McOsker 2016, I suggested the possibility that Demetrius had used Crates of Mallus' handbook just like Philodemus seems to have done (the phrase ἐν Κράτητι, Phld., *On Poems* V. 24. 25 f. seems to indicated such a book). As far as we

The mention of the ἴδιον is of particular interest: the *idion*, particular, or defining, feature of poetry is a topic of much discussion throughout Philodemus' *On Poems*, but to a much lesser extent in Demetrius. If κωμωιδία is correctly restored, the defining feature in question is probably that of comedy (or possibly of drama generally). I wonder if the *idion* should be connected with the πραγματικῆς τῆς ζήτησεως (if I have restored the phrase correctly). If so, whether comedy even counts as poetry could have been under discussion.

The parts of comedy could also be at issue. From ca. col. L Romeo = *50 McOsker to ca. col. LV Romeo = *55 McOsker, there seems to be a discussion of the Pythian Nomos.⁷ Col. LII Romeo = *52 McOsker, where the σπονδῆον and καταχωρῆον (in Demetrius' idiosyncratic spelling) are mentioned, is particularly interesting. Perhaps there was a comparable discussion of the parts of comedies here?

The second new chapter seems to be an investigation in poetic style, perhaps a *pragmatikē zētēsis* into what specifically makes it different from prose and the various tropes specific to it. Unfortunately, this part is particularly poorly preserved. The density of mentions of ζήτηω and related words, as well as ἐπιβλησία, suggests a good deal of methodological reflection or argument. I wonder if again the *idion* was at issue, but of poetry more generally here rather than of a specific genre. The specific features, like metaphor and *syndesmoi*, could easily enter into such a discussion. Statements like «we could use as witnesses [sc. those who?] depart from common usage» (χρησαίμ[εθα] | δ' ἂν μάρτυσιν ο[. . .]ς | κ[α]τὰ πολλὰ τὴν κοί[5][ν]ῆ[ν] συνήθηαν ἐκβεβηκόσι [, 20* McOsker = XVIII Romeo, ll. 2-6)⁸ and mentions of avoiding a certain kind of style (28* McOsker = XIV Romeo, ll. 5-6) and barbarism (? ll. 8) recall Heracleodorus' statement, which Philodemus agrees with, that the poet's job is to write in a poetic style.

On Poems I.167.15-20 Janko

15	εἶδ' ἔμ[ε]ν φ[ι]λίππειον λέγειν ὅτι “ποιητῶν ἔργον ἐσ- τὶν οὐ λέγειν ὁ μηδεὶς, ἀλλ' οὕτως εἰπεῖν ὡς οὐδεὶς τῶν μὴ ποιη- 20 τῶν”...	«He seems to say well that “the poet's <i>ergon</i> is not to say what no one (sc. has said) but to say it in such a way as no one else of those who are not poets (sc. would say it)”...».
----	---	---

can tell, which is not far, Philodemus agreed with Demetrius, and so we would not expect him to duplicate so much work. I wonder if he wrote his own *On Poems* before he got possession of Demetrius' *On Poems*, or if he found flaws in Demetrius' treatment that warranted redoing the work.

⁷ See Romeo 1988b for commentary.

⁸ The anonymous reviewer of this article plausibly suggested μάρτυσιν ο[ἴ]τως ... ἐκβεβηκόσι, [ὥ]στε.

The apparent mention of Metrodorus in XIX Romeo = *21 McOsker is important because Metrodorus wrote an *On Poems* which at a minimum treated the question of definition, but potentially served as the major point of reference for Epicurean thinking on poetry and poetics.⁹ Demetrius might have invoked him here to support a *hypographē* of the *prolēpsis* (*in lieu* of a definition).

The third new chapter is also difficult to pin down precisely at this point in time. I suspect it has to do with the question of intelligibility and meaning in poetry, which is a problem that Philodemus also mentions at various points in his treatise, especially in connection with the *Kritikoi*, the euphonist literary theorists whom Crates collected and whom Philodemus discusses in books I-III. One of Demetrius' statements is very interesting: «... and they do not depart the common view that these things are signifying of something» (καὶ σημαντικῶς τ[ό] [ἐ] | γε κοινὸν οὐκ ἐκβεβήκα[ς] [σι]ν τὸ ση[μ]αντικά [τι] | γος εἶνα[τι] ταῦτα. *41 McOsker = XXXVII Romeo, ll. 3-6). This must be closely related to the problem of *anhypotakta poēmata*, which must be understood with Epicurus' statement in *Ep. Hdt.* 37 that we must take to care to grasp «what underlies our utterances» (τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα τοῖς φθόγγοις), which are usually understood to be the *prolēpseis*. The phrase, then, probably refers to poems that do not have any intelligible meaning. Philodemus says that *anhypotakta poēmata* cannot entertain except under a certain condition which is lost to us (II 48 Janko), and more generally, we cannot even be sure that such compositions are even poems (II 32 Janko, though the word *anhypotakton* is not used there).

In this context, Πέρραμον βαγάταν may have appeared as an example (*35 McOsker = XXXI Romeo). The phrase appears in a line of poetry (φεῦ, κατέκτας, κατέκτας Πέρραμον βαγάταν); *Perramos* is Aeolic for Priam (found once each in Sappho and Alcaeus), and the term βαγάτας probably means something like «lord».¹⁰ Neither of these words would have clearly meant anything to speakers of *Koine* Greek in Demetrius' lifetime. Spoken Aeolic was nearly dead by 100 B.C., and *bagatas* was never Greek in the first place. Those the verse raises interesting questions about intelligibility: φεῦ, κατέκτας, κατέκτας is clear enough, but without understanding the direct object, it is not clear that we really understand the verse. Perhaps we would have to admit that we do not understand the earlier part of the verse either; e.g., is κατέκτας meant literally or metaphorically? Do interjections like φεῦ have meaning in the relevant sense? Obscure words and those in foreign languages do not point to a meaning or *prolēpsis*, and this fact has obvious effects for a reader's ability to understand a poem. It may also have effects on the reader's ability to decide if it is a poem at all.

⁹ See McOsker 2020.

¹⁰ On this fragment generally and especially the word βαγάτας, see Dettori 2005. *Bagatas* is related to the Old Persian *baga-* «god» and perhaps a diminutive in *-ata-*, but the root underwent substantial weakening before middle Persian, where it is generally honorific and no longer reserved for divinities. His point about the use of βαγα- for μεγα- only beginning with Ctesias is well-taken, but I suspect that the Aeolic and Ionic Greeks of Asia Minor could have encountered the original form earlier.

New Readings in Alcaeus, fr. 358 Voigt = Libermann.

The last passage I want to call attention to is part of Demetrius' discussion of a poem by Alcaeus, which he quotes and then glosses at length. I've made a few new readings in both the poem and what appears to be the glosses. In column 63, I read what is probably a *mu* and ruled out Liberman's supplement of κείτο on the basis of the size of the lacuna. In column 64, I managed to restore a linked series of imperatives giving advice of the sort that we might associate with Theognis. Notable here is the striking metaphor of a «tongue that barks in vain», which recalls images in Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1662) and Philo Judaeus (*De somniis* II 267).

63* McOsker = lxiii Romeo

margo, ut videtur

1] . [. .] οἶδ' ἀρίσ-
 τῶ[ς] ἔμμεναι πῶνων·
 αἶ δὲ κὲν ηγ[. . . (.)]c πε-
 . [.]η φρένας οἶνος, οὐ δι-
 5 ὠξιος, κάτω γὰρ κεφά-
 λαν κατίσχε[ι] τὸν ἴδον
 θάμα θῦμον αἰτιάμε-
 νος πεδαδευόμενος
 τά κ' εἴπη τὸ δ' οὐκέτι
 10 . . [. . .]μεν πεδα[. (.)]ε-
 τῶ· καὶ τ[οι]αῦτα καὶ ῥυ-
vestigia

0-1 οἶνον φάρμακον] Liberman post Vogliano ([φάρμακον|κον μελιάδε' οἶνον εὔ]) 1-2 ἀρίστ[ος] Diehl 2 ἔμμεναι Bergk : ενμ P 3 ἡγ[άναι]ς * post Romeo (ἡγ[ανέα]ς), cf. col. LXV.2 3- 4 πε[δάσει] Lobel ex 45.3, πε[δάσ]η possis, sed longius 6 κατισχει leg. Romeo ut Vogliano¹ conī. 8 corr. Philippson : α P 9 τ' ἄ κ' εἴπη Vogliano³ το P : τὰ Vogliano³ 10 κείτο] Liberman (brevius) : μίμνε] * : δὴ μάλ' Maas apud Vogliano 10-11 ἐν πεδαγ[ρέ]τω Vogliano 11 τ[οι]αῦτα Blass (apud Vogliano¹) 11-12 ῥυ|[θμικῶς] Romeo : ῥυ|[παρότερα] Blass

The meter is the Greater Alcaic (G1 | G1 + Ia or οο – ~ – ~ – | οο – ~ – ~ – ~ – ~ × , in West's notation); here is the fragment laid out metrically with two of my conjectures:

1 οο – ~] οἶδ' ἀρίστῶ[.] ἔμμεναι
 πῶνων· αἶ δὲ κὲν ηγ[~ –]c
 πε[δά]η φρένας οἶνος, οὐ διώξιος

κάτω γὰρ κεφάλαν κατίσ-
 5 χε[ι] τὸν φὸν θάμα θῦμον αἰτιάμενος
 πεδαδευόμενος τά κ' εἴ-
 7 πη τὸ δ' οὐκέτι [- -]μεν πεδα[γρ]έτω. '

«I know that (wine is the best drug?)
 when I'm drinking, but whenever wine binds my
 (*adjective missing*) mind, he (it?) is not to be pursued,¹¹
 for it (= the wine?) holds my head down,
 while blaming my own soul over and over again,
 regretting whatever it says. But let it no longer hunt ...?».

The mark after]ετω probably marks the end of the quotation. Many of the lacunae have resisted supplementation.¹² In the first line, Libermann's οἶνον φάρμακον]...ἄριστο[ν] is very plausible, and his objections to Romeo's ἡγάνεας at the end of l.2 are convincing. Πεδάση at the beginning of l. 3 is suggested by Demetrius prose paraphrase and good sense, but seems too long for the space. A quasi-epic πεδάη (cf. πεδάα at *Od.* 4. 380) is a better fit, and the present might be better than an aorist. In l. 7, Libermann's κεῖτο is too short (and does not match the μ or possibly λ legible at the end of the lacuna). I considered μί[μνε] μ' ἐν, with μοι elided. Ἐν πεδαγρέτω is taken to mean something like «in regret», relying on a slightly jumbled gloss in Hesychius and Demetrius' paraphrase. But the run of the passage suggests to me that we want a «but don't worry about that now», and πεδαγρέτω, if the form is possible, does nicely.¹³

More promising has been the next column:

64* McOske = lxiiv Romeo

5 ...σαφῶς τὸν ἐν τῷ θώρα-
 κί σου συνιστάμενον
 θῦμον, καὶ τὰ ῥάστ[ην]
 τὴν ψυχὴν φυλάσ[σου],

¹¹ See Pisani 1948, 163; adjectives in -σιο- often have a passive meaning or indicate obligation (as if διωκτός or διωκτέος).

¹² In the previous column, Demetrius commented on the high number of *glossai* in Sappho and Alcaeus: διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐν|τροχάζουσαν ἀδηλόγητα περὶ τοῦν γλωσσ|σήμασιν εἰσιν Ἀλκαῖος τε καὶ Σαπφώ κ[ι]τ[ι]γ[ο]ύ[μενοι] («on account of the lack of clarity that occurs, Sappho and Alcaeus are practiced in the matter of *glossai*», *61 McOske = LXI Romeo, ll. 5-10). For this meaning of κινέομαι, cf. Plato, *Leg.* 908d. Demetrius seems to think that Sappho and Alcaeus set out for ambiguity, at least on some occasions.

¹³ Between Hesychius' (not very clear) gloss (πεδάγρετον· μεταμέλητον, μεταληπτόν, ποικίλον, μεταδίωκτον) and the mentions of μεταμελοῦνται and μεταμελεῖται in col. LXV Romeo = *65 McOske, it was easy to restore ἐν πεδαγρέτω here. But the gloss of πεδα[γρ]έτω, however understood, does not begin until the end of the column, and it is not clear that the regrets mentioned earlier are to be connected to it.

μηδὲ πάντα ἐπίτρε-
 10 πε τ[ῆ] γλώσσ[η τ]ῆ μά-
 _ταια [] ὕλα[κ]τοῦσ[η . . . (.)
 τὸ δὲ ὄνομα] . . . [. . .] .
 vestigia

7 ταρασσ[ειν De Falco : ταρασσ[οντα Bergk 8 φυλάσσ[ου De Falco 10 τ[η]ι γλώσση[ι Diels 11 ται . . υδα[O

Much remains mysterious, but now we see more clearly that Demetrius is listing imperatives: «do» something (maintain?) «clearly to the spirit that consists in your chest, and then keep your soul easy-going, and don't entrust everything to a tongue that barks out vanities». In this form, it is not poetry (no meter is apparent), and the dialect is probably a *koine* (note φυλάσσω in l. 8, but η from ā elsewhere). This may be Demetrius' rewriting of advice contained in or implied by Alcaeus' poem.¹⁴

¹⁴ Needless to say, Diels' attribution to Democritus (D.-K. 68 B 298 a) should not be allowed to stand, nor can Bergk's attempts to attribute it to Sappho (⁴1882, III.169, followed by Hartung) or Ibycus. Croenert's idea (1903, 134 n. 5), that this material is from a letter by Metrodorus of Lampsacus, is more plausible, but does not really fit the context in the treatise.

Bibliography

- Bergk, T. ⁴1882, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, Leipzig (3 voll.).
- Crönert, W. 1903, *Memoria Graeca Herculensis*, Leipzig.
- Diels, H. and Kranz, W. ⁶1951, *Die Fragmente der Presokratiker*, Tübingen (3 voll.).
- Dettoni, E. 2005, “ ‘Trag. adesp’. *120c K.-Sn. (BAΓATAN)”, *ZPE* 153, 75-82.
- Essler, H. 2006, “Bilder von Papyri und Papyri als Bilder”, *CErc* 36, 103-143.
- Janko, R. ²2003, *Philodemus, On Poems Book One*, Oxford.
- 2020, *Philodemus On Poems Book Two*, Oxford.
- Libermann, G. 2002, *Alcée: Fragments*, Paris (2 voll.).
- McOsker, M. 2014, “A New Edition of *P.Herc. 188* (Demetrius Laco *On Poems I*)”, *CErc* 44, 19-48.
- 2016, “Verso una nuova edizione del *P.Herc. 188* (Demetrio Lacone, *Sulla Poesia I*): storia del papiro e identificazione degli avversari,” in Derda, T. / Łajtar, A. / Urbanik, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology*, Warsaw, 503-514.
- 2020, “Poetics” in P. Mitsis (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Epicureanism*, Oxford, 347-376.
- Pisani, V. 1948, “Nota alla nota precedente”, *Acme* 1, 163.
- Romeo, C. 1978, “Nuove letture nei libri *Sulla poesia* di Demetrio Lacone”, *CErc* 8, 104-123.
- 1988a, *Demetrio Lacone: La poesia*, Napoli.
- 1988b, “La testimonianza di Demetrio Lacone sul *nomos pitico* (*P.Herc. 1014* col. XLVIII)”, in Mandilaras, B. G. et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May 1986*, Athens, 283-289.
- Voigt, E.-M. 1971, *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam.