FOOTNOTES TO SAPPHO: AN EXAMINATION OF THE FEMALE POETS OF GREECE

by

Jonathan Milton Rowland

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Studies)
in The University of Michigan
2012

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Ruth Scodel, Chair
Professor Yopie Prins
Assistant Professor J. Mira Seo
Professor Benjamin Acosta Hughes, The Ohio State University

This work is dedicated to my mother, Ellen,

who taught me, among many things,

that not all great literature is required reading in school.

Acknowledgments

Many people have helped me with this project and, more generally, in life, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank as many of them as space allows.

I could never express the debt I owe to my father, Milton. He has inspired me, pushed me, and given to me all the advice and aid he possibly could. He is the smartest man I have ever met, as well as the best. Truly, I would not be where I am today without his influence.

My mother Ellen has always been, to me, the very embodiment of quiet strength and courage. She has always believed in me, and I have always believed in her.

This project would not have been possible were it not for my wonderful fiancée Simone. She has read and edited my drafts, made me laugh, made sure I slept and ate, and been more than patient with me throughout this process. I am very grateful to her for all of this and more.

My beautiful and precocious son Henry has been a source of pure joy and constant optimism as I wrote this dissertation.

I am blessed with a wonderful family that has been very patient with me, even though this project has not allowed me to see them nearly often enough. My siblings Jessica, Patrick, and Amanda are kind and loving people for whom I am very grateful.

My nephew Liam is a smart, kind, and good young man, and I'm very proud to be able to call myself his uncle. Lengley is an adorable two year-old who is and hopefully will always be Henry's closest friend. I love you all.

I am very fortunate to have assembled an excellent committee who have provided many readings, edits, and helpful comments to me. Special thanks are owed to Ruth Scodel, who answered all my (many) questions. Any errors in this dissertation more than likely correspond to suggestions from my committee that I forgot to take. Thank you all very much.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends who kept my spirits up whenever I was overwhelmed, especially Jackie Murray, who helped me rework some of the more problematic spots, and Robin Greene, who provided me with helpful insights and a lot of laughs. I am very grateful to David, Brian, Conison, Chris, Michael, Elizabeth, Matt, Vicki, Ian, Marty, and Jim for their friendship and support, and to Shol, who was a healing influence on many of us.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AP = *Anthologia Palatina*

FGE = D.L. Page, ed. *Further Greek Epigrams.* Cambridge, 1981.

GP = A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams.*

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. 1ff. Berlin, 1873-.

LP = E. Lobel and D.L. Page. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford, 1955.

PMG = D.L. Page. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford, 1962.

Chapter 1

Footnotes to Sappho

1.1. Introduction to the Study

The 7th or 6th century BCE poet Sappho of Lesbos was in antiquity, and very likely still is today, the most famous and influential female poet in the world.[1] She was known in the Greek world as "the tenth Muse" and her poetry has been read, imitated, and translated for over two thousand years.[2] As a consequence of her renown, Sappho's poetry has cast a tremendous shadow over the work of other female poets, especially other Greek female poets. The poetry composed by these later Greek women is largely ignored by the wider scholarly world for a variety of reasons -- their extant corpus is too small, little to nothing is known about them outside of their poetry -- but the underlying reason is simple: these women are typically assumed to be imitators of Sappho.[3] It is the goal of this study to challenge that assumption and hopefully to help restore these poets to their rightful places in the history of Greek literature as innovative and influential poets worthy of scholarly attention.

---

[1] On her date, the *Suda* claims that she either flourished or was born (the Greek is unclear) in the 42nd Olympiad, or 612/608 BCE, while Eusebius notes that she was famous in the first year of the 45th Olympiad, or 600/599 BCE.

[2] On the Hellenistic conception of Sappho as the tenth Muse, see Gosetti-Murrayjohn 2006, Acosta-Hughes 2010: 82-87.

[3] Cf. Barnard 1978: 213 "Anyte, Erinna and Nossis...followed the tradition of Sappho"; Gutzwiller 1997: 202 claims that "in [composing lyrics] as in so much else, the principal model was Sappho."

Sappho's poetry focuses primarily on women and the concerns of women and this has led to various readings of her poetry and life; the most dominant interpretations of Sappho's life are Sappho as lesbian (in the modern sense) lover and Sappho as schoolmistress.[4] Scholars for the most part agree that her poetry was composed and likely performed for a predominantly female audience.[5] This view of Sappho as not just a female poet but a *female* poet has persisted from antiquity to the modern era and has dovetailed with the recently emerging scholarly interest in "women's songs".[6] Broadly defined, "women's songs" are those songs sung publicly or privately by women that were part of a female oral tradition that was not written down and consequently did not enter the literary canon. As a result of this intersection, Sappho's work is understood as a glimpse into the exclusively female poetic tradition.[7] Although this is a study of later poets, and not of Sappho, this view of Sapphic poetry as *female* is important to the present work inasmuch as it has influenced scholarly interpretations of the later Greek female poets from the Hellenistic period to today.

Antipater of Thessalonica lists nine women in his epigrammatic catalogue of Greek female poets: Praxilla, Moero, Anyte, Sappho, Erinna, Telesilla, Korinna, Nossis, and Myrtis.[8] Of these nine, this study will explore the poetry of three -- Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis. These poets were chosen because modern scholarship on their poetry has for too long been fixated on questions about how feminine or masculine their poems are, or

[4] For an excellent discussion of the different readings of Sappho's life and social circle, see Parker 1996.
[5] See bibliography in Parker 1996.
[6] Recent studies on women's songs include Stehle 1997, Lardinois 2001, Bowman 2004, Klinck 2008. For discussion of Sappho's poetry as providing a woman-centered model of poetry, see Williamson 1995, duBois 1996, Skinner 1996, Winkler 1996, Stehle 1996.
[7] Snyder 1997: 2ff.
[8] *AP* 9.26.

to what extent they are imitators of Sappho, rather than about the poetry itself.[9] In this study I will attempt to refocus the conversations about these poets away from Sappho and onto the poems, the innovations, and the poetic projects of these excellent poets. This is not to say that Sappho did not influence their poetry, only that to focus on Sappho's influence marginalizes the poets who came after her and detracts from our understanding of their poetry.

1.2. Sappho's Influence on the Female Poets

Men in the ancient world seem to have equated all poetry written by women with Sappho's work. In the *Greek Anthology*, the compilation of compilations of epigrams, we find that female poets are described as "from Mytilene" even when they certainly were not.[10] The *Suda* entry for Erinna claims that she was actually Sappho's companion, even though we are quite certain that she wrote in the 4th century BCE. Although modern scholars rightly dismiss these biographical errors, the ancient instinct to connect any later Greek female poet to Sappho has remained mostly unchallenged for several hundred years.

Sappho's poetry undoubtedly did have a tremendous influence on many poets who came after her, and the poets of our study are no exception. There are several ways in

[9] Skinner 1991a: 80 "...both Sappho and her Hellenistic imitator Nossis". Barnard 1991 is a defense of Anyte's femininity against the perception of her poetry as masculine; Parsons 1993: 154 "Erinna, whose poem transfuses Sapphic material into epic meter and Doric dialect." Rayor 1993 defends Korinna from a similar treatment, criticized for her upholding of patriarchal values by feminist scholars (notably Skinner 1983) and praised as "a spokeswoman of female experience along with Sappho" (here arguing against Hallett 1979). Korinna is not included in this study for two reasons: her date is debated and the scholarship on Korinna has recognized the problems with reading an important ancient poet solely in terms of gender.
[10] Cf. *AP* 9.332 = Nossis 4 GP ("by Nossis of Lesbos"), *AP* 7.710 = Erinna 1 GP ("by Erinna of Mytilene").

which Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis show their debt to Sappho. This debt, however, is typically overstated and leads to one-dimensional readings of their poetry; more than this, one crucial element of Sappho's poetry that the Hellenistic female poets are said to have borrowed is not completely understood. Sappho's focus on women in her poetry, her dialect, and her use of a female narrative persona are the primary attributes of Sapphic poetry that allegedly provide a foundation for the later female poets, but the first of these has been debated for many years.

The vast majority of Sappho's poems concern women, presumably (and at times explicitly)[11] young women, and the relationships between the narrator and these women. These relationships are difficult to understand; this difficulty has led scholars to widely divergent interpretations of Sappho's life. Many understand Sappho to have been involved in sexual relationships with these women, or at least to have been expressing homoerotic desire in her poetry.[12] Others, rejecting what they see as a overly sexualized biographical reading of her poetry and more specifically defending Sappho against charges of homosexuality, understand Sappho as having been the headmistress of a school of young women on Lesbos.[13] Holt Parker has argued convincingly that our current understanding of Sappho as a teacher of young girls and leader of a *thiasos* owes much more to our own cultural inheritance from the Victorian period, and the Victorian conceptions of Sappho, than it does to her poetry.[14]

[11] 30, 56, 122, 140a, 153 LP.
[12] For thorough discussion and bibliography, see Snyder 1997.
[13] First articulated by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913. See discussion of the context for this argument in Parker 1996: 150ff.
[14] Parker 1996. The definitive work on Sappho in the Victorian period, and its consequences for modern scholarship, is Prins 1999.

Although Parker's insight is an important one, and his distrust of scholars' ability to explain Sappho's poetic contexts is reasonable, Sappho's poetry was certainly composed for an audience which must have included women. Her *epithalamia*, for instance, were surely performed at public (or at least quasi-public) occasions.[15] What is important for this study is not the specific makeup of Sappho's audience, but rather that her poetry was composed to be performed in public. More specific questions about her intended audience, especially those concerning whether her audience was predominantly male or female, cannot be answered definitively.

This understanding of Sappho as composing poetry for an audience of women, the female analogue to the male symposium, has led scholars to understand a female audience for later female poets, especially Nossis.[16] More broadly, their poems are read as expressions of what it means to be female. When this reading is coupled with the paucity of available information about the lives of women in the Greek world, the result has been a series of biographical readings of these female-authored poems, just as Sappho's poetry inspired. In this study I argue that in order to fully appreciate these poets and their poetic works, we must read them as poets first, and female poets second. To reverse this order, as many have, is to deny these poets the ability to challenge notions of gender, to assume male voices (as male poets assume female voices without discussion of their inner femininity or masculinity), or to compose a poem without a distinctly female narrator.[17]

---

[15] See Acosta-Hughes 2010: 99-102 for the most recent discussion of Sappho's *epithalamia*.
[16] For Nossis, see Skinner 1989, Skinner 1991b, Bowman 1998b: 46ff. For Korinna, see Skinner 1983. On Sappho's audience, see Parker 1996: 178-183 with notes.
[17] In order to understand the degree to which a fixation with femininity has led to fanciful and unsupported readings of relatively simple narrative strategies, one need only look at Skinner 1991b: 124, where she

Of the many actual influences of Sappho on these later poets, the two most obvious are their use of Sappho's Aeolic dialect and their focus on women, but these too are more complicated than they appear at first glance. All three of the poets in this study write in mixed dialects, like many poets in the Hellenistic period. Sappho was also not the only famous poet to write in this dialect, but no scholar mentions Alcaeus' dialect as a model for the female poets. In these poets' works, however, especially in Nossis' and Erinna's, it seems likely that their use of Aeolic is a subtle nod to Sappho's poetry. But this is by no means certain and, even if it is likely that this explains the incorporation of Aeolic into non-Aeolic poetry, this does not mean that any poem that includes Aeolic forms is necessarily Sapphic in nature. The poets' focus on women is likewise not as straight-forward as it appears. While Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis presumably composed more poetry about women than about men, as far as we can tell from their extant works, Anyte and Nossis at least wrote epitaphs for men: Nossis for the poet Rhinthon and Anyte for a fallen soldier mourned by his (male) comrades.[18] Because these poems challenge the perceptions of feminist scholars, they have been unconvincingly interpreted as poems that are actually about women.[19] These analyses are perfect examples of the dangers of reading these poets as women first and poets second, rather than the other way around. The assumption of the all-encompassing influence of Sappho on these poets precludes the possibility of reading their poetry as poems that build on multiple traditions and make use of various models.

---

discusses Nossis' epitaph for the dithyrambic poet Rhinthon. Nossis here assumes the voice of Rhinthon (a common strategy in funerary epigram), but Skinner reads the epigram as "call[ing] attention to the female poetic presence behind the mask." See discussion of this poem in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.4).

[18] *AP* 7.414 = Nossis 10 GP; *AP* 7.724 = Anyte 4 GP.

[19] On the epitaph for Rhinthon, see n.15 above. On Anyte's epigram, see Greene 2005: 151-153 who reads this poem as a challenge to the traditional opposition of "what may be considered strictly 'masculine' and 'feminine' sensibilities".

1.3. The Hellenistic Revolution

This is not the place for a detailed analysis of the myriad changes to poetry that took place in the Hellenistic period, but two general points are relevant to this study. The first is the transition from an oral to a literate culture that began before the Hellenistic period but was fully realized in the poetry from that period. The second is the emergence of a new genre, the literary epigram. As an understanding of these two developments is crucial to this study, a very brief sketch will suffice for our purposes.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance to the Greek world of the transition to a textual culture that began in the 5th century. This development not only changed the way poetic works were disseminated but also changed the nature of poetic performance. Socrates in the *Phaedrus* shows a disdain for this transition in a famous and relevant passage (275d):

Δεινὸν γάρ που, ὦ Φαῖδρε, τοῦτ᾽ ἔχει γραφή, καὶ
ὡς ἀληθῶς ὅμοιον ζωγραφίᾳ. καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἐκείνης ἔκγονα
ἕστηκε μὲν ὡς ζῶντα, ἐὰν δ᾽ ἀνέρῃ τι, σεμνῶς πάνυ σιγᾷ.
ταὐτὸν δὲ καὶ οἱ λόγοι· δόξαις μὲν ἂν ὡς τι φρονοῦντας
αὐτοὺς λέγειν, ἐὰν δέ τι ἔρῃ τῶν λεγομένων βουλόμενος
μαθεῖν, ἕν τι σημαίνει μόνον ταὐτὸν ἀεί.

For, Phaedrus, writing has this peculiar quality, and truly is like painting: for the creatures of paintings stand as if they are alive, but if they are asked a question, they are solemnly silent. And so it is with written words: you might think they speak as if they are thinking beings, but if, desiring to know about what they are saying, they always say the same one thing.

This passage illustrates the tension between orality and text in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE. While Socrates here is specifically referring to oratory, the same tension is found

in poetry, especially in epigram, the quintessentially written genre.[20] Archaic poetry was composed to be performed in front of live audiences, accompanied by music; Hellenistic poetry and epigrams in particular were poetic texts, composed to be read.[21] The evolution from a viewing and listening audience to a (primarily) reading audience had a tremendous effect on poetic self-presentation.[22]

In addition to the changes in poetic presentation came the emergence of a "new" genre of poetry, the literary epigram. As this is a study of three poets who produced epigrams, an understanding of the development of the literary epigram is crucial to this work.[23] Perhaps as early as Homer, or only a few generations after, hexameter verses were inscribed upon grave monuments and dedicated objects. These verses were simple in their purpose and presentation. Epitaphs named the dead to commemorate them, and dedicatory epigrams named "the deity, the donor, and sometimes the reason for the gift."[24] By the late archaic period elegaic couplets had replaced hexameters as the predominant form of the genre and they remained so throughout the Hellenistic period. By the beginning of the Hellenistic period, the two genres of epigram --funerary and dedicatory-- had expanded to include ecphrastic, erotic, and sympotic poetry, though likely these new types evolved from different sources.[25]

---

[20] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 322-323 discuss this passage in relation to the epigrammatic strategies of Callimachus.
[21] Gutzwiller 1998: 1-14.
[22] Important recent studies include Tarán 1979: 1-5, Bing 1988, Gutzwiller 1998: 183-226, Bing and Bruss 2007: 1-26, Höschele 2007.
[23] This is not meant to be a thorough discussion of the evolution of the epigram; see Gutzwiller 1998: 1-14, Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 283ff., Day 2007 for concise introductions to the topic.
[24] Gutzwiller 2007: 106-107.
[25] Gutzwiller 2007: 107-108.

This brings us to the Hellenistic period, the age when our authors composed their poetry (though Erinna was likely one or two generations earlier).[26] At the same time that poetry began to be encountered in books, the epigram, which was already a "written" genre due to its derivation from inscribed poetry, evolved from solemn notices written to convey information into a truly literary genre.[27] The emergence of the poetry book afforded poets an opportunity to compose epigrams completely divorced from the inscriptional context in which they had previously been encountered.[28] Bing has argued that the loss of the inscriptional context, which would in itself inform the reader what type of poem he or she was reading (e.g. if the verses were inscribed on a tomb in Sparta, then the reader would know even before reading that this was most likely a funerary poem commemorating a dead Spartan), led poets to play a game with the audience wherein the reader would attempt to understand the poem's context, a context which was not explicitly provided by the poet.[29]

These two developments, the transition from oral to textual poetry and the epigram's freedom from its inscriptional beginnings, are essential to understanding the poetic strategies of the three poets in our study; the first of these also illustrates a profound difference between Sappho's poetry and the work of the three female Hellenistic poets. Whereas Sappho's poetry, as discussed above, was composed for public performance (especially in the case of her epithalamia), Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis wrote texts. The tension in the Hellenistic period between the poet as singer and the poet as

[26] See Chapter 2 for discussion of Erinna's date and bibliography.
[27] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 283-349; Gutzwiller 2007: 106-120.
[28] The discovery of the Milan Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl.VIII 309) has convinced even the more skeptical scholars that Hellenistic poetry was to some extent composed for the book. See the excellent collection of essays in Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou, and Baumbach 2004.
[29] Bing 2009: 85-105.

writer informs much of the work of the three women discussed here. All three were not only very famous and influential in the Hellenistic period, but they also contributed to these developments by exploring the new possibilities for poetry in a textual age.[30] If we as critics always look backwards from the Hellenistic period to Sappho to explain these poets, we risk overlooking their complex relationship to the new poetic landscape in which they were composing.

1.4. The Study

In this study I examine in successive chapters the poetry of Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis. After providing a brief sketch of the life and works of the author, as far as we know it, each chapter will present two distinct arguments that are then combined to provide a new reading of the poet's work. Too often these poets are grouped together, although they write on different themes, in different genres, with different voices; by separating the poets into different chapters, I aim to analyze each poet only in terms of her own work. But although these poets' work did not survive to the modern era intact, each poet's extant corpus consisting of fewer than 100 lines of Greek, one chapter is hardly enough to explore every aspect of a poet's work, especially when that poet is influential and innovative. To that end I have separated each chapter into two related but distinct studies, illustrating the variety of possible lenses through which to read the poetry of Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis. As the ultimate goal of this study is to illustrate the

[30] As this study focuses on literary epigrams, which were never intended for inscription, I am not concerned with actual inscriptions except in those few cases in which the poet is playing with and challenging the conventions of inscription. For a discussion of the relationship between inscribed and literary epigram, see Bettenworth 2007.

importance of these poets and to encourage more scholars to read their poetry, I hope that these arguments will help provide a foundation for future studies.

Methodologically speaking, I do not consciously adhere to any particular theoretical ideology. I simply aim to provide close readings of the texts in question and explore the predominant themes, motifs, and poetic models found or alluded to in the texts. Operating under the assumption that while every poem is a unique work, poets tend to revisit ideas, narrative structures, themes, and voices in different poems, this study looks at a poet's corpus as a whole when analyzing individual poems, words, or lines.[31] Given the paucity of the surviving work of the three poets in our study, this approach can lead to excessive speculation about the nature of the poetry that we have lost; I attempt to avoid this by referring whenever possible to ancient testimonia. Where this is impossible, especially in the case of epigrams, I operate under the assumption that Meleager selected poems that were to some degree representative of the poet's work.[32]

As a result of the poetic revolution described above, the viewing and listening audience was in the process of being replaced by the reading audience during the periods in which our three poets composed poetry. Many Hellenistic poets took advantage of the declining importance of public performance and the emergence of the written text as a physical object that could be re-read and studied alongside other texts by composing

[31] For the sake of the convenience, every text discussed at length is reprinted in the Appendix. All translations are my own.

[32] This is, of course, dangerous. If modern scholarship is any indication, Meleager's primary interest in the female poets could well have been limited to those poems that expressed in his view a markedly feminine subjectivity, especially in the case of Nossis. With few exceptions, however, our collection of the epigrams of female poets is limited to the poems Meleager selected, and we must therefore assume that he chose the best poems (in his estimation) for his collection.

highly allusive poems that challenged generic and thematic boundaries. Of these poets, Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis were among the most influential.

In Chapter 2, "Erinna", I examine the three epigrams attributed to Erinna in the first section and the extant fragments of her masterpiece, the poem known as the *Distaff*, in the second. Instead of dividing the chapter into two arguments that would analyze Erinna's epigrammatic poetry alongside this much larger work, I separated the epigrams from the *Distaff* for two reasons. First, the epigrams have not been adequately explored by scholars, most of whom deny the authenticity and therefore the importance of the poems. The second and perhaps more important reason for dividing the chapter this way is that although the epigrams share certain themes and characters with the *Distaff*, hexameter poetry and literary epigrams differ in many key respects, such as performance context, subject matter, and narrative strategies.

In this chapter I examine the ways in which Erinna subtly focuses on the "writtenness" of her poetry. Of the three epigrams, two are companion pieces, meaning that each provides information that the other omits and that they were meant to be read together. These two poems play with the idea of performing epigram by featuring monuments that purport to speak, all the while acknowledging that the poems are actually texts (γράμμα) inscribed by Erinna herself. The third epigram is ecphrastic, describing a portrait of a young woman in glowing terms before noting that the one difference between the woman and her portrait is that the portrait does not possess a voice. As in the other two epigrams, Erinna here is challenging the ability of a silent text to accomplish mimesis. Erinna's *Distaff* is a highly allusive and complex work that requires much more space to fully explore than this study allows; consequently this study provides

a reading of the poem which is centered around the variety of poetic activity found within the *Distaff*. Here I show that the epigrams attributed to Erinna and the *Distaff* are connected by more than their shared characters. All of Erinna's extant poetry is shown to be concerned with the silence of the text and the poet's inability to participate in public performances of poetry.

In Chapter 3, "Anyte", I analyze the inscriptional frame of Anyte's epigrams as well as her expansion of the developing genre of literary epigram to include women, children, and pets, all with the same solemnity as her epitaph for a fallen soldier. Every one of Anyte's epigrams contains several allusions to earlier literature, including epic, lyric, and tragedy. In the first section I assert that these allusions are part of the strategy by which Anyte justifies solemn epitaphs for crickets and puppies. It has been argued that Anyte's epigrams were perhaps the first to be collected into a author-arranged book; this study adds to this argument with close readings of her epigrams that show how Anyte self-consciously presents her poems (as well as her narrator) as literary products while never explicitly removing the inscriptional frame, the hallmark of early epigram.

Chapter 4, "Nossis", examines the eleven poems undoubtedly composed by Nossis as well as one poem whose authenticity has been challenged by several scholars. The first argument details Nossis' penchant for literary polemic in her epigrams and how this polemic separates her audience into men and women. The women are invited to participate in the poetic journey on which the narrator embarks over the course of several poems, while the men are not. This is an important departure from Sappho, who included everyone as her potential audience. The second section explores other models for Nossis' presentation of her poems' imagined performance context as well as of her narrator. Here

I focus on her dedicatory epigrams, which form a series, and show that Nossis configures these written texts as a *partheneion*. Nossis' poems contributed to the development of the literary epigram by completely divorcing her poems from any imaginable inscriptional context, laying the foundation for future poets whose works are collected in the ninth book of the *Greek Anthology*, the "declamatory" epigrams. Like Erinna and Anyte before her, Nossis used past models to interact with the present circumstances of poetry; the result was an innovative set of epigrams that reconfigured the relationship between the poet and her audience.

One study cannot possibly "explain" the poetry of three very talented, learned, and innovative poets, but it can help point scholarship in a new direction. In the case of these poets, it is hoped that this study will point out a few of the ways in which they explored the nature of Hellenistic poetry and in doing so changed it. While Sappho may have been the greatest female poet of the Greek world, Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis were important poets also, and deserve to be studied and read as influential poets, not as footnotes to Sappho.

Chapter 2

Erinna

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter I explore Erinna's *Distaff* and the epigrams attributed to her. As Erinna was composing poetry in the first half of the fourth century BCE, she is not technically a Hellenistic poet, nevertheless, her poetry displays quintessentially Hellenistic properties - it is allusive, concise, and innovative with respect to genre and subject matter.[1] Erinna was writing poetry right at that crucial point when texts were beginning to replace performance as the primary way people experienced poetry, as Plato's *Phaedrus* (roughly contemporary with Erinna) illustrates in the case of oratory.[2] As in Plato's dialogues, so too in Erinna's poetry; in the *Distaff* and her epigrams the poet problematizes the new, textual, world of poetry. It is, consequently, the "writtenness" of Erinna's poetry that I will examine in this chapter. In particular, I will explore the tension between performance and textuality that is evident in all her poems. The first section concerns the *Distaff*, examining the *Distaff* as an imperfect substitute for a forbidden performance. In the second section I will examine her epigrams in light of the same

[1] Recently Acosta-Hughes 2011 has called into question the whole legitimacy of applying the historical understanding of the Hellenistic period to literature. Literary trends do not necessarily move lock-step with historical movements.

[2] See Bing 1988 for the best discussion of this transition. See also Section 1.3 for the relevant passage in the *Phaedrus*.

tension, focusing on Erinna's critique of the silence of texts, a silence imposed by the genre itself.

2.1.1. Life and Works

The lives of many ancient authors are shrouded in mystery, controversy, and fallacious biographical readings of their poetry. Even among these authors, the case of Erinna is especially fraught with difficulty for the modern critic. Two ancient mentions of Erinna illustrate the scope of the problem. The first is the entry on Erinna in the Suda:

Ἤριννα, Τεΐα ἢ Λεσβία, ὡς δὲ ἄλλοι Τηλία· Τῆλος δέ ἐστι νησίδιον ἐγγὺς Κνίδου· τινὲς δὲ καὶ Ῥοδίαν αὐτὴν ἐδόξασαν. ἦν δὲ ἐποποιός. ἔγραψεν Ἠλακάτην· ποίημά δ᾽ ἐστιν Αἰολικῇ καὶ Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ, ἐπῶν τ′. ἐποίησε δὲ ἐπιγράμματα. τελευτᾷ παρθένος ἐννεακαιδεκέτις. οἱ δὲ στίχοι αὐτῆς ἐκρίθησαν ἴσοι Ὁμήρῳ. ἦν δὲ ἑταίρα Σαπφοῦς καὶ ὁμόχρονος.

Erinna, from Teos or Lesbos, or according to others, Telos-- Telos is a small island near Knidos-- and some even think she was from Rhodes. She was an epic poet. Erinna wrote *The Distaff*; this was a poem in Aeolic and Doric dialect of three hundred lines. She also wrote epigams. She died a nineteen year-old maiden. Her verses were judged equal to Homer's. She was a companion of Sappho and lived at the same time [as Sappho].

The Suda entry illustrates our lack of basic knowledge about Erinna's place of birth and provides several disputed facts about her life. It connects Erinna to four different cities. Stephanus of Byzantium, four centuries earlier, noted that she was from Telos.[3] Tatian in the second century C.E. wrote that she was from Lesbos, and the manuscript of the *Greek Anthology* ascribes one of her epigrams to 'Erinna of Mytilene'.[4] It is generally agreed

[3] Steph.Byz. *s.v.* Τῆνος.
[4] *Or. ad Graecos* 33.2.

that references to Erinna (or any other female poet after Sappho) as Lesbian are to be viewed skeptically, as all female poets were thought to be 'connected' to Sappho.[5] We cannot be sure whether Erinna was born in Telos, Teos, or Rhodes; her sophisticated use of multiple dialects, a feature of her poetry that the Suda entry mentions in connection to the *Distaff*, prevents critics from using her poems to determine her homeland.[6]

This entry also informs us that Erinna was Sappho's companion. While this is not taken seriously by modern scholars for the reason mentioned above, it shows that by the tenth century C.E. Erinna's poetry was already being studied for biographical details due to the conflicting nature of the available evidence. Tatian, in addition to writing that Erinna was from Lesbos, notes that Naucydes built a statue of Erinna.[7] This Naucydes, if the famous one, as most presume, was a sculptor around the year 400 B.C.E.[8] Eusebius, however, writes that she became known in the 107th Olympiad, or 352 BCE.[9] The earliest evidence we have comes from the epigrammatist Asclepiades, who lived in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E. He wrote an epigram praising the *Distaff*, a poem which might have accompanied editions of Erinna's work.[10] Many scholars have sided with Eusebius, citing Tatian's numerous fictions with regard to biography,[11] though recently the case has been made that Eusebius' text has been corrupted, with the text now

[5] See Levin 1962: 195, Gow and Page 1965.2: 281.
[6] West 1977: 117 describes the use of dialects in the *Distaff* as a carefully constructed artifice, meant to convey a particular narrative persona. The Doric signifies humble origins while the Aeolic announces that the author is a female. See also Levaniouk 2008 who argues that the mixed dialect of the *Distaff* finds parallels in choral poetry and possibly earlier hexameter poetry. Barnard 1978: 206 asserts that Telos is most likely given her dialect.
[7] *Or. ad Graecos* 33.2.
[8] Pliny *NH* 34.19.50.
[9] Euseb. *Chron*. Ol.107.1.
[10] *AP* 7.11 (Asclepiades). On the likelihood of its accompanying Erinna's work, see Bowra 1953: 164-65.
[11] See esp. Gow and Page 1965.2: 281.

reading ρζ′ for original ϙζ′.[12] It seems much more likely that the Tatian who claimed that Erinna was from Lesbos was mistaken than that Eusebius' text was misread, although both are possible. The prudent course is to place Erinna's *floruit* somewhere in the first half of the fourth century; Erinna thus belongs one or two generations before Anyte, who was a member of the first generation of Hellenistic poets.[13] Any attempt to further narrow the range of Erinna's date must rely on a choice between two texts prone to error and risks compounding the original mistake(s).

Several sources including the Suda note that Erinna was nineteen years old when she wrote the *Distaff*; they also note that she died at nineteen.[14] As will be discussed later, the phrase ἐννεα̣[και]δέκατος ("nineteenth [year]") is found in the *Distaff*. This reference to the age of nineteen is presumably the source of the biographical tradition which concludes that Erinna wrote this poem as a teenager and then died shortly thereafter, with the result that many, though not all, scholars disregard this tradition.[15]

The second reference that illustrates the mystery of Erinna is found in Athenaeus' second century C.E. work *Deipnosophistae* (7.283d):

Ἤριννά τε ἢ ὁ πεποιηκὼς τὸ εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναφερόμενον
ποιημάτιον·

...and Erinna, or the man who wrote the short poem attributed to her, [wrote]: ...

[12] Neri 2003: 211. This date, 392 BCE, would be much closer to the date Tatian gives.
[13] Gow and Page 1965.2: 281-82 argue that perhaps she is too early to be included in a list of Hellenistic epigrammatists, though they believe that Erinna's date is later than Eusebius contends.
[14] *AP* 7.11 (Asclepiades); *AP* 9.190 (anonymous).
[15] West 1977 uses her early death as the foundation for his argument that there was no Erinna (see below). Gow and Page 1965.2: 282 also accepts the Suda's account and cites as evidence the epigrams written about Erinna that will be discussed below. Barnard 1978: 208 accepts the story without comment.

Despite the various difficulties involved in accurately contextualizing Erinna's poetry with regard to time or geography, this passage demonstrates *the* Erinna problem. Already in the time of Athenaeus' writing it was debated whether Erinna even existed at all, or if her poetry was actually written by a man writing under the guise of a woman, perhaps to give 'authenticity' to the female voice of the narrator. While the many testimonia to the *Distaff* lead most scholars to believe that Erinna wrote at least this work, in 1977 West famously resurrected this idea, first recorded in the *Deipnosophistae*.[16] In his article, he claimed that the level of erudition and sophistication of the *Distaff* makes it highly unlikely to have been written by a nineteen year-old girl.[17] This argument was immediately attacked and derided, primarily by feminist scholars,[18] although Erinna's other extant works are mostly regarded as later imitations.[19] There appears to be no convincing evidence that suggests Erinna did not exist, though we cannot with any precision know when or where she did her writing.

Very little of Erinna's work survives to the present day. Three epigrams attributed to Erinna can be found in the *Greek Anthology*; two short hexameter fragments have been preserved, one by Athenaeus and the other by Stobaeus;[20] a relatively long fragment of the *Distaff* was discovered in 1928 and confirmed as Erinna's based on a different quotation from Stobaeus.[21] The fragment recorded by Stobaeus seems to be from the

[16] West 1977: 116 ff.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Pomeroy 1978; Arthur 1980.
[19] Neri 2003: 85-88 provides the rather lengthy list of scholars who dispute Erinna's authorship of the epigrams. The case that the three extant epigrams were written by Erinna is made in Cavallini 1991b.
[20] Athen. 7.283d; Stob. 4.51.4.
[21] 4.50a.14.

Distaff.[22] The other short hexameter fragment, found in Athenaeus, is generally assumed to have been separate from the *Distaff*, due to its subject matter, although it is impossible to tell.[23] Erinna's masterpiece, as noted before, was three hundred lines long, of which only approximately fifty (likely from the very end of the poem)[24] survive on the papyrus from Oxyrynchus. This means that there are two hundred and fifty lines of the *Distaff* that are completely lost; these lost sections may well have touched on subject matter that differs greatly from the themes we now associate with the *Distaff*.

Many scholars now deny the authenticity of the three epigrams attributed to Erinna.[25] Two of these epigrams, *AP* 7.710,712 = Erinna 1,2 GP, are funerary epigrams for Baukis, the girl whose marriage and subsequent death are the focus of the *Distaff*, while the third, *AP* 6.352 = Erinna 3 GP, is a poem celebrating a life-like portrait of a young woman named Agatharchis. The funereal epigrams are generally presumed to have been later Hellenistic works based on the *Distaff*.[26] The main thrust of the argument is that because these two epigrams do not contain any information that is extraneous to the *Distaff*, and because many epigrams were ascribed to famous authors who could not have written them, these epitaphs for Baukis should be considered testimonia, not the work of Erinna.[27] The dedicatory epigram on the portrait of Agatharchis is rejected based on an assumption that if the other two epigrams of Erinna are spurious, this one

[22] Maas 1934, however, made the unconvincing case that the *Distaff* and the lament for Baukis were two separate poems.
[23] Since Reitzenstein 1893: 143 who argued that the fragment preserved in Athenaeus belonged to a *propemptikon*. Gow and Page 1965.2: 282 concur. Neri 2003: 223-227 makes a convincing if ultimately speculative case for their inclusion. See also Levaniouk 2008 for the case that nautical themes pervade the *Distaff*.
[24] See West 1977: 112; Neri 2003: 422.
[25] The complete bibliography is found in Neri 2003: 86ff and notes. In favor of attribution to Erinna, see Levin 1962, Gow and Page 1965.2, Cameron and Cameron 1969, Pomeroy 1978, Balmer 1996, Plant 2004.
[26] Neri 2003: 86ff.
[27] *ibid.*

probably is too.[28] Due to its focus on femininity and realism, it has been argued that this epigram was actually written by Nossis.[29]

I do not find these arguments at all persuasive, especially but certainly not limited to those concerning the Agatharchis epigram. An anonymous epigram from the second or third century BCE notes that Sappho surpassed Erinna in lyric poetry by as much as Erinna surpassed Sappho in hexameters, providing evidence that Erinna composed poetry in various meters.[30] As the genre of literary epigram was becoming very popular in Erinna's time, a learned poet who wrote different styles of poetry would very likely have written epigrams, and the death of Baukis, the inspiration for her *Distaff*, would have fit perfectly into this genre.[31] It is important to note here that Erinna wrote a hexameter poem that dealt with death, mourning, and burial practice, three elements which were an unusual focus for an epic but around which funerary epigram was centered. The subject of the *Distaff* was consequently an ideal choice for the subject of funereal epigrams, and we cannot know whether it was Erinna or later poets who realized this. The Agatharchis epigram is not based on the *Distaff*, and there is no good reason to reject it.[32]

In this chapter I will treat the epigrams, as well as the fragments of the *Distaff*, as genuine works of Erinna. Since none of these epigrams can be reasonably ascribed to

---

[28] West 1977: 115-116.
[29] *ibid.* This attribution was rejected by Pomeroy 1978: 21. Gow and Page 1965.2: 284 argue that the similarity between these epigrams is evidence that Erinna influenced the poetry of Nossis, a view that seems much more likely. See also Gutzwiller 1998: 86-87 for a discussion of Nossis' relationship with Erinna's poetry and reception.
[30] Gow and Page 1965.2: 282. *Contra* Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924: 108n4, West 1977: 95.
[31] I do not assume that there was necessarily a real woman named Baukis who was a companion of Erinna's.
[32] The primary argument made against Erinna's authorship of this poem is that a rejection of the Baukis epigrams shows that Erinna was used as a pseudonym in Hellenistic epigram and thus her ascription in the Agatharchis poem means very little. See Pomeroy 1978: 21. West 1977: 116 argues in addition that the ascription of *AP* 7.190 = Anyte 20 GP to Anyte or Leonidas in the *Greek Anthology* but to Erinna in Pliny 34.57 proves that female poets were often confused. It seems more likely that Pliny simply made an error.

another poet, whereas there are other epigrams concerning the *Distaff* that have been attributed to different poets or left anonymous, I believe that it is in this instance safer to trust the editors of the *Greek Anthology* than our own understanding of Hellenistic imitation. In the case of the Agatharchis poem, there is simply no good reason to exclude it. Even if these epigrams were not actually Erinna's work, an imitator must have composed them to be read in relation to the *Distaff*. So, a thorough study of these epigrams can at least enable us to come to a greater understanding of the issues raised in the fragments of the *Distaff*.

2.1.2. Ancient Assessment

The many ancient references to the *Distaff* show that the poem was very popular until well after the Hellenistic period. Asclepiades' epigram seems to indicate that Hellenistic poets viewed Erinna's epic as an embodiment of the new aesthetic:

Ὁ γλυκὺς Ἠρίννης οὗτος πόνος, οὐχὶ πολὺς μέν,
ὡς ἂν παρθενικᾶς ἐννεακαιδεκέτευς,
ἀλλ᾽ ἑτέρων πολλῶν δυνατώτερος· εἰ δ᾽ Ἀίδας μοι
μὴ ταχὺς ἦλθε, τίς ἂν ταλίκον ἔσχ᾽ ὄνομα;

This is the sweet labor of Erinna. It is not long,
as it was written by a nineteen year-old girl,
but it is more powerful than many others. If Hades
had not come for me so soon, whose name would be as great?
AP 7.11 (Asclepiades)

As a poem that may have served as a preface to published copies of the *Distaff*, Asclepiades' poem does not include any details from Erinna's work. Instead, the description of the poem as a γλυκὺς πόνος, οὐχὶ πολὺς and πολλῶν δυνατώτερος has

been correctly interpreted as a nod to the delight in the meticulously elegant arrangement of powerful diction that came to define Hellenistic poetry.[33] The contrast between the poem's length and power marks the *Distaff* not only as an important model for Asclepiades' epigrams, but also as an exemplar of the aesthetic tenets laid down by Callimachus in his famous *Aetia* prologue.

The influence of Erinna's poetry on the scholarly, Callimachean, poetic movement is best illustrated by the satirical epigram by the first century CE poet Antiphanes (*AP* 11.322) :

Γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζωρύχα μούσης
ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,
τῶν μεγάλων κηλῖδες, ἐπ' Ἠρίννῃ δὲ κομῶντες,
πικροὶ καὶ ξηροὶ Καλλιμάχου πρόκυνες,
ποιητῶν λῶβαι, παισὶ σκότος ἀρχομένοισιν,
ἔρροιτ', εὐφώνων λαθροδάκναι κόριες.

You busybody race of grammarians, who dig up the poetry
of others, miserable bookworms who walk on thorns,
defilers of the great, priding yourselves on Erinna,
bitter and dry hounds of Callimachus, bane of poets,
darkness to youthful beginners,
away with you, bugs who stealthily bite the eloquent.

This portrait of the reception of Erinna's poetry, while unflattering to her admirers, serves to illustrate Erinna's significance to the development of the new "Hellenistic" poetry, whose major proponent is usually said to be the cantankerous Callimachus. The fact the Erinna is the only other poet mentioned besides Callimachus in this epigram reveals her relative importance to the movement.[34] To poets immersed in the new aesthetic, such as Antiphanes and Asclepiades, Erinna was at the forefront of the revolution in poetry.

[33] Hunter 1996: 15; Neri 2004: 55-56, 187; Gutzwiller 2007: 31.
[34] Bowra 1936: 341; Levin 1962: 194.

Therefore, the aesthetic we associate with Hellenistic poetry should more appropriately be seen as Erinnan-Callimachean, rather than simply Callimachean.

Other epigrammatic poetry concerning the *Distaff* was much more positive. Besides Asclepiades' tribute to Erinna's poem, four Hellenistic epigrams celebrated the *Distaff* as a monumental work.[35] The unnamed author of *AP* 9.190 praised the poem in distinctly Hellenistic terms:

Λέσβιον Ἠρίννης τόδε κηρίον· εἰ δέ τι μικρόν,
ἀλλ᾽ ὅλον ἐκ Μουσέων κιρνάμενον μέλιτι.
οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοι ταύτης στίχοι ἶσοι Ὁμήρῳ,
τῆς καὶ παρθενικῆς ἐννεακαιδεκέτευς·
ἣ καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἠλακάτῃ μητρὸς φόβῳ, ἣ καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἱστῷ
ἑστήκει Μουσέων λάτρις ἐφαπτομένη.
Σαπφὼ δ᾽ Ἠρίννης ὅσσον μελέεσσιν ἀμείνων,
ἬρινναΣαπφοῦς τόσσον ἐν ἑξαμέτροις.

This is the Lesbian honeycomb of Erinna. Though it is small,
it nevertheless is totally infused with the Muses' honey.
Her three hundred lines are equal to Homer,
although she was only a girl of nineteen.
Plying her distaff in fear of her mother, and at the loom,
she stood occupied as a servant of the Muses.
As much as Sappho exceeds Erinna in lyric verses,
so much does Erinna exceed Sappho in hexameters.

This poem celebrates the *Distaff* as at once Sapphic and Hellenistic, though it has been argued that Λέσβιον Ἠρίννης τόδε κηρίον has been misinterpreted and that it actually refers to the poem's sweetness rather than to Sappho's influence.[36] The comparisons of Erinna to Homer and Sappho demonstrate the essential "Hellenisticness" of Erinna's poetry in the eyes of later poets. Sappho is better at lyric poetry, a genre that was predominantly Archaic, while Erinna's hexameters are better. These hexameters are

[35] *AP* 7.12 (anonymous), 7.13 (Leonidas or Meleager), 7.713 (Antipater of Sidon), 9.190 (anonymous).
[36] Neri 2003: 195. *Contra* Williamson 1995: 18.

equal to Homer's Archaic epic, but are described with concessive phrases that remind the reader of Callimachus' claim that he is criticized for not writing long poems about kings or heroes. Erinna's hexameter poem is marked by its brevity; unlike Homer's epic, the *Distaff* represents a new kind of hexameter poem, one that is shorter but not worse. In this poem, the celebration of the *Distaff* is a celebration of the new style of poetry which Erinna's poem represents.

The other epigrams that mention Erinna praise her poetry and mention her untimely death. As in Asclepiades' epigram, the *Distaff* is described in terms which demonstrate that later poets understood the poem and the poet as Hellenistic in terms of aesthetics. The *Distaff* is referred to as a καλὸς πόνος[37] and Erinna is described as a παρθενικὰν νεαοιδὸν ἐν ὑμνοπόλοισι μέλισσαν [38] and as παυροεπὴς ... καὶ οὐ πολύμυθος ἀοιδαῖς.[39] This ancient assessment of Erinna's poetry as simultaneously Sapphic and Hellenistic, whether based on the poem(s) or her gender and dialect, survives to this day.[40]

Meleager, introducing his anthology, writes that he wove into the *Garland* καὶ γλυκὺν Ἠρίννης παρθενόχρωτα κρόκον ('also the maiden-colored crocus of Erinna').[41] The crocus was used in rites of transition to adulthood for girls,[42] while the word παρθενόχρωτα is a Meleagrean invention. The description of her poetry as maiden-

[37] *AP* 7.12.5.
[38] *AP* 7.13.1.
[39] *AP* 7.713.1.
[40] See Levin 1962: 193ff.
[41] *AP* 4.1.12 (Meleager).
[42] See Levaniouk 2008: 206.

colored underscores his apprehension of the blatant 'femaleness' of Erinna's poetry.[43] Yet, her *Distaff* was written in Homeric hexameters, which conveyed enough masculinity that Athenaeus, as noted above, could imagine a male poet composed it.[44]

Herondas uses Erinna's name and allusions to her poetry together with that of Nossis in his bawdy *Mimiambs* 6 and 7. In *Mimiamb* 6, Koritto is informed by her guest Metro that the fantastic dildo she bought from a certain cobbler known as Kerdon, the dildo she subsequently gave to her close friend Eubole, was now in the possession of 'Nossis, the daughter of Erinna'.[45] In *Mimiamb* 7, the same Kerdon, in an attempt to entice his female patrons to buy his dildos, which he euphemistically refers to as shoes, rhymes off several slipper styles including *Nossides* and *Baukides*. The metapoetic implications of these references to Erinna and Nossis, especially their mother-daughter relationship, is clear: Herondas wanted to represent Nossis as a follower of Erinna, i.e. part of the new poetic revolution. Most scholars have assumed that Herondas sought to disparage these female poets by associating them with sexual deviance. According, to Kutzko, there is no reason to believe the women in these poems have violated any social norms. In Mimiamb 6, the women take pains to ensure that the conversation takes place in private and in Mimiamb 7, it is Kerdon who is making all the suggestive remarks which ultimately drive the women away in fear of their reputations.[46] Following up on this argument, Murray argues that the comparison between cobbling and lyre-playing renders the dildo a potent metapoetic symbol for Herondas' poetry, which is imitative of

[43] Most scholars agree on this interpretation of Meleager's adjective, though Gow and Page 1965.2: 598-99 argue that the word refers to Erinna's early death.
[44] For a full discussion of this tension between gender and genre in Erinna's poetry, see Murray and Rowland 2007.
[45] *Mimiamb* 6.20.
[46] Kutzko 2006.

Erinna and Nossis, in that he is trying to represent a female perspective. But whereas they compose in the lofty registers of epic and epigram, symbolized by traditional images of spinning and weaving, his poetry operates in the bawdy registers of invective and mime. In this reading, the dildo is not a symbol for transgressive *female* sexual behavior, but for male perversion of female poetics. The dildo symbolizes Herondas' recognition that Nossis and Erinna belong to a female tradition of poetry that male poets do not really understand.[47] I find this argument to be an attractive one, especially because everyone 'knew' that Erinna died a nineteen year-old *parthenos* and thus casting her as another woman's mother is ridiculous enough to suggest that Herondas was making a point that had nothing to do with female sexuality.

Herondas' reference to the shoes as *Baukides* is more puzzling, unless it simply forms a connection to the previous mime. Baukis, unlike Nossis, was not a poet. So why were the shoes named after the subject of a poem and not the poet? One answer to this problem is that the *Baukides* stand for Erinna's poetry, since Baukis was the subject of the *Distaff* and two of her epigrams, similar to the cases of Catullus and Lesbia and Propertius and Cynthia.[48] Murray suggests that the plural, *Baukides*, refers to the fact that the *Distaff* and the Baukis epigrams were companion pieces, in much the same way Herondas' two mimiambi are companion pieces. This suggestion, in addition to taking into account the implication made by the anonymous poet of *AP* 9.190 that Erinna wrote

[47] Murray (forthcoming); cf. Murray and Rowland 2007 where we read the *Distaff* and the Baukis epigrams as companion pieces.
[48] Cf. Neri 2004: 227-228.

many different types of poetry, supports my position that Erinna's Baukis epigrams are legitimate.[49]

2.2. The Distaff

2.2.1. Introduction and the Text of the *Distaff*

I hesitate to begin with the *Distaff* because it is such a difficult poem to interpret. In addition to the considerable problems that accompany a poem that features only one complete line, the fragments that we have comprise only one-sixth of the entire work.[50] It is therefore hard to believe that any reading derived from evidence so scant can escape the realm of pure conjecture. Nevertheless, those few scraps of poetry we do possess are enough to give us a general sense of the themes, motifs, and structures of the surviving passage,[51] if not of the *Distaff* as a whole.

In 1928, Italian archaeologists discovered a papyrus that contained remnants of 79 lines in four columns and published their findings the following year.[52] After years of careful editing, as well as the realization that the second and third columns actually belonged to the same column, Maas produced a text that is still the basis for current studies, apart from a few emendations.[53] Several scholars have attempted to supplement the text, especially the nearly complete second column;[54] in this study, however, I will be

[49] Or at least that Herondas, like Asclepiades, believed the epigrams to be so.
[50] Line 46, which is preserved in Stob. 4.50a.14.
[51] See Section 2.1.1 above for discussion of the orthographic mark that makes it likely that the fragment we possess is from the end of the poem.
[52] For a complete technical description of the papyrus, see Neri 1997: 57-68; Neri 2003: 60-73.
[53] Maas 1934.
[54] Maas 1934; Bowra 1936; Edmonds 1938; West 1977; Neri 1997; Neri 2003.

using the text that is actually on the papyrus, except in certain cases where the missing word is obvious.

[ ].ν̣[
[ ]εοι.[ ].
[ ]ε κώρας·
[ ].ι νύμφαι·
[ ] χελύνναν (5)
[σ]ελάννα·
[χε]λ̣ύννα· @ι
[ ].ε̣λῆσ[
[ ]ω̣.ει·
[ ].αφυλλοισ[(10)
[ ].λασσ̣ει·
[ ].ανν̣.ν·
[ ]νί.απέξα[
[ ].[..]υ̣κυμα[ ]
..]υκᾶν μαινομεν̣[ ].σσι̣ν̣αφ.[.]π̣.[(15)
αἰ]α̣ῖ ἐγ̣ώ, μέγ᾽ ἄϋσα· φ[ ] χελύννα
..].ομένα μεγάλασ̣[ ] χορτίον αὐλᾶς·
τα]ῦτα τύ, Βαῦκι τάλαι̣[να]χεισα γόημ[ ]
τα]ῦτά μοι ἐν κρα[δ].΄..χνια κεῖται
θέρμ᾽ ἔτι· την[ ].υ̣ρ̣ομες ἄνθρακες ἤδη· (20)
δαγύ[δ]ων τεχ̣[ ]ίδε̣ς ἐν θαλάμοισι
νυμ[φ]αι.[ ]έες· ἅ τε ποτ᾽ ὄρθρον
μάτηρ αε[ ].οισιν ἐρείθο̣ις
τ̣ηνασηλθ[ ]ν̣α ἀμφ᾽ ἀλιπαστον·
..μικραισ.[ ]ν̣ φόβον ἄγαγε Μορ̣[μ]ώ (25)
..].εν μὲν κ.[ ].ατα ποσσὶ δὲ φοιτῆι
.]..[.]σιν· ἐκ δ᾽[ ] μετεβάλλετ᾽ ὀπωπάν·
ἀνίκα δ᾽ ἐς [λ]έχος̣ [ ]ό̣κα πάντ᾽ ἐλέλασο
ἅσσ᾽ ε.[ ]..ηπιασ..τ.[ ] μ̣ατρὸς ἄκουσας,
Βα̣ῦκ̣ι φίλα· λαθα...ε.[ ]. Ἀφροδίτα· (30)
τ̣ῶ τυ κατακλα̣[ί]οισ̣ατα[ ].[ ]...ε λείπω [·]
ο̣ὐ [γ]άρ μοι πόδες ....[..].[ ]..ο δῶμα β̣έ̣βαλοι·
οὐδ᾽ ἐσιδῆν φαε̣.[ ]κυν οὐδὲ̣ γοᾶσαι
γυμναῖσιν χαιταισ.ν[ ].νικεος αἰδὼς
δρύπτει μ᾽ ἀμφι..[(35)
α..[ ]δε π̣[ρ]οπάροιθ[εν
ἐννεα̣[και]δέκατος .[
Ἠρ̣ι̣ννα[..]ε φίλαι π.[
ἀλακ̣άταν ἐσ̣ορει̣[
γνωθ᾽ ὅτι τοικ[(40)
αμφ..ι̣κ.σ.ε.[
ταῦτ᾽ α̣ἰδώς μ.[

παρθε̣[ν]ί̣οισ...[
δερκομένα δ᾽ ε̣ἰ̣[
καὶ χαιτα.α̣ν̣.[(45)
πραϋλόγοι πο̣ι̣λιαί, ταὶ γήραος ἄνθεα θνατοῖς
τῶ τυ φίλα φ.[
Βαῦκι κατακλα̣[
αν φλόγα μι̣ν .[
ὠρυγᾶς ἀϊοισ.ο[(50)
ὦ πολλὰν ὑμεν̣[
π]ολλὰ δ᾽ ἐπιψαυ[
π]άνθ᾽ ἑνός, ὦ υμ[
αἰαῖ Βαῦκι τάλαιν[α
— — — — — (54)

maidens;
brides;
tortoise
moon;
tortoise;
...
...
in(?) leaves
shakes (?);
moon;
shorn lamb
deep wave
with maddened feet ...from white horses
"Alas for me," I yelled loudly...tortoise
leaping...the fence of the large courtyard;
[Grieving for] you, Baukis, I lament these things.
These traces lie...in my heart,
still warm. Those...we found are coals now;
of dolls...in the bedrooms
brides...And near dawn
mother ...for the ...wool-workers
she came to you...with salted...;
to little ones...Mormo brought fear
on four feet she walked...
but she changed her visage;
But when into the bed...you forgot everything
that when a child...you heard from your mother,
dear Baukis: Aphrodite...forgetfulness.
For this reason weeping for you, I leave off...
For my feet are not permitted...away from the house;
I am not allowed to see you dead nor lament
with my hair unbound ...(blushing?) shame

tears my [cheeks]...
but ... before...
nineteenth [year]
Erinna dear...
gazing upon the distaff...
know that
the spinning (?)
these things shame me ...
with maidenly ...
But looking from ...
and long hair....
kind-speaking grey-haired women, the flowers of old age for mortals
For this reason, dear...
Baukis, I weep [for you]
the flame...
I hear the howling...
O Hymen, ...many..
but often...touch...
everything for one, O Hymen...
Alas, poor Baukis

SH 410 = P.S.I. 1090

An examination of the fragments shows that the title of Erinna's poem is even more apt than other scholars have realized. As a reference to women's work, spinning and weaving, the title highlights the narrator's exclusion from the public sphere, where the lament is performed, and her relegation to the private sphere, where the text is written.[55]

In general, with archaic and classical poetry, a real performance context lies behind the text we have, such that the poem, for all intents and purposes, stands for the performance, as the record or after-image of it. However, since the premise of the *Distaff* seems to be that social conventions prevented Erinna's narrator from participating in the funeral lament for her dear friend Baukis, the *Distaff* (at least in the bits we have) is a

[55] Throughout this section I shall refer to the narrator of the *Distaff* as Erinna, as she is mentioned by name in the text.

lament for Baukis that is Erinna's substitute for the lamentation she never performed. Erinna through her *Distaff* produces a *text* without any prior or concurrent existence in a real-world public performance. The result is that her poetic voice exists only in the private domestic sphere of the *Distaff*'s weft and warp.

Two of the most prominent contrasts found in the fragments of the *Distaff* center around this very issue: (1) public as opposed to private speech (and, importantly, public silence), and (2) movement as opposed to stasis.[56]

This examination of Erinna's most influential work will show that the *Distaff* is a lament in more than one sense. The poem is, first and foremost, a lament for Erinna's companion Baukis.[57] On the deeper metapoetic level, however, the *Distaff* is also a lament for Erinna's loss of her true poetic self. Erinna not only lost forever her childhood friend and the opportunity to play their childhood games, but because she is still a child (*parthenos*) her mother and social convention prevented her from lamenting her loss in the most traditional and psychologically satisfying way, i.e. by composing and performing the public lament song for Baukis' funeral.[58] This means, ultimately, that Erinna has been robbed of the opportunity to compose the poem for Baukis that she truly desired. Thus the *Distaff* should be understood as a protest against the current state of poetry: unlike in Sappho's era, when poetry was synonymous with dancing and singing,

[56] The second opposition listed was first noticed by Stehle 2001: 187ff.
[57] Lloyd-Jones and Parsons 183:189 assert that it is a *threnos*. Skinner 1982 points out that the poem is much more likely a *goos*, which was performed by women close to the deceased. See also Gutzwiller 1997: 206-207.
[58] I am here assuming that under normal circumstances Erinna as a poet would have been afforded the opportunity to write the lament song that would have been performed by herself and the other mourners.

now the opportunity for public performance has disappeared, and all that remains is the text. [59]

2.2.2. Erinna's Silent Sounds, or Erinna's Lament

Although Erinna's persona is prevented from taking part in the singing and dancing that defined funeral lament, she nevertheless uses sound and movement to reinforce, rather than mitigate, her sense of exclusion from the community. This poetic response is evident at the end of the fragment (which may be the end of the poem) with the address to Hymen that, as we will see in the next section, is echoed in the epigrams for Baukis.

After the initial lines of the fragment, we observe Erinna connecting speech with movement in her description of the childhood game "Torty-tortoise."[60] In this game, as it is described by Pollux, one girl is designated the "tortoise" and sits in the middle of the circle while the rest of the girls run around. The girls then enter into a set dialogue with the tortoise, each giving two lines.

Girls: χελιχελώνη, τί ποιεῖς ἐν τῷ μέσῳ;
("Tortoise, what are you doing in the middle?").
Tortoise: ἔρια μαρύομαι καὶ κρόκην Μιλησίαν.
("I'm weaving my wool and the Milesian woof.").
Girls: ὁ δ' ἔκγονός σου τί ποιῶν ἀπώλετο;
(And your son, how did he die?").

[59] It is ironic, then, that this text only barely survived, and more ironic yet that this poem survived only because it was a text, unlike the actual lamentation sung for Baukis (if real), of which we have nothing.
[60] Bowra 1936: 328.

Tortoise: λευκᾶν ἀφ᾽ ἵππων εἰς θάλασσαν ἅλατο.

("He leapt from white horses into the sea.").

After the tortoise speaks her last line, she jumps up and attempts to catch another girl, who then becomes the new tortoise.[61] Erinna describes a moment when she or Baukis becomes the tortoise.[62] The phrase αἰ]ᾳᾶι ἐγώ could either signify that Erinna has been caught or that she, as the tortoise, is shouting as she attempts to catch the other girls (16).[63] Various interpretations of these first lines have been offered, but it seems that this moment involves the "tortoise" springing up after the reference to white horses (15) and catching Erinna (16).[64] She then describes running with or chasing after Baukis through the fenced courtyard (16-17). This happy memory of running and shouting with Baukis is immediately put in the context of the loss of these games and Erinna's "lament" (18).

Although the fragmentary nature of this scene makes the precise way the memory of this game fit into the poem as a whole impossible to determine, modern scholars have posited that χελιχελώνη, and the role of the tortoise in particular, functioned as an important symbol in the *Distaff*.[65] Arthur proposed an interesting interpretation, based in psychoanalytic theory: the tortoise symbolizes the interior, female, space, while the horses represent the exterior, male, sphere. According to this interpretation the leap into the sea represents death and rebirth, as it is at this point that the game starts anew with a

[61] Pollux (9.125); The game is called χελιχελώνη. Bowra was the first to realize that this was the game found in this section of the *Distaff*, as he notes in Bowra 1953: 154n1. In his reading, Erinna begins our fragment as the tortoise, and then catches Baukis, who becomes the tortoise and leaps up and runs through the courtyard.

[62] The precise action being described is debated.

[63] Bowra 1953 argued that Erinna was the original tortoise and caught Baukis; West 1977: 102-104 claimed Baukis had been the tortoise and then caught Erinna.

[64] Stehle 2001: 187-188.

[65] In addition to the interpretations discussed here, Levaniouk 2008: 206-210 argues that since it was customary for *parthenoi* to play games before a wedding, citing Theocritus *Id.* 18, this game is evidence that this poem is a wedding song for Baukis.

new tortoise.[66] Pomeroy, meanwhile, noted a connection between the tortoise and the handloom, as the tortoise shell was fashioned by Hermes into a lyre by passing strings through it and because the handloom closely resembles a tortoise-lyre.[67] The implication I draw from Pomeroy's observation, moreover, is that the evocation of Hermes' handloom like tortoise-lyre in the tortoise game is a metapoetic symbol for the *Distaff* itself. This is a reading consistent with Manwell's view that this scene in the *Distaff* has a poetic resonance: the girls engage in poetic discourse with each other and instantiate their bond through responsion and movement.[68] The tortoise-game defines the relationship between Baukis and Erinna, and thus, according to Maxwell when Baukis forgets about Erinna's friendship (30), the poet loses her poetic voice.[69] In general, I find Maxwell's reading attractive, but I do not think Baukis forgets Erinna; rather, as Stehle has shown convincingly, what Baukis forgot was the teachings of her mother about shame and modesty.[70] So, the parallel is more that when Baukis forgot the *aidos* appropriate to a maiden, the same *aidos* took away Erinna's poetic voice.

Erinna's memory of the tortoise game clearly evokes the dances and songs of choruses of *parthenoi*, especially given the tortoise's relationship to the lyre and the references to maidens and brides (3,4).[71] Erinna's direct response to this happy poetically charged memory is to utter a lament. In doing so she transforms the maiden-song

---

[66] Arthur 1980. The interpretations of the *Distaff* found in Snyder 1989: 94-95, Stehle 2001, and Manwell 2005 adopt this interpretation and use it as a basis for their own arguments.
[67] Pomeroy 1977: 19 (with Figures 1-3 on p.22). The original story of the first lyre is found in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.
[68] Manwell 2005: 78-79.
[69] Manwell 2005: 80-82. I disagree with Maxwell that Baukis forgets Erinna. I have argued in Murray and Rowland 2007 in support of Sthele's view that Baukis forgets the lessons of *Aidos* and that caused her premature death.
[70] Stehle 2001.
[71] See Magrini 1975.

ambience of tortoise game into a different more somber genre, replacing the dialogue of the group with a solo lament.[72] The scene seems to begin at line 31 with the phrase τ̣ῶ τυ κατακλα̣[ί]οισ̣ατα[...]... λείπω ("For this reason, weeping for you I leave off...") and continues until Erinna's version of the *hymenaios* (51ff). In this scene Erinna is at her home, grieving both for Baukis and for her own inability to join in the ritual lament.[73]The switch to the present moment juxtaposes Erinna alone gazing at her distaff with the group lament for Baukis that is taking place in public: solitary, private, silence on the one hand, communal, public, performance, on the other.

This is the first time in the fragment that the Erinna refers to the present, and unlike her earlier memory, there is a lack of song and action. Erinna marks the distinction between herself and the mourners as based primarily on her lack of movement. She then describes exactly what she is forbidden to do: leave the house, see Baukis dead, lament, unbind her hair, or tear her cheeks (32-35).[74] All of these activities would have taken place in a traditional funeral lament. Presumably the next three lines give the reason(s) for Erinna's absence from the funeral, but it is impossible to be certain given the gaps in the text (36-38).[75] Several highly fragmentary lines later, Erinna hears the howling (ὠρυγᾶς) of the women's lament for Baukis.[76]

---

[72] Gutzwiller 1997: 207 notes that as a woman Erinna is able to represent the Homeric *goos* in the first person.
[73] Scholars debate the reason for this exclusion. It has been argued that Erinna was a priestess (Bowra 1936), that she was unmarried (West 1977), and that Baukis' forgetting of what her mother told her, trapping Erinna in between propriety, which states that she should not go to the funeral, and her love for Baukis (Stehle 2001, Murray and Rowland 2007).
[74] See discussion in West 1977: 109.
[75] Stehle 2001: 195. She then convincingly reads the last couplet of *AP* 9.190, in which Erinna is described as staying at her distaff out of fear of her mother, as providing the reason for Erinna's absence from the funeral.
[76] Cf. Neri 2003: 418-422.

These two scenes from the *Distaff* include many common elements. Both activities involve ritual song and movement. The tortoise game involves four set lines spoken in responsion and actions directed by those lines; the lament for Baukis is a procession accompanied by a range of utterances.[77] Both actions fill Erinna with longing, as evidenced by the phrase "These traces lie...in my heart" (19), and by the repeated references to Erinna's shame with regard to her absence from the funeral (34-35, 42). Perhaps most importantly, both actions are impossible for Erinna to take part in. The game of Torty-tortoise is inaccessible to Erinna because it is a child's game and also because her playing partner is dead. Erinna is forbidden from taking part in the funeral, for some reason, and just as she can never play her memorable games with Baukis again, she will never be able to attend Baukis' funeral because it is a unique event. The exclusion is permanent.

The significance of these scenes to the *Distaff* as a whole is hard to understand, but they appear to be especially marked on a metapoetic level. If the tortoise game evokes the poetic exchanges and movements common to choral song and dance, and if the funeral lament for Baukis' was a communal performance, as seems clear, then Erinna's exclusion from these activities represents an exclusion from those types of women's song that are generally performed in public.[78] Important here is Erinna's reaction to her inability to relive the tortoise game immediately following her description of it (18): τα]ῦτα τύ, Βαῦκι τάλαι̣[να ...]χεισα γόημ[ι] ("Grieving for] you, Baukis, I lament these things"). The same verb meaning "to lament" is used in the catalogue of

[77] Klinck 2008: 19 describes women's lamentation as "ranging from inarticulate wailing to emotional but coherent utterance."
[78] The bibliography on women's songs is extensive. See esp. Stehle 1997 and Klinck 2008.

funeral-related activities in which she cannot participate (33): οὐδ᾽ ἐσιδῆν φαε̣[...]κυν οὐδ̣ὲ̣ γοᾶσαι ("I am not allowed to see you dead nor to lament"). If Erinna is not allowed to lament, the use of the same verb fifteen lines earlier to describe what she is currently doing is peculiar. Forbidden from performing women's traditional lamentation, unable to participate in the choral activities of *parthenoi*, Erinna laments alone and at her *Distaff*.

The next time we can be certain that Erinna moves, she is "leaving off" something (λείπω, 31), most likely her domestic duties.[79] Though the object of λείπω is unknown, Erinna does give her reason: she is too busy crying over Baukis. So, over the next few lines, she leaves off something to weep for Baukis (31) and she gazes at her distaff (39); these actions are poetic. Unlike her desired actions, however, Erinna's weeping and gazing are done in private. Erinna's response to the prohibitions against her evokes poetic activity.

Although the importance of shame in the *Distaff* has been explored recently,[80] Erinna's mention of shame tearing her cheeks (34-35) requires more discussion.[81] In this scene, Erinna is alternating between describing what she would like to be doing (performing public lamentation at Baukis' funeral) and what she is actually doing (crying and lamenting in private). It is in this context that Erinna notes that shame, perhaps blushing shame, is tearing her cheeks. In public laments, women would tear their cheeks

[79] Stehle 2001 argues that Erinna is here neglecting the lament for Baukis. Skinner 1982: 269 agrees that the funeral rites constitute the object of λείπω but asserts that this is not a conscious choice on the part of Erinna.
[80] Stehle 2001.
[81] Levaniouk 2008: 215-216 argues that Erinna is discussing her maidenhood in 37-41. This is an intriguing possibility, but does not find much in the way of textual support. Stehle 2001:197 argues that *aidos* here signifies modesty and reverence for her mother.

and wail over the deceased.[82] Erinna, due to reasons not explicitly named in the extant fragments, is unable to publicly perform a lament but hints here that she is performing a private lament for Baukis, gazing at her distaff while weeping with reddened cheeks. Not only does this image signify Erinna's powerlessness in that the reddening of her cheeks is effected by shame rather than by Erinna's own hands, but it also lends support to the idea that Erinna's response to her exclusion from the public sphere of ritualized movements and speech acts takes the form of a parallel lament in the private sphere. Instead of public ululations, Erinna weeps alone; instead of tearing her cheeks, her cheeks are rent by shame; instead of gazing at Baukis' funeral pyre, Erinna gazes upon her distaff.

After ten fragmentary lines wherein Erinna mentions spinning, being shamed, looking, old women, weeping for Baukis again, a flame, and the howling discussed above, Erinna addresses Hymen for three lines. As these lines essentially close the fragment (and possibly the poem), the fact that the papyrus only contains six complete words is incredibly frustrating, although scholars have drawn many conclusions about this scene's significance.[83] An obvious parallel to this concluding address to Hymen is found in the epigram Erinna 2 GP. The epigram closes with the following couplet:

καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν
ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθαρμόσαο.

and you, Hymenaios,changed the wedding song
into cries of mournful lamentation.

[82] Cf. West 1977: 108-109.
[83] Bowra 1953: 161-162 argued that the scene simply indicated that Baukis died after marriage. West 1977: 111 described it as "an outburst of feeling" brought about by the fact that "spinsterhood is Erinna's great impediment." Neri 2003: 422-430 asserts that this fits in with the *Distaff*'s juxtaposition of light and tragic elements. Levaniouk 2008: 216 claims that this is evidence that the entire poem is framed by Baukis' wedding.

Not only does this couplet focus on the sounds of the changed scene (four words in the couplet refer to sound) but the difference between the two sounds is the difference between two public genres of poetry.[84]

Besides the obvious parallel between the two passages, the epigram's emphasis on sound is echoed in the scene from the *Distaff*. Directly preceding Erinna's address to Hymen, she hears the howling (ὠρυγᾶς ἀϊοισ.ο, 50) mentioned above. The ὠρυγᾶς in the *Distaff* and the φθέγμα in the epigram refer to similar sounds, both are used for the roaring of animals and, in Erinna's poetry, characterize the sounds of lamentation. In the epigram Hymen changed the *hymenaios* into a roaring sound of grief, while in the *Distaff* Erinna hears the howling and immediately addresses Hymen. If the epigram is any indication of the role of Hymen in the *Distaff*, it is possible that Erinna attempts in this scene to reverse Hymen's work. Erinna here responds to the sounds of a funeral by singing her own *hymenaios*, in private, next to her distaff.[85] The tantalizing fragment following this private song, αἰαῖ Βαῦκι τάλαιν[α, perhaps the last line of the poem, informs the audience that her attempt was unsuccessful.

These three scenes from the fragments of the *Distaff* show that among the many dichotomies found in the poem (outside/inside, memory/forgetfulness, the good/bad daughter), the opposition of private and public speech, as well as that of private and public movement, is significant and pervades the entire fragment, from the tortoise game at the beginning to the lament for Baukis following the *hymenaios*. Erinna is excluded from public lament, so she offers her own private lament. Her cheeks are red, but not

[84] So also Neri 2003: 426-427.
[85] See also Levaniouk 2008 who argues that the entire poem is a *hymenaios* performed as a lament.

from any public ritual. Her movement is restricted to the private sphere, so her only movements are to gaze (at the distaff, at the old women performing the lament,[86] and possibly at the funeral pyre in 49) and to cry. In short, everything she is doing in private is parallel to the activities of the women at Baukis' funeral. This parallel serves to further isolate Erinna, who like Hymen transforms songs; Erinna here translates the sounds of public lament into the lines of a poem in hexameters, the *Distaff*.

2.2.3. The Applicability of the Title

The title of the poem referred to as the *Distaff* has been debated for many years, though all recent scholars accept the *Distaff* as the correct title, presumably given by Erinna herself.[87] The applicability of the title to the fragments we possess has generally been defended with a few similar arguments. There is a mention of a distaff (39). Weaving is mentioned at least once, possibly twice (23, maybe 41).[88] More generally, the distaff is a symbol of the female sphere, and there is a possible reference to the Fates (45-46).[89] While none of these is conclusive on its own, together they make a strong case for the *Distaff* as an appropriate title for the poem, although the relevance of the Fates to

[86] West 1977: 110ff argued that the reference in line 46 to grey hairs actually signified Erinna's anticipation of her own. Stehle 2001: 198n71 speculates that the "obscure" line may refer to mother figures. As the surrounding lines seem to refer alternately to Erinna's current situation indoors and to the funeral outside, I find it likely that Erinna is expressing envy towards the grey-haired old women performing the lament.
[87] Crusius 1907: 456 was the first to suggest that the title was a later invention, though this idea is not now generally accepted. On the title's appropriateness to the poem, see esp. Levin 1962: 200; Cameron and Cameron 1969: 287-288.
[88] Stehle 2001: 198 asserts that weaving was a metaphor for Erinna's "acceptance of her woman's role and her 'leap' via weaving/poetry to mobility and expressiveness."
[89] Cameron and Cameron 1969; c*ontra* Levaniouk 2008: 217 who notes that there is no mention of the Fates in the text.

the poem is speculative and not rooted in the text.[90] The observations found in this chapter concerning movement and song/speech in the *Distaff* point to a new reading of the poem, one that is based on the prevalence of poetic activity throughout the fragment and that illustrates how this poem could not really have been titled anything else. This reading shows that at several moments Erinna, who is excluded from public poetic performance, responds to her exclusion by replacing public poetry with private poetry. Instead of playing the tortoise game with her group of *parthenoi*, she laments in private. Forbidden from participating in the lament at Baukis' funeral, she stands (or sits) at her distaff privately performing her own version of the lament taking place outside and then sings a *hymenaios* by herself. These private songs at the distaff become a written text, the most private poetic medium,[91] and the epic poem of which we now have only fragments is a poem that explores the difference between a song and a text.

After Erinna remembers and laments the tortoise game and the less decipherable memory involving her dolls, she transitions to her discussion of Mormo and Baukis' forgetting of the lessons from her childhood by mentioning a mother coming for "the weavers". Although the lines are far too fragmentary for a detailed analysis of the specific transitional strategy Erinna is using here, it is clear that one aspect of the transition from memories of youthful play to a critique of Baukis' actions as a young adult involves weaving with a mother, whether Baukis' or Erinna's.[92] As Mormo was the bogey-figure employed to scare little girls, the transition that includes weaving and

[90] Levaniouk 2008: 217.
[91] A short disclaimer: I am not, as Bowra famously did, arguing that this poem is a genuine expression of genuine grief. The *Distaff* was not a fragment from Erinna's diary that archaeologists happened to find. This is a learned and sophisticated narrative that was meant for public consumption. In this section, as before, I refer to the narrator of the poem as Erinna, though I do not mean to say that the narrator is Erinna herself.
[92] Stehle 2001: 190.

Mormo seems to concern growing up and setting dolls aside in favor of work.[93] Here we see the second hint that a major theme in this poem is transformation, the first being Erinna's lament in response to the memory of the tortoise game. This is, however, the first transformation in the *Distaff* that involves weaving.

The second reference to weaving again occurs at a moment of transition in the *Distaff*. After Erinna lists the activities taking place at Baukis' funeral which she is forbidden to take part in, she seems to discuss the reason she is not allowed to participate, namely the fact that she is nineteen (37, followed by a possibly condescending "Erinna dear" in 38).[94] The next line only preserves ἀλακ̣άταν ἐσ̣ορει̣[("gazing at the distaff"), but scholars agree that Erinna is the subject of the verb.[95] After gazing at the distaff and noting her shame, she then shifts her gaze to the women performing the lament, noting their advanced age, and refers to a flame, which is probably the funeral pyre.[96] Just as the earlier reference to the weavers marks a transition in the poem from Erinna's private lament and longing to participate in youthful games into Baukis' fateful marriage, this mention of the distaff marks a transition from Erinna's private lament and longing to participate in public lamentation into Baukis' funeral. These two transitional moments are centered around weaving.

Erinna's reddened cheeks and cries of lamentation are two responses to her inability to perform poetic sounds and actions in public, and both are configured as a private version of these public activities. Her lamentation in response to the memory of the tortoise game is followed by a story about weaving, and her reddened cheeks in

[93] *ibid.*
[94] West 1977 first made the case that this is a personified *Aidos* speaking to Erinna.
[95] Neri 2003: 395-397.
[96] Neri 2003: 417.

response to her exclusion from public lamentation is followed by a mention of Erinna gazing at her distaff. As weaving marks two transitional moments in the extant fragments of the *Distaff*, and as both transitions involve the substitution of moments of public poetic activity with private poetic actions, it follows that in this poem weaving, and the distaff in particular,[97] is used as a poetic symbol that denotes these substitutions. Weaving by Erinna's time was an established metapoetic symbol, and in the *Distaff* the poet uses the relationship between poetry and weaving to frame important poetic moments and transitions.

Although the *Distaff* survives only in fragments, and thus is very difficult to interpret as a whole work, it appears that weaving was used as a metapoetic symbol for the poetry Erinna's narrator was "performing" throughout the poem: private poetry that was not meant to be performed. When Erinna grew up and was no longer able to play the tortoise game, which is poetic in its structured movement and dialogue, her lament begins a story about weaving. When Erinna is forbidden from taking part in public lamentation, her own private lament takes place at the distaff. Erinna is not allowed, for various reasons, to make public poetry, either in the chorus of *parthenoi* or at Baukis' funeral. Instead of composing public poetry, she composes private poetry; instead of poetic performance, she sits (or stands) at her distaff. The distaff is Erinna's alternative to public performances of poetry, and it is at this distaff that she cries, reddens her cheeks, and laments Baukis.

[97] Although the distaff is technically used in spinning, not weaving, it is part of the same process.

2.2.4. Conclusion

The *Distaff* is a poem with many layers and meanings, and its fragmentary state precludes a thorough understanding of the poem in its entirety. One important theme of the work, as we can see from the fragments, is the performance of poetry, both publicly and privately. The distaff functions as a substitute for the poetry Erinna's narrator wishes that she could be performing. As this poem was almost certainly composed in writing, and as Erinna was composing in a period where writing was transforming the poetic landscape,[98] it is possible that the distaff symbolizes the poetic text, which epitomizes poetry without performance. It clearly seems to represent private poetry. Erinna's narrator is unable to play the poetic tortoise game with the *parthenoi* or perform a public lament with the *gunaikes*, but her private lament at the distaff became the most popular poem written by a woman in the ancient world outside of Sappho's lyrics in part *because* it was a poetic text. The *Distaff*, if this reading is correct, was the only acceptable title for this poem.

2.3. Erinna's Epigrams

2.3.1. Introduction

The three epigrams attributed to Erinna have received some scholarly attention, most of it concerning the authenticity question; to date, these poems have been the

[98] For discussions of the general trend towards the written text in the Hellenistic period, see Bing 1998, Gutzwiller 1998. For the *Distaff* as a written text, see Gutzwiller 1997: 202.

subject of only a few interpretive studies.[99] The reason for this lack of attention is clear: if the epigrams were later imitations, why should scholars afford them the care that, say, the *Distaff* warrants? If, on the other hand, the epigrams were actually written by Erinna, as the ancients clearly believed, they could be helpful tools for anyone attempting to understand the *Distaff* more fully. I would argue that even if they were imitations, these poems were written by poets with access to the entirety of the *Distaff*, as well as the rest of Erinna's corpus. Consequently, from a purely reception standpoint, these epigrams would provide us with what the ancient poetic community considered to be in keeping with her larger poetic project.[100] While this study does assume that the epigrams are authentic, my argument is not predicated upon this. The epigrams do not have to be by Erinna for them to illuminate important features of the *Distaff*.[101]

2.3.2. Messages from the Grave

Erinna's epigrams display a consistent focus on the limits of the written word and the loss of voice that accompanies non-performance poetry. In these poems she seems to accept the text as the standard means of performance,[102] or perhaps as the substitute for performance, but implies that this is not an ideal situation. The Baukis epigrams (1,2 GP) configure the text as a substitute, albeit a poor one, for Baukis' (and Erinna's) actual

[99] For a discussion of this trend, see Manwell 2005: 72. Interpretive studies of Erinna's epigrams include Snyder 1989, Rayor 2005, Manwell 2005, Murray and Rowland 2007.
[100] Asclepiades' quotation of Erinna 2.3 GP discussed above shows that at least 2 GP was considered authentic.
[101] Throughout these pages I will be referring to the epigrams as "Erinna's epigrams", in order to avoid repeating the phrase, "the epigrams attributed to Erinna." For a similar reason I write "she wrote" instead of "Erinna, or whoever wrote the epigrams, wrote."
[102] Very few modern scholars entertain the possibility that these epigrams were actually inscribed. See Gow and Page 1965.2: 282, Snyder 1989: 91, Rayor 2005: 67, Plant 2004: 49.

voice, while the Agatharchis epigram (3 GP) configures the painting of the girl in the same way, replacing the girl herself but imperfectly. All of these epigrams feature the artist or ventriloquizer in the background; these marginalized figures play important roles in the poems, helping to illustrate the limits of the media.

Two of Erinna's epigrams are funereal poems written about Baukis' death:

Στᾶλαι καὶ Σειρῆνες ἐμαὶ καὶ πένθιμε κρωσσέ,
ὅστις ἔχεις Ἀίδα τὰν ὀλίγαν σποδιάν,
τοῖς ἐμὸν ἐρχομένοισι παρ᾽ ἠρίον εἴπατε χαίρειν,
αἴτ᾽ ἀστοὶ τελέθωντ᾽ αἴθ᾽ ἑτεροπτόλιες·
χὤτι με νύμφαν εὖσαν ἔχει τάφος, εἴπατε καὶ τό·
χὤτι πατήρ μ᾽ ἐκάλει Βαυκίδα, χὤτι γένος
Τηλία, ὡς εἰδῶντι· καὶ ὅττι μοι ἁ συνεταιρὶς
Ἤρινν᾽ ἐν τύμβῳ γράμμ᾽ ἐχάραξε τόδε.

My stelae and Sirens and mournful urn that holds
these few ashes belonging to Hades,
to those passing by my tomb say farewell,
whether they be from my hometown or other cities;
and tell that this tomb holds me, a bride; and this too,
that my father called me Baukis, and that my family
is from Telos, so that they may know; and that my friend
Erinna engraved these lines upon my tomb.[103]
AP 7.710 = Erinna 1 GP

Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί· πολυκλαύταν δὲ παρέρπων
στάλαν τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀίδᾳ·
"Βάσκανός ἐσσ᾽, Ἀίδα." τὰ δέ τοι καλὰ σάμαθ᾽ ὁρῶντι
ὠμοτάταν Βαυκοῦς ἀγγελέοντι τύχαν,
ὡς τὰν παῖδ᾽, ὑμέναιος ἐφ᾽ αἷς ἀείδετο πεύκαις,
ταῖσδ᾽ ἐπὶ καδεστὰς ἔφλεγε πυρκαϊᾷ·
καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν
ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθαρμόσαο.

I belong to Baukis, the bride. You passing by her
much lamented stele please say this to Hades below:
"Hades, you are envious!" These beautiful monuments
will announce to those who see them the sad fate of Baukis,

[103] Translations of Erinna's epigrams adapted from Murray and Rowland 2007.

that with the very torches over which the Hymenaios was sung,
her father-in-law lit this girl's funeral pyre; and you, Hymenaios,
changed the wedding song into mournful lamentation.
AP 7.712 = 2 GP

It has been argued that these two epigrams are companion pieces and thus are meant to be read together.[104] According to this reading, the tomb accoutrements (the stelae, Sirens, and urn) are given a message to pass on to wayfarers in 1 GP, and the message actually delivered by those same accoutrements is found in 2 GP.[105]

In 1 GP, Baukis is telling her tomb decorations what message they are to pass on to travelers. This information includes the standard information an epitaph typically provides (name, homeland, marriage status) as well as one additional piece of information: the name of the poet herself.[106] The entirety of the message is made more complicated by the inclusion of the lines concerning Erinna. To summarize the problem, the dead Baukis tells the decorations on her tomb to pass on a message. One of the pieces of information that the stelae and Sirens and urn are supposed to pass on is that "Erinna wrote these lines (γράμμ᾽ ... τόδε) on my tomb (τύμβῳ)." But if the rest of the message is composed of these exact lines, as τόδε makes clear, why would Baukis be telling other objects to pass them on in order to inform the audience (1.7 ὡς εἰδῶντι)? Presumably any person passing by could simply read the lines that are attributed to Erinna and would not need tomb decorations to pass on the information found in the lines.

[104] Scholz 1973: 24. Gow and Page 1965.2: 282-83 mention that these two poems concern "the same grave" and discuss the difficulties in interpreting the physical tomb of Baukis in 1 GP alongside the same tomb in 2 GP, implying that they read these epigrams together as well.
[105] Murray and Rowland 2007: 223.
[106] This is not to say that *sphrageis* such as this are extremely rare in literary epigram; they are not. Cf. Tarán 1979: 4-5.

In 2 GP, the tomb directs the wayfarer to pass on a message and also to learn the sad fate of Baukis from the beautiful monuments, which will announce the sad fate of Baukis (2.3-4). The wayfarer, who is presumably alive, is told to tell Hades that he is envious, although Baukis would make a more convenient and effective messenger, considering she is already dead.[107] The fate of Baukis, the message announced by the monuments, does not include any of the information typically found in an epitaph except for her name; instead, the monuments tell how Baukis died immediately following her wedding.[108] As in 1 GP, however, the message is complicated by a twist found at the end of the poem. The tomb-narrator addresses Hymenaios and tells Hymenaios that he changed the wedding song into a song of lament. But if Hymenaios did change the song, then he already knows that he did, and has no need of Baukis' reminders.[109] It would be more useful to tell the reader what Hymenaios did. Thus in both epigrams there is some difficulty in understanding exactly how this message is to be passed on.

These epigrams' focus on voice and ventriloquization compounds the already substantial interpretive difficulties of the messages themselves. In 1 GP, any message that a passerby receives is taken third-hand from Erinna, who wrote the lines that the dead Baukis then read and instructed the tomb decorations to pass on. Typically if a dead person speaks in an epitaph, he or she is "speaking" the words that the passerby is reading

[107] Cf. the inversion found in *AP* 7.524 (Callimachus) where the deceased brings back a report about the afterlife.
[108] Rayor 1991: 188 asserts that these monuments are actually the epigram itself. But as the monuments are described as only telling the sad tale of Baukis, and not the instruction to tell Hades that he is envious, it is more likely that this epigram belongs in the category of "meta-memorials," discussed in the following chapter (Section 3.2.2).
[109] Additionally, there is nothing to prevent the reader of the poem from understanding Hymenaios to be the addressee throughout the poem, although until the final couplet an unidentified passerby is assumed.

and is thus an intermediary between the poet and the audience;[110] in this poem the dead Baukis is configured as reading the lines of Erinna and then using the tomb decorations as an intermediary between Baukis and the audience, just as Baukis is the intermediary between Erinna and the tomb decorations. Baukis' role, then, is largely superfluous due to the fact that the tomb is already displaying her words.

2 GP provides a similar problem with respect to voice, in addition to the problem stated above concerning Hymenaios. The tomb-narrator uses many different "voices" within the same poem, each of which presents its own difficulties for interpretation. It begins with an unnamed narrator announcing that he is "of Baukis the bride" (2.1), a narrator that is presumably her tomb. The narrator then addresses the passerby in the second person (2.1-2) and reports in the first person the message that the passerby is supposed to deliver (2.3). The narrator then tells the passerby in the third person the story that the monuments convey (2.3-6). The monuments' potential audience is limited to "the person looking at them" (2.3); presumably that would not include readers of this epigram, who cannot see the monuments. But "the person looking at them" need only look at the tomb, as the monuments are announcing the story that is found upon it.[111] Finally, the narrator addresses Hymenaios and tells the god what he already did.

By problematizing the act of conveying the message of Baukis' life and death, Erinna directs the reader to a more central problem: the limits of the written word and the subsequent separation of author and text.[112] The poet's presence in 1.7-8 GP belies the

[110] See Tueller 2008: 112ff.
[111] This deliberate confusion of sight and sound is difficult to interpret. The poet seems to be implying that the person looking at the monuments will hear the announcement they make. This juxtaposition, though jarring, nevertheless fits into the larger poetic program of Erinna within the epigrams.
[112] This was an important debate in the fourth century, as suggested by Plato's *Phaedrus*.

apparent speech of Baukis to her tomb decorations, reminding the reader as well as the wayfarer that he or she is reading text (γράμμ᾽), not hearing the actual words of Baukis. The audience is limited to those passing by the tomb (1.3) and Baukis admits that she does not know who her audience is (1.4).[113] The problem of the limited audience is taken up more explicitly at 2.1-3, where the tomb addresses the wayfarer and then tells him or her that the monuments will tell them a story, provided the travelers can "see" them (ὁρῶντι). When read as companion pieces, the information that Baukis orders her tomb accoutrements to tell the passerby in 1 GP is retold by the monuments in 2 GP, and the information contained in the two passages is quite different.[114] Here it is important to remember that in 1 GP Erinna is established as the ultimate source of this information.[115] Erinna wrote lines, Baukis read them and passed them to her tomb decorations, the tomb decorations then displayed them, whereupon the reader notices that the story in 2 GP does not include Baukis' homeland or Erinna's relationship to Baukis (1.7 μοι ἁ συνεταιρὶς)[116] or her composition. The transmission of the story of Baukis' life and death is made problematic by the textual nature of these poems.

2.3.3. The Textual Sirens and Erinna the Engraver

Implied in these textual moments is the difference between a written poem and a song, as the unusual use of the Sirens in 1 GP illustrates.[117] In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus tells the Phaiakians about the Sirens, reporting their words to him. According to

[113] Cf. Rayor 2005: 61.
[114] Murray and Rowland 2007: 223.
[115] Manwell 2005: 85-86.
[116] See discussion of this previously unattested word in Neri 2003: 433.
[117] Manwell 2005: 84ff.; Murray and Rowland 2007: 219-221.

Odysseus, they mention that they sing to all men who pass by, and they brag that they know all things that come to pass on the fruitful earth.[118] The Siren's ability to attract an audience (*Od*. 12.186-87 οὐ γάρ πώ τις τῇδε παρήλασε νηΐ μελαίνῃ / πρίν γ᾽ ἡμέων μελίγηρυν ἀπὸ στομάτων ὄπ᾽ ἀκοῦσαι 'for never yet has any man passed by on his black ship before hearing our melodious voice from our mouths') would render them the ideal mouthpiece for an epitaph, due to the tendency of wayfarers to not read inscribed epigrams,[119] but their infinite knowledge is contradicted by the instructions of Baukis in 1.3-8 GP. If the Sirens know all things, then Baukis doesn't need to actually say what her name is or what her homeland is or what Erinna's name is; instead, she could simply say, "Tell them my name and my homeland and who wrote this." The infinite knowledge of the Sirens is reduced to three facts about Baukis and Erinna's name in that they are to repeat these facts verbatim to every passerby.[120]

Moreover, the Sirens et al. are instructed to say farewell to the passersby "whether they be from my hometown or other cities" (1.3-4), implying that if Baukis had not specified that everyone is to be wished farewell, then the Sirens could presumably have ignored some travelers based on where they were born. But that is not the case with an inscribed text- the text, being stationary as well as an object, cannot choose its audience or performance context.[121] Here the Sirens, symbols of epic verse and female autonomy

[118] *Od.* 12.191 ἴδμεν δ᾽ ὅσσα γένηται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ. This aspect of the Sirens is discussed in Manwell 2005: 84-85.
[119] See Bing 2002.
[120] Rayor 2005: 67.
[121] Cf. Rayor 2005: 61, where she argues that unlike Sappho, "Erinna addresses only Baukis and the unknown readers of her own poems."

and power, have been rendered utterly powerless by their placement in an inscribed text, reduced to repeating to everyone a short list of facts that another person composed.[122]

The Sirens are not only diminished by the detail and brevity of their instructions; they are further reduced by their loss of song. In the *Odyssey*, the Sirens' songs have magical power, a magic which allows them to ensnare men (*Od*. 12.41-44):

ὅς τις ἀϊδρείῃ πελάσῃ καὶ φθόγγον ἀκούσῃ
Σειρήνων, τῷ δ᾽ οὔ τι γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα
οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι παρίσταται οὐδὲ γάνυνται,
ἀλλά τε Σειρῆνες λιγυρῇ θέλγουσιν ἀοιδῇ,

Whatever man approaches them in ignorance
and hears the voice of the Sirens, his wife and small children
never again stand beside him rejoicing at his return,
but the Sirens beguile him with their clear song.

The Sirens in this passage are said to take advantage of ignorant men who pass by their meadow by singing their clear song. In Erinna's epigram Baukis notes that the reason she wants the information passed along is so that the passersby will know (1.7 ὡς εἰδῶντι), implying that these, too, are ignorant travelers passing by the Sirens. Unlike the Sirens from the *Odyssey*, however, not only are these Sirens instructed to communicate three simple facts and no more, but they are not even allowed to use their magical song. Baukis tells them to "say" farewell and that Baukis was a bride (1.3-5), and to "say the following" (1.5 εἴπατε καὶ τό). By replacing the famous song of the Sirens with a specific set of lines for them to speak, Baukis has essentially stripped the Sirens of all of their power.[123] And by instructing the Sirens to say farewell to all passersby, regardless

[122] See Manwell 2005: 84-85, Murray and Rowland 2007: 219-221 for discussion of some of the symbolism evoked by the inclusion of the Sirens.
[123] Rayor 2005: 68.

of whence they came, Erinna's Baukis hints at the lack of power the textual Sirens have, for these Sirens can neither discriminate nor detain the traveler with song. A text, as Baukis reminds the Sirens, cannot sing.

While the instructions given to the Sirens illustrates the loss of subjectivity that occurs when a song becomes a text, the final instruction concerning the poet Erinna herself highlights the difference between the traditional bard and the Hellenistic book-poet.[124] The final message that the Sirens are to pass on is "that my friend Erinna engraved these lines upon my tomb" (1.7-8). Like the Sirens, Erinna is known for her poetic compositions, and, like the Sirens, in 1 GP her role is dramatically reduced by the physical nature of the text. Again the primary difference between her roles inside and outside of this epigram is shown in the choice of verbs; just as the singing of the Sirens becomes speaking in the epigram, Erinna's poetic composition is transformed from composing (or singing, or creating, or perhaps weaving) into "inscribing" (ἐχάραξε). Erinna is not credited with creating poetry but instead with the physical carving of lines (γράμμ᾽) onto the tomb.

Erinna's role in this epigram is small but significant, especially when we consider the fact that in the final couplet of this poem the reader learns that Erinna is the ultimate source of all of the information found in the poem.[125] The reader discovers at the end of the epigram that it is not Baukis who is subjugating the Sirens and removing their song, but her companion (συνεταιρὶς) Erinna, the engraver. Indeed by engraving Baukis' instructions to the Sirens, Erinna has transformed Baukis as well as the Sirens into texts,

[124] A difference that Antiphanes noticed much later, in *AP* 11.322.
[125] Cf. Tueller 2008: 54-55.

who cannot think or act independently.[126] In order to immortalize Baukis, Erinna has replaced her companion with a textual version. No longer will Baukis speak words for herself; Baukis' voice has become γράμμ᾽ ... τόδε.

If these two poems are truly companion pieces in the sense suggested above, then Baukis' instructions to the Sirens and the Sirens subsequent refusal to follow the rules illustrate the separation of an author from his or her text that is an inevitable consequence of written poetry. According to this reading, the monuments in 2 GP announce the sad fate of Baukis and her death immediately following her marriage in defiance of the orders that Baukis gave them and that Erinna gave to Baukis. The instructions that the poet wished the Sirens to follow were rejected. One important result of the poet's use of an intermediary text (1 GP) was the absence of Erinna's name in 2 GP, as the monuments did not pass that part along.[127] Not only is the information that is given in 2 GP not what the original author intended, but the author has been denied credit for her work and thus separated from her poems. "Erinna's" mistake here was using an intermediary text rather than simply writing lines in the voice of the Sirens, although, as we shall see, Erinna's poetry problematizes the compatibility of poetic text and voice.

[126] *Contra* Rayor 1991: 188 who argues that Erinna is here endowing Baukis with a voice. See also Rayor 2005: 67.
[127] Manwell 2005: 86 notes Erinna's absence from 2 GP.

2.3.4. The Text of Agatharchis

Erinna's final epigram, *AP* 6.352 = 3 GP, explores the limits of artistic expression and of the poetic text:[128]

Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· λῷστε Προμαθεῦ,
ἔντι καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὶν ὁμαλοὶ σοφίαν·
ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὰν παρθένον ὅστις ἔγραψεν,
αἰ καὐδὰν ποτέθηκ', ἦς κ' Ἀγαθαρχὶς ὅλα.

From delicate hands is this painting: My good Prometheus,
there are humans on a level with you in artistry.
Well this maiden at least he depicted truly, whoever he was;
if he had but added a voice, Agatharchis would be complete.

While this poem seems on first reading to be celebrating the anonymous artist's lifelike representation of Agatharchis, the representation's lack of voice in the final line seems to overshadow the praise of the first three lines. By closing her epigram with a critique of the medium's ability to represent people fully, Erinna invites the reader to reexamine her previous praise of the painter. The "delicate hands" of the artist implies that *he* (as we come to find out in 3.3) has feminine features, and his femininity seems to be given as the reason that the painting is so good.[129] He is then deemed equal to Prometheus, the creator of human life. Finally, he depicted her truly (3.3 ἐτύμως ... ἔγραψεν). But Erinna's effusive praise serves to subvert audience expectations when the praise turns to criticism; this bait-and-switch illustrates how Erinna's epigrams focus on limits of physical media.

[128] In Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.3), I explore the ways in which the later epigrammatist Nossis used this epigram as a model for her own ecphrastic poems on paintings of women.
[129] Meyer 2007: 197; Männlein-Robert 2007: 255; Murray and Rowland 2007: 223-224.

Knowing that the praise of the artist is about to be replaced by criticism of the efficacy of paintings in general to capture the essence of the subject, the complimentary first three lines take on a new meaning. The feminine features of the artist are, in the end, judged to be insufficient to render Agatharchis completely; the comparison of the artist to Prometheus moves from hyperbole to satire; the "truth" of his depiction, though not quite satirical, becomes a pointed critique of the medium.[130] To Erinna's narrator, the painting of Agatharchis is perfect for what it is: a fundamentally flawed attempt at recreating a person.

As in 1 and 2 GP, epigrams in which the loss of the Sirens' song and the author's control over her creations illustrates the difficulties of poetry as text, this epigram invites a metapoetic reading, one that ultimately reinforces the observations made in the previous section. This invitation is found in the first line, where the painting is described as τάδε γράμματα; this evokes Erinna's engraving in the previous epigram (1.8 γράμμ᾽ ... τόδε). The reader is not sure what exactly τάδε γράμματα means until the third line.[131] This ambiguity is intentional. As τάδε γράμματα could refer to painting or poetry, as could the other words used to describe the artist's work (σοφίαν, ἔγραψεν), the parallel between Erinna's engraving and this anonymous artist's work hints at a double meaning of this poem.[132] The first meaning is relatively straight-forward: the artist painted Agatharchis very well, though it is not possible to paint Agatharchis herself, because even an excellent artist cannot paint voice.

[130] Rayor 2005: 69; Manwell 2005: 87; Meyer 2007: 197.
[131] Murray and Rowland 2007: 225.
[132] Männlein-Robert 2007: 255.

The other level on which this poem operates is metapoetic, wherein Erinna's narrator is expounding on the limits of written representation, specifically poetic representation.[133] The narrator acknowledges that there is a significant gap between what the poet aims to do and what the poet is able to do in a poetic text. This gap is represented by the missing voice of Agatharchis.[134] These γράμματα, in this context written or perhaps inscribed poetry, are able to visually represent the "real" Agatharchis, but poetry without sound is only able to accomplish so much before the reader, in this case Erinna's narrator, comes to realize that aural mimesis is an essential component of poetic representation. In this way Erinna 3 GP can be read almost as a lament for the loss of traditional poetry in the face of the written revolution that is occurring during her lifetime.[135]

The unnamed artist in 3 GP lends some support to the metapoetic reading and reinforces the argument that the separation of artist and written text is a common and important theme found throughout these epigrams. The role of the artist is much larger than the role of Agatharchis in that she is only mentioned in the third and fourth lines, even though this epigram seems at first glance to be about the girl. As a dedicatory epigram, presumably on a painting dedicated by Agatharchis, the poem is unusual for its focus on the artist at the expense of the subject.[136] Although the poem begins with an unusual comment concerning the artist's feminine touch (3.1 Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν), it is

[133] A metapoetic reading of this poem is well-established in modern scholarship. See Rayor 2005: 69 where she remarks that "the portrait cannot replace or re-create the living girl; the written text cannot replace the song and come alive." Männlein-Robert 2007: 255 argues that the poem and painting are differentiated, the poet being able to represent voice, unlike the painter.
[134] Manwell 2005 discusses the emphasis on the role of voice in fashioning a self in Erinna's poetry.
[135] Rayor 2005: 69-70.
[136] Contrast the epigrams of Nossis in Chapter 4 (esp. Section 4.2.3), in which almost no mention is ever made of the artist.

not until the third line that the reader learns the most significant piece of information about him: he is unknown (3.3 ὅστις).[137] The painting survives to be viewed and admired, but nobody knows who the artist was because his name was not attached to the work. This separation of the artist from his own work and the subsequent lack of fame for the artist is especially striking in that Erinna's narrator seems to find this an amazing painting, on par with Prometheus' work - except, of course, for its lack of voice. Unfortunately for the artist, he and his name have been separated from his work, and so already by the time Erinna wrote this poem the fame of this man, like the voice of Agatharchis, was lost to the physical text.

2.3.5. Conclusion

In this section we investigated the "writtenness" in Erinna's epigrams and found that at several points the physical, textual nature of the poetry was represented as problematic. The problems posed by the replacement of song with poetic text were two-fold. Erinna, in her constant interplay with modes of artistic production and the limits of the written word, questions the ability of the silent text (or painting) to capture the essence of the subject. She also makes the case that the creator of a non-performed poetic text is almost irrelevant once the text is completed, since the text stands for itself and has no need of a performance context that would afford the poet a prominent role after composition. These critiques of the limits of poetic texts are made more striking by the fact that they are epigrams, those most written of poems.

[137] Gow and Page 1965.2: 284.

All of Erinna's extant epigrams focus on the physical nature of the epigram and invite metapoetic readings that explore Erinna's (or her narrator's) ideas about the silence of text. The use of the Sirens in 1 GP illustrates the problem of the written poem, as the Sirens are effectively made impotent by the loss of their song. As their song was the source of their power to attract an audience and provided the vehicle for their displays of infinite knowledge, the loss of their song in Erinna's epigrams render them powerless to detain their audience and even implies that they no longer know "all things that come to pass on the fruitful earth." Likewise the artist who painted the portrait of Agatharchis is praised for his technique but was not able to make Agatharchis complete. The text cannot duplicate the power of the Sirens' song or the voice of Agatharchis, or even the lament for Baukis, which in 2 GP differed from how it was dictated in 1 GP.

In 2 GP, the one epigram that does not include any reference to a poet or artist, Erinna engages with the separation of poet from his or her written work in a way that suggests that Erinna's poetry was as focused on itself as it was on its subject. Although the *Distaff* was Erinna's masterpiece and was known in the ancient world as such, her epigrams, though few and relatively short, show a poet very much concerned with the state of poetry and her own poetic project. Both Erinna and the unnamed painter are marginalized in the reception of their creations. The unnamed painter, soon after painting an incredibly lifelike and accurate depiction of Agatharchis, becomes ὅστις; Erinna, the accomplished and learned poet, becomes an engraver whose poetic creations rebel against her wishes and ultimately overshadow her.

As we move on to an examination of the fragments of the *Distaff*, it will be important to note one aspect of the epigrams, related but not identical to the observation

that "writtenness" is a key element of Erinna's epigrammatic poetry: in these three poems Erinna hints that her poetry is insufficient to capture the humanity that she aims to get across to the audience. In 1 and 2 GP, her lines both silence the Sirens and are not able to tell the story of Baukis the way she intends. The portrait of Agatharchis is criticized because the artist's medium, like Erinna's, does not succeed in its goal of reproducing Agatharchis. Others have read these poems as celebrating the relative power of the poet,[138] but they have all overlooked Erinna's use of γράμμα to describe her own art as well as the failed portrait.

2.4. Conclusion - Erinna's Voice

Erinna's poems are meant to be experienced as texts. Indeed they all show a preoccupation with the absence of any performance context; her epigrams were obviously not inscribed, while the epigrammatic reactions to her *Distaff* support the idea that this was a written poem, an idea that all modern scholars accept. Erinna composed her poetry one or two generations before the Hellenistic period officially began and anticipated the fascination that writing and text held for Hellenistic poets such as Callimachus, Apollonius, or Nossis. Unfortunately, very little of her work survives, but her extant poetry contains a sufficient number of references to text and the loss of performance that we can conclude that this was a predominant feature of her poetry.

In Erinna's epigrams, she problematizes the textual nature of the poems by composing two that interact with each other as texts. As companion pieces, each

[138] Manwell 2005: 86-88; Männlein-Robert 2007: 255-256.

provides some information that the other does not. 1 GP, which is narrated by the dead Baukis, gives us her homeland, her name, and her relationship to Erinna, while 2 GP tells us "the sad fate of Baukis," which is the story of a girl who died right after her wedding. In 1 GP, Erinna includes that she engraved the poem upon Baukis' tomb, which not only acknowledges that this poem is a text but also informs the audience that this was not actually inscribed, as this would be a unique instance in epitaphic poetry of a female companion inscribing an epitaph for a female friend. By association, we can safely read 2 GP as a literary exercise as well. 3 GP, on the portrait of Agatharchis, confronts the problems inherent to the poetic representation of a person by using the same description of the portrait as she used to describe her "inscription" in 1 GP. As is the case with portraiture, the written text is incapable of reproducing a person, because a text does not have a voice. Here we see the same dynamic illustrated by that famous passage in Plato's *Phaedrus* in which Socrates criticizes writing and painting as two arts united by their silence.[139]

In the *Distaff,* several different types of performed poetry can be seen in the background, though the narrator Erinna is separated from all of them. Due to the fragmentary nature of the text, we cannot know the performance context imagined within the poem, though Erinna's exclusion from public performances hints that it was not a public one. The image of the poet gazing upon her distaff and composing a lament that was never to be performed was one that fascinated Hellenistic poets and provides support for the argument that this poem was presented as a text. Like the epigrams, the extant fragments of the *Distaff* illustrate the problematic nature of the poetic text. The narrator

[139] *Phaed.* 275d. See Chapter 1 (Section 1.3) for discussion.

hears the howling of the lament for Baukis, sees the women performing it, and composes her own lament. The narrator desires to perform in the public lament, and this substitute lament, which we know as the *Distaff*, highlights the importance of performance in Erinna's poetry. Just as the portrait of Agatharchis is a poor replacement for the girl herself, so too is the *Distaff* an insufficient lament for Baukis. In Erinna's poetry, the text cannot replace the voice.

Chapter 3

Anyte

3.1. Introduction

This chapter will examine some of the many innovations of Anyte, among the earliest literary epigrammatists. Her *floruit* places her at the beginning of the transformation of the epigrammatic genre, a transformation which continued over the next two hundred years, and her narrative innovations were extremely influential in shaping the course of this evolution. This study aims to rescue Anyte's poetry from the feminist 'defense' of Anyte which argued that her poetry was significant in that it centered thematically around women's concerns, as well as the myriad biographical readings of her poetry. The chapter is divided into three sections; the first, 'Life and Works,' provides the information we have about Anyte followed by an evaluation of important references to Anyte in ancient poetry; the second, 'The Traditional Poet,' argues that Anyte had a poetic agenda of portraying the universality of grief and that she used two primary strategies to accomplish this goal; the final section, 'The Textual Poet,' shows that Anyte's poetry was composed with the understanding that it would be encountered as text, not inscription, making her the first poet to completely remove the performance context central to pre-literary epigram.

3.1.1. Life and Works

Although there is no *Suda* entry for Anyte, several sources attest that she lived in Tegea, an important religious center in Arcadia.[1] Pollux, who provides an important epigram (Anyte 10 GP) that is not included in the *Greek Anthology*, refers to her as ἡ Τεγεᾶτις Ἀνύτη;[2] Stephanus Byzantinus, in his entry on Tegea, states that ἦν δὲ καὶ μελοποιὸς Ἀνύτη Τεγεᾶτις. Pausanias provides an interesting anecdote concerning Anyte at 10.38.13, connecting her to the establishment of the sanctuary of Asklepius in Naupactos,[3] but does not mention where she lived, only that she was able to sail to Naupactos.

Dating Anyte's poetry with the precision it deserves is difficult; because there is no real biographical information for her, we are only able to date her work through a complicated and contested series of intertexts. Anyte's poetry is so closely connected to the work of other epigrammatists, namely Nicias and Mnasalcas, whom we can date somewhat more precisely, that scholars agree there must be imitation of one by the other.[4] Theocritus dedicated *Idyll* 11 to Nicias as a *remedium amoris*, so we can place him in the first half of the 3rd century BCE. Mnasalcas is a little more complicated, but since Theodoridas wrote a funerary epigram on Mnasalcas,[5] and Theodoridas was a contemporary of Euphorion, who was chief librarian (presumably in his later years) to

[1] Tegea was the site of the temple of Athena Alea. Cf. Paus. 3.5.6. Geoghegan 1979: 37 argues that our sources may have been mistaken and reads Anyte 2 GP as evidence that she was from Tegea.
[2] Poll. 5.48. This is the first evidence we possess of Anyte's life. See Baale 1903: 11ff.
[3] See below (Section 3.1.2) for discussion.
[4] Reitzenstein 1893: 123-27 argued that Anyte was the borrowed, not the borrower, in cases of similar epigrams. Gow and Page 1965.2: 90 are less confident but ulimately accept the dating of Anyte to c.300, which confirms Anyte as the model for Nicias and Mnasalcas.
[5] *AP* 13.21.

Antiochus III the Great (who ruled 222-187 BCE), scholars place Mnasalcas in the middle of the 3rd century BCE.[6] Scholars after Reitzenstein have been persuaded by his argument that Nicias and Mnasalcas were imitating Anyte, not the other way around; the result of this argument (with which I also agree) dates Anyte's *floruit* to *c.*300.[7] This date is supported by Tatian's assertion that Euthycrates, the son of Lysippus, and Cephisodotus, the son of Praxiteles, made statues of Anyte.[8] Both of these artists' fathers were active in the second half of the 3rd century, with the result that their sons' works could hardly be much later than *c.*300 BCE.

In addition to the epigram preserved by Pollux, twenty-four epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* are ascribed to Anyte in the Palatine Anthology, the Planudean Anthology, or both. Of these, twenty-one are ascribed only to Anyte (two probably falsely) and three are ascribed both to Anyte and another poet. One of the three whose authorship is in doubt (20 GP)[9] is almost certainly Anyte's work, as stylistically the poem looks nothing like the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum, the other author to whom the anthologies ascribe it. Leonidas' later poem on the same subject seems to have been the reason for the double ascription.[10] The other two poems have not been conclusively demonstrated to have been written by Anyte or the other authors to whom they have been ascribed,[11] and

[6] The rationale is that Theodoridas' epitaph for Euphorion shows that Theodoridas wrote epitaphs for his near-contemporaries. Gow and Page 1965.2: 400.
[7] Cf. Gow and Page 1965.2: 90, Geoghegan 1979: 12, Gutzwiller 1998: 54n22.
[8] *Or. ad Graecos* 33.
[9] Both anthologies ascribe this to Anyte or Leonidas.
[10] Geoghegan 1979: 171 asserts that in the case of Anyte 20 GP, "there can be no doubt of Anyte's authorship."
[11] Anyte 21 GP = *AP* 7.232 (Antipater in Palatine, Anyte in Planudean), Anyte 22 GP = *AP* 7.236 (Antipater of Thessalonica in Palatine, Anyte in Planudean).

as these epigrams have little in common with the rest of Anyte's corpus I do not include them here.[12]

The aforementioned two poems ascribed falsely are 23 and 24 GP. 23 GP, on maidens who commit suicide rather than become slaves, seems too late to have been written by Anyte (the sack of Miletus referred to occurred in 277 BCE) and would be the only funerary poem by Anyte that concerns suicide or historical events or that does not center around grief. For these reasons, and others,[13] none of which is conclusive but which taken altogether make this poem's ascription highly unlikely, I do not include it. 24 GP is just as unlikely, and no modern scholar entertains the possibility that Anyte actually wrote it,[14] The poem is a philosophical reflection that argues that all people are equal when they die. I do not include it in my study of her poetry, but it is worth mentioning that Pausanias' anecdote on Anyte (see below) seems to imply that future generations saw Anyte as something of a holy figure, to whom the ascription of a poetic bit of philosophy is not altogether surprising.

Anyte wrote on many traditional themes as well as some that were new to literary epigram, including her 'bucolic' epigrams as well as her epitaphs on animals; many of her poems reverse expected gender roles by featuring women in contexts where traditional epigrams typically employ men. Reitzenstein placed her at the head of the so-called 'Peloponnesian' school of epigram, presumably linked not by geography so much as the

[12] This is not to say that it is impossible that they were written by Anyte. The arguments I make in this chapter will provide a different avenue for an argument against inclusion, as these poems (in addition to the two ascribed falsely) do not fit into the thematic structure of the rest of her work.
[13] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924: 136 points out Anyte's predilection for quatrains; Baale 1903 notes two Attic correptions. Gow and Page 1965.2: 103 note that there are dialect questions.
[14] Cf. Geoghegan 1979: 7.

themes of their poetry.[15] Her dialect is a mixture of Doric and Ionic, and occasionally she uses Atticisms; this mixture adds an element of variety to the sound of her poetry, though it makes solving the problem of dubious ascription more difficult. Anyte was a *docta poetria* and her poems are exceptionally dense and allusive. Geoghegan has pointed out that nearly every line in Anyte's poetry contains some reminiscence of Homer.[16] As we shall see, Anyte's allusions are not confined to Homer, however; in addition to epic, Anyte also draws from lyric poetry, earlier epigram, and tragedy.

3.1.2. Ancient Assessment

Aside from the few references to Anyte as 'Tegean,' we have three later references to the poet, each of which helps the modern audience understand her reputation in antiquity. The first is from Meleager's introduction to his *Garland*:

Μοῦσα φίλα, τίνι τάνδε φέρεις πάγκαρπον ἀοιδὰν
ἢ τίς ὁ καὶ τεύξας ὑμνοθετᾶν στέφανον;
ἄνυσε μὲν Μελέαγρος· ἀριζάλῳ δὲ Διοκλεῖ
μναμόσυνον ταύταν ἐξεπόνησε χάριν·
πολλὰ μὲν ἐμπλέξας Ἀνύτης κρίνα, πολλὰ δὲ Μοιροῦς
λείρια

Dear Muses, to whom will you bring this song
of every fruit, and who was the one who compiled
the votive offering, this garland? Meleager accomplished it;
he made this as a monumental gift to Diocles;
He inwove many lilies of Anyte, many lilies of Moero ...
AP 4.1.1-6 (Meleager)

[15] Tradition connects Nicias to Miletus, for instance.
[16] Geoghegan 1979: 9-10.

After this excerpt, Meleager lists presumably every poet included in his *Garland*; it is significant that he begins with Anyte.[17] This list is obviously not arranged alphabetically, as Alcaeus can be found later on in the list, or chronologically, as Plato and Sappho (in addition to Alcaeus) appear later as well; Anyte's position in this catalogue should be understood as a testament to Anyte's significance to the field of literary epigram or at least to Meleager's appreciation of her poetry.

In Antipater of Thessalonica's epigram cataloguing the most famous ancient female poets, there is some doubt as to what exactly Antipater writes about Anyte:

Πρήξιλλαν, Μοιρώ, Ἀνύτης στόμα, θῆλυν Ὅμηρον,
Λεσβιάδων Σαπφὼ κόσμον ἐυπλοκάμων,

[Helicon and the rock of Macedonian Pieria nourished with song]
Praxilla; Moero; Anyte, the female Homer;
Sappho, the adornment of the well-tressed Lesbians;...
AP 9.26.3-4 (Antipater of Thessalonica)

There has been some debate about whether Sappho or Anyte is referred to as θῆλυν Ὅμηρον. Scholars are split on the issue and there is a convincing argument on both sides.[18] Although Sappho was indisputably more famous than Anyte, her erotic lyric verse has very little to do with Homeric subjects-- she actually rejects them in her famous priamel. Anyte's extant poetry contains so many allusions to Homeric poetry that if this description concerned poetic content it must refer to the epigrammatist.[19] Although this problem cannot be solved conclusively, it is important to note that a prominent Hellenistic poet *may* have referred to Anyte as 'a female Homer.'

[17] De Martino 2006: 63-64.
[18] See Werner 1994 for a thorough summary of the debate.
[19] Geoghegan 1979: 9.

The final testimony to Anyte from the ancient world is a strange anecdote in Pausanias (10.38.13).[20] In the story, the god Asclepius appears to Anyte in a dream and tells her to travel to Naupactus and to give a tablet to a blind man (Phalysius). Upon waking, she had the tablet in her hands. She sailed to Naupactus and told Phalysius to break the seal and read the tablet, which he was able to do, having regained his sight. The tablet informed Phalysius to give 2,000 gold staters to Anyte. He then built the Sanctuary of Asclepius in Naupactus for answering his prayers.

Although we should not read this story as historical fact, Pausanias' anecdote does provide us with some information about Anyte. It suggests that Anyte was still read (or at least known) in the 2nd century CE. The description of Anyte as Ἀνύτην τὴν ποιήσασαν τὰ ἔπη has suggested to scholars that she wrote hexameter poetry, possibly even a hexameter inscription in the temple of Naupactus.[21] As the section "The Traditional Poet" will show, Anyte shows a certain amount of philosophical reflection on grief and loss in her extant poetry; this could help explain Anyte's role as servant of Asclepius, the god of healing, in this story. This anecdote, though it seems to raise more questions about Anyte than it answers, shows that her poetry and reputation survived over four hundred years after she died.[22] More than this, it shows a conception of Anyte as a pseudo-heroic figure who held divine favor and was in direct contact with a god;

---

[20] τοῦ δὲ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐρείπια ἦν, ἐξ ἀρχῆς δὲ ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτὸ ἀνὴρ ἰδιώτης Φαλύσιος νοσήσαντι γάρ οἱ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ οὐ πολὺ ἀποδέον τυφλῷ ὁ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ πέμπει θεὸς Ἀνύτην τὴν ποιήσασαν τὰ ἔπη φέρουσαν σεσημασμένην δέλτον. τοῦτο ἐφάνη τῇ γυναικὶ ὄψις ὀνείρατος, ὕπαρ μέντοι ἦν αὐτίκα· καὶ εὗρέ τε ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ ταῖς αὑτῆς σεσημασμένην δέλτον καὶ πλεύσασα ἐς τὴν Ναύπακτον ἐκέλευσεν ἀφελόντα τὴν σφραγῖδα Φαλύσιον ἐπιλέγεσθαι τὰ γεγραμμένα. τῷ δὲ ἄλλως μὲν οὐ δυνατὰ ἐφαίνετο ἰδεῖν τὰ γράμματα ἔχοντι οὕτω τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν· ἐλπίζων δέ τι ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ χρηστὸν ἀφαιρεῖ τὴν σφραγῖδα, καὶ ἰδὼν ἐς τὸν κηρὸν ὑγιής τε ἦν καὶ δίδωσι τῇ Ἀνύτῃ τὸ ἐν τῇ δέλτῳ γεγραμμένον, στατῆρας δισχιλίους χρυσοῦ.

[21] Reitzenstein 1893: 133 argued for the inscription; Gow and Page 1965.2: 89-90 describe this suggestion as improbable but agree that τὰ ἔπη refers to hexameter poetry. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924: 136 asserts that the phrase simply described epigrams.

[22] Snyder 1989: 67-68.

Pausanias' story illustrates that not only was Anyte's poetry still read in Pausanias' time, but she was viewed as something of a foundational poet, the type of poet who would be considered important enough for a god to use as a messenger, a poet who, in short, would merit a title such as "the female Homer."

When these three testimonia are read together, it appears that Anyte was understood to be an important poetic figure in the ancient world. Anyte's position in Meleager's catalogue suggests that her poetry was enjoyed and celebrated by the foremost editor of Hellenistic epigrams. If we understand Anyte and not Sappho to be the female Homer in the poem of Antipater of Thessalonica, Anyte's reputation as a poet of consequence in the ancient world cannot be doubted. Pausanias' story shows that her fame had not abated by the 2nd century CE. In the eyes of ancient scholars and poets, the poetry of Anyte was canonical.

3.2. The Traditional Poet

3.2.1. Introduction

Anyte's poetry has been dismissed as simple and traditional by scholars expecting in her poetry to find traces of the poet's innate femininity, only to be disappointed that Anyte in many respects maintains the traditional narrative strategy of epigram, hiding the poet behind the voices of others.[23] The defense of Anyte has come primarily from feminist scholars who found in her poetry many signs that there truly was a woman's

[23] Wright 1923 esp. 328; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924: 136; Skinner 1991b: 21.

voice behind the masks.[24] The primary evidence for Anyte's feminine poetic technique comes from her pet epitaphs and pastoral poems, with the result that most of the work that has been done in recent years focuses on these poems.[25] These subcategories of epigram, coming from a poet in the first generation of Hellenistic epigrammatists, may have been her own invention.[26] Anyte's innovation is thus understood to be the creation of new types of epigrams as well as the first iteration of a constant narrator throughout her poetry.[27] While the pet epitaphs and bucolic epigrams are certainly among Anyte's most significant creations, an examination of her use of and engagement with established poetic tradition shows that both of these innovations fit into a sophisticated artistic program. This section will illustrate the ways in which Anyte negotiated the line between convention and novelty in her poems and how even her most 'traditional' poems contain significant deviations from the norms of the epigrammatic genre as she inherited it.

Anyte, especially in her funerary epigrams, shows a constant awareness that her chosen genre evolved from inscriptions on stone, which were written to memorialize the deceased for all eternity, without any need for public reperformance. Indeed most of these poems do *seem* to have been inscribed,[28] and many scholars have advanced the argument that some or all of them actually were written on stone.[29] Short of actually

[24] Barnard 1991; Gutzwiller 1998; Greene 2005. Geoghegan 1979 is the primary exception, in that his praise of Anyte derives mostly from her status as a *docta poetria*, but he offers little in the way of interpretation.
[25] Cf. Snyder 1989: 70-72, Barnard 1991, Gutzwiller 1998: 60-66.
[26] Cf. Barnard 1991, Gutzwiller 1998: 69, Greene 2005.
[27] Gutzwiller 1998: 55-56. As we shall see, the term "constant narrator" in the case of Anyte's epigrams is problematic, as most of her epigrams were composed from the traditional and impersonal perspective of inscriptions. For discussion of the traditional narrator(s) in epigram, see Tueller 2008.
[28] For discussions of the difficulty of ascertaining whether Anyte's epigrams were actually inscribed, see Snyder 1989: 68, 70; Gow and Page 1965.2: 90.
[29] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924: 136 argued that they were all inscribed. Reitzenstein 1893: 123ff argued that they were all literary exercises. Gow and Page 1965.2: 90-91 takes the safe middle ground, referring to Reitzenstein's view as 'overconfident' and pointing out that at least *AP* 6.153 = Anyte 2 GP was

finding the inscriptions in Tegea and dating them to Anyte's time, it is impossible to conclusively prove whether these were literary or inscriptional (or both); what is significant for our study is that, unlike the work of many later epigrammatists, they *could* have been inscribed.[30] This shows that Anyte's epigrams require the reader to be aware of the contextual framework of early epigram in order to appreciate her innovations. Consequently it is important to understand that Anyte's poetry is always engaged in a dialogue with the boundaries and expectations of the genre she inherited.

Although Anyte preserves the inscriptional 'feel' of earlier epigram, a closer look at her funereal epigrams shows that she had a literary agenda and that she used the traditions of epigram against themselves in pursuing it. The genre as Simonides and the other (mostly anonymous) earliest epigrammatists left it was remarkably one-sided-- the subjects of almost every funerary epigram were men, either old, rich men or young, brave men.[31] Other perspectives on death or loss were found in non-epigrammatic genres, such as tragedy or lyric, but epigrams were the province of men. As such, early, preliterary funereal epigram was very formal and solemn, only rarely giving way to sentimentality. Anyte rejected these constraints and changed the course of epigram by means of two strategies: the meta-memorial and the parallels of grief. This section will show that the meta-memorial (my term for Anyte's innovative strategy) allowed her to tell stories typically passed over in epigrams, and how Anyte made parallels both to her own work and to classical literature in order to expand the genre, infusing this traditional genre with fresh and new perspectives on death and grief.

---

inscribed. Gutzwiller 1998: 54 is more skeptical, pointing out that some of Anyte's epigrams could hardly have been inscribed, and the more 'traditional' epigrams show a "high degree of poetic self-consciousness."

[30] Hellenistic epigrammatists often play with the idea that literary epigrams are divorced from a physical context that seems necessary to understanding the poems. For discussion see Bing 2009: 85-90.

[31] Gutzwiller 1998: 55; Greene 2005: 141.

3.2.2. The Meta-Memorial

In many of her funerary epigrams, Anyte uses the inscriptional context of traditional funerary epigram as a backdrop for her own poetic narrative, centered around the grief of those mourning the deceased.[32] The result of this literary strategy is a style of poem I refer to as a 'meta-memorial'. In a meta-memorial, Anyte's epigram is not to be understood as the memorial itself, or inscribed upon it; her poems are adornments of (imagined) monuments and inscriptions.[33] These meta-memorials serve to provide added context for the monuments she describes as well as allow her to make artistic choices that might be constrained by the limits of the epigrammatic genre otherwise.

Ἥβα μέν σε, πρόαρχε, ἔσαν· παίδων ἅτε ματρὸς,
Φειδία, ἐν δνοφερῷ πένθει ἔθου φθίμενος·
ἀλλὰ καλόν τοι ὕπερθεν ἔπος τόδε πέτρος ἀείδει,
ὡς ἔθανες πρὸ φίλας μαρνάμενος πατρίδος.

The youth buried you, captain; like the grief of children for their mother,
Pheidias, when you died you cast them into dark sorrow.
But the stone above you sings this beautiful song,
that you died fighting for your dear fatherland.
AP 7.724 = Anyte 4 GP[34]

In this epigram the two couplets express different sentiments, sorrow and consolation respectively. The first couplet is allusive and vivid, but it expresses a relatively standard epigrammatic theme-- those around the deceased are saddened by

[32] Díaz de Cerio Díez 141 ff. notes that the fixation on grief in Anyte's poetry represents a deviation from traditional, inscribed funereal epigrams. See also Greene 2005.
[33] Scholars have argued that a few of her poems could have been on works of art, an interesting if ultimately not provable suggestion. See discussion of 10 GP below, as well as Bing 2009: 85ff on the intentional vagueness of context in certain Hellenistic epigrammatists' work.
[34] The text of the first line is difficult to interpret, though the manuscripts agree. This has given rise to several conjectures. I follow Geoghegan (and the mss.) who argues that παίδων is subjective genitive, ματρὸς is objective genitive with understood πένθος. For his discussion, as well as many examples in Homer, tragedy, and Hellenistic poetry, see Geoghegan 1978; Geoghegan 1979: 59 (with n9-12). Greene 2005: 154n3 follows Geoghegan. Not only does the text make sense, and the 'oddities' follow substantial precedent, but the principle of *lectio difficilior* argues against simplifying a complex yet intelligible text.

Pheidias' death. The final couplet subverts the expectations of the audience, however, because while a standard close to the epigram might be expected to contain references to his family, the name of his homeland, praise of his life or death, or a gnomic statement about mortality, instead the reader finds a description of his epitaph in indirect statement. This 'beautiful song' should not be understood as a reference to Anyte's own epigram for two reasons: the poem does not reveal what Pheidias' homeland is, as epitaphs of fallen warriors who die *for their homeland* almost always do, and the entire first couplet and a half of the short poem describe events after his death. The reader does not find out how he died, or where, or at whose hands, or how brave he was; this is not a poem about Pheidias' death, but about what happened afterwards.[35] The image of the singing stone, apparently Anyte's own creation,[36] as well as the description of the song as καλόν, gives the impression that this poem is a reaction to the monument. The second-person perspective found throughout the poem adds to the effect and paints a picture of a passerby who reads the epitaph and makes his or her own aesthetic judgment.[37]

In Anyte 4 GP, the poet embeds a poem within her epigram. The internal poem is only referred to in indirect discourse and reads, " ὡς ἔθανες πρὸ φίλας μαρνάμενος πατρίδος." As far as the reader of Anyte's epigram can see, this poem could well have been culled from the *Sylloge Simonidea*.[38] The theme of a soldier's dying for his fatherland is found throughout epigram, and Simonides especially, as are the specific

[35] A detailed discussion of Anyte's constructions of death can be found in Díaz de Cerio Díez 1997.
[36] Geoghegan 1979: 62; Greene 2005: 152. The stone speaks in Pindar's *Olympian* 7.87-88, but it does not sing.
[37] This perspective, that of the passerby making subjective judgments about the tomb/inscription, becomes a hallmark of later Hellenistic epigrammatists like Callimachus, and forms the basis for the riddle epitaphs, where the 'passerby' attempts to decipher images and symbols found on the gravestone. See Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 328ff.
[38] Geoghegan 1979: 61. Cf. *AP* 7.251, 7.254, 7.258, 7.514, *inter alia*.

words Anyte's narrator reports (see above). Anyte refers to this poem as a καλόν ἔπος, which could possibly refer to a poem in hexameters or even prose but more likely refers to the story itself, the story of a young man dying in a battle for his country. But if the final couplet of this epigram asserts that an epigram (or perhaps a prose inscription) has already been written for Pheidias, what is the reader to make of the first couplet, wherein the narrator describes Pheidias' burial and the sorrow of his fellow soldiers?

Anyte, by briefly mentioning another epitaph that (presumably) follows the 'rules' of funereal epigram for a fallen soldier (mentioning family names, country, his bravery, a brief description of the battle and/or his bravery in the battle), creates space in this short poem to make artistic choices. The first couplet tells us much about Anyte's thematic focus within her funerary epigrams. The first word of the couplet is ΄Ηβα and the final word is φθίμενος, foreshadowing (for our study -- this does not intend to imply that 4 GP was earlier in her collection) her epigrams on dead young women. As we shall see, the death of the young is a pervasive theme throughout her collection. In this couplet Anyte also compares the grief of the soldiers to the grief of children for their dead mother. This is a common feature in Anyte's funereal epigrams; in these poems Anyte often compares the grief of one person over a dead family member or animal to another's. Anyte's funereal epigrams focus not on the qualities of the deceased but on the grief left behind; her efficient use of space in the poem, especially seen in the substitution of the meta-memorial for the traditional information provided by a funereal epigram, allows her to write her own style of epigram without completely subverting the expectations of the genre.

Another epigram that features the meta-memorial is the poem on Cleina, mourning at the tomb of her daughter Philaenis:

Πολλάκι τῷδ᾽ ὀλοφυδνὰ κόρας ἐπὶ σάματι Κλείνα
μάτηρ ὠκύμορον παῖδ᾽ ἐβόασε φίλαν,
ψυχὰν ἀγκαλέουσα Φιλαινίδος, ἃ πρὸ γάμοιο
χλωρὸν ὑπὲρ ποταμοῦ χεῦμ᾽ Ἀχέροντος ἔβα.

The mother, Cleina, often mourning here at the tomb of her daughter,
lamented her beloved daughter who died too soon,
calling back the soul of Philaenis, who before her marriage
crossed over the pale stream of the river Acheron.
AP 7.486 = 5 GP

The first word of this epigram belies the inscriptional appearance of the rest of the poem. Πολλάκι ('often') implies of course that Cleina visited this tomb after the tomb was erected; presumably any inscription would have been written on the tomb before it was set up. Thus the tomb at which Cleina mourned did not feature the inscription we now know as Anyte 5 GP. Some have suggested that this poem is actually on a frieze depicting a woman mourning at a tomb,[39] but Πολλάκι does not help this argument, as it is not possible to paint 'often' in a single painting.[40] But if we read 5 GP as a meta-memorial, Cleina's lament can be understood in a more 'epigrammatic' context.

In this poem, as in 4 GP, Anyte's focus is events after the death of the 'subject.' The story of Philaenis is relegated to a relative clause extending from the caesura in the third line to the end of the poem; as in the case of Pheidias, the portion of the epigram that discusses the death itself comprises less than half of the poem. Both of these poems

[39] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924: 136n6; Gow and Page 1965.2: 94; Gutzwiller 1998: 59.
[40] τῷδ᾽ also points to a funereal monument as the intended fictive context, but this is another case of Bing's *Ergänzungsspiel*. Speculation is part of the enjoyment of the poem. Geoghegan 1979: 65 argues that it is impossible to prove one way or the other.

open with a focus on the mourning of the survivors. Also, in both epigrams their grief is compared to that of others: in 4 GP the sorrow of the soldiers is like that of children mourning their mother, and in 5 GP Cleina's grief is compared to Achilles' when he is mourning Patroclus. The position of ψυχὰν and the rarity in Homer of ὀλοφυδνὰ point to Ψ101ff:[41]

ταφὼν δ᾽ ἀνόρουσεν Ἀχιλλεὺς
χερσί τε συμπλατάγησεν, nzἔπος δ᾽ *ὀλοφυδνόν* ἔειπεν·
ὦ πόποι ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι
ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον, ἀτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἔνι πάμπαν·
παννυχίη γάρ μοι Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο
ψυχὴ ἐφεστήκει γοόωσά τε μυρομένη τε,
καί μοι ἕκαστ᾽ ἐπέτελλεν, ἔϊκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῷ.

...astounded, Achilles leapt up
and struck his hands together, and made lamentation:
'Oh truly even in the house of Hades there are
souls and phantoms, but there is no life in them;
for all night long the soul of poor Patroclus
stood above me, wailing and moaning,
and telling me all I should do, and looking just like himself'

Thus the use of the meta-memorial in 5 GP allows Anyte in four lines to tell two stories, the traditional funereal story about Philaenis and the story of Cleina's grief. Compare this to a standard funerary epigram which would presumably discuss the life and death of Philaenis for the duration of the epigram. By placing the epigrammatic context in the background, Anyte can tell the story where the 'inscription' would end: at Philaenis' death. This epigram could not have been inscribed in the way it pretends to (i.e. at the tomb of Philaenis directly following her death) but instead is a poetic adornment of the

[41] Baale 1903 :110ff. was the first to notice this connection. Geoghegan 1979: 68 adds Ψ218-224 as another possible source for Anyte 5 GP.

tomb that incorporates another character. Anyte uses the meta-memorial to tell another side of the story, providing an additional layer of context for the reader.

3.2.3. Parallels of Grief

The meta-memorial is one strategy used by Anyte to draw attention in a funerary epigram away from the deceased and onto the grief of those mourning the dead; in these poems Anyte asserts or implies that the lamentations of one person or group is much like another.[42] Anyte shows grief from many angles and alludes to more.[43] These parallels of grief can be found throughout Anyte's funereal poems and suggest a universalizing perspective: all grief is the same, whether the deceased is a man, woman, child, or animal, no matter who the mourner is. In this section I will provide close readings of several funerary epigrams and show the ways in which Anyte makes this point again and again.

These parallels of grief, however, serve a purpose greater than showcasing her knowledge of traditional poetic laments or providing the reader with something to think about concerning the concept of mortality. Anyte's use of analogy allows her to expand the scope of the funerary epigram. The vast majority of archaic and classical funerary inscriptions feature a young man as the subject and his father as the mourner;[44] by use of analogy, Anyte is able to justify to her audience (men, for the most part) the inclusion of mourners and deceased subjects that do not conform to the traditional patterns of

[42] Barnard 1991: 173 notes that animals and people in Anyte's epigrams "become" something else.
[43] Snyder 1989: 68-69.
[44] Gutzwiller 1998: 58-60; Greene 2005: 141-142.

epigrams. Not only does Anyte's poetry feature women and children mourning, but the objects of lamentation vary widely, from a captain to a daughter, from a warhorse to a pet locust. Anyte composes laments from a variety of perspectives and employs a system of analogies that justifies their inclusion into the formerly restrictive field of funerary epigram.

To begin, let us revisit the two poems we discussed in the previous section, 4 GP (on the captain Pheidias) and 5 GP (on Cleina, mourning her daughter Philaenis). In 4 GP, the young soldiers who served under Pheidias are compared to children mourning their mother. This comparison achieves two objectives: by universalizing the experience of grief, it explains to those in the audience who have not spent time in the military how strong the bond between fellow soldiers is, and more generally it incorporates children and mothers into the world of funereal epigram. Anyte, by pointing out that dead mothers are mourned like dead captains, expands the scope of funerary epigram to include all members of the family. She invites the question, "If we can use this genre to mourn dead soldiers, and mourning for soldiers is the same as mourning for mothers, why shouldn't we be able to use this genre to mourn dead mothers? Or daughters?" Anyte's comparison of Cleina in 5 GP and Achilles in *Iliad* Ψ101ff serves a very similar purpose. When the ghost of Patroclus appears to give Achilles instructions for his funeral rites, Achilles wants to hold him one last time, but Patroclus' shade disappears. Achilles wakes up and speaks the words quoted above, to which Anyte alludes in 5 GP. This is one of the greatest scenes of *pathos* in the *Iliad,* for we see Achilles grief renewed and made fresh by the visit. Anyte' allusion to Achilles' speech is also an allusion to his sorrow; her learned audience is able to better understand Cleina's sadness by means of this reference.

Anyte uses this Homeric allusion to establish a poetic model for Cleina by showing that her defining characteristic, grief, is patterned after one of the most important characters in the Greek poetic imagination and thus that Cleina's relationship to her daughter parallels the famous relationship of Achilles and Patroclus.[45]

Anyte 8 GP makes use of a complex network of allusions to create parallels of grief:

Ἀντί τοι εὐλεχέος θαλάμου σεμνῶν θ᾽ ὑμεναίων
μάτηρ στῆσε τάφῳ τῷδ᾽ ἐπὶ μαρμαρίνῳ
παρθενικὰν μέτρον τε τεὸν καὶ κάλλος ἔχοισαν,
Θερσί· ποτιφθεγκτὰ δ᾽ ἔπλεο καὶ φθιμένα.

Instead of a marriage-blessing bedchamber and holy wedding rites,
your mother placed upon your marble tomb
a woman having your height and beauty, Thersis:
and you, though dead, can be spoken to.
AP 7.649 = 8 GP

The theme of opposing marriage rites and funeral rites is a common theme in Greek literature, from epic poetry to tragedy, and can also be found in inscribed epigram.[46] Anyte makes this opposition in several of her funerary epigrams.[47] Although scholars have found many possible literary parallels,[48] this epigram alludes in several key respects to the exchange between Antigone and the chorus at *Soph. Ant.* 810-838:

Αν. ... ἀλλά μ᾽ ὁ παγ-
κοίτας Ἅιδας ζῶσαν ἄγει
τὰν Ἀχέροντος
ἀκτάν, οὔθ᾽ ὑμεναίων
ἔγκληρον, οὔτ᾽ ἐπὶ νυμ-
φείοις πώ μέ τις ὕμνος ὕ-

[45] Greene 2005: 141-144.
[46] The earliest surviving inscription containing this theme is the 'Phrasikleia' inscription (*IG* I.2.1014) from the 6th century.
[47] 5,6,8 GP.
[48] See Geoghegan 1979: 89-95.

μνησεν, ἀλλ᾽ Ἀχέροντι νυμφεύσω.
Χο. οὔκουν κλεινὴ καὶ ἔπαινον ἔχουσ᾽
ἐς τόδ᾽ ἀπέρχῃ κεῦθος νεκύων;
οὔτε φθινάσιν πληγεῖσα νόσοις
οὔτε ξιφέων ἐπίχειρα λαχοῦσ᾽, (820)
ἀλλ᾽ αὐτόνομος ζῶσα μόνη δὴ
θνητῶν Ἅίδην καταβήσῃ.
Αν. ἤκουσα δὴ λυγροτάταν ὀλέσθαι
τὰν Φρυγίαν ξέναν
Ταντάλου Σιπύλῳ πρὸς ἄ-
κρῳ, τὰν κισσὸς ὡς ἀτενὴς
πετραία βλάστα δάμασεν,
καί νιν ὄμβροι τακομέναν,
ὡς φάτις ἀνδρῶν,
χιών τ᾽ οὐδαμὰ λείπει, (830)
τέγγει δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ὀφρύσι παγ-
κλαύτοις δειράδας· ᾧ με δαί-
μων ὁμοιοτάταν κατευνάζει.
Χο. ἀλλὰ θεός τοι καὶ θεογεννής,
ἡμεῖς δὲ βροτοὶ καὶ θνητογενεῖς.
καίτοι φθιμένῃ μέγα κἀκοῦσαι
τοῖς ἰσοθέοις ἔγκληρα λαχεῖν
ζῶσαν καὶ ἔπειτα θανοῦσαν.

Antigone. But Hades who makes all sleep
leads me living to the shore of Acheron,
having no share in the *hymenaios*,
nor has any bridal song been mine,
but I will marry Acheron.
Chorus. Then famous and with praise
you depart to that deep place of shadows;
neither struck by wasting disease nor earning
the wages of the sword, but guided by your own laws
and still alive, like no mortal before,
you will descend to Hades.
Ant. I have heard how our Phrygian guest,
the daughter of Tantalus, perished so miserably
on steep Sipylus, how, like clinging ivy,
the stone shoots overcame her,
and the rains, as men say, do not leave her melting form,
nor does the snow, but she makes the ridge of hills damp
from under her weeping eyebrows; a god puts me to rest
exactly like her.
Chor. But she was a goddess, you know, and the offspring of gods,
and we are mortals and mortal-born. And yet it is a great thing
to have it said of a dead woman that she obtained the lot

of the godlike while alive and, afterwards, when she dies.

The structural resemblance of the opposition in the first couplet of Anyte's poem to Antigone's statement at 813-816 that she will not be hymned (note that ὑμεναίων is found in both passages) but will instead marry Acheron has been observed.[49] The thematic parallels between these two passages deserve more study, however. In Anyte's epigram, the mourning mother erects a statue to replace her daughter. Antigone compares her fate to Niobe, the mourning mother who becomes a statue. By substituting a statue for Thersis, Thersis is treated as if she were still alive, as is made clear by the last line, even though she is actually dead. Antigone describes the statue of Niobe as moistening the hills with her weeping brows. More than this, the juxtaposition of living and dying is found throughout Antigone's lament, as well as the chorus' replies. Finally, just as in the epigram the statue is suggested to be practically identical to Thersis in that it has the same beauty and height, Antigone says that the god is killing her *just like* Niobe (833).

Anyte's allusion to this scene is among the most complex references in a very dense corpus, because Antigone is in a unique position in that she is singing her own lament. She takes on two roles: the mourner and the deceased. She simultaneously configures herself as the maiden Antigone and Niobe (both the grieving mother and the statue), at once alive and dead. Anyte splits these parts and divides them between Thersis, who takes the roles of Antigone and the statue of Niobe, and Thersis' unnamed mother, who represents the grieving mother Niobe in life. In Anyte's epigram, this statue

[49] Geoghegan 1979: 90. Barnard 1991: 170 refers to this passage in a general discussion of Anyte's epitaphs for young women.

becomes a permanent testament to the mother's grief inasmuch as it alludes to the forever weeping Niobe.[50] The *pathos* evoked here by Anyte avoids over-sentimentality by deriving from an allusion. On its face, this is a relatively traditional epigram on the death of a girl; to the learned reader, however, the grief of this unnamed mother is transformed into Niobe's unbearable anguish and the unspecified death of the girl becomes a tragedy. Thersis and her mother are thus incorporated into the literary tradition and their presence in funerary epigram is justified.

It is important to note that in these funerary epigrams Anyte is *not* carving out a subgenre within epigram for 'funerary epigrams involving women'; by employing parallels to earlier literature Anyte's narrator makes the case that the grief of these women is like any other grief. The funerary epigram for Pheidias displays the same poetic strategies as the poems on women, proclaiming how he is mourned like a mother. This poem as much as any other shows that Anyte's poetry breaks down the distinction between female and male poetry and promotes the idea that funereal epigram, by virtue of its focus on universal emotions, is a genre for all.

3.2.4. More Parallels - Animal Epitaphs

By setting her mourners in the context of famous passages in Greek literature, Anyte expands the nascent genre of literary funereal epigram to include lamentations by

[50] This poem, as stated above, is dense with intertexts and hints at several models and traditional motifs. Geoghegan 1979: 89-95 provides a thorough list. One of the more interesting possibilities is a reference to the story of Protesilaus and Laodamia, where the grieving wife Laodamia commissions a statue in place of the deceased Protesilaus and is caught embracing it by a servant who thinks Laodamia has taken a lover. It is, however, difficult to remove the sexual component of the story. If Anyte's epigram is in fact alluding to this story it would provide further evidence that grief is universal in her poetry, although this would be a risqué treatment of a mother's grief for her daughter.

and for women. These parallels of grief also serve to justify funerary epigrams concerned with non-human funerals.[51] As stated above, Anyte's animal epitaphs have been read in very different ways by scholars, with some finding them bizarre and others ironic.[52] Some have argued that Anyte's focus on animals, women, and children is evidence of her femininity as a writer.[53] But Anyte's poems on animal epitaphs vary widely, from a man and his warhorse to a girl and her locust, from a second-person reminiscence to a first-person self-lament; it is therefore problematic to read any of these characters as representing the 'real' Anyte. These reactions to the animal epitaph poems are all symptomatic of a misunderstanding of the subgenre-- that is to say, that scholars consider the animal poems to be a subgenre.[54] By examining the parallels of grief found within these poems, we will see that Anyte treats these epitaphs in the same ways she treats her other funerary epigrams and implies that the sorrow caused by the death of a beloved pet is the same as that caused by the death of a person.[55] Grief is grief, no matter the relationship, gender, or even species, in the poetry of Anyte.

Anyte's most famous funerary epigram on the death of an animal is 20 GP, featuring Myro mourning the death of her two pets, a grasshopper and a cricket:[56]

---

[51] Funerary epigrams on animals are not uncommon in the *Greek Anthology*, though Anyte is the earliest poet whose animal epitaphs are found within the collection. See Gutzwiller 1998: 60-62 for a discussion that infers from the limited evidence available that men and women were constrained by society to view animals differently, with men viewing them as helpmates and women feeling "sympathetic feeling" for animals, thus marking Anyte's pet epitaphs as feminine due to their "empathy free of self-interest."

[52] See Snyder 1989: 70 where she claims that "certainly the kind of mock seriousness created in a poem posing as the ultimate tribute to a deceased grasshopper prepared the way for later use of the epigram as a vehicle for wit and satire."

[53] Barnard 1991; Gutzwiller 1998: 62.

[54] Díaz de Cerio Díez 1998 argues that this 'subgenre' is actually a merging of two genres, funereal epigrams and elegy.

[55] Díaz de Cerio Díez 1998: 142; Gutzwiller 1998 64; Greene 2005: 148.

[56] This poem is also a meta-memorial. No scholar entertains the possibility that it was actually inscribed, and as in the case of the other meta-memorials, Myro is the focus of the epigrams and the tomb merely a setting for her grief.

Ἀκρίδι, τᾷ κατ᾽ ἄρουραν ἀηδόνι, καὶ δρυοκοίτᾳ
τέττιγι ξυνὸν τύμβον ἔτευξε Μυρώ,
παρθένιον στάξασα κόρα δάκρυ· δισσὰ γὰρ αὐτᾶς
παίγνι᾽ ὁ δυσπειθὴς ᾤχετ᾽ ἔχων Ἀίδας.

Myro erected a common tomb for her locust,
the nightingale of the fields, and her oak-dwelling cicada,
a girl weeping a maiden's tears: for implacable Hades
departed taking both of her pets.
AP 7.190 = 20 GP

Anyte's modern audience tends to read this poem as humorous in its overly sentimental *pathos* considering the subject matter, and others argue that it must be in some way metapoetic, playing on the names Myro and Moero (the poet), justifying the inclusion of a small child into a solemn genre;[57] these readings, however, overlook the significance of the parallel between this girl's grief and the tears of a (much older) young woman. When the mourning soldiers in 4 GP are compared to children lamenting the loss of their mother, far from infantilizing their grief Anyte's narrator legitimizes it. The same is true for the other parallels of grief we have seen. Myro's tears are no exception. While a crying child needs not be taken as seriously as a crying young adult, this poem, by equating the two, demands that the reader take Myro seriously, at least for this moment. The reference to the tears of the maiden invokes Anyte 7 GP, wherein Erato speaks her final words to her father as she dies, shedding pale tears. The parallel between Myro's tears and Erato's suggest that, like 7 GP, 20 GP is to be understood as a serious funerary epigram, no matter what Anyte's later imitators did. This poem also employs the opposition of youth and death, as seen above in the discussion of 4.1-2 GP (Ἥβα ... φθίμενος), in the final line (παίγνι᾽ ... Ἀίδας). As Hades is opposed to 'playthings', a symbol of youth, it is clear that this poem concerns the loss of innocence, a serious topic.

[57] For a discussion of childhood in Hellenistic poetry, see Ambühl 2007.

And while the mourner and the objects of mourning are unconventional in funerary epigram, Anyte, by means of parallels, establishes girls and pets as new possibilities for poetic treatment within this most solemn (and masculine) genre.

Anyte makes an allusive case for the warhorse of Damis in 9 GP:

Μνᾶμα τόδε φθιμένου μενεδαΐου εἵσατο Δᾶμις
ἵππου, ἐπεὶ στέρνον τοῦδε δαφοινὸς Ἄρης
τύψε· μέλαν δέ οἱ αἷμα ταλαυρίνου διὰ χρωτὸς
ζέσσ᾽, ἐπὶ δ᾽ ἀργαλέᾳ βῶλον ἔδευσε φονᾷ.

Damis erected this memorial for his deceased steadfast
horse, since bloodthirsty Ares smote his chest:
his black blood bubbled up through his tawny hide,
and drenched the earth with grievous death.
AP 7.208 = 9 GP

The success of this epigram hinges on the epic adjective μενεδαΐου, which in Homer is used of (human) heroes, being followed in the second line by the surprising ἵππου. In a linear reading, by the end of the first line the reader is expecting that the adjective will describe Damis' fellow soldier, or a captain, or perhaps his friend. The other adjective (indirectly) describing the horse, ταλαυρίνου in line 3, is also seen in the *Iliad* to refer only to humans. This memorial is for a horse, yet Anyte employs anthropocentric adjectives for the dead horse in such a way that it seems *almost* human.[58] Anyte, however, by describing the horse in terms fitting for a heroic human and by focusing on the gruesome details of his death, avoids the over-sentimentality for which animal epitaphs were mocked.[59] In this poem Damis seems to have erected a memorial for a horse he saw as a heroic companion in war, and the fact that this companion was a horse

[58] As Barnard 1991: 173-174 writes, "the war-horse becomes a war-god... The horse...mourned by Anyte [is] mourned in the guise of [a] young human soldier."
[59] Barnard 1991: 173 refers to the epigram as "graphic". Gutzwiller 1998: 62-63 notes that this epigram does not refer to Damis' grief.

is almost an afterthought. Here again Anyte couches the non-traditional in the vocabulary and style of the traditional, and again it has the effect of rejecting the old boundaries of epigram.

The narrator's second-person address to her deceased puppy, 10 GP, channels one of the most famous laments in Greek epic:

ὤλεο δή ποτε καὶ σὺ πολύρριζον παρὰ θάμνον,
Λόκρι, φιλοφθόγγων ὠκυτάτη σκυλάκων·
τοῖον ἐλαφρίζοντι τεῷ ἐγκάθετο κώλῳ
ἰὸν ἀμείλικτον ποικιλόδειρος ἔχις.

You, too, died once beside a bush with thick roots,
Locris, swiftest of the puppies who love to bark;
the merciless viper with dappled neck injected
such venom into your swift leg.
Pollux 5.48 = 10 GP

This is perhaps the most allusive poem in a corpus dense with intertexts. The first couplet alone contains several instances of allusion, opening with a Homeric *unicum* followed by a reference to a simile from the *Iliad* and a variation on another *unicum* modified by one of her own.[60] The first word of this epigram, ὤλεο, sets the tone for the poem and provides a literary context in which to understand it. ὤλεο is found at *Il*.24.725 in the first line of Andromache's lament for Hector. This allusion establishes a parallel between a woman mourning her husband and the narrator mourning her puppy. Modern critics have typically seen this allusion as ironic and exaggerated for comic effect,[61] but (especially seen in the broader context of her use of parallels of grief) the allusion serves

[60] φιλοφθόγγων is Anyte's own creation. See Geoghegan 1979: 105-110 for a thorough compilation of references to Homer within this poem.
[61] Greene 2005: 149-151. Snyder 1989:70 makes this point generally about Anyte's pet epitaphs.

to convey a serious point.[62] The frequent references to Homer in this poem tells the reader that this poem is to be understood alongside the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The *Iliad* provides many instances of women making lamentation for fallen heroes whose relationships with the mourners varied from marriage to slavery. In the *Odyssey,* Argos sets a precedent for the relationship between a dog and its owner in that the dog is the only one to recognize Odysseus in his disguise and Odysseus can't help but cry when he sees the dog mistreated. In this epigram, the narrator (presumably marked as female by the invocation of Andromache) mourns the loss of her puppy with parallels drawn from an epic tradition wherein lamentation was among the primary speech-genres of women and it was acceptable for even a great hero to mourn a dead dog.

Anyte's epigrams on animals exhibit the same traits as her epigrams on people: highly allusive, full of *pathos*, appearing inscriptional (but not upon close examination), and focused on the mourner as much as on the deceased. As in case of those epigrams in the previous section, the result is not a new subgenre of epigrammatic poetry, but rather an expansion of the subjects available to the epigrammatists. Anyte's later imitators (and others) wrote many animal epigrams, bearing witness to the success of this project.

3.2.5. Conclusion

Through her use of meta-memorials and parallels of grief, Anyte was able to manipulate the restraints of epigram, allowing her to tell stories that were typically

[62] This is not to say that there is necessarily nothing self-consciously melodramatic about this poem, but rather that this element is overemphasized in studies on 10 GP. I believe that the parallels serve to legitimize the grief of the narrator, even if the reader acknowledges that this is not as sad a situation as, say, that of Cleina in 5 GP.

confined to more private, 'feminine' genres, such as lyric. We cannot know if Anyte wrote non-epigrammatic poetry, though it is entirely possible that she did, but her innovative inclusion of new perspectives and subjects into epigram would help explain why some of her epigrams are ascribed to 'Anyte the lyric poet.'[63] Her new subjects were not limited to women and children; some of her poems show new perspectives on the grief of men-- specifically how they grieve.[64]

When understood together, these two new strategies expand the field of epigram in two ways. First, because meta-memorials illustrated the great potential of epigram to tell any story, while still maintaining the form and structure of the inscribed epigram, they were the first step towards the eventual need for the creation of Book 9 of the *Greek Anthology*, the book devoted to non-inscriptional epigram. It is telling that many 19th and early 20th century scholars assumed that these were actually inscribed. Anyte used the traditional funerary epigram as a starting point for her own brand of poetry, which simultaneously incorporated and rejected the inscribed context inherent to epigram.

Anyte's use of parallels to include many new voices into epigram transformed the genre as much as her meta-memorials did. If we are correct in determining her date, she anticipated the Hellenistic obsession with realism while providing poetic justification for doing so. Catullus in *Carmina* 3 illustrates the far-reaching influence of Anyte's animal

[63] 4-9,12,16 GP. This is not, of course, to assert definitively that Anyte did not write lyrics. It seems likely that she did. Unfortunately, these ascriptions and Stephanus Byzantinus' entry on Tegea (see above) are the only pieces of evidence that suggest that she did.
[64] This is, in part, why a purely feminist reading of Anyte is inadequate.

epitaphs, as it shows that the Roman poet read Anyte and was aware of her poetic strategies[65]:

Lugete, o Veneres Cupidinesque,
et quantum est hominum uenustiorum:
passer mortuus est meae puellae,
passer, deliciae meae puellae,
quem plus illa oculis suis amabat.
nam mellitus erat suamque norat
ipsam tam bene quam puella matrem,
nec sese a gremio illius mouebat,
sed circumsiliens modo huc modo illuc
ad solam dominam usque pipiabat.
qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum
illuc, unde negant redire quemquam.
at uobis male sit, malae tenebrae
Orci, quae omnia bella deuoratis:
tam bellum mihi passerem abstulistis
o factum male! o miselle passer!
tua nunc opera meae puellae
flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli.

Mourn, you Loves and Cupids,
and all men with noble spirits:
the sparrow of my girl is dead,
the sparrow, my girl's darling toy,
whom she loved more than her own eyes.
For it was honey-sweet and its mistress
knew it as well as a girl knows her mother;
nor did it move from her lap,
but hopping around, now here, now there,
it chirped continuously only to her.
Now it must wander along that shadowy path
whence nothing can ever return.
May evil befall you, wicked shades of Orcus,
who devour all beautiful things:
You have snatched the beautiful sparrow from me.
Oh wicked deed! O hapless sparrow!
Now on your account the swollen eyes of my girl
redden with teardrops.
Catullus *Carmina* 3

[65]Anyte influenced the work of several Latin poets. For an example of Ovid reading Anyte, see Trypanis 1970. Barnard 1991: 167 argues that all of the Hellenistic pet epitaphs pave the way for Catullus 3, not acknowledging that Anyte was the first.

Several lines in this poem point to the innovations of Anyte. First and foremost, this is a funerary poem for an animal, but like most of Anyte's funereal epigrams this poem is about the sadness of the girl as much as it is about the dead sparrow.[66] In lines 5-6, Catullus justifies the girl's sadness in part by comparing her relationship with the sparrow to the girl's (or a girl's) relationship with her mother; as in Anyte 20 GP, when Myro mourns the insects described as her pets (παίγνι᾽), Catullus' sparrow is referred to as *deliciae meae puellae*. Thus, even as the dead animal is designated as inferior to a human being, Catullus uses a parallel to show that the relationship between the girl and her plaything is much more intense than one might assume. Towards the end of the poem, Catullus condemns the shades of Orcus for absconding with the animal, just as Myro's maidenly tears are caused by implacable Hades when he takes her pets away. This poem is sentimental, perhaps overly so, but like Anyte's similar poems it makes the case that all grief is worthy of poetic treatment, even if the object of lamentation is a small pet. The poem closes with an argument in defense of an 18-line poem about a bird: the girl is crying, and that is enough justification; this argument comes from Anyte.

[66] Perhaps the most common reading of Catullus 3 is that the *passer* actually refers to Catullus' penis. This may be correct, but if so the poem operates on two levels. As no scholar would ever argue that Anyte's pet epitaphs should be read so irreverently, this discussion will only focus on the more literal reading of Catullus' poem.

3.3. The Textual Poet

3.3.1. Introduction

While we may never know whether any of Anyte's epigrams were actually inscribed, or composed for actual inscription, we can confidently claim that at least a handful were definitely not composed for actual inscription. Gutzwiller argued convincingly that two of Anyte's rural dedications served as introductory poems to a collection of her poetry,[67] and the preceding section of this chapter introduced the meta-memorial, a style of poem that seems to demand a non-inscriptional context in order to achieve its full effect. Moreover, the consistent use of literary parallels throughout her funerary epigrams, although not necessarily a conclusive demonstration of any one poem's innate writtenness, suggests that they were composed for a context in which the poems could be read together so that the reader could understand the programmatic importance of these allusions to Anyte's innovative conception of the funerary genre. As a consequence of this awareness that certain poems were almost certainly not inscribed, doubt should be cast over the rest of her epigrams.[68]

This section does not claim that all of Anyte's epigrams were definitely composed for the scroll rather than the marble; instead, after briefly laying out the case for the literariness of a few of her poems, I provide close readings of several of the poems that are rarely treated at any length under the assumption that they were literary rather than inscriptional. Scholars have essentially ignored most of these poems, inferring an

[67] This argument was originally made in Gutzwiller 1993: 86-89.
[68] Gow and Page 1965.2: 91 note that the likelihood that the animal epitaphs were not inscribed, "they cast some doubt on the *bona fides* of A.'s other epigrams, all of which are similarly phrased as though for inscription."

inscriptional context that has been lost,[69] but literary readings show that the assumption that they were written for the book provides new possibilities for understanding or appreciating these poems. Reading these poems as if they were literary exercises is itself an act of appreciating the varieties of *Ergänzungsspiel* in Anyte's poetry and can provide another basis for an argument that Anyte was truly a textual poet.

Bing's observation that Hellenistic epigrammatists intentionally omitted seemingly necessary information from their epigrams (*Ergänzungsspiel*) in order to more fully engage the reader, who was thus implicitly tasked with filling in the informational gaps for himself or herself, was an important step forward for scholarly understanding of literary epigrams. In the case of Anyte, the realization that her epigrams do not always tell the whole story has often led to the assumption that these poems must have been inscribed and consequently the missing pieces of information are lost forever. This is not necessarily true, as Bing has demonstrated in the case of Callimachus. If we read these poems as complete, or at least as complete as they ever were, we can look to the other poems in her corpus as well as to other poets' readings of her works to fill in the gaps for ourselves.

The aim of this strategy, reading these poems as if they were poems meant for a collection, rather than poems composed for inscription and then collected together later, is two-fold. First, if these poems actually were non-inscriptional, and understood as such in the 3rd century BCE, by assuming composition for the book we are able to make more sense of certain questions, such as the subject of 11 GP (either a rooster or a cicada), that

[69] Especially in the case of Anyte 2 GP, which scholars are nearly unanimous in reading as inscriptional; Geoghegan 1979: 29-40 is the only one who entertains the possibility that it was a literary exercise. See Section 3.3.4 for discussion.

have eluded scholars who have understood Anyte's early date to imply that some of her epigrams must have been inscribed. The second reason to assume a literary intention is that, by rejecting the possibility of a context we have lost, we can connect some of her more traditional poems, those that seem most likely to have been inscribed, to her work as a whole. When we approach this poetry as literature and assume that the scroll was the context in which this literature was disseminated, we find that Anyte's poetry possesses the literate self-awareness that comes to define Hellenistic poetics.

3.3.2. The Argument for Anyte's Book

In Kathryn Gutzwiller's seminal work, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, she makes the argument that Anyte's poems circulated in an author-arranged collection, making her one of the first epigrammatists (and very possibly the first) to have done so.[70] Gutzwiller's most salient argument for Anyte's poetry book concerns two poems that she argues served as frontispieces for this collection:

῞Ιζε' ἅπας ὑπὸ καλὰ δάφνας εὐθαλέα φύλλα
ὡραίου τ᾽ ἄρυσαι νάματος ἁδὺ πόμα,
ὄφρα τοι ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος φίλα γυῖα
ἀμπαύσῃς πνοιᾷ τυπτόμενα Ζεφύρου.

Sit, everyone, under the beautiful well-blooming foliage of the laurel,
and draw sweet drink from the flowing spring,
so that your limbs, panting from the labors of summer,
may rest, beaten by the breeze of Zephyr.
AP 9.313 = 16 GP

Ξεῖν᾽, ὑπὸ τὰν πέτραν τετρυμένα γυῖ᾽ ἀνάπαυσον·
ἁδύ τοι ἐν χλωροῖς πνεῦμα θροεῖ πετάλοις·

[70] For fuller discussion, see Gutzwiller 1998: 68-74.

πίδακά τ᾽ ἐκ παγᾶς ψυχρὰν πίε· δὴ γὰρ ὁδίταις
ἄμπαυμ᾽ ἐν θερινῷ καύματι τοῦτο φίλον.

Stranger, rest your weary limbs under this rock-
sweetly does the breeze sound in the green foliage-
and drink cold water from the spring. For to travelers
this respite from the heat of summer is dear.
AP 16.228 = 18 GP

Gutzwiller here builds on her previous argument[71] that the poet and the herdsman are analogically connected and thus that rustic themes are inherently metapoetic, adding here that the addresses to the wayfarers in these two poems were programmatic statements. The refreshment of Zephyr's breeze and cool water from the flowing springs refers to the poetry that the reader, configured as a stranger who is passing by, is about to read. One important piece of evidence for the metapoetic reading of 16 GP is a poem by Asclepiades in response to Anyte's epigram:

Ἡδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιὼν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δὲ ναύταις
ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
ἥδιον δ᾽, ὁπόταν κρύψῃ μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
χλαῖνα καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων.

Sweet in summer is an icy drink to the thirsty, and sweet for sailors
to see the Crown of spring after a storm.
But sweeter still when one cloak cover two lovers
and Cypris is honored by both.
AP 5.169 (Asclepiades)

This epigram, undoubtedly a programmatic poem, may have opened Asclepiades' collection;[72] as this opening poem rejects Anyte 16 GP, Anyte's poem is thus understood to have opened her own collection. Because Anyte 16 GP also begins a Meleagrean sequence (*AP* 9.313-338) that is largely pastoral in nature, Gutzwiller surmises that

[71] Gutzwiller 1991: 23ff.
[72] Gutzwiller 1998: 72-73.

Meleager here expropriates Anyte's voice and by means of arrangement adopts her programmatic statement for his own.

The argument that Anyte 18 GP was programmatic is supported by the opening to Theocritus' *Idyll* 1:

Ἁδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἁ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα,
ἁ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι, μελίσδεται,

That whispering of the pine, goatherd, sings sweetly,
That one by the springs.
Idyll 1.1-2

Like Asclepiades' poem, the introduction to the first *Idyll* is clearly programmatic and, as Theocritus composed his bucolic poetry after Anyte wrote her rural epigrams, can be understood as an allusion to Anyte 18 GP (and possibly more of her pastoral poems). These two metapoetic responses to Anyte's epigrams are evidence that her poems were read by ancient poets as metapoetic as well, and the position of 16 GP within the *Garland*[73] suggests that it opened a collection and was thus composed for a book, rather than an inscription.

3.3.3. Funereal Texts: Meta-Memorials Revisited

In addition to these two pastoral poems, the above study of meta-memorials suggests that Anyte's funerary epigrams were intended to be encountered outside an inscriptional context. As it hardly seems likely that a verse inscription (like 4 GP, the

[73] 16 GP is found at the beginning of a Meleagrean sequence (*AP* 9.313-338). See Gutzwiller 1998: 72-73.

epigram on the captain Pheidias, mourned like children for their mother)[74] would have been set up next to the original verse inscription (the one that 'sings [the] beautiful song' about his dying for his fatherland) after the tomb had been erected and adorned with the traditional poem, this poem should not be considered inscriptional. By pointedly removing her epigram from its expected physical context, Anyte is pointing to a different physical context in which it is meant to be encountered. As a substantial number of her funereal epigrams fall into the category of meta-memorials,[75] Anyte seems to have approached this particular subgenre of epigram as an opportunity to subvert convention and audience expectations.[76] Not only does an awareness of the literary quality of Anyte's funerary epigrams enable the reader to revisit some of her seemingly 'traditional' poems with a new perspective, it also provides possible solutions to two problems posed by the manuscripts of the *Anthologies*.

One of Anyte's least discussed funerary epigrams is 7 GP:

Λοίσθια δὴ τάδε πατρὶ φίλῳ περὶ χεῖρε βαλοῦσα
εἶπ᾽ Ἐρατὼ χλωροῖς δάκρυσι λειβομένα·
"Ὤ πάτερ, οὔ τοι ἔτ᾽ εἰμί, μέλας δ᾽ ἐμὸν ὄμμα καλύπτει
ἤδη ἀποφθιμένης κυάνεος θάνατος."

Throwing her arms around her dear father, Erato spoke
these final words, shedding pale tears:
"Father, I am yours no longer, and as I die, dark black death
is already covering my eyes."
AP 7.646 = 7 GP

[74] See Section 3.2.2 for discussion of the poem.
[75] 4,5,8,12, 20 GP.
[76] Cf. Snyder 1989: 70-72, Díaz de Cerio Díez 1998b.

Scholars have suggested that this poem could have accompanied a tomb relief of Erato with her arms around her father.[77] Beyond imagining an inscriptional setting for the poem, however, most scholarly treatments of this poem have fixated on the style and word choice of the final couplet, arguing that μέλας and κυάνεος are tautologous,[78] as well as on the debate over whether this poem or the epigram of 'Simonides', *AP* 7.513, came first.[79] An examination of this poem alongside *AP* 7.513, assuming that of the two, at least Anyte's poem (if not both) was not an accurate recording of last words for the purposes of inscription, offers a glimpse of Anyte's artistic agenda and shows how it fits in with her more 'literary' epigrams.

Φῆ ποτε Πρωτόμαχος, πατρὸς περὶ χεῖρας ἔχοντος,
ἡνίκ᾽ ἀφ᾽ ἱμερτὴν ἔπνεεν ἡλικίην·
"Ὦ Τιμηνορίδη, παιδὸς φίλου οὔποτε λήσῃ
οὔτ᾽ ἀρετὴν ποθέων οὔτε σαοφροσύνην."

Protomachus said, as his father held him in his arms,
when he breathed out his lovely youth:
"Timenorides, you will never stop longing for
the virtue and temperance of your dear son."
AP 7.513 ('Simonides')

These two poems are certainly related, as evidenced by similarities in structure and the descriptions of the fathers' embraces. If this epigram preceded Anyte's, then we should understand Anyte's poem as a poetic response to the epigram of 'Simonides'; more specifically, in addition to replacing the son with a daughter, Erato's last words would be responding to Protomachus'. Erato begins, as Protomachus does, by addressing her father. While Protomachus refers to his father by the more formal patronymic, Erato

[77] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913: 226ff; Gow and Page 1965.2: 95.
[78] See discussion in Geoghegan 1979: 86-87.
[79] Reitzenstein 1893: 129 was the first to argue for the provenance of *AP* 7.513; Boas 1905: 185 disagreed.

begins "ὦ πάτερ", an address that is not only less formal but also indicates a more intimate connection between the two. In using the patronymic, Protomachus directs attention to his family, and more specifically the impact that his death will have on its future, rather than his relationship with his father. In fact, the entire couplet containing Protomachus' last words essentially disregard any emotional sentiment; Protomachus' father will be overcome by longing not for his dear son, but rather for his virtue and temperance, two qualities that would have made his son an effective steward of the family possessions. Intimate emotion is rejected in favor of formality and practicality; rather than expressing anything personal, Protomachus' last words express standard sentiments in traditional epigram from a different perspective, beginning with the patronymic and ending with his father's future longing for his son's temperance and virtue.

In Anyte's poem, Erato's words directly following the address to her father, " οὔ τοι ἔτ᾽ εἰμί," confirm the difference in tone; she begins her final words by tenderly addressing both her father and their intimate relationship. Anyte's ventriloquization of Erato then describes the moment of death, a common theme in Anyte's funerary epigrams,[80] and we could thus understand the tautologous adjectives μέλας and κυάνεος as contributing to the dramatic effect of the poem, because Erato is being overcome by death with the result that her speech is not polished.[81] Whereas 'Simonides' assumes the voice of the dying son in order to reinforce patriarchal values and aspirations, Erato's last words reflect Anyte's general style in her funerary epigrams by focusing on intimate relationships, the moment of death, and a rejection of the standard boundaries of epigram.

[80] Díaz de Cerio Díez 1997.
[81] See Geoghegan 1979: 88, who notes that the narrator uses the dual, but Erato does not.

If, on the other hand, the epigram of 'Simonides' was composed in the Hellenistic period, this response to Anyte 7 GP displays an attempt to recast Anyte's innovative storytelling technique in more traditional terms; one could call this a sort of counter-reformation against Anyte's aggressive expansion of the epigrammatic genre. By replacing the daughter with a son and replacing Erato's tenderness with traditional formality, this poem would be a rejection of the new boundaries of funerary epigrams and would mark a return to traditional subjects, themes, and vocabulary. Regardless of which poem actually came first, the Simonidean epigram provides a useful foil for a study of the innovations and literary strategies of Anyte's funereal epigrams; the assumption that Anyte 7 GP was a literary exercise encourages the reader to recognize the choices Anyte makes in her poetry.

As some of Anyte's epigrams, the meta-memorials, feature the frame of funerary inscriptions while at the same time hinting that these poems are not inscriptions, but are instead commentaries on (likely hypothetical) inscriptions, we can perhaps make some sense of the ascription to Anyte in the *Planudean Anthology* of *AP* 7.236 = Anyte 22 GP, a poem that is clearly not Anyte's.[82]

Οὐχὶ Θεμιστοκλέους Μάγνης τάφος, ἀλλὰ κέχωσμαι
Ἑλλήνων φθονερῆς σῆμα κακοκρισίης.

I am not the Magnesian tomb of Themistocles, but I was built
as a reminder of the envious misjudgment of the Greeks.

Although we may never be able to conclusively determine why Anyte's name appeared with this poem, an understanding of Anyte's use of meta-memorials within her funerary

[82] Gow and Page 1965.2: 91, 102-103; Geoghegan 1979: 7; Gutzwiller 1998: 54.

poems offers an intriguing solution to the question. This funereal epigram identifies itself as not actually being what it appears to be: an inscription accompanying a tomb. While this poem (most likely the work of Antipater of Thessalonica) does not resemble Anyte's work stylistically, the 'epitaph that is not an epitaph' does point to the self-consciously literary funereal epigrams of Anyte.

The problem with 11 GP is of a very different type; whereas the issue with 22 GP concerns actions taken by later poets and compilers, Anyte herself is the cause of the confusion in 11 GP, and later poets and compilers attempted to make sense of it.

Οὐκέτι μ᾽ ὡς τὸ πάρος πυκιναῖς πτερύγεσσιν ἐρέσσων
ὄρσεις ἐξ εὐνῆς ὄρθριος ἐγρόμενος·
ἦ γάρ σ᾽ ὑπνώοντα σίνις λαθρηδὸν ἐπελθὼν
ἔκτεινεν λαιμῷ ῥίμφα καθεὶς ὄνυχα.

No longer as before will you, flapping your wings rapidly,
rouse me from bed early in the morning;
for a marauder snuck upon you secretly while you slept,
and slit your throat swiftly with his claws.
AP 7.202 = 11 GP

In this funerary epigram, a musical animal with wings is killed by something with claws. These are our facts. The Lemmatist wrote that this was on the same cicada as the previous epigram, a poem by Pamphilus that is a variation on the previous poem by Nicias; the Corrector writes that this poem is actually about a cock. The Corrector did not end the debate. Scholars still debate which of the two is the deceased and whether a boy or a fox is meant by σίνις. The most common interpretation of this poem is that a fox killed a cock.[83] Opponents cite the two previous poems (coupled with the lemma) as

[83] Herrlinger 1930: 17ff; Gow and Page 1965.2: 97; Snyder 1989: 72; Gutzwiller 1998: 65.

evidence that this epigram concerns a cicada killed by a boy,[84] but the majority opinion is that these two poems are not variations on Anyte's poem.

Here is the text of the two poems:

Οὐκέτι δὴ τανύφυλλον ὑπὸ πλάκα κλωνὸς ἑλιχθεὶς
τέρψομ᾽ ἀπὸ ῥαδινῶν φθόγγον ἰεὶς πτερύγων·
χεῖρα γὰρ εἰς ἀρεὰν παιδὸς πέσον, ὅς με λαθραίως
μάρψεν ἐπὶ χλωρῶν ἑζόμενον πετάλων.

No longer will I delight in reclining under the wide leafy branch,
sending my voice from my tender wings.
For I fell into the warlike hand of a boy, who
caught me stealthily as I sat on the green leaves.
AP 7.200 (Nicias)

Οὐκέτι δὴ χλωροῖσιν ἐφεζόμενος πετάλοισιν
ἁδεῖαν μέλπων ἐκπροχέεις ἰαχάν,
ἀλλά σε γαρύοντα κατήναρεν, ἠχέτα τέττιξ,
παιδὸς ἀπ' ἠλιθίου χεὶρ ἀναπεπταμένα.

No longer do you, sitting upon the green leaves,
send forth your sweet voice in song,
but instead, noisy cicada, the outstretched hand
of a foolish boy killed you while you sang.
AP 7.201 (Pamphilus)

Reading Anyte's poem as a learned, literary epigram suggests a different relationship between her poem and the two related epitaphs. Instead of interpreting the two poems as variations on a theme of Anyte's, we might consider a new possibility: that Anyte's poem is intentionally vague because it is intentionally cryptic, and Nicias was directly responding to it. Using this interpretation we can read the poems of Nicias and Pamphilus as solutions to Anyte's riddle. Let us briefly look at the information supplied by Anyte's epigram, and the information omitted. The deceased creature used to wake

[84] Baale 1903: 68; Geoghegan 1979: 112ff; Barnard 1991: 169-170.

the narrator early in the morning, either while flapping his wings or possibly by flapping his wings.[85] A marauder[86] came upon the creature by stealth and cut its throat using a claw. Anyte does not specify either creature or the use of the wings.

As Nicias wrote variations on several of Anyte's epigrams, it would not be surprising that his cicada epitaph was based on Anyte's poetry. Nicias opens his poem with the same word as Anyte does,[87] and he uses the adverb λαθραίως, which corresponds to Anyte's λαθρηδὸν; as Anyte's adverb is an invention,[88] λαθραίως should be understood as a learned response, showing that he understood the meaning. These two allusions to Anyte's poems suffice to show that Nicias' poem was a response to Anyte's. With that in mind, note that while Nicias does not directly identify the dead creature, he makes it clear that the creature's wings produce its 'voice' and that it lives ὑπὸ πλάκα κλωνὸς, indirectly but surely identifying the creature as a cicada. The motions of the boy are described with an adverb parallel to Anyte's σίνις, and the word χεῖρα is emphatically placed at the beginning of the final couplet, just as Anyte closes her poem with ὄνυχα.[89] Thus Nicias has solved the riddle: the creature is a cicada, which makes sounds by flapping its wings, and it was killed by a boy, whose hands are his claws.

---

[85] Geoghegan 1979: 112-114.

[86] It should be noted that σίνις is typically used of humans. In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 718, λέοντος σίνιν (referring to Paris or Helen metaphorically) is typically replaced by Conington's conjecture λέοντος ἴνίν. Callimachus in his *Hymn to Apollo* 91-92 uses the phrase λέοντα ... βοῶν σίνιν in reference to a lion. Geoghegan points out that Callimachus is probably referring to Aeschylus' use of the word σίνιν. Nicias' and Pamphilus' poems seem to contraindicate a lion as Anyte's σίνις.

[87] Herrlinger 1930: 2 notes that this is a characteristic opening for animal epitaphs.

[88] See discussion in Geoghegan 1979: 118.

[89] Geoghegan 1979: 114-115 note that the Nicias epigram is related to Anyte's, and from this connection we can infer that Anyte's killer was a boy, but he does not see Nicias as responding to Anyte. He then (119) notes that ὄνυχας would be expected for an animal.

It seems clear that Pamphilus' poem is a variation on Nicias' rather than Anyte's, as evidenced by the repetition of several words (as well as the first two words of the poem) in addition to the fact that his cicada is singing while Anyte's was sleeping, but Pamphilus' lack of misdirection clearly states the solution to the puzzle. While Nicias describes the creature in terms that would really befit only a cicada, Pamphilus in line 3 actually addresses the deceased as a 'noisy cicada'. The Lemmatist connects Anyte's poem to this epigram of Pamphilus, which precedes it, by writing as a lemma to Anyte's εἰς τὸν αὐτόν τέττιγα. This is usually understood as reading, 'on the same [theme, a] cicada', but perhaps the Lemmatist read Anyte's poem as a puzzle as well. In that case the lemma should read, 'on the same cicada'.

The entire modern debate as to what types of creatures are found in Anyte's poem stems from a refusal to recognize Anyte as a poet taking full advantage of the epigrammatic genre's divorce from its original performance context. Whereas a traditional funerary inscription would reasonably be expected to provide the identity of the deceased, given the solemnity of the poem's function, an explicit absence of context affords a literary epigrammatist poetic freedom. If one understands Anyte's poem as a poetic riddle written in the form of a funerary epigram, one can then read Nicias' (and, in a sense, Pamphilus') epigram as a direct response to Anyte. It seems that the Lemmatist did just that. Only after we reject the assumption that Anyte's poetry has an inscriptional basis can these epigrams be fully understood.

3.3.4. Dedicatory Texts: Programmatic Offerings

As shown above (Section 2.3.2), the case for Anyte's poetry book relies in large part on a metapoetic reading of two of Anyte's rural epigrams, 16 and 18 GP. Since Anyte employed these rural dedications as a vehicle for poetic declarations, Anyte's other dedicatory poems merit another reading. A literary examination of two of the least-discussed dedicatory epigrams shows Anyte reflecting on her craft in ways that illuminate the rest of her poetry. One of these poems is pastoral, and like 16 and 18 GP is clearly programmatic; the other, one of the two non-rural dedications, provides a case-study in Anyte's literate re-working of the formal structure of traditional dedicatory inscriptions. The two dedications studied in this section embody the range of Anyte's epigrammatic innovation: one from a subgenre Anyte invented[90] and one that appears so manifestly inscriptional that scholars have seen no need to argue the point. Unlike the funerary poems, wherein Anyte employed various devices to expand the genre to include those rarely mentioned, her dedicatory poems are indicative of a general rejection of traditional epigram.

AP 16.291 = Anyte 3 GP concerns a dedication to Pan and the nymphs:

Φριξοκόμᾳ τόδε Πανὶ καὶ αὐλιάσιν θέτο Νύμφαις
δῶρον ὑπὸ σκοπιᾶς Θεύδοτος οἰονόμος·
οὕνεχ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀζαλέου θέρεος μέγα κεκμηῶτα
παῦσαν ὀρέξασαι χερσὶ μελιχρὸν ὕδωρ.

To bristly-haired Pan and the grotto Nymphs,
the shepherd Theudotus dedicated this gift under the peak,
because they refreshed him, weary from the parching summer heat,
by offering sweet water from their hands.

[90] Luck 1954: 181. See discussion of "the true pastoral spirit" of Anyte's rural epigrams in Whitmore 1918: 618-619.

In many ways this poem seems almost identical to those discussed in the previous section, especially in the rural setting and the discussion of water as a remedy for summer-inspired weariness.[91] *AP* 5.169 (Asclepiades),[92] in a priamel, rejects the sweetness of an icy drink to the thirsty, a statement that has been read as a rejection of Anyte's subject matter, and of Anyte 16 and 18 GP in particular.[93] Anyte 3 GP, however, contains many elements common to those two programmatic poems and facilitates a metapoetic reading; indeed, Asclepiades' epigram could well have been a response to this poem.

Like 16 and 18 GP,[94] this poem concerns sweet water as respite from weariness caused by the summer heat; unlike the other two, this poem actually makes a reference to the dedicated object, indirect though it may be. Theudotus (a curious name, given his role in this poem)[95] dedicates a 'gift' to Pan and the Nymphs. If Asclepiades rejected cool water for the thirsty in favor of one cloak holding two lovers, drawing poetic inspiration from erotic rather than pastoral settings, then it is clear that to him cool water for the thirsty corresponds to Anyte's poetic inspiration. In this epigram, a shepherd gives a gift to Pan and the Nymphs in recompense for this water that refers to poetic inspiration and Anyte's choice of poetic subjects. One could make an argument that Asclepiades was actually referring to this poem and not 16 or 18 GP, especially since, as in Asclepiades'

[91] Snyder 1989: 74 points out that "this poem has all the elements that appear in Anyte's pastoral epigrams."
[92] Ἡδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιὼν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δὲ ναύταις
ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
ἥδιον δ', ὁπόταν κρύψῃ μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
χλαῖνα καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων.
[93] See Section 3.3.2 for discussion of cool water and a breeze as programmatic symbols in Anyte.
[94] *Ibid.*
[95] Geoghegan 1979: 47.

epigram, this poem mentions water and not the breeze as refreshment.[96] The dedication of τόδε... δῶρον in this poem could be the dedication to Anyte's poetry book.

According to this reading, the shepherd Theudotus would stand for the poet herself. As the shepherd and poet are often connected by analogy, this would not be an altogether unexpected *persona* for the poet.[97] More interesting would be Anyte's identification with a male character, although Anyte in her twenty extant poems assumes many voices, some of which are male. Anyte's poetic voices include an anonymous mourner (6 GP), a dying girl (Erato, 7 GP), a dolphin (12 GP), Hermes (17 GP), and Pan (19 GP).[98] Anyte's assumption of these various *personae* throughout her poetry adds to the pathetic effects of her funerary epigrams, as seen especially in Erato's redundant description of her death, as well as to the charming rusticity of her pastoral poems.

The identification of the shepherd Theudotus with Anyte in a programmatic statement would alert the reader of her book to several features found therein. It would foreshadow the preponderance of voices within her poems, as well as her characterization of those people and objects whose voices she assumes. Anyte's willingness to subvert her own expected gender role, as shown by the programmatic assumption of a male voice, would also implicitly invite the reader into the egalitarian world of her epigrams, a world where men, women, children, and even animals are given equal respect. Additionally, as much of her poetry is dense and allusive, this association with a shepherd would evoke the opening of the *Theogony* to her learned audience and illustrate that intertextuality is a predominant characteristic of the poem. Theudotus' gift to Pan and the Nymphs, the

[96] 16.4, 18.2 GP mention the breeze as a complement to the water.
[97] Especially given Hesiod's *persona* in the introduction to the *Theogony*.
[98] For Anyte's use of varied perspectives, see Gutzwiller 1998: 54ff.; Greene 2005 esp.154n8.

unspecified δῶρον that would stand for the collection of poetry, could suggest to the reader that the poems within this collection do not always follow the norms of the genre; since an identification of the gift would require a physical context that is (obviously, in this case) lacking, so too do many of Anyte's epigrams play with the removal of the poem from any inscriptional context and force the reader to understand the context for him- or herself. Anyte 3 GP, if understood as programmatic, tells the ancient reader and the modern scholar that those poems that seem inscriptional, as 3 GP does, are not. Although these are poems artfully constructed to hint at the origins of the genre, they were not written for the stone but for the δῶρον.

A literary reading of Anyte's poetry must include the most inscriptional epigram in her collection. Anyte 2 GP is a dedication of a cauldron to Athena; in structure and style it appears at first reading as so traditional and inscriptional that it stands apart from all of her other extant poetry:

Βουχανδὴς ὁ λέβης· ὁ δὲ θεὶς Ἐριασπίδα υἱός,
Κλεύβοτος· ἁ πάτρα δ᾽ εὐρύχορος Τεγέα·
τἀθάνᾳ δὲ τὸ δῶρον· Ἀριστοτέλης δ᾽ ἐπόησεν
Κλειτόριος, γενέτᾳ ταὐτὸ λαχὼν ὄνομα.

The cauldron could hold an ox: Cleubotus, the son of Eriaspis
dedicates it. His fatherland is broad Tegea.
The gift is to Athena. Aristoteles of Cleitor, who shares
his father's name, fashioned it.
AP 6.153 = 2 GP

Nearly every scholar, even those who are more inclined to read Anyte's poetry as non-inscriptional, agrees that 2 GP was inscribed;[99] Geoghegan was the first to make an

[99] Gow and Page 1965.2: 91. Snyder 1989: 72-73 hedges on the issue, but goes on to note that the artist must have been well-known in Arcadia, a point that implies that the epigram was 'real'. Reitzenstein 1893: 126 was the first to assert that all of Anyte's poems were literary exercises.

argument in favor of a literary reading, though he did not definitively accept it.[100] According to this reading, this poem is a scholarly etymological game. As there is no attestation of Ἐριασπίδα or Κλεύβοτος prior to this epigram, Anyte might have invented the names as puns, the former as a reference alongside Βουχανδὴς, another invention, to Homer's use of the word βοῦς to mean shield, and thus to the fact that in contests shields were often given as prizes, as were *lebes*; the latter would play on traditional epithets of Tegea. As Geoghegan notices, the poem's final word is ὄνομα, which lends some support to his argument.

If it is the case that 2 GP was a literary exercise rather than an inscription, this seemingly simple and straightforward poem becomes the best extant example of the poet's rejection of the limits of the epigrammatic genre. This poem is the only epigram of Anyte's that makes no attempt at characterization or ecphrasis, no variety of voices, no emotion.[101] After a one-word description of the cauldron, it contains only names - names of people and names of places, even ending with the word ὄνομα. It is telling that this poem, which reads like a laundry list of people and places, is the only poem that is assumed by nearly every scholar to have been inscribed. If literary, however, this poem is ironic in its simplicity. It rejects the traditional dedicatory epigram as metrical prose, as evidenced by the dramatic qualities of her other dedications; in this epigram, the poet begs the question, "If one includes all of the standard information required by the formal context, is there any room left for *poetry*?". Read as fiction, it provides a *reductio ad*

[100] Geoghegan 1979: 29-40.
[101] Interestingly, this poem does omit one piece of information: the reason for the dedication. Perhaps Anyte here is making a point about the nature of dedicatory inscriptions, which are ostensibly written to honor a god but which typically say much more about the dedicator than the dedicatee.

absurdum argument against generic norms; given the innovations Anyte made to the boundaries of epigram, this reading of 2 GP is attractive.

3.3.5. Conclusion

In this section I have explored several of Anyte's poems as literary works rather than formal poems commissioned for inscription. A brief overview of the case for understanding Anyte's epigrams as non-inscriptional showed that this position is a credible possibility; it is hubristic to assume that we can definitively know whether a poem was originally written for the stone when it adheres to the inherited structure, norms, and boundaries of inscribed epigram. That said, the more we read these poems as if there was never any physical context we have lost, the more likely this possibility seems. These epigrams form a cohesive work absent any need for additional information; several of Anyte's poems make more sense when read together. If the epigrams were composed for individual inscriptions and originally intended to be separated from one another, the thematic links we have explored would have to be understood as exposing predilections and personal biases of Anyte. The refined and allusive narrative techniques that Anyte employs argue against any reading that implies that this cohesion was a fortunate accident.

Many of Anyte's poems manipulate the expectations of the genre to tell another side of a traditional story, such as the mourning of the soldiers or the anonymous mother of Thersis.[102] In order to focus on characters in the periphery, Anyte diverts attention

[102] If the epigram of 'Simonides' predates Anyte, one might also include Erato's last words in Anyte 7 GP.

from the traditional subjects by employing the meta-memorial or by allusions to sections of classical literature where the traditional story has already been told. These strategies, and their aim, are in themselves arguments for a non-inscriptional composition, since it is unlikely that someone would pay a poet to foreground issues and characters that are irrelevant to the cause of the inscription. The narrative style of varied perspectives adds both to the dramatic effects of Anyte's epigrams but also to their inherent literary quality.

Anyte composed several poems that appear to be programmatic statements, especially those that have been responded to in the programmatic (and certainly literary) poetry of other authors. 16 and 18 GP mention water and a cool breeze as respite for the weary from the summer heat. Asclepiades and Theocritus offer support to the idea that these were programmatic. The dedication of Theudotus echoes the elements of 16 and 18 GP that were alluded to by these poets as well, and it provides the reader with a glimpse of Anyte the male shepherd-poet offering a gift to repay Pan and the Nymphs for that respite that is central to Anyte's other programmatic poems. To this list of metapoetic epigrams we must add 2 and 4 GP, the former the cauldron poem that shows Anyte ironically rejecting the formal confines of epigram, and the latter the epitaph for the captain Pheidias that features Anyte's narrative *persona* observing an inscription, praising it, and telling her own story from the raw material provided. These two poems, when added to the three programmatic pastoral epigrams, inform the attentive reader of the strategies, methods, and style of Anyte's epigrammatic literature.

3.4. Conclusion - Anyte's Contribution

Anyte's poetry provides a complex puzzle for any scholar who attempts to "explain" it exclusively in terms of gender. Unlike Erinna's *Distaff*, which describes a scenario that a woman could relate to more closely than a man could, Anyte's themes are universal. If the epigrams preserved by the *Greek Anthology* (and Pollux) are in any way representative of her corpus (and enough epigrams were preserved that it seems likely that they are), this universality seems to have been to some extent the point. Soldiers grieve like children, a dog and a war horse are mourned in the same terms as a great hero was, and a mother's loss of a daughter evokes the same emotions as a girl's loss of her pets. Anyte establishes these parallels by taking advantage of two related but separate innovations that were emerging during her lifetime: the literary epigram and the poetry book.

As we saw in Chapter 2, the freedom of epigram from its inscriptional context afforded poets new opportunities within the genre. Anyte, especially in her epitaphs, makes full use of this separation and by doing so changes the nature of epigram. Originally, funerary inscriptions were commissioned by the family of the deceased, and thus cost money to create. This cost was prohibitive enough to prevent most families from commissioning inscriptions for their dead pets, for instance. But in the early Hellenistic period, as epigrams were becoming a fully literary genre, poets began to compose epigrams as purely literary pursuits; Anyte was among the first of these poets. No family would pay money to have an epitaph for a cricket or a rooster, but a poet could compose one for free. Presumably nobody would pay for a funerary inscription that only briefly refers to the deceased, but a poet could compose a poem that seems very much

like an inscription while at the same time telling the story from another perspective. Anyte's meta-memorials and her animal epitaphs influenced many Hellenistic and Roman poets by illustrating the ways in which the literary epigram could expand the well-established boundaries of inscribed epigram.

If the proper place for a funerary inscription is a stele or a gravestone, then the proper place for the literary epigram is a book, which afforded the possibility of interrelated poems and recurring themes to the epigrammatist. As I have discussed in this chapter, there are several reasons to suggest that not only did Anyte compose her poetry in such a way that any one poem makes more sense when read in the context of a collection, but that she was one of the earliest poets to do so. No one theme runs through every single poem, but many of Anyte's extant poems feature parallels either through explicit comparison or through allusions to well-known literature. In her funerary epigrams, these parallels from different poems together establish grief as a universal experience, known to all men, women, and children. This theme, which runs through many of Anyte's epigrams, creates a precedent that influenced poets from Mnasalcas to Catullus, from Nicias to Wordsworth. While grief as a universal human experience could be found in earlier poets, including Homer, the brevity of epigram afforded Anyte the opportunity to focus each poem on one person, one experience of grief. Her influence stems in part from her skill as a poet and her knowledge of earlier poetry, and in part from her innovations of the still-evolving genre of the literary epigram.

Chapter 4

Nossis

4.1. Introduction

The following pages will provide a thorough examination of the epigrams of Nossis. The purpose of this chapter is to illustrate how little we know about her, to rescue her poetry from the biographical fallacy that has contaminated almost every previous study of her poems, and to present this poet as she presented herself in the epigrams we have. Nossis' poetic persona, easily visible in every one of her poems, is bold, confident, and fond of strong polemic. Her debt to Sappho is undeniable but overestimated – she is typically understood to pledge allegiance to Sappho, but her truest allegiance is to her own poetic voice. After a brief examination of evidence from the ancient world, this chapter is divided into two sections. The first part deals with issues related to gender and polemic, while the second is concerned with genre and Nossis' unique rebellion against the constraints of epigram. These two sections when taken together will provide the reader with a new and fresh look at an important but misunderstood poet.

4.1.1. Life and Works

Nothing reliable is known from independent sources about Nossis' life. As a result, her poetry tends to be read as a poetic biography of her (early?) adult life, providing us with both her approximate dates and place of residence.[1] Given that she wrote an epitaph for Rhinthon (*AP* 7.414 = 10 GP), we can argue that she was composing poetry after his death. The *Suda* gives us Rhinthon's *floruit* in the reign of Ptolemy Soter, who died in 283/2. Gutzwiller uses Herondas' slander of Nossis in *Mimiambs* 6 and 7, poems that are agreed to be from the second quarter of the third century, as a *terminus ante quem* for the collection of Nossis' poetry, which Gutzwiller then dates to the 280s or 270s.[2] Since, however, Herondas was not averse to integrating poets of the past into the present,[3] and since we have no evidence whatsoever that Nossis' poems were circulated only after having been collected, I believe this date is too precise. In addition, the *Suda* does not tell us that Rhinthon died before Ptolemy Soter, so the funereal epigram cannot be dated with any certainty to the decade and a half after Ptolemy's death. Let us be satisfied with a more general *floruit* of the first half of the third century.

Thankfully, we know a bit more about Locri, although this too is debated. The colony, founded by Dorians in the seventh century, is mentioned by Polybius.[4] Scholars are not sure whether to trust Polybius' statement that inclusion among the aristocracy was

[1] Cf. Skinner 1989, Barnard 1978, Gutzwiller 1998: 74-88.
[2] Gutzwiller 1998: 74-5.
[3] One example of this can be found in *Mimiamb* 8, where the speaker (Herondas, as is generally understood), quarrels with an old man, who is widely held to represent Hipponax (see Cunningham 1971: 194), and uses the young man who seems to be Dionysus(see Rist, 1997: 355) as arbiter. This shows that in his *Mimiambs* time is a fluid thing to Herondas, and one should be hesitant to base dating on his work. One should also note that Erinna (who lived a few generations earlier than Nossis) was mocked in this work as well. For discussion see above (Section 2.1.2).
[4] Polybius XII.5-6.

determined by matrilineal descent.[5] The argument that the use of the metronymic in *AP* 6.265 = 3 GP illustrates and proves the matrilineal nature of the aristocracy has been effectively refuted by Skinner, who argues that this metronymic is often employed by women speaking among themselves.[6] Despite their disinclination to accept Polybius' account and the refutation of the argument using metronymics as evidence, most scholars are willing to accept a compromise, admitting that Locri did at least grant women more freedom in society than did other cities in the region.[7] The entire debate has little to do with our present study other than to show that the current scholarship on Nossis displays a disturbing tendency to read her poetry as biography, years after Lefkowitz showed us how dangerous that can be.[8]

We know nothing about Nossis' life, although if her "unusually subjective" epigrams were biographical we could figure out a little.[9] She refers to herself as ἀγαυὰ, 'noble', in 3 GP. This Homeric epithet has led many to believe that she was from an aristocratic family, especially in the context of a dedication to Hera Lacinia, possibly at a sacred festival.[10] Nossis' acceptance and apparent defense of prostitution have led some to think she may have been a prostitute, perhaps state-sanctioned, while others have found this assertion laughable.[11] Again, we cannot know for sure, because her poetry

[5] Polybius follows Aristotle in asserting this at XII.5.6: πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι πάντα τὰ διὰ προγόνων ἔνδοξα παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐστιν, οἷον εὐθέως εὐγενεῖς παρὰ σφίσι νομίζεσθαι τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν οἰκιῶν λεγομένους.
[6] Skinner 1991b: 23; Snyder 1989: 79.
[7] Barnard 1978: 210; Furiani 1991: 183-4; Skinner 1991b: 37. See Snyder 1989: 77 who states that it is 'perhaps only a curious coincidence' that many of Nossis' epigrams concern women exclusively. Gigante 1974 remains the definitive study of Locri's possible influences on Nossis' poetry.
[8] Lefkowitz 1981.
[9] Skinner 1991a: 90.
[10] Skinner 1991b: 22-3.
[11] For Nossis as prostitute, originally Reitzenstein 1893: 142, tentatively accepted by Gow-Page 1965 v.2: 436; Barnard 1978: 211-12 does not dismiss the possibility. Opposed is Gutzwiller 1998: 75. See also

does not necessarily contain anything biographical (excepting, perhaps, the names of her mother and grandmother).

Of Nossis' poetry only 11 epigrams are extant with certain attribution, as well as one that is headed ὡς Νοσσίδος (*AP* 6.273 = 12 GP). Gow and Page include 12 GP among the other poems of Nossis (albeit at the end of the collection), noting that it would be difficult to understand the existence of such a heading without some external evidence.[12] Gigante argues that it is hers based on metrics and stylistic choices, and others include it for different reasons.[13] Some scholars exclude this poem when examining Nossis' corpus, arguing that whether the doubt was Meleager's own or he believed an anonymous poem to be Nossis', exclusion is 'the more prudent course.'[14] Skinner is right to discount the metrical argument as ignoring the possibility of a decent imitator of Nossis, but the argument that there would have been no reason for an anonymous poem to be ascribed, however conservatively, to Nossis without any evidence remains unanswered.

To exclude this poem from a study of Nossis' epigrams is a mistake, and to relegate it to a footnote, as some have done,[15] is to do a disservice to those who want to learn all they can about Nossis' poetry. If this poem was actually Nossis' own work, then it should obviously be included; if it wasn't by Nossis, we should examine what it was about this poem that made the ancient poets think it was hers. Since we cannot know for certain who wrote this poem, the more prudent course is to include it in this

---

Skinner 1991b: 45 who is concerned with both Nossis and prostitution in her poetry, but dismisses this theory in a footnote.

[12] Gow-Page 1965 v.2: 443.

[13] Gigante 1974: 29-30. Other scholars including the poem are Snyder 1989, Balmer 1996, Plant 2004.

[14] Skinner 1989: 5.

[15] Gutzwiller 1998: 74; Skinner 1989: 5.

comprehensive study, acknowledging that whether the author was Nossis or someone imitating her (or perhaps a poet similar to Nossis in aesthetics and subject matter) this poem might help us understand the poetry of Nossis more fully. Therefore I include it, and any reference to Nossis as the author of 12 GP can be read as inside or outside of quotation marks, as the reader chooses; I will simply say Nossis.

4.1.2. Ancient Assessment

We do not know precisely how Nossis was received in the ancient world. There is no *Suda* entry for her, and our knowledge of her reputation and standing among ancient poets relies on just three sources. The first reference to Nossis is found in Meleager's introduction to his *Garland, AP* 4.1.9-10:

σὺν δ᾽ ἀναμὶξ πλέξας μυρόπνουν εὐάνθεμον ἶριν
Νοσσίδος, ἧς δέλτοις κηρὸν ἔτηξεν Ἔρως

And thereupon he wove the sweet-scented well-blossoming iris
of Nossis, upon whose tablets Eros melted the wax.

The image of the iris, beautiful and fragrant, alludes to the priority given to the visual and olfactory senses in Nossis' poetry,[16] while the reference to Eros could refer either to poetry we have lost or simply to Nossis' own programmatic statement in 1 GP.[17] Meleager here devotes two highly complimentary lines of his opening poem to Nossis;

[16] See Furiani 1991: 84. Sight: 4, 6-9 GP. Smell: 3,5 GP.
[17] Some scholars argue that this statement is not fully supported by the poetry that survives, esp. Skinner 1989: 13-15, Skinner 1991a: 93-95. Skinner concludes that we have probably lost many explicitly erotic poems, and that they were very likely homoerotic. Gutzwiller 1997: 216 (and 1998: 80) wonders whether Meleager was simply basing his observation on the imagery of *AP* 5.170 = Nossis 1 GP, a view that Skinner 1991a: 93-4 allows is "equally plausible." Cf. also Gow and Page 1965.2: 434.

most poets receive only one line or less. Though we should be careful not to extract more from these lines than we can convincingly justify (especially because we may not fully understand the reference in line 10), we can safely conclude that Meleager appreciated her poetry.

Nossis is not given nearly as much space in Antipater of Thessalonica's famous epigram cataloguing the most important female poets, listing nine to correspond to the nine Muses (*AP* 9.26.7): Νοσσίδα θηλύγλωσσον ("'woman-voiced' Nossis"). This epithet is never used before or after this poem; as a result, scholars have struggled to translate or even to understand it.[18] Skinner's interpretation has, for the most part, been accepted as correct, or at least correct enough: this refers simply to Nossis' preoccupation with women as the primary subjects, objects, and audience of her poetry.[19] But Antipater's unique epithet could be applied to any of these women, except perhaps Anyte, and it is not so metrically inconvenient that it would be difficult to place elsewhere. So why Nossis? Modern solutions, including Skinner's, have answered the question, "Does it fit Nossis' poetry (as we have it)?", but not the more interesting question, "Why Nossis and not Sappho, or Erinna, or Moero?".[20] Since all of these women wrote primarily about women and as women, a solution that states that Nossis writes about women and as a woman does not answer the second question. I will attempt to explore this word more fully in the pages to follow.

Herondas' *Mimiambs* 6 and 7 have long been accepted as two mimes that should be read together, especially as both feature the same principal characters, Metro and

[18] Gow and Page 1968.2 note that the epithet is "not very descriptive." Cf. Skinner 1991b: 22n8.
[19] Skinner 1991b, esp. 36-38.
[20] This question was asked as an aside by Goldhill 2007: 14.

Kerdon. Nossis, 'the daughter of Erinna', is said to have Koritto's βαυβών in 6.20, and two of the shoe styles featured are *nossides* and *baukides*, the latter, as mentioned before, a reference to Erinna (7.57-58). As stated before, the standard reading of this diptych is that Nossis and Erinna are being slandered by a representative of the masculine and often misogynistic regime.[21] The attractive argument discussed in the chapter on Erinna[22] concerning the metapoetic statement of Herondas, however, leads to an interesting reading of these mimes with respect to Nossis' reputation. Nossis is not necessarily being slandered here for an unrestricted sexuality that threatens masculine authority; Nossis according to this reading is the woman who is currently carrying the 'torch' for other women, with none-too-subtle hints of eroticism and misanthropy thrown in. Nossis' relationship to Erinna and her link to Baucis are fascinating, especially because Baucis was not a poet, but the central character and love-interest of Erinna's poetry. Even if Murray's argument is incorrect, one should still wonder why Nossis and Baucis are intertwined in Herodas' *Mimiambs*, as one was a poet and the other was not.

4.2. Gendered Polemic

4.2.1. Introduction

In the epigrams we possess Nossis frequently engages in polemic. Sometimes the polemic serves to reject poetic models, while at other times the rejection, as we shall see in this section, is of poetic audiences. Nossis owes much to Sappho on many levels, such as diction, imagery, and overall subject matter, but she rejects one of Sappho's most

[21] Since Crusius 1892: 118.
[22] See Section 2.1.2.

famous pronouncements.[23] Nossis conveys that she denies the validity of this key tenet of Sapphic poetics several times in her poems by excluding men from her intended reading audience.[24] This section will explore this exclusion by examining the *sphragis* poem assumed to open her collection, her series of 'remarkably similar' dedicatory epigrams, the *sphragis* poem assumed to conclude her collection, and two rarely studied epigrams in order to show that Nossis frequently divides her audience into two groups, the feminine and the masculine, the women and the men. This gendered division of the audience helps explain the sense in which θηλύγλωσσον was the perfect adjective to apply to Nossis, and the sense in which Nossis, of all the female poets, was the most fitting recipient of the adjective.

4.2.2. *AP* 5.170 = 1 GP

Nossis in her epigrams presents a narrator often given to polemical statements that are concerned with the rejection of one or more poetic models. Sometimes this persona seems to provide an oblique reference to an acceptable model[25] used instead of the rejected one; at other times she does not. Her rejection in *AP* 6.132 = 2 GP, for instance, of the moral relativism found in the famous Archilochus poem about the soldier who

[23] Sappho's pronouncement is found at fr. 16.5-6 LP.
[24] This paper does not, of course, assume that this exclusion is serious. Goldhill 2007: 8-15 argues convincingly that as we have no evidence whatsoever of any poetic circles that were exclusively female, any attempt to demonstrate that Nossis' entire original audience was female is misguided. I understand Nossis' exclusion of males from her poetry to be a pose that illustrates to her poetic readership (mostly male, presumably) the problem that arises when men write 'Sapphic' or feminine poetry. See Murray and Rowland 2007: 211-13 for a brief discussion of the ventriloquization of female characters by both men and women. Contrast Skinner 2001: 210-11, 1991b, where she argues that this pose is, in fact, serious, and that Nossis was actually only writing for women.
[25] The 'acceptable model' in almost every case is universally understood to be Sappho. See, for instance, Gigante 1974: 25, where 5 GP alludes to Sappho fr. 140 LP, 9 GP to 31 LP, etc.

casts his shield aside is not coupled with any obvious acceptance of another model.[26] Polemic and rejection are two important strategies found in her poetry, as this section will illustrate, far more than any outright acceptance of another poetic model. Of the poetic models implicitly and allusively treated in her polemical poems, Nossis' narrator rejects every one.

Perhaps nowhere is Nossis' use of polemic and rejection more complex and misunderstood than in *AP* 5.170 = 1 GP, her famous *sphragis* poem. Scholars since Luck have understood 1 GP to open a collection of Nossis' poetry:[27]

Ἄδιον οὐδὲν ἔρωτος· ἃ δ᾽ ὄλβια, δεύτερα πάντα
ἐστίν· ἀπὸ στόματος δ᾽ ἔπτυσα καὶ τὸ μέλι.
τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς· τίνα δ᾽ ἁ Κύπρις οὐκ ἐφίλασεν,
οὐκ οἶδεν τήνας τἄνθεα ποῖα ῥόδα.

Nothing is sweeter than love: all desirable things
are second to it. From my mouth I have spat even honey.
Thus says Nossis: The person whom Aphrodite has not kissed
Does not know what sort of flowers her roses are.[28]
AP 5.170 = 1 GP

The first three words of this poem echo Sappho's famous priamel and form the first instance of polemic in Nossis. The remainder of the couplet serves to underscore this point and reject Hesiod's understanding of proper poetic inspiration. Many have noted the allusion to Hesiod's *Th.* 96-7 (ὁ δ᾽ ὄλβιος, ὅντινα Μοῦσαι / φίλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή 'He is fortunate whom the Muses love; sweet speech flows from his mouth').[29] The parallel between Nossis' ἃ δ᾽ ὄλβια and Hesiod's ὁ δ᾽ ὄλβιος is

[26] Tueller 2008: 100-101.
[27] Luck 1954: 183.
[28] I follow Gow and Page, and later Skinner and Gutzwiller, in accepting the Renaissance emendation τήνας for the manuscripts' κῆνα. Gow and Page 1965.2: 435-36 provide a brief discussion of the crux.
[29] Cavallini 81: 180; Skinner 1991a: 91-93; Gutzwiller 1998: 76-77.

clear, and hints at Nossis' tendency to subvert readers' expectations: one is tempted, at first reading this poem, to understand 'she is fortunate...', though the editor's accent on ἃ precludes this possibility, as does the following phrase, which not only terminates the parallel to Hesiod's text but then rejects the subject of the parallel.[30] In this way Nossis' rejection of honey is also a rejection of Hesiod's description of poetic excellence,[31] because in Hesiod 'sweet speech' is the definition of poetic excellence but in Nossis there is something greater than even honey, the parallel all the more obvious due to the presence of the phrase ἀπὸ στόματος occurring in both in the context of poetry.[32] Note that this is not a rejection of the Muses, as some have argued, [33] for in the last poem of the collection Nossis claims to be 'dear to the Muses' (11.3 GP).

In this first couplet there are two allusions to Sappho. The first allusion lies in the opening phrase, "Nothing is sweeter than love", and the subsequent vague illustration of things subordinate to love in sweetness, such as "pleasant things" and honey. The most obvious referent of this allusion is the well-known priamel from Sappho fr. 16.1-4:

ο[ἰ μὲν ἰππήων στρότον οἰ δὲ πέσδων
οἰ δὲ νάων φαῖσ᾽ ἐπ[ὶ] γᾶν μέλαι[ν]αν
ἔ[μμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν᾽ ὅτ-
τω τις ἔραται·

Some say an army of cavalry, some say
an army of infantry, others an army of ships
is the most beautiful thing upon the black earth.
But I say it is whomever one loves.

[30] Cavallini 81: 180; Skinner 1991a: 91-93; Gutzwiller 1997: 213.
[31] Honey has also been seen as a reference to Erinna, the maiden (and so 'bee-like') poet, but this interpretation is not as widely accepted. See Gutzwiller 1997: 213-14; Gutzwiller 1998: 76-77. See discussion of epigrams on Erinna's *Distaff* that refer to the poem as a honeycomb and Erinna as a bee in Section 2.1.2.
[32] This sweet speech is parallel to the sweet dew upon the tongue from *Th.* 83, and dew and honey are closely connected.
[33] Skinner 1991a: 91-93; Gutzwiller 1997: 213.

Sappho's priamel serves as a mission statement for Sapphic poetics: poetry that aims at being κάλλιστον should employ as its subject matter that which is itself κάλλιστον, namely objects of desire and love. Nossis with this allusion seems to be aligning herself with the Sapphic idea, with only the slight difference that in Sappho's case the love object is κάλλιστον, while in Nossis it is the subjective experience of love itself which is not surpassed in sweetness by anything.[34]

The second allusion to Sappho comes at the end of the second line when Nossis' narrator rejects honey. Readers of Nossis have seen both Hesiod and Erinna as the referent(s) of this allusive language. Unmentioned in this discussion, however, is Sappho fr. 146 LP: μήτε μοι μέλι μήτε μέλισσα ('for me, neither the honey nor the bee'). As this is the only rejection of honey in Greek poetry, and as Sappho is understood to be the most important influence on Nossis' poetry, it is surprising that this connection has been missed. If Sappho's statement is a metaphor concerning love, this fragment seems to be a lover's rejection of both the delights and the pains of love, which in the eyes of the lover cancel each other out; Nossis' spitting of honey could then be read as a gentle correction of Sappho, arguing that love is much sweeter than honey and thus that the pleasures of love are worth the pain of the sting.[35] It is dangerous to read too much into one fragmentary line, but this line (assuming that this line was not spoken by a character in the poem whom Sappho is mocking) seems to be central to an understanding of Nossis' rejection of honey.

---

[34] Skinner 1991a: 86-87, 92.

[35] Cf. the explanation of the phrase in Diogen. 6.58: Μηδὲ μέλι, μηδὲ μελίσσας: ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ βουλομένων παθεῖν τι ἀγαθὸν μετὰ ἀπευκτοῦ.

In the first couplet of 1 GP, Nossis weaves multiple allusions together in order to produce her own programmatic statement. This statement rejects Hesiodic poetics (and perhaps Erinna's) in favor of a Sapphic aesthetics, which emphasizes subjective erotic experience and ignores more traditional subjects for poetry, such as armies, navies, and war. At this point in Nossis' *sphragis* poem, the reader understands that Nossis' narrator has pledged allegiance to Sappho.

The second and final couplet opens with Nossis asserting her own authority. In a poem of only four lines, almost 1/8 of the entire poem is taken up by this assertion. Scholars have noticed that this phrase is more in keeping with historiographers than lyric poets and that this is a strange break from Nossis' declaration of her poetic program.[36] While the inclusion of her name makes this properly a *sphragis* poem, τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς is very different from Sappho's, fr.1.19-20 LP: τίς σ', ὦ / Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει; In Sappho's poem her name is simply included within a dialogue; though the theme of the dialogue is love, Sappho's name is not attached to any message. Sappho here has cast herself as the main character in her own poem. The author Sappho uses the character Sappho to display both her persona and the poetic eroticism of her discourse.

In the phrase τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς Nossis evokes several models, the two most significant to our study being Theognis and Phocylides. Theognis' famous *sphragis*, IEG 22-23, places Theognis' name in the mouths of others (as in Sappho), but the poet is declaring that men shall forever know his name: 'Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη / τοῦ Μεγαρέως • πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός.' While the exact meaning of this declaration

[36] Gigante 1974: 27 notes that this resembles Hecataeus of Miletus' Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται or Phocylides' Καὶ τόδε Φωκυλίδεω.

is disputed, it is clear that the poet was concerned that his name be inextricably connected to his ἔπη.[37] Theognis' 'future men', when they hear certain poems, will immediately point out that this is the poetry of the famous Theognis. This *sphragis* helps formalize the connection. Many of Phocylides' *Gnomai* begin with the phrase Καὶ τόδε Φωκυλίδεω·.[38] This is more specific than Theognis' *sphragis* in that the demonstrative is included alongside the name; whereas Theognis links his poetry in general to his name, Phocylides links his name to the specific adage to follow. By so doing he both takes credit for the adage and also adds weight to it by appealing to what is in his mind an authoritative force, the poet himself.[39] Nossis here channels both Theognis' and Phocylides' style of *sphragis* in τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς, and editors are free to decide which model is more directly followed, and make their choices clear, by means of their punctuation after the phrase. Most editors use a colon, which points forward, and this makes more plain the relationship between the *sphrageis* of Phocylides and Nossis.[40]

As Phocylides appealed to his own authority while linking his specific adages to his own name in order to ensure that his name would survive if his adages did and *vice versa*, Nossis with this allusive phrase τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς makes clear that she is relying on her own authority and poetic output to immortalize her.[41] Thus after the first couplet, wherein Nossis seemed to align herself with Sappho poetically and aesthetically,

---

[37] Pratt 1995, esp. 172-73.
[38] See discussion by West 1978: 164.
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] If a full stop is used, then the phrasing is still closer to Phocylides but the sense points more to Theognis. With a full stop the τοῦτο refers to all that came before: nothing is sweeter than love, everything pleasurable is second, the poet spits (or spat) honey from her mouth. τοῦτο allows Nossis to take credit for these points, which are not introduced or framed in any way. Nossis is simply linking her name to these statements, presumably well-known (or why else would she see the need to take credit?), without the assumption of authority. I think the proper punctuation here is a colon, because the phrasing, line placement, and the following adage evoke Phocylides.
[41] Gigante 1974: 27.

Nossis in three words informs the audience that there are three authoritative poets in play within this poem: Sappho, Hesiod, and Nossis.

τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς introduces the remainder of the poem, a gnomic statement about the person who hasn't been kissed by Aphrodite not being able to differentiate flowers. This is the second instance of polemic, and rejection, in Nossis. In this case, the rejection is two-fold. The first rejection is fairly straight-forward, though dense and allusive: the rejection is of the person who has not been kissed by Aphrodite, because he or she cannot distinguish between flowers. The second rejection found in this couplet, however, is less direct but at least as significant. The second rejection is of Sappho.

Nossis issues this proclamation in language reminiscent of mystery cults, carefully leaving out any specific detail of this process which seems central to the appreciation of her poem.[42] To make this couplet even more mysterious, problems in the manuscripts render this declaration difficult to translate, much less understand perfectly, but the text in Gow-Page is legible and provides the reader with at least the general sense of the statement. Degani's interpretation of 1.4 GP, which asserts that Nossis' name is the referent of the demonstrative pronoun, both establishes her poetry's association with roses and also makes clear that the effect of being kissed by Aphrodite has something to do with one's ability to appreciate poetry.[43] The sense of this statement, then, is clear: if one hasn't been kissed by Aphrodite, then one will not be able to recognize how beautiful Nossis' poems are. Nossis is saying here that her poetry is not for everybody, only those

[42] See Pausanias 9.25.5 where he mentions the grove of Cabeirean Demeter and that he cannot tell the curious who the Cabeiri are, before telling stories about those who defiled the area and were severely punished.
[43] Degani 1981: 51-52.

who have been "initiated" by means of the kiss of Aphrodite.[44] But the kiss of Aphrodite is not clearly explained; it could mean falling in love, having sex, or establishing a personal relationship with the goddess, perhaps by means of entering a mystery cult of Aphrodite, or a number of other possibilities.[45] Despite the indirect language and the difficulty of the text, τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς clearly introduces a statement that divides her potential readership into two groups, those who can appreciate her poetry and those who cannot.

Nossis, by asserting that some people cannot understand the value of her poetry, rejects a certain part of her audience. In doing so she stands in direct opposition to Sappho. Sappho fr. 16.1-4 LP has been shown above as a primary model for 1.1-2 GP. Here is Sappho fr. 16.1-6:

ο[ἰ μὲν ἰππήων στρότον οἰ δὲ πέσδων
οἰ δὲ νάων φαῖσ᾽ ἐπ[ὶ] γᾶν μέλαι[ν]αν
ἔ[μμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν᾽ ὄτ-
τω τις ἔραται·
πά]γχυ δ᾽ εὔμαρες σύνετον πόησαι
π]άντι τ[ο]ῦτ᾽,...

Some say an army of cavalry, some say
an army of infantry, others an army of ships
is the most beautiful thing upon the black earth.
But I say it is whomever one loves.
It is perfectly easy to make this understood by anyone....[italics mine]

In Sappho's poem the narrator makes clear that anyone can understand love poetry. The priamel serves to make a case for erotic poetry over other genres, and her subsequent discussion of Helen's erotic motivations is an attempt to win over an imaginary audience

[44] Skinner 1991a.
[45] The kiss of Aphrodite has been equated with erotic poetry as derived from a personal relationship with the goddess, but there is a difference between the Hesiodic 'those the Muses love' and those Aphrodite kisses. See Skinner 1989:9.

of skeptics. Sappho's intended audience is 'anyone,' and lines 5-6 argue that the private subjectivity expressed in 3-4 is universal and thus public.

When Nossis rejects that part of her audience made up of those who haven't been kissed by Aphrodite, she is challenging Sappho's assertion that anyone can understand her poetry. Nossis' rejection of everything in favor of love in 1.1-2 GP points the learned reader to Sappho's priamel, but directly following this pledge of allegiance she rejects Sappho's attempt to universalize the private subjective experience. Sappho's audience might consist of 'anyone', but Nossis divides her potential readership into two groups and rejects one of them by declaring that they will not be able to understand her poetry.

4.2.3. Dedicatory Epigrams

The division of the audience into those who can understand Nossis' poetry and those who cannot is based on the kiss of Aphrodite. This phrase is deliberately vague and multi-layered, but Nossis provides assistance to the reader in her dedicatory epigrams. These poems form a majority of her extant work (seven out of twelve epigrams)[46] and create a private world that celebrates all things feminine and into which men are not invited. Nossis rejected some unspecified portion of her audience in the final couplet of her introductory *sphragis* poem, and in these poems she makes clear who constitutes this portion - men.

Ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας
τὸ βρέτας, ὡς χρυσῷ δαιδαλόεν τελέθει.

[46] Six of these dedicatory poems are shown here; these epigrams are generally understood to form a series. The seventh dedicatory epigram, *AP* 6.265 = 3 GP, will be discussed separately.

εἴσατό μιν Πολυαρχὶς ἐπαυρομένα μάλα πολλὰν
κτῆσιν ἀπ᾽ οἰκείου σώματος ἀγλαΐας.

Let us girls go to the temple of Aphrodite
to see the statue, how it is adorned with gold.
Polyarchis erected it, having gained much treasure
from the splendor of her own body.
AP 9.332 = 4 GP

Χαίροισάν τοι ἔοικε κομᾶν ἄπο τὰν Ἀφροδίταν
ἄνθεμα κεκρύφαλον τόνδε λαβεῖν Σαμύθας·
δαιδάλεός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἁδύ τι νέκταρος ὄσδει
τοῦ, τῷ καὶ τήνα καλὸν Ἄδωνα χρίει.

Surely rejoicing, Aphrodite received this gift,
a headdress from Samytha's hair.
For it is elaborately wrought and in some sweet way smells of nectar,
nectar with which she, too, anoints beautiful Adonis.
AP 6.275 = 5 GP

Τὸν πίνακα ξανθᾶς Καλλὼ δόμον εἰς Ἀφροδίτας
εἰκόνα γραψαμένα πάντ᾽ ἀνέθηκεν ἴσαν.
ὡς ἀγανῶς ἕστακεν· ἴδ᾽, ἁ χάρις ἁλίκον ἀνθεῖ.
χαιρέτω· οὔ τινα γὰρ μέμψιν ἔχει βιοτᾶς.

Callo, having had her portrait taken, dedicated it,
a perfect likeness, in the house of fair-haired Aphrodite.
How gently she stands! See how her grace is blossoming.
Let her rejoice: for she has no blame in her life.
AP 9.605 = 6 GP

Θαυμαρέτας μορφὰν ὁ πίναξ ἔχει· εὖ γε τὸ γαῦρον
τεῦξε τό θ᾽ ὡραῖον τᾶς ἀγανοβλεφάρου.
σαίνοι κέν σ᾽ ἐσιδοῖσα καὶ οἰκοφύλαξ σκυλάκαινα
δέσποιναν μελάθρων οἰομένα ποθορῆν.

The portrait contains the beauty of Thaumareta: well does it
contain the pride and youth of the gentle-eyed girl.
Your house guardian, the puppy, looking at you, would wag her tail,
thinking she sees the mistress of her house.
AP 9.604 = 7 GP

Αὐτομέλιννα τέτυκται· ἴδ᾽, ὡς ἀγανὸν τὸ πρόσωπον.
ἁμὲ ποτοπτάζειν μειλιχίως δοκέει·
ὡς ἐτύμως θυγάτηρ τᾷ ματέρι πάντα ποτῴκει.
ἦ καλόν, ὅκκα πέλῃ τέκνα γονεῦσιν ἴσα.

Melinna herself has been depicted: look how gentle her face is!
She seems to look at me sweetly.
How truly the daughter appears like her mother in all respects.
It is a good thing, when children are like their parents.
AP 6.353 = 8 GP

Γνωτὰ καὶ τηλῶθε Σαβαιθίδος εἴδεται ἔμμεν
ἄδ᾽ εἰκὼν μορφᾷ καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνᾳ.
θάεο· τὰν πινυτὰν τό τε μείλιχον αὐτόθι τήνας
ἔλπομ᾽ ὁρῆν· χαίροις πολλά, μάκαιρα γύναι.

This image is known to be that of Sabaethis even from afar,
because of its beauty and dignity.
Observe: I seem to see her prudence and gentleness from here.
May you rejoice greatly, blessed woman!
AP 6.354 = 9 GP

These 'remarkably similar' epigrams, considered among the earliest ecphrastic epigrams,[47] describe a statue and portraits dedicated to Aphrodite (or an unnamed goddess assumed to be Aphrodite). All of these works of art depict women and were presumably or explicitly dedicated by women. The style and structure of these dedications make these dedicatory epigrams seem less like an unconnected group of ecphrases and more like a tour of a temple's offerings, led by the narrator as tour guide.[48] This tour begins with the exhortation in the first couplet of 4 GP, 'let us girls go to the temple of Aphrodite to see the statue,' and continues until the farewell to Sabaethis which marks the end of the tour.

Nossis' use of the feminine participle Ἐλθοῖσαι has convinced some scholars that Nossis' intended audience was a small circle of women.[49] But epigram is a public genre;

[47] Gutzwiller 1998: 80ff; Skinner 2001: 201-2; Tueller 2008:166ff.
[48] Gutzwiller 1998: 83; Männlein-Robert 2007: 256.
[49] Skinner 1991b: 117; Skinner 2001: 210-211.

literary epigram affords the paradigmatic separation of text from original performance context. The publishing of this poem made this internal address to women a public statement.[50] Her female companions are urged to go to the temple in order to appreciate up close the beauty of the statue dedicated to Aphrodite; once this epigram was published, the gender of the participle remained feminine, though a change to the inclusive masculine would have made the reader (whether man or woman) a participant in the field trip to the temple. It remained Ἐλθοῖσαι, and men are not invited along to see the art.

Ἐλθοῖσαι provides an indication that perhaps these public poems are not meant for the ears of men. In these dedicatory poems, Nossis creates a metapoetic parallel between portraiture and poetry. Thus when the internal narrator (the 'tour guide') invites women and not men to see the works of art at the temple, she is also inviting women to see (Nossis') poetry; this doubling of narrators, the tour guide and the poet, implies a doubling of audiences, the internal audience (the viewers of the art) and the external audience (the viewers of Nossis' poetry). As men are not invited to appreciate the dedications, Nossis' narrator is implying that men are not the target audience for Nossis' poetry. Painting in Nossis is a feminine act, and as poetry and portraiture are made parallel in these epigrams, poetry is too.[51]

Nossis in these poems weaves poetry and portraiture together. This is seen in part by the Homeric words she uses to describe the women in the portraits; ἀγανῶς, μειλιχίως, ἀγανὸν, and μείλιχον are all found in Homer's *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, or else are

[50] See 11 GP, which shows that Nossis was concerned about the dissemination of her poetry. While this certainly does not prove that Nossis published a full collection of her works, it does show an awareness of her poems being circulated in the public and a concern that they be presented correctly.
[51] See Furiani 1991: 181-83, Skinner 2001: 211.

derived from words that are found therein. In Homer, however, all of these words with which Nossis describes portraiture are typically used to describe words or speeches, not people.[52] By means of this reassignment of adjectives and adverbs Nossis subtly equates the subjects of paintings with the speeches in hexameter poetry. This assimilation serves to keep poetry in the mind of the reader while discussing non-poetic artistry.

But Nossis' conflation of painting and poetry is not confined to subtle verbal allusions. The narrator in these epigrams frequently confuses the subject of the painting with the painting itself; this confusion adds a metapoetic, as well as dramatic, quality to the poems.[53] In 7 GP, the narrator is describing a *pinax* portraying Thaumareta, but then in the third line refers to Thaumareta in the second person. In 9 GP, the narrator wishes farewell to Sabaethis; whether this address is to the portrait or the actual Sabaethis, we cannot be sure. In 8 GP Αὐτομέλιννα is staring at the viewing narrator, implying a two-way relationship between 'Melinna-herself' and the poet. While I agree that part of the purpose of this confusion is to show us exactly how realistic these paintings are, in the style of epigrams on Myron's cow,[54] there is another purpose. These are poems describing portraits, but because the portraits are so accurate, these poems end up describing the women themselves. Thus the poems and the paintings have the same subject, and are two different artistic modes which converge on the same points - the woman involved is beautiful, noble, and gentle. In this way Nossis uses the verisimilitude of the portraiture to show that these ecphrastic epigrams perform the same function as the paintings, and that poetry is parallel to painting. Just as Thaumareta's dog

[52] ἀγανῶς, ἀγανὸν: cf. *Il.*2.164, *Od.* 2.230; μειλιχίως, μείλιχον: cf. *Il.* 12.267, *Od.* 6.148.
[53] See Tueller 2008: 166-69 for a discussion of the dramatic quality of these epigrams. I find it hard to believe, however, that the narrator is actually confused as to whether she is looking at the person or the portrait.
[54] *AP* 9.713-42, 793-98.

will not respect the inherent separation of subject and portrait due to the skill of the anonymous painter, Nossis' reference to Thaumareta in the second person dissolves the separation of subject and poem/poet.[55]

The subjects of these poems (and paintings) are all women, and the paintings are praised for their illustration of feminine qualities. Nossis' praise of the portraits, more specifically the subjects of said portraits, does not include actual physical description (tall, broad-shouldered, brown-eyed, etc.) or any discussion of the skill of the painter (brush strokes, color, composition). Her only concern seems to be that the painter captured the subjects' femininity; at times the narrator even praises the portrait for showing feminine traits of the subject that cannot be painted.[56] The portrait of Callo (6 GP) illustrates that she is gentle (ἀγανῶς) and with blooming grace (χάρις...ἀνθεῖ), but then without any indication that the subject has switched from the portrait to the woman herself, the narrator remarks that she should rejoice at having accrued no blame in her life (χαιρέτω· οὔ τινα γὰρ μέμψιν ἔχει βιοτᾶς). This line illustrates the relationship between subjects of poetry and portraiture, but Nossis again subverts the expectations of the audience: there is no way to paint blamelessness. This painting of the unpaintable occurs again in 9 GP. The narrator thinks she sees τὰν πινυτὰν τό τε μείλιχον ("the prudence and gentleness") of Sabaethis in her painting. The narrator is actually saying that she thinks that she sees in this portrait the prudence, or wit, of Sabaethis. Anyte in *AP* 7.490.3 describes the suitors of Antibia as driven to woo her by her reputation for beauty and prudence (κάλλευς καὶ πινυτᾶτος ἀνὰ κλέος). Thus there is an

[55] Tueller 2008: 167-68, 171.
[56] Though Gutzwiller 1997: 218 does assume that gentleness, wisdom, and other qualities are paintable, I do not understand how that is at all possible. She later states (at 219) that Nossis asks the audience to visualize the women physically *and spiritually*.

epigrammatic precedent for describing prudence as a positive feminine quality, though there is no way to paint it.

Nossis uses 'the theme of exact resemblance' and the description of unpaintable characteristics to illustrate the qualities of the ideal portrait, and, by analogy, of the ideal poem.[57] The characteristics that are unpaintable are all feminine. The portraits are praised for their verisimilitude, the incredible likeness described only in terms of feminine qualities, such as gentleness, grace, and sweetness. These epigrams, in confusing the portrait with the poem and the poetic with the artistic subject, fuse together the roles of the painter and the poet.[58] The role of the painter is to paint exactly what he or she sees, provided that what the painter sees is femininity; the unpaintable characteristics show the reader that feminine qualities are to be displayed even when the medium does not allow it. The implication here is that the role of the epigrammatist is the same as the role of the painter.

In these dedicatory epigrams, the painter (or craftsman, in the cases of Polyarchis' statue and Samytha's headdress in 5 GP) is an important if absent figure. While the headdress and the statue are both described as well-wrought (δαιδάλεός and χρυσῷ δαιδαλόεν, respectively), and while the portraits are noted for their accuracy, the artists are never mentioned. Nossis uses different strategies to remove the artist from the poems. In three epigrams, 7 GP, 8 GP, and 9 GP, the portrait is personified as "possessing" or "being" the subject of the painting. By personifying the portrait Nossis transfers all credit for the verisimilitude to the painting itself. In two of the epigrams, 4 GP and 6 GP, the

[57] Tueller 2008: 166-77.
[58] Männlein-Robert 2007: 257 argues that this fusion is the result of the absence of the name of the painter. While this absence is important, as I discuss below, I find that the relationship between Nossis' poem about the portrait of Callo, for instance, and the portrait itself is more complicated than this.

dedicator of the object is given credit for having it made, a common motif though complicated by the ambiguous use of the middle voice in 9.605.2. γραψαμένα can mean either "painted for her own benefit" or the more likely "caused herself to be painted". The middle voice in these two poems allows Nossis to give indirect credit for the artistry to the relevant woman and ignore the artist completely.

In only one of Nossis' dedicatory epigrams is the artist mentioned, *AP* 6.265 = 3 GP:

Ἥρα τιμήεσσα, Λακίνιον ἃ τὸ θυῶδες
πολλάκις οὐρανόθεν νισομένα καθορῇς,
δέξαι βύσσινον εἶμα, τό τοι μετὰ παιδὸς ἀγαυᾶς
Νοσσίδος ὕφανεν Θευφιλὶς ἁ Κλεόχας.

Revered Hera, you who often look upon the fragrant
Lacinian shrine, descending from heaven,
receive this linen robe which Theophilis daughter of Cleocha
wove with her noble daughter Nossis.

It has been noticed that in this epigram Nossis gave credit for the weaving to her mother as "her earliest creative mentor."[59] Significantly, Nossis and her mother are the only named artists in this collection.[60] Much ink has been spilled over the use of the metronymic describing Theophilis in line 4; Skinner's discussion of private female speech patterns seems to have ended the debate.[61] But Nossis' use of private gendered speech in this context is significant for reasons other than the opening up of a private world. In the only dedicatory epigram that assigns art to an artist, Nossis not only names

[59] Skinner 1991b: 23. Bowman 1998a argues that this epigram also serves as an epitaph for Nossis' mother, an interesting if ultimately unconvincing suggestion.
[60] The absence of the name of the artists is symptomatic of a general Hellenistic tendency to play on the illusion of sculpture (and portraiture). See Männlein-Robert 2007: 253-54.
[61] Skinner 1991b: 23; Snyder 1989: 79.

the artists as female, but uses specifically feminine speech to do so. The weavers of this robe were not just female, but *female*.[62]

Nossis' most immediate model for these epigrams seem to be Erinna's poem celebrating the verisimilitude of the anonymous artist's portrait of Agatharchis.[63] This poem focuses on the accuracy of the portrait, and more specifically the recreation of a person (noting that the absence of voice is the only difference between the portrait and the subject). But as discussed in Chapter 2, issues of gender and the subversion of gendered expectations are brought up throughout the poem.[64] The reader does not know until the third line that the ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν do not belong to Agatharchis, but instead the male artist.[65] Nossis corrects this by describing only the subjects with words that are marked as feminine, as ἀταλᾶν is. The artists, aside from Nossis and her mother, are not mentioned. Although Nossis lived in what can be safely assumed to have been a patriarchal society, where most of the artisans were men, Nossis shuts them out of the picture entirely. Men have no place in these dedicatory poems, even if, like Erinna's painter, they are quite feminine.

Nossis' dedicatory epigrams show us a world where men are not allowed; where poetry, portraiture, and weaving are parallel; where pure femininity is the only aesthetic worth discussing.[66] The subjects of portraits are women especially marked by their feminine qualities. The internal audience, seen in 4 GP, is composed exclusively of women. The artists are women, or else ignored completely. It seems clear that to Nossis,

---

[62] Skinner 1991b: 29-30.
[63] *AP* 6.352 = 3 GP. See discussion of the poem in Section 2.3.4, as well as Gutzwiller 1998: 77-79.
[64] Murray and Rowland 2007: 223-26; See Section 2.3.4.
[65] Murray and Rowland 2007: 225.
[66] See Furiani 1991: 181-83; Skinner 2001: 211.

portraiture is a feminine genre.[67] The fusion of poetry and portraiture in these epigrams suggests that Nossis is making a stronger statement, especially given the fact that Nossis the poet is one of the only two (non-poetic) artists mentioned in the epigrams. Nossis the artist is Nossis the poet. In the world of the two Nossides, men don't belong. And while the robe of the artist is dedicated in a temple to a goddess, and is thus situated in a semi-private, feminine, space, the poems of the poet are circulated in the public, masculine, arena.[68] Nossis in these epigrams frequently reminds the reader that he is reading Nossis' poetry and that her art (and his) is a feminine thing.

4.2.4. Two Poems Often Ignored

Nossis' rejection of the masculine in two rarely studied epigrams lends support to the argument that Nossis claims the sphere of poetry for women. 12 GP is overlooked because of the question of authenticity discussed above,[69] while *AP* 7.414 = 10 GP, the epitaph for the dithyrambic poet Rhinthon, typically warrants one paragraph in any extensive treatment of Nossis, and no more.[70] Thematically these poems are linked to the others studied above in that both of these poems feature implicit claims to the superiority of the feminine.

---

[67] Skinner 2001: 211 argues that the ecphrastic epigram was a new way for women to express their gendered perspective. As the genre was for all intents and purposes invented with the sole purpose of allowing women to express their femininity, and as the poetry of this genre was interwoven with the art it described, it is no large stretch to say that the femininity that was integral to the establishment of the genre of ecphrastic epigram spilled into the discussion of the art. This overlap provided evidence that this artwork was feminine to begin with.

[68] Cf. Skinner 1991b: 32 for a discussion of 1 GP and 11 GP as "Nossis' only two demonstrably public poems—'public' insofar as they patently speak to an audience larger than her coterie of female friends."

[69] See Skinner 1989: 5.

[70] Tueller 2008: 64; Gutzwiller 1998: 85; Skinner 1991b: 31-32.

As discussed in Section 4.1.1, *AP* 6.273 = 12 GP is either the work of Nossis or of some other poet whose poem bore enough similarity to Nossis' poetry to confuse editors:

Ἄρτεμι, Δᾶλον ἔχουσα καὶ Ὀρτυγίαν ἐρόεσσαν,
τόξα μὲν εἰς κόλπους ἅγν᾽ ἀπόθου Χαρίτων,
λοῦσαι δ᾽ Ἰνωπῷ καθαρὸν χρόα, βᾶθι δ᾽ ἐς οἴκους
λύσουσ᾽ ὠδίνων Ἀλκέτιν ἐκ χαλεπῶν.

Artemis, you who inhabit Delos and beautiful Ortygia,
set your bow in the chaste bosom of the Graces,
wash your skin clean in Inopus, and come to the home
of Alketis to deliver her from difficult childbirth.

This poem engages with the somewhat contradictory dual nature of Artemis, the maiden huntress and aid to women in childbirth.[71] 12 GP has been analyzed by scholars intent on attributing this poem to Nossis, and thus they have focused on more traditional features of Nossis' poetry, such as dialect and overall 'femininity'. To date there has not been a study on this poem of more than one page, but this epigram invites several questions, only one of which concerns our topic. Why does the narrator ask Artemis to take a bath before aiding in childbirth, washing off the blood of the hunt in order to become dirty again, presumably, with the blood of childbirth? This is the only time in Greek literature a mortal has demanded that a goddess bathe. Here the two roles of Artemis seem to be opposed to each other; one cannot come into direct contact with the other. Nossis' request that Artemis put away her bow is in part a request that Artemis not kill Alketis, but the desire for her to bathe creates a total separation—Artemis seems to be forbidden to be 'the other Artemis', the huntress, when she arrives.

[71] The focus on duality in this poem has been used as an example of Nossis' talent as a poet. Balmer 1996: 84-85.

An awareness that the rejection of the masculine is central to Nossis' poetic program helps explain this bath Artemis must take. Artemis is a goddess of two spheres: the huntress and the midwife, one masculine (or at least non-feminine) and the other feminine. The narrator demands that she put down her bow, a symbol of her masculine pursuits, and wash off the blood, the evidence of these pursuits. This bath resembles ritual purification to be done before entering a sacred space, in this case her feminine role as midwife. In the world of Nossis' poetry, masculinity renders even divinities unclean. This poem's rejection of the masculine sphere in favor of the feminine explains why Nossis' name came to be upon this poem, even though the mythological geography and non-intimate relationship between woman and deity do not occur elsewhere in her extant poetry:[72] Nossis, at least in the eyes of Antipater of Thessalonica and Herondas, was known for her decidedly feminine aesthetics.

Nossis' aggressively feminine narrator disappears only twice. In one of these poems, discussed above, Nossis ventriloquizes the arms of the Bruttians in order to rebuke the moral relativism expressed in Archilochus. In *AP* 7.414 = 10 GP, Nossis adopts the voice of a male poet, the deceased Rhinthon:

Καὶ καπυρὸν γελάσας παραμείβεο καὶ φίλον εἰπὼν
ῥῆμ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοί. Ῥίνθων εἴμ᾽ ὁ Συρακόσιος,
Μουσάων ὀλίγη τις ἀηδονίς· ἀλλὰ φλυάκων
ἐκ τραγικῶν ἴδιον κισσὸν ἐδρεψάμεθα.

Laugh loudly as you pass by, and speak a kind word
over me. I am Rhinthon of Syracuse,
a small nightingale of the Muses; but from my tragic
burlesques I plucked for myself my own wreath of ivy.

[72] Though Gigante 1974: 29-30 argues that this sounds exactly like Nossis.

Nossis' hyperfemininization of the feminine noun ἀηδών to describe the male narrator suggests that the gendered polemic seen in many of her epigrams may be at issue here. In this epigram Nossis is praising Rhinthon's poetry while implying that at least in her time his poetry was underappreciated; the previously unattested noun ἀηδονίς constitutes part of this praise. The entire poem is centered around the phrase Ῥίνθων εἴμ'.... ἀηδονίς. The fact that ἀηδών is already a feminine noun marks the superfluous noun ending -ονις as significant. By adding the feminine ending -ονις to ἀηδών Nossis is bestowing upon Rhinthon's work the greatest compliment she can give, namely that it is feminine.[73] This is one of only two poems in which Nossis assumes the voice of someone who is indisputably not Nossis. When she describes Rhinthon as a feminine nightingale she does so in his voice. Nossis pays tribute to Rhinthon in 10 GP by allowing him to side with Nossis on the issue of the masculine/feminine divide in his 'own' words. As is the case with the disputed Artemis poem, this epigram foregrounds issues of gender; in one poem the masculine is rejected in favor of the feminine, in the other what seems to be praise of a man is actually a celebration of his femininity.

4.2.5. *AP* 7.718 = 11 GP

Nossis' self-epitaph, *AP* 7.718 = 11 GP, is as multi-layered and apparently contradictory as any in her corpus. In it she appears to claim that her poetry descends from Sapphic

[73] Skinner 1991b: 31 argues that ἀηδονίς "appear[s] to call attention to the female poetic presence behind the male mask." This may also be true, but to suggest that Nossis' only purpose behind creating this hyperfeminine noun and then applying it to a man is to create a subtle *sphragis* ignores the anti-masculine pose of her consistent narrator.

tradition, and again she rejects her masculine audience. This time, however, her masculine audience is a character in the poem.

Ὦ ξεῖν᾽, εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν
τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος,
εἰπεῖν, ὡς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήνᾳ τε Λοκρὶς γᾶ
τίκτε μ᾽ · ἴσαις δ᾽ ὅτι μοι τοὔνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.

Oh stranger, if you set sail for Mytilene of the beautiful dances
to be inspired by the flower of the graces of Sappho,
say that the Locrian land bore me, dear to the Muses and to her.
Learning that my name is Nossis, go.[74]
AP 7.718 = 11 GP

On the surface, this epitaph appears to be Nossis' own declaration that she is an imitator of Sappho. There are two pieces of evidence to support this. First, assuming that τήνᾳ in the third line is correct, Nossis claims that her poetry is dear to Sappho, implying a similarity between Nossis' poetry and Sappho's. Second, by passing on her own name and birthplace to those people currently performing Sappho's poetry, Nossis in this self-epitaph informs the passerby (and the reader) that her own wish is to be included in Sappho's tradition.[75]

Several questions remain unanswered about this poem, questions that can be answered by studying the epigram from the gendered perspective advanced in this chapter. Reitzenstein's argument, which asserted that this poem was an *envoi,* was in part an attempt to explain certain peculiarities of the epigram.[76] These peculiarities include the absence of any reference to Nossis' death, the message being sent away from Nossis'

[74] Here I follow the text, as most do, of Page, combining Meineke's and Brunck's contributions to a rather problematic text. See Gow and Page 1965.2: 442 for a longer discussion of the issues involved.
[75] Bowman 1998b; Gutzwiller 1997: 215-16.
[76] Reitzenstein 1893: 139; Wilamowitz 1913: 299. Acosta-Hughes 2010:85-6 revives the idea of the *envoi* by noting the similarities between the first couplet and the *propemptikon*. This argument, however, does not in any way imply that this epigram was *actually* an *envoi*.

birthplace,[77] and the fact that the entire first couplet (half of the poem) describes Mytilene and the performances of Sappho's poetry, not Nossis or her poetry.[78] In addition, it is difficult to name the narrator with much confidence—in a literary sepulchral epigram involving a passerby, the stone is very often the speaker, though it is not uncommon for the deceased to tell of his or her own death.[79] Because there is no reference to death, the reader does not know whether this is Nossis or her tombstone speaking.

An awareness of Nossis' penchant for gendered polemic and the complete rejection or emasculation of the masculine in her poetry helps answer these questions. In the first couplet, we learn a couple of things about the anonymous passerby. First, he is a man. This is shown by the participle ἐναυσόμενος in the second line. This participle is in the inclusive masculine with the result that scholars have overlooked its gender. But 4.1 GP (Ἐλθοῖσαι) and 10.3 GP (ἀηδονίς) show that the gender of nouns and participles is significant in Nossis' poetry. Second, this man is traveling to Mytilene in order to be inspired by Sappho's poetry; in other words, he is visiting Lesbos in order to be able to compose lyric poetry. Looking at this couplet from the gendered perspective advanced in this section, that the masculine sphere is rejected again and again in Nossis' poetry, one might expect it to be followed by a rebuke of the man or a rebuke of his desire to learn to compose Sapphic poetry.

---

[77] Typically this type of epitaph tells the passerby to inform the deceased's family of the death. See Tarán 1979: 132-49, Bowman 1998b: 40-41.

[78] Additionally, the claim of *philia* to Sappho is curious, both because *philia* is a two-way relationship and Sappho had been dead for hundreds of years and also because Sappho in Nossis' time was included among the Muses, with the result that the phrase, "to the Muses and to Sappho," seems to imply that Sappho is not one.

[79] Tarán 1979: 132-49; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 306-12. Tueller 2008 is an excellent study of the varieties of voice in Hellenistic (and pre-Hellenistic) epigram, including tables (Figures 1-6, pp. 17-22) that show how many epigrams use particular speakers, such as object, deceased, or other.

The information provided to the male passerby suggests that there is more to this poem than Nossis attaching her name to the Sapphic tradition. The passerby is told her name, her birthplace, and her claim to *philia* with the Muses and Sappho.[80] Nossis' wish that the passerby know that her name is Nossis is emphatically placed at the end of the poem and is significant for its implication that the passerby has not read her poetry. In the twelve epigrams still extant, this is the third time Nossis has included her name in her poetry.[81] But the passerby does not know her name until the last line of her epitaph (ἴσαις δ᾽ ὅτι μοι τοὔνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι "learning that my name is Nossis, go"). If he is just now learning her name, and Nossis' narrator makes it clear that he is, then he hasn't read any of the poems in which Nossis names herself. This means that he had not read 1.3-4 GP:

τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς· τίνα δ᾽ ἁ Κύπρις οὐκ ἐφίλασεν,
οὐκ οἶδεν τήνας τἄνθεα ποῖα ῥόδα.

Thus says Nossis: The person whom Aphrodite has not kissed
Does not know what sort of flowers her roses are.

This man who is traveling to Lesbos to experience Sappho's poetry is not assumed to have read Nossis' poem wherein she rejects part of her potential audience, and she does not try to convince him to. The passerby is told to inform the people of Lesbos that Nossis of Locri is dear to the Muses and to Sappho, coded language that is typically understood to mean "a poet and a Sapphic poet," but he himself is only to learn her name.[82] As with the final couplet of 1 GP, the coded language implies a rejection of

[80] The text of this poem, and especially the final couplet, is difficult; for discussion, see Gow and Page 1965.2: 442. I follow the text of Page 1975: 70.
[81] The other instances are found at *AP* 5.170.3, 6.265.4.
[82] Skinner 1989: 11-12.

those who do not understand the code. Nossis assumes that unspecified people in Mytilene would appreciate her poetry, but that the man would not even have read it.

It is significant that the *sphragis* poem which the male passerby had not read concerns a division of her audience into those who could appreciate her poetry and those who could not, and that in doing so Nossis rejects the inclusive pronouncement of Sappho that anyone can understand her poetic sensibilities. This man is traveling to Mytilene to be inspired by Sappho's poetry, which Sappho assumed he could understand; on his way he encounters an epigram by Nossis, a poet who denies (in a poem he has not read) his ability to understand her own work, and this epigram commands him to pass on a message he does not understand and to *go*. This man might be able to appreciate Sappho's poetry, but not Nossis'. This poem serves to emphasize the temporal, geographical, and aesthetic differences between Nossis and Sappho while at the same time claiming that their poetry is connected by a relationship of *philia*.

Understanding that Nossis rejected, on gendered grounds, Sappho's statement about the universality of the themes and emotions of lyric poetry sheds new light on some of the peculiarities of 11 GP. First, Nossis divides this poem into two couplets, the first about Sappho and the second about Nossis; for a self-epitaph, this seems like an inordinate amount of space to devote to someone else, but it makes sense if you consider the man in the middle. Nossis and Sappho represent two opposing positions with regard to the poetry of women. Nossis excludes men (for the most part, though Rhinthon the female nightingale seems to have been excepted) while Sappho does not. Sappho's poetry promises to inspire the man, Nossis offers the man nothing but information to pass on to those who would appreciate her (read: women). In emphasizing Sappho's potential

inspiration (perhaps ironically) of this aspiring poet, Nossis showcases a major difference in the way the two poets present similar poetry. Second, Nossis does not include the patronymic or her father's name, necessary information in many funerary epigrams, which would stand in stark contrast to the coded and female language used elsewhere in her work.

4.2.6. Conclusion

Antipater of Thessalonica's description of Nossis as θηλύγλωσσον is apt in two ways. First, Nossis composed epigrams celebrating femininity in all of its forms. In the world of Nossis' poetry, just as good paintings are good because they are perfectly feminine, Nossis' poetry is given authority primarily on the grounds that it is as feminine as any portrait of a young girl. Second, Nossis' poetry is vociferously anti-masculine. After strongly asserting that some people cannot understand her poetry, men are not invited to see the feminine artwork; in the only instance in which Nossis assumes a male voice, that of Rhinthon, "Rhinthon" boasts about being feminine; the only address to a man makes clear that her poetry is not for him by implying that he has not read her poetry and by instructing him only to pass a coded message to Sappho's Mytilene. Thus θηλύγλωσσον should be translated 'with a feminine tongue', but understood to mean 'with a not masculine tongue.' This opposition to all things masculine helps explain the disputed Artemis poem and the kiss of Aphrodite, as well as θηλύγλωσσον, but it also creates a division between Nossis' epigrams and Sappho's inclusive philosophy.

Meleager's introduction to his *Garland* provides further evidence that Nossis was read in antiquity as rejecting part of her audience in 1.3-4 GP, but not in lines 9-10, where he discusses Nossis. The evidence is found just three lines earlier, at *AP* 4.1.6:

... καὶ Σαπφοῦς βαιὰ μέν, ἀλλὰ ῥόδα,

...and (Meleager interwove) few (poems) of Sappho, but they are roses ...

Meleager does not include the type of flower as an afterthought elsewhere. Roses may be an excellent choice of flowers to describe the poetry of Sappho, but the sense in this unusual line seems to be that Meleager is making a distinction of quality. Meleager asserts here that he knows what sort of flowers roses are. This is a response to Nossis 1.3-4 GP, especially given the fact that the word ῥόδα is placed in the final position of the pentameter, just as it is in Nossis' poem. Meleager includes himself as one of Nossis' admirers in *AP* 4.1.9-10, but he includes himself as a member of her audience in this line. The placement of this subtle allusion highlights the difference between Sappho's poetic philosophy and Nossis' rejection of the masculine - Meleager (a man) argues that he knows what sort of flowers roses are while praising Sappho's poetry. Meleager understands the division and uses Nossis' coded language to side with Sappho. Having shown that he is able to distinguish between flowers, he describes Nossis' poetry as the iris, not the rose that she declares her poems to be in 1 GP. The rose he reserves for Sappho.

4.3. Generic Games

4.3.1. Introduction

The assumption that the poetry of Sappho explains Nossis' epigrams has stood in the way of any real search for Nossis' other poetic models. Now that we have seen that the relationship between Nossis and Sappho is more complicated than previously thought, we can turn our gaze away from Sappho in order to examine other important influences on Nossis, namely Pindar and the genre of *partheneia*, best exemplified by Alcman. Pindar's traveling narrator and the stage directions for young girls in Alcman will help us understand one peculiarity in Nossis -- namely, that the narrator and the implied internal audience found in the epigrams (particularly in the ecphrastic poems) seem to be *moving*. This movement defies the fictional performance context demanded by epigram and shows Nossis to be a truly unique and unconventional epigrammatist. Understanding this generic rebellion is critical to answering several questions about Nossis that have gone either unanswered or unnoticed.

Let us begin with an epigram we discussed previously, *AP* 9.332 = 4 GP:

Ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας
τὸ βρέτας, ὡς χρυσῷ δαιδαλόεν τελέθει.
εἵσατό μιν Πολυαρχὶς ἐπαυρομένα μάλα πολλὰν
κτῆσιν ἀπ᾽ οἰκείου σώματος ἀγλαΐας.

Let us girls go to the temple of Aphrodite
to see the statue, how it is adorned with gold.
Polyarchis erected it, having gained much treasure
from the splendor of her own body.

This epigram is found within a Meleagrean sequence (9.313-338) that is composed of dedicatory epigrams like those of Book 6. The poems from this sequence are united by

the fact that they all seem to be literary exercises rather than real inscriptions because they do not include all of the necessary information that a proper dedication gives. Nossis' poem is unique within this sequence, however, because this poem's fictional performance context precludes the possibility of inscription. The "inscription" could not have been placed at the base of the statue, or on a commemorative stele beside the statue, or else the address to the group of women that they should all go to the temple in order to marvel at it is unintelligible. If the epigram could not accompany the votive offering, though, where would it be placed? At some meeting place where men never go, perhaps? If so, this would be a unique case of the fictional performance context for a dedicatory epigram.

The real problem, generically speaking, with 4 GP is that epigrams do not move. Epigrams, even after the revolution of the literary epigram (of which Nossis was an important part), always maintain the illusion of inscription by including the information essential to the inscription.[83] Amatory epigrams pretend to be like modern diary entries, funerary epigrams pretend to be inscribed on headstones or steles, and dedicatory epigrams pretend to accompany the work of art they describe. To maintain this illusion, funerary and dedicatory epigrams contain features such as *deixis* to invite the reader into the fictional scene; they also "look" like the real inscriptions from which they evolved.[84] That is to say, the dedicatory poem will say that so-and-so dedicated *this* object (which is almost always described to varying degrees of detail) to this god or goddess.[85] Often it will specify the reason for the dedication. 4 GP names the dedicator (Polyarchis), the

[83] See Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 292-93, Bettenworth 2007.
[84] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 292-93; Day 2007; Bing and Bruss 2007: 8; Bettenworth 2007: 73-74, 83-85.
[85] For the system of patronage on display in these epigrams, see Ambühl 2007a: 278-79.

object (the statue), and the divinity (Aphrodite), three details that show that Nossis followed the proper protocol for dedication poems, but has made the performance context more like a procession than a commemorative monument.

The lack of a stable performance context for 4 GP is indicative of a larger pattern within Nossis' epigrams. In several poems, the narrator seems to be moving. In two of the poems on portraits discussed above, 6 GP and 9 GP, the narrator bids the portraits farewell. Implicit in the bidding of farewell is the parting of one from the other—in these cases, since the portrait (presumably) cannot move, we must assume that the narrator does. In 9 GP (Sabaethis) the poem begins with the narrator far away (τηλῶθε) from the portrait; over the course of the poem the narrator seems to be coming nearer and nearer the painting.[86] It should make us wonder where this "inscription" is supposed to be placed, whether far away from or beside the portrait. Like the poem exhorting the women to travel to the temple of Aphrodite, this epigram cannot really be imagined to physically stand anywhere, since if it is beside the portrait τηλῶθε does not make sense, but if far away the greeting and farewell seem quite impersonal. The traditional fictions of the literary epigram are pushed to their limits by Nossis by the simple act of employing a moving narrator.

[86] Tueller 2008: 168-69 has noticed this movement, attributing it to the dramatic quality of the poem, and argues that this is really meant to be a clever deception: the narrator cannot tell what is real and what is a painting, and thus neither can the reader. But the phrase ἅδ᾽ εἰκὼν in the first couplet argues strongly against this interpretation.

4.3.2. Nossis and Epinikian Poetry

By employing a single narrator and making her move between poems, Nossis at once defies the established norms of epigram and enters into the world of epinikian poetry, where travel and praise depend on each other. Traveling in Nossis seems to have a fairly consistent aim. Nossis' narrator travels to the temple of Aphrodite in order to see and praise Polyarchis' beauty and dedicatory offering; she bids farewell to the painting of Callo, noting her beauty and her blameless life, ostensibly to move on to praise another portrait; she says goodbye to Sabaethis, pointing out that she is blessed, gentle, and prudent. The capacity for movement in these epigrams is a necessary precondition for praise. And Nossis' narrator, a woman bound by the immovability of her poetic subjects, is configured in many ways as an inverted version of the Pindaric *ego*, who is bound by *philia* and the pursuit of fame to travel around the Greek world singing praise songs.

The overlap in purpose between dedicatory epigram and epinikian poetry is obvious. Both aim, first and foremost, to praise. But while Pindar's narrative strategy is largely understood as following generic rules,[87] Nossis' narrator bears a strong resemblance to Pindar's precisely when she is breaking the rules of her own genre. Pindar's *ego* is consistent throughout his odes,[88] travels throughout the Greek world in order to praise his patrons, and praises not just accomplishments but everything about his patrons, including their physical features, family history, and personalities. Nossis, at least in the small number of poems surviving, follows the Pindaric model by doing all of

[87] After Bundy 1962; see Young 1970 for discussion of the effect of *Studia Pindarica*; see Lefkowitz 1991: 1-71 for a breakdown of the different "I"s in Pindar.

[88] This statement admittedly comes close to asserting that Pindar's poetry was originally performed by a lone singer, as Lefkowitz 1991 argues. I am merely referring to his 'personal I', the persona that states very subjective and personal information, such as his relationship with his patrons or his hopes for his own future.

these things, as much as her genre allows (and often more). Gutzwiller points out that Nossis was among the first epigrammatists to use a narrator who is the same throughout her collection.[89] Nossis was certainly the first epigrammatist to have her narrator travel throughout and beyond the performance context implied by the genre. This traveling narrator is modeled after Pindar's—they travel for the same reasons and with the same short-term results— but Nossis' use of this model and her writing of epigrammatic poetry turn out to be mutually exclusive in the eyes of her narrator. An examination of this mutual exclusivity will help us answer an important question about 11 GP, the address to the passerby, namely why a poem that does not mention death would be found in Book 7 of the *Greek Anthology* rather than, say, Book 9, the book devoted to epideictic epigrams.

Traveling is an important motif within Pindar's odes. The journeys of the athletes provide them with opportunities for greatness, and thus victory odes. The travels of the narrator have multiple functions. First, by describing the narrator as traveling from one place to another, Pindar invites the audience to share in the journey, making the scene more real.[90] Second, the journeys of the poet create opportunities to create a network of *xenoi* all over the Greek world; this relationship of *philia* inspires the poetic conceit of the "debt" owed to victorious athletes with whose families Pindar has this bond.[91] Third, in the odes the spreading of fame through song occurs when the song is sent to different places to be performed. One of the most famous examples of this relationship between song and travel is the opening to *Nem*.5 (lines 1-5):[92]

---

[89] Gutzwiller 1998: 87.
[90] Felson 1999.
[91] Pindar expresses this most directly at *Ol.*4.1-5; for discussion see Steiner 1986: 77 and Goldhill 1991, esp.130-37.
[92] Others are *Ol.* 9.25, *Isth.* 5.262-63, *Isth.* 2.43-48, *Nem*. 6.27-30.

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
 ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
ἑσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
 ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι

I am no sculptor so as to make stationary
statues that stand on the same base.
But on every ship and on every boat,
sweet song, travel from Aegina announcing that...

Here the fame of the victor is tied to the repeated performances of his victory ode. The fame and immortality of the poet is tied to the successful reperformance of the poems.[93] The idea of creating a stationary monument, which cannot be performed or travel, is rejected outright.[94] The sculpture is set in stark contrast to the sweet song, which announces to the entire Greek world the fame of Pytheas. Implied in this contrast is that the sculptor cannot make the subject as famous as the singer can, or at least that the singer can spread the fame of the subject to a much wider audience. Nossis' traveling narrator seems to agree, as we shall see.

Understanding the relationship between traveling and fame in Pindar is a key to understanding those aspects of Nossis' poetry (especially in her dedicatory poems) that defy the conventions of her genre. For instance, the opening couplet of 4 GP (Ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας / τὸ βρέτας, ὡς χρυσῷ δαιδαλόεν τελέθει) evokes the opening of Pindar's *Nem.* 9: Κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Σικυωνόθε, Μοῖσαι, /τὰν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν ("Let us make revelry from Apollo at Sikyon,

[93] *Pyth.* 4.298-99.
[94] Though in *Nem.* 8.47-48 the narrator expresses desire to erect a "loud-sounding stone," we can understand this as a reference to both a performing chorus and a monument at the same time. Contrast *Isth.* 2.45-46.

Muses, to newly founded Aitna..."). In Nossis' poem, the narrator urges her unnamed companions to go with her to the temple of Aphrodite to see the dedication of Polyarchis; in Pindar's, the narrator exhorts his companion Muses (1-2) to strike up a song at the house of his patron (3). In both passages the narrator begins the poem with an exhortation to praise, and in both there is a proper place to do this. Nossis here uses Pindar's strategy of simultaneously opening the song and the discussion of the song by means of travel, a strategy that invites the listener to join in the song's journey,[95] in a new way: Nossis opens the poem with traveling in order to include the reader (provided that the reader is female) in the fictive viewing performance of the poem.[96] Although the celebration is, in the case of Nossis' narrator, a silent, viewing, one, the aim is the same. The audience is situated in the text, invited to join the narrator in her praise of Polyarchis; as in the case of Pindar, the inclusion of the audience in praising the patron renders the praise essentially universal, as everyone coming into contact with the poem joins in the praise.

In her ecphrastic epigrams Nossis does not focus so much on the skill of the artist, but rather the ability of the artist to portray traits of the subjects' personalities;[97] here an understanding of the influence of epinikian poetry, a genre in which the poet includes both situation-specific and general praise, is helpful. Pindar often praises victors for traits that have very little to do with the subject matter, as in *Nem.* 11.12 where he praises Aristagoras for his admirable build and inborn courage, as well as for his victory. The

[95] Cf. Felson 1999:5 : "Pindar uses deixis...primarily to make his audiences 'travel' across space and time. First he locates them in the text either at the site of victory or at the victor's hometown. Then he transports them along carefully demarcated pathways, ultimately returning them (again, in the text) to their place of origin."
[96] Gutzwiller 1998: 84.
[97] Skinner 1991b: 26; Gutzwiller 1997: 83; Tueller 2008: 168.

poem, however, is occasioned by his installation as councilor in Tenedos, an occasion that does not seem to demand praise of Aristagoras' physical characteristics. Nossis' statement in 6 GP that Callo has earned no reproach in her life has led scholars to believe that perhaps she is a prostitute whom Nossis feels she must defend, though the situation does not call for anything other than praise of her dedication.[98] But the precedent is set in Pindar's epinikian poetry to praise *everything*, even when the situation does not demand it (as in the case of Aristagoras). Nossis' statement in 6 GP that Callo has earned no reproach in her life has led scholars to believe that perhaps she is a prostitute whom Nossis feels she must defend, though the situation does not call for anything other than praise of her dedication.[99] The gnomic close found in epinikian poetry is an important model for the "Melinna herself" poem, 8 GP,which closes with a specific statement (Melinna looks like her mother) followed by a gnomic restatement about children looking like their parents.[100] Pindar often praises the ancestors of his patrons, and as *arete* is passed down from parents to children, the identification of Melinna with her mother is high Pindaric praise and justifies the fact that half of the epigram on the portrait is given to statements about the mother-daughter resemblance.

4.3.3. Nossis' *Partheneion*

Pindar's narrator is an important model for Nossis', as both see traveling as an important prerequisite for praise poetry and both praise as many attributes of the subject as space allows. An understanding of Nossis' use of movement in her epigrams,

[98] Skinner 1991b: 26-27.
[99] *Ibid*.
[100] See Bundy1987: 28-32 on a nearly identical situation in *O*.11.19-20.

movement that borrows from genres outside of epigram, enables the reader to look beyond Sappho as a model for the poetry of Nossis. In none of her poems can Sappho's lyric narrator be conclusively shown to travel over the course of the poem. In several she summons others to her and in 94 LP she recounts how her companion left her, but the narrator is stationary.[101] Pindar's formulation of the relationship between travel and praise explains the movement of the group of women towards the temple in 9.332, but we must look to another source to find a precedent for the dramatic interactions between the portraits and the narrator found within the series of interconnected dedicatory epigrams. Nossis features a viewing narrator as a character in several of these epigrams. This is an unusual narrative strategy within the subgenre, as the narrator of these poems is typically either the object or an objective, impersonal, narrator.[102]

Nossis' narrator is making the journey with a group of women who are typically assumed to be unmarried girls.[103] Along the course of the art tour, we meet several additional characters - women addressed in the second person. We think we know that these 'women' are merely images, but we can never be entirely comfortable with that judgment due to the direct addresses of the narrator.[104] Not only does the narrator address these images (as well as her audience) directly, but these paintings seem at times to be physically interacting with the narrator. In these poems the narrator thinks that the painting is looking "at me" (8.2 GP); after noting that she is far away from the portrait, the narrator remarks, "I expect to see..." (9.1,4 GP); the narrator refers to a portrait as

[101] This lack of movement may have given rise to the various critical interpretations of Sappho, as schoolmistress or isolated housewife. See Chapter 1.
[102] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 306; Tueller 2008: 12-27, 32-35. For a discussion of Nossis' innovation in these epigrams see Skinner 2001, esp. 210-211.
[103] The possible exception is Sabaethis in 9 GP. She is referred to as γύναι, which has led many to assume that she is a married woman. But see Theocritus 20.30, where γυναῖκες could hardly mean married women.
[104] See Tueller 2008: 166-72, Zanker 2007: 245 n.36.

"you" (7 GP); in several places she tells the audience to look at something (6,8.1,9 GP). Although the fictional performance context of dedicatory epigram demands that the epigrammatic narrator and dedicated object are immobile, Nossis' narrator and these pieces of art move and interact.

While Nossis' narrative strategies were certainly innovative with respect to epigram, there is no reason to believe that she 'invented' them from nothing: the movement and interaction found within these poems suggest that Nossis was incorporating elements from choral lyric poetry into her epigrams. More specifically, Nossis replaced the stationary fictional performance context of epigram with the dancing, communal performance context of the *partheneion*. The many points of contact between this series of poems and *partheneia* (at least insofar as Alcman's 1 and 3 *PMG* and, to a lesser extent, Pindar's frs. 94a and 94b Maehler, can be understood to represent *partheneia* generally) suggest that Nossis modeled the presentation of these epigrams on the choral lyric genre.[105] The overlap in purpose between a *partheneion* and a dedicatory epigram celebrating a portrait of a *parthenos* is clear - they both celebrate the external and internal beauty of young women[106] - but the performance contexts could not be more different. Nossis in these poems self-consciously bridges the gap between the two genres by hinting at choral performance in her epigrams; this generic shift creates the 'dramatic' quality of Nossis' dedicatory epigrams.

[105] Although Calame 1977 and 1983 made a solid case that *partheneia* do not constitute a specific genre, I use the term in its most general, and Alexandrian, sense: a dancing and singing chorus made up of young women. For an excellent summary of the genre, see Swift 2010: 173-240.
[106] "Internal beauty" refers to the unpaintable characteristics mentioned above. For examples in *partheneia*, see Pindar fr.94b.67-68 Maehler, Alcman 3.82 *PMG*.

In Alcman's *Partheneia* (*PMG* 1 and 3), the performance context allows (and at times demands) the song to describe physical interaction between the members of the chorus by means of *deixis* and direct addresses to the audience. In 1.50-57 *PMG*, the chorus addresses the audience directly, illustrating the song's dependence on its performance context:

ἦ οὐχ ὁρῆις; ὁ μὲν κέλης
Ἐνετικός· ἁ δὲ χαίτα
τᾶς ἐμᾶς ἀνεψιᾶς
Ἀγησιχόρας ἐπανθεῖ
χρυσὸς [ὡ]ς ἀκήρατος·
τό τ᾽ ἀργύριον πρόσωπον,
διαφάδαν τί τοι λέγω;
Ἀγησιχόρα μὲν αὕτα·

Why, do you not see? The race-horse is
Venetic; but the hair of my cousin Hagesichora
blooms like undefiled gold; and her silver face -
why do I ask you openly? This is Hagesichora here;

The poem refers to the physical presence of the women again, as well as the performance context, at 1.78-81 *PMG*:

οὐ γὰρ ἁ κ[α]λλίσφυρος
Ἀγησιχ[ό]ρ[α] πάρ᾽ αὐτεῖ,
Ἀγιδοῖ [δ᾽ ἵκταρ] μένει
θωστήρ[ιά τ᾽] ἄμ᾽ ἐπαινεῖ;

For is fair-ankled
Hagesichora not here,
does she not stand near Agido
and praise our festival?

The silent gaze of the chorus leader Astymeloisa is described at 3.61-65 *PMG*:

,τακερώτερα
δ᾽ ὕπνω καὶ σανάτω ποτιδέρκεται·
οὐδέ τι μαψιδίως γλυκ[ῆα κ]ήνα·
Ἀ[σ]τυμέλοισα δέ μ᾽ οὐδὲν ἀμείβεται
ἀλλὰ τὸ]ν πυλεῶν᾽ ἔχοισα

...and she looks [at me?] more meltingly
than sleep or death;
and she is not sweet in vain;
But Astymeloisa does not answer me anything
but holding the garland....

In these passages it is clear that the performance and the song are interdependent, as the song gives stage directions to the women (for instance, it has been suggested that Ἀγησιχόρα μὲν αὔτα is accompanied by a pointing motion,[107] and Hagesichora is supposed to stand next to Agido at 1.80-81) and the actual physical presence of the women described is a necessary condition for these lines to make any sense.[108] The audience is expected to be able to follow along with these movements and deictics because they are actually present at the dance. The object of desire and praise (the chorus leader) as well as the speaker (the chorus) share a space with the audience, with the result that the audience can watch these movements which the song implies.[109] These stage directions and addresses to the audience are important elements of Alcman's poems; they direct attention to the physical presence and beauty of the young women and engage the audience. Alcman's use of *deixis* and stage direction is aimed at conferring more praise onto the subject.

[107] Campbell 1982: 204.
[108] Peponi 2007: 351.
[109] Peponi 2007: 355 on the second *Partheneion*: "As the chorus speaks of the developing choreography, spatiality permeates their discourse and becomes fundamental for the understanding of lines 64-81."

Nossis employs the same strategies in her praise of portraits. Like the chorus in Alcman's first *Partheneion,* Nossis' narrator moves from woman to woman (or, rather, from portrait to portrait) praising each in turn.[110] The speaker shares what seems to be a mutual gaze with Melinna's portrait (8.2 GP ἁμὲ ποτοπτάζειν μειλιχίως δοκέει "She seems to look at me sweetly"); she tells the audience to look at Callo (6.3 GP ἴδ', ἁ χάρις ἁλίκον ἀνθεῖ "Look, how her grace is blossoming") and Melinna (8.1 GP ἴδ', ὡς ἀγανὸν τὸ πρόσωπον "Look, how gentle is her face"); she refers to Thaumareta in the second person (7.3-4 GP σαίνοι κέν σ' ἐσιδοῖσα καὶ οἰκοφύλαξ σκυλάκαινα / δέσποιναν μελάθρων οἰομένα ποθορῆν "Your house guardian, the puppy, looking at you, would wag her tail, thinking she sees the mistress of her house"). Perhaps nowhere in these poems is the resemblance to 1.78-81 *PMG* more striking than at 9.3-4 GP, when the narrator situates Sabaethis in relation to herself (θάεο· τὰν πινυτὰν τό τε μείλιχον αὐτόθι τήνας / ἔλπομ' ὁρῆν "Observe: I expect to see her prudence and gentleness from here"). All of these moments imply that, as in the performance context of the *partheneia*, the speaker, the portraits, and the audience share a space, a space that shifts, as in a procession, to the temple, and from portrait to portrait. The audience is supposed to see the way in which Melinna is looking at the narrator; this echo of 3.61-62 *PMG* brings the audience into the world of the narrator in such a way that the audience can see the narrator as much as the portrait.[111] This had never been done before in dedicatory

[110] See discussion of the choir in Page 1951: 44-51, 62-64. The question he is attempting to answer concerns the respective roles of Hagesichora and Agido, but on 48 refers to the choir's passing "in proper sequence from its leaders to its rank and file."

[111] Cf. Skinner 2001: 201-2, 206-11; Skinner 1991a: 95 provides discussion of the internal audience's bond with the speaker through the "thrilling desire" brought on by the erotic relationships between the women involved.

epigram; Nossis' innovation here is the invocation of a performance context that is alien to epigram.[112]

Nossis' dedicatory epigrams break several rules of the epigrammatic genre but follow the rules of the *partheneia*. First, epigrams before Nossis' do not feature a consistent narrative persona, while in a *partheneion* the chorus[113] sings throughout the song, changing their subjects but not their perspective. Second, epigrams are short and unconnected poems, while these clearly form a series and are thus meant to be read together, forming a longer poem (like a *partheneion*). Third, the performance context of dedicatory epigram does not allow movement due to its evolution from actual physical inscriptions, while the *partheneia* is a choral dance, complete with stage directions and movements embedded within the song itself. Fourth, owing to the aforementioned performance context, dedicatory epigrams do not feature an internal audience,[114] while the *partheneion* requires audience interaction, at least on a visual level. Fifth, Nossis omits information that is very often found in dedicatory epigrams (the name of the artist, the name of the dedicator, the name of the dedicatee, and family names, among others) but includes information that is *never* found in dedicatory epigrams (such as the hypothetical interaction of the portrait and the puppy, the gnomic statement about mother-daughter resemblance, and the praise of the unpaintable characteristics of the paintings). The omitted information, while necessary for the dedicatory epigram, would

[112] Day 2007: 46 argues that there remains "a fossil" of the original performance context alive in literary epigram, but he is referring to the act of viewing and responding by the reader.
[113] Page 1951: 57-62.
[114] The standard address of the tomb or the deceased to the passer-by is a very different situation from Nossis' narrator bringing her friends to the temple in order to show them the dedications and to react to the art for their benefit. For one thing, Nossis' narrator knows and specifies her internal audience. For another, as the group of girls are not specifically mentioned in the other dedicatory epigrams, the narrator here is a closer parallel to the passer-by. This leaves the group of girls in uncharted territory as the audience of the audience of the dedications.

be out of place in a *partheneion*; the information that Nossis does provide finds parallels in *partheneia*. The information that Nossis does provide finds parallels in *partheneia*.

4.3.4. Conclusion

But the genre of epigram is a limited one.[115] Nossis pushes the boundaries of the genre to the breaking point by employing standard features of Alcman's *Partheneia* and Pindar's *Odes* (and, to a lesser extent, his *Partheneia*) that do not actually work without an actual performance to accompany the poem. She indicates the limits of the genre with constant references to features that may be common in other poetry but are impossible or inappropriate to communicate in such a written genre.[116] The smell of Samytha's headdress, the exhortation to her band to journey to the temple, the stage directions in the portrait epigrams, the praise of characteristics that cannot be painted as if they were—all of these features explore and test the boundaries of epigram. The incompatibility of the poems with the genre when added to the above arguments concerning her rejection of the masculine and her use of the Pindaric narrator points to a new reading of Nossis' epigrams.

[115] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004:283-349, esp. 283-285.
[116] There is, of course, debate over performance of epigram. See Cameron 1995: 100 for the view (following Reitzenstein 1893) that epigram was the preferred poetic form of the symposium, and contrast Bing 2009: 113-15 who argues that the finest epigrams of the Hellenistic period were very likely not composed extempore at symposia.

4.4. Conclusion - Nossis' Texts

By examining Nossis' penchant for polemic and issues of gender in her poetry together, we have seen that these two elements are interrelated. As many of her epigrams make clear, Nossis' poetry is fundamentally concerned with oppositions: male/female, public/private, reading/performing. None of these oppositions stand alone; one of Nossis' great talents was the economic interweaving of many issues in very short poems. When these issues are added to Nossis' general disregard for the long-established rules of epigram, we can start to read Nossis' poems in a new light.

Many scholars have understood Nossis' poems biographically; I did not intend to set these scholars up as straw men for this new study to defeat. Indeed a biographical reading is a natural critical response to perhaps *the* dilemma in Nossis: Why do these public poems seem so private? Or, perhaps, to restate the question: Why were these private poems written in such a public genre? The most common answer is, ultimately, fallacious; it states that Nossis wrote these poems for a private audience (so that these were actually private poems written in private), and published them afterwards. Since there is no evidence that Nossis had anything like a private pre-publication audience, or that a pre-publication audience was a normal first step for any epigrammatist, we must assume that these epigrams were composed as texts - that is to say, as public poems. To read these poems biographically is to give in to the bias that has plagued criticism of female poetry from Sappho to Dickinson: men carefully and intellectually craft poetry with a large audience in mind while women write poetry straight from their souls, without artifice. But Nossis' poetry has no shortage of artifice, from subtle Sapphic

allusions to Hesiodic rejections, from an epitaph for a living person to a moving monument.

If one reading could unite the myriad issues found in Nossis' few surviving epigrams, it would be in her narrator's profound ambivalence towards the poem as text. In Nossis' time poems had become physical things that could be read in private and not performed publicly, even poems (like Sappho's) that were meant to be sung. Like Socrates in the *Phaedrus,* Nossis' *persona* illustrates the difficulties that arise when the text replaces the performance. This ambivalence explains why Nossis composed epigrams, the most 'bookish' of poems, that require an impossible performance context, like the journey to the temple; it explains why Nossis 'says' twice, and weaves once, but never sings; it explains why many of her short poems form a single *partheneion*; it explains her pose that rejects men, in that this pose illustrates (ironically) that once the poem becomes a text the poet has no control over the audience - her male readers will in fact share in the journey that begins with Ἐλθοῖσαι.

This reading finds support from Meleager's introduction to his *Garland* (*AP* 4.1.9-10):

σὺν δ᾽ ἀναμὶξ πλέξας μυρόπνουν εὐάνθεμον ἶριν
Νοσσίδος, ἧς δέλτοις κηρὸν ἔτηξεν Ἔρως

And thereupon he wove the sweet-scented well-blossoming iris
of Nossis, upon whose tablets Eros melted the wax.

Nossis is the only poet who is referred to in this poem as writing. Every other poet's poems are flowers or fruits or trees, but Nossis' irises are specifically written things. Meleager has been shown in this paper to be a careful reader of Nossis' poems, alluding

to her in his reference to Sappho, and here he provides us with a clue. Just as Nossis' epigrams are written poems, so too are her flowers.

Like Erinna and Anyte before her, Nossis composed poetry as texts, and like them explored the significance of the transition from an oral culture to a book culture. Unlike the other two poets' works, however, some of Nossis' poems simply refused to accept that they were texts. Whereas Erinna's poetry at times laments the non-performance nature of textual poetry and Anyte's explores the new possibilities afforded by the absence of contextual restrictions brought about by the literary epigram, Nossis' poetry shows a much more antagonistic relationship to the new poetic environment.

We can see in this divergence a major problem with reading these poets as one collective unit, as they so often have been. While it is true that Sappho, Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis were all women, and their experiences as women undoubtedly had some influence on their poetry, in so many respects the differences between these poets outnumber the similarities. The three Hellenistic poets engaged with a poetic world that was evolving during their lifetimes and responded in three distinct ways. Their use of poetic models, including but certainly not limited to Sappho, varied from poet to poet. It is important that we understand that no one tradition can explain a gifted poet, and most definitely not a tradition defined solely by their sex. Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis were all excellent poets, and they were also female. If we accept these as separate facts, these poets will be able to take their proper places in the history of poetry, and not simply as footnotes to Sappho.

Epilogue

The Grouping Paradox

It must be acknowledged that at the heart of this study lies an apparent paradox. Simply put, this study purports to reject the grouping together of these women while at the same time including them all in the same study. If gender is not a valid reason to study these poets together, and if this assertion is the central purpose of this dissertation, why then would this dissertation study Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis, but no other (read: male) poet? Was not these poets' gender the reason for this grouping?

The answer to the last question is to some extent the most apt solution to the paradox. These poets have been placed in the same category since the late Hellenistic period because they were all female. There exist many pieces of evidence to support this claim, including Antipater of Thessalonica's list of female poets, but most telling are the ascriptions of Nossis 4 GP to 'Nossis of Lesbos' and of Erinna 1 GP to 'Erinna the Mytilenean' in that the gender of these poets in large part determined their afterlives in transmission and reception. As this dissertation has attempted to show in the cases of three Hellenistic poets, this gender-based reception has survived in one form or another to the present day. Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis are in this study not grouped together based on their shared gender but on the commonality of their reception. While the reception of these poets has been determined by ancient and modern attitudes towards gender

differences, this study attempts to bring these attitudes to light and by doing so to help the scholarly community move beyond our present assumptions about the determinative effects of gender in order to bring the poetry of these women into sharper focus.

As I hope that this study has shown, however, the poets whose work has been analyzed here actually did have much in common. First, they were (as far as we can tell) writers first and foremost, rather than singers. They may also have sung their poems, but the *Distaff* and the epigrams are all justifiably considered book poetry, composed to some degree for a reading audience. Considering the fact that the latest of these, Nossis, composed her poetry in the early part of the Hellenistic period, this commonality becomes more significant; one could safely call each of these women pioneers in the transition of the Greek poetic landscape from a predominantly oral to a predominantly literate culture.[1] Although the symposium likely continued to be a prominent original performance context for epigram, the surviving discussions of symposia from the ancient world all suggest that these were exclusively male. Female poets may well have performed their poems in a context parallel to the all-male symposium, but we have no evidence of this. This may be one area where gender actually does determine some aspect of the poetry composed by women, as original performance contexts very likely had some bearing on the final (written) product.[2]

In addition to their common place in the history of Greek poetry, Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis were all influential poets whose work has mostly disappeared. Erinna's masterpiece, which to some degree defined the Hellenistic aesthetic, survives only in

[1] Cameron 1995: 74-103 argues that the symposia remained a standard performance context for poetry in the Hellenistic period, even for epigram, and that it is 'a gross oversimplification to think of an age of reading *succeeding* [emphasis in original] an age of listening' (102). Bing 2000 refutes this claim and discusses the focus on reading in Hellenistic epigram.
[2] Cameron 1995: 102.

small fragments; Anyte's poetry expanded the boundaries of epigram (not to mention the possible impacts of her lyric and epic poetry, if it ever actually existed), yet we possess only twenty short poems; Nossis' poetry, which seems to have been a particular favorite of Meleager, only survives in forty-four or forty-eight lines. Although we are fortunate that at least some of their poetry is extant, the quality of the surviving poems and lines serves as a reminder of the poetry that we have lost. We cannot even know if the poems we now possess were the best examples from each poet's corpus, except in the case of Erinna, whose seminal work can only be considered barely extant.

The fact that so little of their poetry has survived is perhaps responsible at least in part for scholars' acceptance of many parts of the ancient biographical tradition. But, as this dissertation has argued, scholars do not need to accept these parts in order to analyze and interpret the poetic *agenda* or visions of these poets. In fact, by reading the poems on their own terms, given only a rough estimation of date and location, we can begin to explore these poets' uses of various models (such as Alcman and Pindar for Nossis, or Homer and Simonides for Anyte) and the ways in which they helped define the poetry of the Hellenistic period by expanding, rejecting, or engaging with the poetic landscape as they experienced it. In rejecting both ancient and modern ascriptions to 'Nossis of Lesbos' or 'Erinna the Mytilenean', this study will hopefully encourage scholars to rethink some of their assumptions about poetry written by Greek females and opened the doors for a new set of studies. As classical scholars, we owe Erinna, Anyte, and Nossis that much.

Appendix

Frequently Discussed Texts[1]

Erinna

[ ].ν̣[
[ ]εοι.[ ].
[ ]ε κώρας·
[ ].ι νύμφαι·
[ ] χελύνναν 5
[σ]ελάννα·
[χε]λύννα·
[ ].ε̣λ̣ῆσ[
[ ]ω̣.ει·
[ ].αφυλλοισ[10
[ ].λασσ̣ει·
[ ].ανν̣.ν·
[ ]νί.απέξα[
[ ].[..]υ̣κυμα[ ]
..]υκᾶν μαινομεν̣[ ].σσ̣ιν̣αφ.[.]π̣.[15
αἰ]α̣ῖ ἐχ̣ώ, μέγ᾽ ἄϋσα· φ[ ] χελύννα
..].ομένα μεγάλασ̣[ ] χορτίον αὐλᾶς·
τα]ῦτα τύ, Βαῦκι τάλαι̣[να]χεισα γόημ[ ]
τα]ῦτά μοι ἐν κρα[δ].΄..χνια κεῖται
θέρμ᾽ ἔτι· την[ ].υ̣ρ̣ομες ἄνθρακες ἤδη· 20
δαγύ[δ]ων τεχ̣[ ]ίδ̣ες ἐν θαλάμοισι
νυμ[φ]αι.[ ]έες· ἅ τε ποτ᾽ ὄρθρον
μάτηρ αε[ ].οισιν ἐρείθοις
τ̣ηνασηλθ[ ]ν̣α ἀμφ᾽ ἀλιπαστον·
..μικραισ.[ ]ν̣ φόβον ἄγαγε Μορ̣[μ]ώ 25
..].εν μὲν κ.[ ].ατα ποσσὶ δὲ φοιτῆι
.]..[.]σιν· ἐκ δ᾽[ ] μετεβάλλετ᾽ ὀπωπάν·
ἀνίκα δ᾽ ἐς [λ]έχος̣ [ ]ό̣κα πάντ᾽ ἐλέλασο
ἅσσ᾽ ε.[ ]..ηπιασ..τ.[ ] μ̣ατρὸς ἄκουσας,
Βα̣ῦκ̣ι φίλα· λαθα...ε.[ ]. Ἀφροδίτα· 30
τ̣ῶ̃ τυ κατακλα̣[ί]οισ̣ατα[ ].[ ]...ε λείπω [·]
ο̣ὐ [γ]άρ μοι πόδες ....[..].[ ]..ο δῶμα β̣έ̣βαλοι·
οὐδ̣᾽ ἐσιδῆν φαε̣.[ ]κυν οὐδ̣ὲ̣ γοᾶσαι
γυμναῖσιν χαιταισ.ν[ ].νικεος αἰδὼς
δρύπτει μ᾽ ἀμφι..[35

[1] All translations are my own. Translations of Erinna's epigrams adapted from Murray and Rowland 2007.

α..[ ]δε π̣[ρ]οπάροιθ[εν
ἐννεᾳ̣[και]δέκατος .[
Ἠρι̣ννᾳ̣[..]ε φίλαι π.[
ἀλακ̣άταν ἐσ̣ορει̣[
γνωθ᾽ ὅτι τοικ[40
αμφ..ι̣κ.σ.ε.[
ταῦτ᾽ αἰ̣δώς μ.[
παρθε̣[ν]ί̣οισ...[
δερκομένα δ᾽ ε̣κ̣[
καὶ χαιτα.ᾳ̣ν̣.[45
πραϋλόγοι πο̣ιλιαί, ταὶ γήραος ἄνθεα θνατοῖς
τῶ τυ φίλα φ.[
Βαῦκι κατακλᾳ̣[
αν φλόγα μι̣ν .[
ὠρυγᾶς ἀϊοισ.ο[50
ὦ πολλὰν ὑμεν̣[
π]ολλὰ δ᾽ ἐπιψαυ[
π]άνθ᾽ ἑνός, ὦ υμ[
αἰαῖ Βαῦκι τάλαιν[α
— — — — —

maidens;
brides;
tortoise 5
moon;
tortoise;
...
...
in(?) leaves 10
shakes (?);
moon;
shorn lamb
deep wave
with maddened feet ...from white horses 15
"Alas for me," I yelled loudly...tortoise
leaping...the fence of the large courtyard;
[Grieving for] you, Baukis, I lament these things.
These traces lie...in my heart,
still warm. Those...we found are coals now; 20
of dolls...in the bedrooms
brides...And near dawn
mother ...for the ...wool-workers
she came to you...with salted...;
to little ones...Mormo brought fear 25
on four feet she walked...
but she changed her visage;

But when into the bed...you forgot everything
that when a child...you heard from your mother,
dear Baukis: Aphrodite...forgetfulness.
For this reason weeping for you, I leave off...
For my feet are not permitted...away from the house;
I am not allowed to see you dead nor lament
with my hair unbound ...(blushing?) shame
tears my [cheeks]...
but ... before...
nineteenth [year]
Erinna dear...
gazing upon the distaff...
know that
the spinning (?)
these things shame me ...
with maidenly ...
But looking from ...
and long hair....
kind-speaking grey-haired women, the flowers of old age for mortals
For this reason, dear...
Baukis, I weep [for you]
the flame...
I hear the howling...
O Hymen, ...many..
but often...touch...
everything for one, O Hymen...
Alas, poor Baukis

SH 410 = P.S.I. 1090

Στᾶλαι καὶ Σειρῆνες ἐμαὶ καὶ πένθιμε κρωσσέ,
ὅστις ἔχεις Ἀίδα τὰν ὀλίγαν σποδιάν,
τοῖς ἐμὸν ἐρχομένοισι παρ᾽ ἠρίον εἴπατε χαίρειν,
αἴτ᾽ ἀστοὶ τελέθωντ᾽ αἴθ᾽ ἑτεροπτόλιες·
χὤτι με νύμφαν εὖσαν ἔχει τάφος, εἴπατε καὶ τό·
χὤτι πατήρ μ᾽ ἐκάλει Βαυκίδα, χὤτι γένος
Τηλία, ὡς εἰδῶντι· καὶ ὅττι μοι ἁ συνεταιρὶς
Ἤρινν᾽ ἐν τύμβῳ γράμμ᾽ ἐχάραξε τόδε.

My stelae and Sirens and mournful urn that holds
these few ashes belonging to Hades,
to those passing by my tomb say farewell,
whether they be from my hometown or other cities;
and tell that this tomb holds me, a bride; and this too,
that my father called me Baukis, and that my family

is from Telos, so that they may know; and that my friend
Erinna engraved these lines upon my tomb.
AP 7.710 = Erinna 1 GP

Νύμφας Βαυκίδος εἰμί· πολυκλαύταν δὲ παρέρπων
στάλαν τῷ κατὰ γᾶς τοῦτο λέγοις Ἀίδᾳ·
"Βάσκανός ἐσσ', Ἀίδα." τὰ δέ τοι καλὰ σάμαθ' ὁρῶντι
ὠμοτάταν Βαυκοῦς ἀγγελέοντι τύχαν,
ὡς τὰν παῖδ', ὑμέναιος ἐφ' αἷς ἀείδετο πεύκαις,
ταῖσδ' ἐπὶ καδεστὰς ἔφλεγε πυρκαϊᾷ·
καὶ σὺ μέν, ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμων μολπαῖον ἀοιδὰν
ἐς θρήνων γοερὸν φθέγμα μεθαρμόσαο.

I belong to Baukis, the bride. You passing by her
much lamented stele please say this to Hades below:
"Hades, you are envious!" These beautiful monuments
will announce to those who see them the sad fate of Baukis,
that with the very torches over which the Hymenaios was sung,
her father-in-law lit this girl's funeral pyre; and you, Hymenaios,
changed the wedding song into mournful lamentation.
AP 7.712 = 2 GP

Ἐξ ἀταλᾶν χειρῶν τάδε γράμματα· λῷστε Προμαθεῦ,
ἔντι καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὶν ὁμαλοὶ σοφίαν·
ταύταν γοῦν ἐτύμως τὰν παρθένον ὅστις ἔγραψεν,
αἰ καὐδὰν ποτέθηκ', ἦς κ' Ἀγαθαρχὶς ὅλα.

From delicate hands is this painting: My good Prometheus,
there are humans on a level with you in artistry.
Well this maiden at least he depicted truly, whoever he was;
if he had but added a voice, Agatharchis would be complete.
AP 6.352 = 3 GP

Anyte

Βουχανδὴς ὁ λέβης· ὁ δὲ θεὶς Ἐριασπίδα υἱός,
Κλεύβοτος· ἁ πάτρα δ' εὐρύχορος Τεγέα·
τἀθάνᾳ δὲ τὸ δῶρον· Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐπόησεν

Κλειτόριος, γενέτᾳ ταὐτὸ λαχὼν ὄνομα.

The cauldron could hold an ox: Cleubotus, the son of Eriaspis
dedicates it. His fatherland is broad Tegea.
The gift is to Athena. Aristoteles of Cleitor, who shares
his father's name, fashioned it.
AP 6.153 = 2 GP

Φριξοκόμᾳ τόδε Πανὶ καὶ αὐλιάσιν θέτο Νύμφαις
δῶρον ὑπὸ σκοπιᾶς Θεύδοτος οἰονόμος·
οὕνεχ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀζαλέου θέρεος μέγα κεκμηῶτα
παῦσαν ὀρέξασαι χερσὶ μελιχρὸν ὕδωρ.

To bristly-haired Pan and the grotto Nymphs,
the shepherd Theudotus dedicated this gift under the peak,
because they refreshed him, weary from the parching summer heat,
by offering sweet water from their hands.
AP 16.291 = 3 GP

Ἥβα μέν σε, πρόαρχε, ἔσαν· παίδων ἅτε ματρὸς,
Φειδία, ἐν δνοφερῷ πένθει ἔθου φθίμενος·
ἀλλὰ καλόν τοι ὕπερθεν ἔπος τόδε πέτρος ἀείδει,
ὡς ἔθανες πρὸ φίλας μαρνάμενος πατρίδος.

The youth buried you, captain; like the grief of children for their mother,
Pheidias, when you died you cast them into dark sorrow.
But the stone above you sings this beautiful song,
that you died fighting for your dear fatherland.
AP 7.724 = 4 GP

Πολλάκι τῷδ᾽ ὀλοφυδνὰ κόρας ἐπὶ σάματι Κλείνα
μάτηρ ὠκύμορον παῖδ᾽ ἐβόασε φίλαν,
ψυχὰν ἀγκαλέουσα Φιλαινίδος, ἃ πρὸ γάμοιο
χλωρὸν ὑπὲρ ποταμοῦ χεῦμ᾽ Ἀχέροντος ἔβα.

The mother, Cleina, often mourning here at the tomb of her daughter,
lamented her beloved daughter who died too soon,
calling back the soul of Philaenis, who before her marriage
crossed over the pale stream of the river Acheron.
AP 7.486 = 5 GP

Λοίσθια δὴ τάδε πατρὶ φίλῳ περὶ χεῖρε βαλοῦσα
εἶπ᾽ Ἐρατὼ χλωροῖς δάκρυσι λειβομένα·
"Ὤ πάτερ, οὔ τοι ἔτ᾽ εἰμί, μέλας δ᾽ ἐμὸν ὄμμα καλύπτει
ἤδη ἀποφθιμένης κυάνεος θάνατος."

Throwing her arms around her dear father, Erato spoke
these final words, shedding pale tears:
"Father, I am yours no longer, and as I die, dark black death
is already covering my eyes."
AP 7.646 = 7 GP

Ἀντί τοι εὐλεχέος θαλάμου σεμνῶν θ᾽ ὑμεναίων
μάτηρ στῆσε τάφῳ τῷδ᾽ ἐπὶ μαρμαρίνῳ
παρθενικὰν μέτρον τε τεὸν καὶ κάλλος ἔχοισαν,
Θερσί· ποτιφθεγκτὰ δ᾽ ἔπλεο καὶ φθιμένα.

Instead of a marriage-blessing bedchamber and holy wedding rites,
your mother placed upon your marble tomb
a woman having your height and beauty, Thersis:
and you, though dead, can be spoken to.
AP 7.649 = 8 GP

Μνᾶμα τόδε φθιμένου μενεδαΐου εἵσατο Δᾶμις
ἵππου, ἐπεὶ στέρνον τοῦδε δαφοινὸς Ἄρης
τύψε· μέλαν δέ οἱ αἷμα ταλαυρίνου διὰ χρωτὸς
ζέσσ᾽, ἐπὶ δ᾽ ἀργαλέᾳ βῶλον ἔδευσε φονᾷ.

Damis erected this memorial for his deceased steadfast
horse, since bloodthirsty Ares smote his chest:
his black blood bubbled up through his tawny hide,
and drenched the earth with grievous death.
AP 7.208 = 9 GP

ὤλεο δή ποτε καὶ σὺ πολύρριζον παρὰ θάμνον,
Λόκρι, φιλοφθόγγων ὠκυτάτη σκυλάκων·
τοῖον ἐλαφρίζοντι τεῷ ἐγκάθετο κώλῳ
ἰὸν ἀμείλικτον ποικιλόδειρος ἔχις.

You, too, died once beside a bush with thick roots,
Locris, swiftest of the puppies who love to bark;
the merciless viper with dappled neck injected
such venom into your swift leg.
Pollux 5.48 = 10 GP

Οὐκέτι μ᾽ ὡς τὸ πάρος πυκιναῖς πτερύγεσσιν ἐρέσσων
ὄρσεις ἐξ εὐνῆς ὄρθριος ἐγρόμενος·
ἦ γάρ σ᾽ ὑπνώοντα σίνις λαθρηδὸν ἐπελθὼν
ἔκτεινεν λαιμῷ ῥίμφα καθεὶς ὄνυχα.

No longer as before will you, flapping your wings rapidly,
rouse me from bed early in the morning;
for a marauder snuck upon you secretly while you slept,
and slit your throat swiftly with his claws.
AP 7.202 = 11 GP

Ἴζε' ἅπας ὑπὸ καλὰ δάφνας εὐθαλέα φύλλα
ὡραίου τ᾽ ἄρυσαι νάματος ἁδὺ πόμα,
ὄφρα τοι ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος φίλα γυῖα
ἀμπαύσῃς πνοιᾷ τυπτόμενα Ζεφύρου.

Sit, everyone, under the beautiful well-blooming foliage of the laurel,
and draw sweet drink from the flowing spring,
so that your limbs, panting from the labors of summer,
may rest, beaten by the breeze of Zephyr.
AP 9.313 = 16 GP

Ξεῖν᾽, ὑπὸ τὰν πέτραν τετρυμένα γυῖ᾽ ἀνάπαυσον·
ἁδύ τοι ἐν χλωροῖς πνεῦμα θροεῖ πετάλοις·
πίδακά τ᾽ ἐκ παγᾶς ψυχρὰν πίε· δὴ γὰρ ὁδίταις
ἄμπαυμ᾽ ἐν θερινῷ καύματι τοῦτο φίλον.

Stranger, rest your weary limbs under this rock-
sweetly does the breeze sound in the green foliage-
and drink cold water from the spring. For to travelers
this respite from the heat of summer is dear.
AP 16.228 = 18 GP

Ἀκρίδι, τᾷ κατ᾽ ἄρουραν ἀηδόνι, καὶ δρυοκοίτᾳ
τέττιγι ξυνὸν τύμβον ἔτευξε Μυρώ,
παρθένιον στάξασα κόρα δάκρυ· δισσὰ γὰρ αὐτᾶς
παίγνι᾽ ὁ δυσπειθὴς ᾤχετ᾽ ἔχων Ἀίδας.

Myro erected a common tomb for her locust,
the nightingale of the fields, and her oak-dwelling cicada,
a girl weeping a maiden's tears: for implacable Hades

departed taking both of her pets.
AP 7.190 = 20 GP

Nossis

Ἄδιον οὐδὲν ἔρωτος· ἃ δ᾽ ὄλβια, δεύτερα πάντα
ἐστίν· ἀπὸ στόματος δ᾽ ἔπτυσα καὶ τὸ μέλι.
τοῦτο λέγει Νοσσίς· τίνα δ᾽ ἁ Κύπρις οὐκ ἐφίλασεν,
οὐκ οἶδεν τήνας τἄνθεα ποῖα ῥόδα.

Nothing is sweeter than love: all desirable things
are second to it. From my mouth I have spat even honey.
Thus says Nossis: The person whom Aphrodite has not kissed
Does not know what sort of flowers her roses are.
AP 5.170 = 1 GP

Ἥρα τιμήεσσα, Λακίνιον ἃ τὸ θυῶδες
πολλάκις οὐρανόθεν νισομένα καθορῇς,
δέξαι βύσσινον εἶμα, τό τοι μετὰ παιδὸς ἀγαυᾶς
Νοσσίδος ὕφανεν Θευφιλὶς ἁ Κλεόχας.

Revered Hera, you who often look upon the fragrant
Lacinian shrine, descending from heaven,
receive this linen robe which Theophilis daughter of Cleocha
wove with her noble daughter Nossis.
AP 6.265 = 3 GP

Ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας
τὸ βρέτας, ὡς χρυσῷ δαιδαλόεν τελέθει.
εἴσατό μιν Πολυαρχὶς ἐπαυρομένα μάλα πολλὰν
κτῆσιν ἀπ᾽ οἰκείου σώματος ἀγλαΐας.

Let us girls go to the temple of Aphrodite
to see the statue, how it is adorned with gold.
Polyarchis erected it, having gained much treasure
from the splendor of her own body.
AP 9.332 = 4 GP

Χαίροισάν τοι ἔοικε κομᾶν ἄπο τὰν Ἀφροδίταν
ἄνθεμα κεκρύφαλον τόνδε λαβεῖν Σαμύθας·
δαιδάλεός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἁδύ τι νέκταρος ὄσδει
τοῦ, τῷ καὶ τήνα καλὸν Ἄδωνα χρίει.

Surely rejoicing, Aphrodite received this gift,
a headdress from Samytha's hair.
For it is elaborately wrought and in some sweet way smells of nectar,
nectar with which she, too, anoints beautiful Adonis.
AP 6.275 = 5 GP

Τὸν πίνακα ξανθᾶς Καλλὼ δόμον εἰς Ἀφροδίτας
εἰκόνα γραψαμένα πάντ᾽ ἀνέθηκεν ἴσαν.
ὡς ἀγανῶς ἕστακεν· ἴδ᾽, ἁ χάρις ἁλίκον ἀνθεῖ.
χαιρέτω· οὔ τινα γὰρ μέμψιν ἔχει βιοτᾶς.

Callo, having had her portrait taken, dedicated it,
a perfect likeness, in the house of fair-haired Aphrodite.
How gently she stands! See how her grace is blossoming.
Let her rejoice: for she has no blame in her life.
AP 9.605 = 6 GP

Θαυμαρέτας μορφὰν ὁ πίναξ ἔχει· εὖ γε τὸ γαῦρον
τεῦξε τό θ᾽ ὡραῖον τᾶς ἀγανοβλεφάρου.
σαίνοι κέν σ᾽ ἐσιδοῖσα καὶ οἰκοφύλαξ σκυλάκαινα
δέσποιναν μελάθρων οἰομένα ποθορῆν.

The portrait contains the beauty of Thaumareta: well does it
contain the pride and youth of the gentle-eyed girl.
Your house guardian, the puppy, looking at you, would wag her tail,
thinking she sees the mistress of her house.
AP 9.604 = 7 GP

Αὐτομέλινna τέτυκται· ἴδ᾽, ὡς ἀγανὸν τὸ πρόσωπον.
ἁμὲ ποτοπτάζειν μειλιχίως δοκέει·
ὡς ἐτύμως θυγάτηρ τᾷ ματέρι πάντα ποτῴκει.
ἦ καλόν, ὅκκα πέλῃ τέκνα γονεῦσιν ἴσα.

Melinna herself has been depicted: look how gentle her face is!
She seems to look at me sweetly.
How truly the daughter appears like her mother in all respects.

It is a good thing, when children are like their parents.
AP 6.353 = 8 GP

Γνωτὰ καὶ τηλῶθε Σαβαιθίδος εἴδεται ἔμμεν
ἄδ᾽ εἰκὼν μορφᾷ καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνᾳ.
θάεο· τὰν πινυτὰν τό τε μείλιχον αὐτόθι τήνας
ἔλπομ᾽ ὁρῆν· χαίροις πολλά, μάκαιρα γύναι.

This image is known to be that of Sabaethis even from afar,
because of its beauty and dignity.
Observe: I seem to see her prudence and gentleness from here.
May you rejoice greatly, blessed woman!
AP 6.354 = 9 GP

Καὶ καπυρὸν γελάσας παραμείβεο καὶ φίλον εἰπὼν
ῥῆμ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοί. Ῥίνθων εἴμ᾽ ὁ Συρακόσιος,
Μουσάων ὀλίγη τις ἀηδονίς· ἀλλὰ φλυάκων
ἐκ τραγικῶν ἴδιον κισσὸν ἐδρεψάμεθα.

Laugh loudly as you pass by, and speak a kind word
over me. I am Rhinthon of Syracuse,
a small nightingale of the Muses; but from my tragic
burlesques I plucked for myself my own wreath of ivy.
AP 7.414 = 10 GP

Ὦ ξεῖν᾽, εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν
τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος,
εἰπεῖν, ὡς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήνᾳ τε Λοκρὶς γᾶ
τίκτε μ᾽ · ἴσαις δ᾽ ὅτι μοι τοὔνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.

Oh stranger, if you set sail for Mytilene of the beautiful dances
to be inspired by the flower of the graces of Sappho,
say that the Locrian land bore me, dear to the Muses and to her.
Learning that my name is Nossis, go.
AP 7.718 = 11 GP

Ἄρτεμι, Δᾶλον ἔχουσα καὶ Ὀρτυγίαν ἐρόεσσαν,
τόξα μὲν εἰς κόλπους ἄγν᾽ ἀπόθου Χαρίτων,
λοῦσαι δ᾽ Ἰνωπῷ καθαρὸν χρόα, βᾶθι δ᾽ ἐς οἴκους
λύσουσ᾽ ὠδίνων Ἀλκέτιν ἐκ χαλεπῶν.

Artemis, you who inhabit Delos and beautiful Ortygia,
set your bow in the chaste bosom of the Graces,
wash your skin clean in Inopus, and come to the home
of Alketis to deliver her from difficult childbirth.

AP.6.273 = 12 GP

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B., E. Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M., eds. 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2010a. "The Pre-Figured Muse: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Poetics." Pp. 81-91 in J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Chichester & Malden.

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2010b. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton and Oxford.

Ambühl, A. 2007a. "Tell, All Ye Singers, My Fame: Kings, Queens, and Nobility in Epigram." Pp. 275-94 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Ambühl, A. 2007b. "Children as Poets: Poets as Children? Romantic Constructions of Childhood and Hellenistic Poetry." *Hesperia Supplements* 41: 373-383.

Arthur, M. 1980. "The Tortoise and the Mirror: Erinna PSI 1090." *CW* 74.2: 53-65.

Baale, M. 1903. *Studia in Anytes Poetriae vitam et Carminum Reliquias*. Haarlem.

Balmer, J. 1996. *Classical Women Poets*. Newcastle upon Tyne.

Barigazzi, A. 1952. "Sopra Alcuni Nuovi Epigrammi Ellenistici." *Hermes* 80.4: 494-96.

Barnard, S. 1978. "Hellenistic Women Poets." *CJ* 73.3: 204-213.

Barnard, S. 1991. "Anyte: Poet of Children and Animals." Pp. 163-176 in F. De Martino (ed.), *Rose di Pieria*. Bari.

Bettenworth, A. 2007. "The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram." Pp. 69-93 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Hypomnemata 90. Göttingen.

Bing, P. 2002. "The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and its Readers in Antiquity." Pp. 39-66 in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Hellenistica Groningana 6. Leuven.

Bing, P., and J. S. Bruss. 2007. "Introduction." Pp. 1-26 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Bing, P. 2009. *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry.* Ann Arbor.

Boas, M. 1905. *De Epigrammatis Simonideis. Pars Prior. Commentatio Critica de Epigrammatum Traditione*. Groningen.

Bowman, L. 1998a. "'AP' 6.265: Theuphilis' Noble Child." *Mnemosyne* 51.5: 578-81.

Bowman, L. 1998b. "Nossis, Sappho, and Hellenistic Poetry." *Ramus* 27: 39-59.

Bowman, L. 2004. "The 'Women's Tradition' in Greek Poetry." *Phoenix* 58:1-27.

Bowra, C.M. 1936. "Erinna's Lament for Baucis." Pp. 325-342 in C. Bailey, E.A. Barber, C.M. Bowra, J.D. Denniston, and D.L. Page (eds.), *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on His 70th Birthday.* Oxford.

Bowra, C.M. 1953. *Problems in Greek Poetry*. Oxford.

Bundy, E. L. 1962 *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Burnett, A. 1989. "Performing Pindar's Odes." *CP* 84.4: 283-93.

Cameron, A. and A. Cameron. 1969. "Erinna's Distaff." *CQ* 19.2: 285-88.

Cameron, A. 1992. "Genre and Style in Callimachus." *TAPA* 122: 305-12.

Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and his Critics.* Princeton.

Campbell, D. A. 1982. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. London.

Cavallini, E. 1991a. "Ancora su Noss. AP V.170." *Eikasmos* 2: 191-6.

Cavallini, E. 1991b. "Due poetesse greche." Pp. 97-135 in F. De Martino (ed.), *Rose di Pieria*. Bari.

Cavallini, E. 1981. "Noss. AP V.170." *Sileno* 7:179-83.

Cazzaniga, I. 1970. "Critica testuale ed esegesi a Nosside *A.P.* VII 718." *PP* 25: 431-445.

Crusius, O. 1892. *Untersuchungen zu den "Mimiamben" des Herondas.* Leipzig.

Crusius, O. 1907. "*Erinna*." *RE* 6.1: 455-458.

Cunningham, I.C. 1971. *Herodas: Mimiambi*. Oxford.

Cyrino, M. S. 2004. "The Identity of the Goddess in Alcman's Louvre 'Partheneion' (PMG 1)." *CJ* 100.1: 25-38.

Day, J. W. 2007. "Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram." Pp. 29-47 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

De Martino, F. 2006. *Poetesse Greche*. Le Rane: Studi 42. Bari.

Degani, E. 1981. "Nosside." *Giornale filologico ferrarese* 4: 43-52.

Díaz de Cerio Díez, M. 1998a. "Tipología formal y función estilística de la referencia a la muerte en los epigramas funerarios de Ánite de Tegea." *Faventia* 20.1: 49-73.

Díaz de Cerio Díez, M. 1998b. "La evolución de un género: elementos estructurales de los epigramas dedicados a animales de Ánite de Tegea." *EM* 66.1: 119-149.

duBois, P. 1996. "Sappho and Helen." Pp. 79-88 in E. Greene, ed. *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches.* Berkeley.

Edmonds, J. 1938. "Erinna P. S. I. 1090." *Mnemosyne* 6.2: 195-203.

Fantuzzi, M., and R. L. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry.* Cambridge.

Felson, N. 1999. "Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's Pythian Four." *HSCP* 99: 1-31.

Furiani, P. 1991. "Intimità e socialità in Nosside di Locri." Pp. 177-95 in F. De Martino (ed.), *Rose di Pieria*. Bari.

Gallavotti, C. 1971. "L'epigramma biografico di Nosside." Pp. 241-50 in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di V. de Falco*. Naples.

Geoghegan, D. 1978. "'A.P.' VII. 724 (Anyte)." *Mnemosyne* 31.2: 198-200.

Geoghegan, D. 1979. *Anyte: The Epigrams.* Rome.

Giangrande, G. 1969. "An Epigram of Erinna." *CR* 19.1: 1-3.

Gigante, M. 1974. "Nosside."*PP* 29: 22-39.

Gigante, M. 1981. "Il Manifesto Poetico di Nosside." Pp. 243-5 in V. Ussani, et al. (edd.), *Letterature comparate: Studi in onore di E. Paratore* (v.1). Bologna.

Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature.* Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. 2007. "What is Ekphrasis For?" *CP* 102: 1-19.

Gosetti-Murrayjohn, A. 2006. "Sappho as the tenth Muse in Hellenistic epigram." *Arethusa* 39: 21-45.

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

Gow, A.S.F, and D. L. Page, eds. 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*. Cambridge.

Greene, E, ed. 2005. *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Norman, Oklahoma.

Greene, E. 2005. "Playing with Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte." Pp. 139-57 in E. Greene (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Norman, Oklahoma.

Gutzwiller, K. 1993. "Anyte's Epigram Book." *Syllecta Classica* 4: 71-89.

Gutzwiller, K. 1997. "Genre Development and Gendered Voices in Nossis and Erinna." Pp. 202-22 in Y. Prins and M. Shreiber (eds.), *Dwelling in Possibility: Women Poets and Critics on Poetry*, Ithaca, New York.

Gutzwiller, K. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context.* Berkeley.

Gutzwiller, K. 2004. "Seeing Thought: Timomachus' Medea and Ecphrastic Epigram." *AJP* 125.3: 339-386.

Gutzwiller, K. 2006. "The Bucolic Problem." *CP* 101.4: 380-404.

Gutzwiller, K. 2007. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature.* Oxford.

Hallett, J. 1979. "Sappho and Her Social Context: Sense and Sensuality." *Signs* 4.447-464.

Herrlinger, G. 1930. *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung*. Stuttgart.

Höschele, R. 2007. "The Traveling Reader: Journeys through Ancient Epigram Books." *TAPA* 137.2: 333-369.

Hunter, R.L. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry.* Cambridge.

Klinck, A. L. 2001. "Male Poets and Maiden Voices: Gender and Genre in Pindar and Alcman." *Hermes* 129.2: 276-79.

Klinck, A. L. 2008. *Woman's Songs in Ancient Greece*. Montreal.

Kutzko, D. 2006. “The Major importance of a minor poet: Herondas 6 and 7 as a quasi-dramatic diptych.” Pp. 167-184 in M.A.Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Beyond the Canon*. Leiden.

Lardinois, A. 2001. "Keening Sappho: Female Speech Genres in Sappho's Poetry." Pp. 75-92 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society.* Princeton.

Lefkowitz, M. 1963. "Τω και εγω: The First Person in Pindar." *HSCP* 67: 177-253.

Lefkowitz, M. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets.* Baltimore.

Lefkowitz, M. 1991. *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'*. Oxford.

Levaniouk, O. 2008. "Lament and Hymenaios in Erinna's *Distaff*." Pp. 200-232 in A. Suter (ed.), *Lament. Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond.* Oxford.

Levin, D. 1962. "Quaestiones Erinneanae." *HSCP* 66:193-204.

Lloyd-Jones, H., and P. Parsons, eds. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.

Luck, G. 1954. "Die Dicheterinnen der griechischen Anthologie." *MH* 11:170-87.

Maas, P. 1934. "Erinnae in Baucidem nenia." *Hermes* 69: 206-209.

Magrini, M. 1975. "Una nuova linea interpretative della Conocchia di Erinna." *Prometheus* 1:225-236.

Männlein-Robert, I. 2007. "Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Hellenistic Epigram." Pp. 251-71 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Manwell, E. 2005. "*Dico ergo sum*: Erinna's Voice and Poetic Reality." Pp. 72-90 in E. Greene (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Norman, Oklahoma.

Meyer, D. 2007. "The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram. Pp. 187-210 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Morgan, K. A. 1993. "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ." *CP* 88.1: 1-15.

Murray, J., and J. Rowland. 2007. "Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram." Pp. 211-232 in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Neri, C. 1994. "Erinna in Eronda." *Eikasmos* 5: 221-32.

Neri, C. 1997. "Erinna a Ossirinco." *ZPE* 115: 57-72.

Neri, C. 2000. "La sorte più crudele ('Erinn.' AP VII 712 [HE 2], 5ss)." *Eikasmos* 11: 205-18.

Neri, C. 2003. *Erinna: Testimonianze e Frammenti*. Bologna: Pàtron (Studi Eikasmos 9).

Page, D. L. 1937. "The Chorus of Alcman's Partheneion." *CQ* 31.2: 94-101.

Page, D. L. 1951. *Alcman: The Partheneion*. Oxford.

Page, D.L. 1975. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford.

Pardini, A. 1991. "Problemi dialettali greci ed interpretazioni antiche e moderne: P.S.I. 1090 (Erinna); P.Oxy. 8 (Anonimo); P. Antinoë s.n. (Teocrito)." *ZPE* 85: 1-7.

Parker, H. 1996. "Sappho Schoolmistress." Pp. 146-183 in E. Greene, ed. *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches.* Berkeley: University of California Press. Originally published in *TAPA* 123 (1993): 309-351.

Parker, H. 2004. ”An Epigram of Nossis (8 GP = AP 6.353)." *CQ* 54:618-20.

Parsons, P.J. 1993. "Identities in Diversity." Pp. 152-170 in A.W. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long, and A. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley.

Peponi, A. E. 2007. "Sparta's Prima Ballerina: *Choreia* in Alcman's Second *Partheneion* (3 *PMGF*)." *CQ* 57.2: 351-62.

Plant, I.M. 2004. *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome: An Anthology.* Norman, Oklahoma.

Pomeroy, S. 1977. "*Technikai kai Musikai*: The Education of Women in the Fourth Century and in the Hellenistic Period." *AJH* 2: 51-68.

Pomeroy, S. 1978. "Supplementary Notes on Erinna." *ZPE* 32: 17-22.

Pratt, L. 1995. "The Seal of Theognis, Writing, and Oral Poetry." *AJP* 116.2: 171-84.

Prins, Y. 1999. *Victorian Sappho*. Princeton.

Rauk, J. 1989. "Erinna's *Distaff* and Sappho Fr.94." *GRBS* 30.1: 101-116.

Rayor, D. J. 1991. *Sappho's Lyre: Archaic Lyric and Women Poets of Ancient Greece.* Berkeley.

Rayor, D. J. 1993. "Korinna: Gender and the Narrative Tradition." Arethusa 26.3:219-231.

Rayor, D. J. 2005. "The Power of Memory in Erinna and Sappho." Pp. 59-71 in E. Greene (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Norman, Oklahoma.

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

Riedweg, C. 1994."Reflexe hellenistischer Dichtungstheorie im griechischen Epigramm." *ICS* 19:141-50.

Rist, A. 1997. "A Fresh Look at Herodas' Bucolic Masquerade." *Phoenix* 51.3/4: 354-63.

Robbins, E. 1994. "Alcman's Partheneion: Legend and Choral Ceremony." *CQ* 44.1: 7-16.

Scholz, U. 1973. "Erinna." *A&A* 18: 15-40.

Scodel, R. 1992, "Inscription, Absence and Memory." *SIFC* 10: 57-76.

Segal, C. 1985. "Messages to the Underworld: An Aspect of Poetic Immortality in Pindar." *AJP* 106.2: 199-212.

Skinner, M. 1982. "Briseis, the Trojan Women, and Erinna." *CW* 75.5: 265-269.

Skinner, M. 1983. "Corinna of Tanagra and Her Audience." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 2: 9-20.

Skinner, M. 1987. "Greek Women and the Metronymic: A Note on an Epigram of Nossis." *AHB* 1: 39-42.

Skinner, M. 1989. "Sapphic Nossis." *Arethusa* 22:5-18.

Skinner, M. 1991a. "Aphrodite Garlanded. Eros and Poetic Creativity in Sappho and Nossis." Pp. 79-96 in F. De Martino (ed.), *Rose di Pieria*. Bari.

Skinner, Marilyn B. 1991b. ”Nossis 'Thelyglossos.' The Private Text and the Public Book." Pp. 20-47 in S. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History*. Chapel Hill.

Skinner, M. 1996. "Women and Language in Archaic Greece, or, Why Is Sappho a Woman?" Pp. 175-192 in E. Greene, ed. *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches.* Berkeley.

Skinner, M. 2001. "Ladies' Day at the Art Institute." Pp. 201-22 in A. Lardinois and Laura McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton and Oxford.

Snyder, J. 1989. *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome.* Carbondale, Illinois.

Snyder, J. 1997. *Lesbian Desire in the Lyrics of Sappho.* New York.

Specchia, O. 1984. "Recenti studi su Nosside." *Cultura e Scuola* 23: 49-54.

Stehle, E. 1996. "Romantic Sensuality, Poetic Sense: A Response to Hallett on Sappho." Pp. 143-149 in E. Greene, ed. *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches.* Berkeley.

Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting.* Princeton.

Stehle, E. 2001. "The Good Daughter: Mothers' Tutelage in Erinna's Distaff and Fourth-Century Epitaphs." Pp. 179-200 in A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society.* Princeton.

Steiner, W. 1986. *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. London.

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

Trypanis, C. 1970. "Ovid and Anyte." *CP* 65.1: 52.

Trypanis, C. 1971. "Anyte (Anth. Pal. 7. 208)." *CP* 66.2: 112-113.

Tueller, M. 2008. *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram* (Hellenistica Groningana 13). Leuven.

Vara, J., and J. Weatherby. 1992. "The Sources of Theocritean Bucolic Poetry." *Mnemosyne* 45.3: 333-344.

Werner, J. 1994. "Der weibliche Homer: Sappho oder Anyte?" *Philologus* 138.2: 252-259.

West, M.L. 1977. "Erinna." *ZPE* 25: 95-119.

West, M.L. 1978. "Phocylides." *JHS* 98: 164-167.

Whitmore, C. 1918. "Pastoral Elements in the Greek Epigram." *CJ* 13.8: 616-620.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*. Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* I. Berlin.

Williamson, M. *Sappho's Immortal Daughters*. Cambridge.

Winkler, J. 1996. ”Gardens of Nymphs: Public and Private in Sappho's Lyrics." Pp. 89-109 in E. Greene, ed. *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches.* Berkeley.

Woodbury, L. 1978. "The Gratitude of the Locrian Maiden: Pindar, Pyth. 2.18-20." *TAPA* 108: 285-299.

Wright, F.A.W. 1923. "The Women Poets of Greece." *Fortnightly Review* 113: 323-333.

Wright, J. 1955. "Erinna to Sappho." *Poetry* 86.6: 349-351.

Young, D. 1970. "Pindaric Criticism." Pp. 1-95 in J. Stern and W. Calder, eds., *Pindaros und Bakchylides.* Darmstadt.

Ypsilanti, M. 2003. "Notes on Anyte." *Hermes* 131.4: 502-507.