

In Her Own Words: The Semantics of Female Authorship in Ancient Greece, from Sappho to Nossis¹

What we call things is important – it reveals what we think about the world.² What we call ourselves, however, is even more important. It reveals ideas and assumptions about identity, gender, community.³ It helps us to see where we fit in in society; what we understand our purpose, our role to be; the kinds of activities we undertake. In a history where women have been largely barred from higher-paying, traditionally male occupations,⁴ the way in which women in particular use terminology to lay claim to skills and expertise in counterpoint to a generally male-dominant culture speaks volumes about the ways in which women see themselves and their relationship to their work. As Erica Jong puts it in her feminist essay, *The Artist as Housewife*, ‘naming is a form of self-creation.’⁵

The debate around gendered professional terminology is ongoing, particularly in languages which have, in all other respects, lost grammatical gender, such as English and Persian.⁶ Terminology for authorship in particular has come under more scrutiny as gender-based divisions between ‘author’ and ‘authoress’ in the English language have begun to be broken down, and the fairness of the usage of male-generic nouns questioned.⁷ Yet the academic debate around gender-based authorship terminology in the ancient world has, thus far, been largely non-existent, with most scholars focusing on terms used by male authors to refer to themselves and their craft.⁸ Of course, the topic of authorship in antiquity is a particularly complex site of inquiry: there is, to begin with, the issue of the definition of authorship itself, particularly in the archaic period of Greek literature, where the blurring of boundaries between composition, performance and written text begs the question at which point we pin down the ‘author’ (if at all);⁹ and the question of the precise location of authorial identity (in the use of the first-person, biographical information, or self-naming (*sphragis*)).¹⁰ Taking authorship here to mean the ascription of the production of discourse to a particular individual (including self-ascription),¹¹ and placing my focus, not on self-naming or *sphragis*,¹² but on the specific, substantive lexis used to describe authorship and authorial identity in

ancient Greece, it is the task of this paper to look at the interrelationship between gender and authorship in the works of three female authors of ancient Greek poetry, through the terminology used by female authors to describe their own authorship. I want to focus on the subtle and suggestive use of language by women in a culture where writing is dominated by men: in particular, the language used to describe and depict their own authorship. Seeing language as a performative process, I uncover a ‘subversive mask’ of language used by female poets to create a double layering that talks about their own authorship.¹³ I also show how female poets reformulate the gendered relationship between male poet and female Muse to suggest a subversive connection of motherhood, Muses and memory.¹⁴ Male authors, of course, speak both of themselves, and of female poets, as being in some way affiliated with the Muses;¹⁵ it is suggested here, however, that female authors lay claim to a very specific connection to the Muses by showing how female authors claim this relationship, but then complicate it with notions of maternity, memory and authorial pride.

It is not within my remit to give a full survey of the authorship terminology employed by male authors, but it is nevertheless important to include a brief summary in order to understand the lexis to which these three female poets are responding, and the poetic environment within which they are working.¹⁶ Andrew Ford, in his chapter in *The Origins of Criticism* titled ‘The Origin of the Word “Poet”’, provides an excellent overview to the topic which I summarise briefly here.¹⁷ Ford traces the evolution of words for ‘poet’ in ancient Greek literature from the archaic period to the 4th century BCE, focusing on the transition from the archaic term for poets, ἀοιδοί or ‘singers’,¹⁸ to a more artisanal vision of poetry reflected in the shift of authorship terminology towards words derived from ποιεῖν (to make), as in ποιητής (poet) and ποίημα (poem). In a particularly interesting observation, he notes a split in the lexicon of high poets (as opposed to prose authors and comic or ‘light’ poets), whereby ποιητής and its cognates (especially compound nouns ending in -ποιός) become the preserve of authors of technical treatises, historians, or parodists, and ἀοιδός remains the favoured word among tragedians.¹⁹ In general, however, with the shift in the fifth and fourth centuries towards ‘a sense of songs as texts to be studied rather than performed’,²⁰ Ford suggests that the overwhelming preponderance of ποιητής and its cognates demonstrates ‘an

increasing awareness of the lasting powers of texts [which] supported the conception of song as a stable work rather than a performance',²¹ and enables the increasing professionalisation of literature and the continuation of a semantics for authorship rooted in -ποιός suffixes into the Hellenistic period.²² These observations hold true in terms of male authors' labelling of female authors, too: a survey of references to female poets in male-authored texts from the classical and later periods suggests a predominance of nouns and adjectives cognate with ποιεῖν and its derivatives, and, most commonly of all (though later than the texts studied here), a feminised form of ποιητής, ποιήτρια.²³

Within the context, then, of discussions around male authorship terminology, from the archaic ἀοιδός to the classical ποιητής, it is the aim here to dissect and explore the terminology for authorship deployed by female authors from the archaic to the Hellenistic periods in response – and at times in opposition – to that of their male counterparts. It is important to acknowledge from the outset the inevitable complexities of such a project. There are several aspects to the topic of female authorship in the ancient world that make it a challenging site of exploration. The first is the scarcity of the source material. It has often been observed that women's voices were largely silenced in the ancient world, both literally and figuratively in their survival in the textual record.²⁴ In a corpus that contains at least 3200 male writers of Greek alone, under a hundred female writers of ancient Greek survive²⁵ – a testimony to the prevailing culture of female silencing,²⁶ in spite of the evidence for at least a certain degree of literacy among women.²⁷ The layered, fragmentary, mediated tradition in which we receive female-authored texts – for the most part, partially recorded in male-authored texts and unreliably transmitted by male scribes – requires that we problematise the extent to which we can, or should, attempt to recover an 'authentic' female voice in the works of ancient Greek women authors.²⁸ This, in turn, becomes the source of the second difficulty that arises in the study of female authorship: the tension between gender and self-expression that arises when women speak/perform/write, challenging cultural expectations about women's silence in public, inevitably becomes an integral feature of the few surviving female-authored texts that cannot be ignored.²⁹

Finally, the third issue, the problem of what 'literary', 'literature', and 'author' meant in the ancient world, introduces another contextual problem to the debate. It would be naïve to assume that there could be an easy continuity between the oral circulation of texts and performances in archaic Greek antiquity, the highly literary productions of Hellenistic Greek culture, and the contemporary machinery of literature.³⁰ Yet I would suggest that, while acknowledging differences in context and genre, Austin's (by now well-known) conception of 'performative utterances' can provide a useful bridge between different genres and performance modes in ancient Greek poetry. Performativity crucially allows us to understand any ritual/scripted act as in some way performative of identity, where 'authorship' (as itself a performed identity) is either substantiated and enacted in the presence of the performer and his/her delivery of a spoken text, or imitated performatively through the written evocation of the authorial self.³¹ Similarly, Judith Butler's understanding of gender as a continuous series of 'constituting acts' maps neatly onto the performativity of authorship and gender in ancient Greek poetry.³² Claims to authoriality made in real-time performance must have become intricately linked with the process of enacting gender: as Eva Stehle points out in *Performance and Gender*, 'since gender is an inevitable part of self-presentation in the flesh and cultural assumptions about gender attach themselves to speakers prior to any speech and inform its reception, oral texts must be read as gendered speech.'³³ The same holds true for the written 'voice', where the authorial voice represents and stages the identity of the author, thus enabling the author, as a gendered body, to enact/perform herself.³⁴ Authorship and gender are thus not only both performative acts in and of themselves: their performativity together constructs each other, where the voice of the poet and the construction of gender interplay and substantiate each other in subtle and complex ways. Rather than attempting to recover an 'authentic' or 'original' Sappho and Nossis, we are instead in the more nuanced position of assessing the construction of the gendered voice in and through the articulation of notions of authorship, as they meet in the performativity of the self through words.

Rather than try to attempt an exhaustive (or even representative) account, therefore, I present three case studies from the surviving female-authored literature, as examples of the application of substantive authorship terminology by female authors.³⁵ Instead of trying to

make a claim for a comprehensive lexical survey, which, given the paucity of surviving female-authored texts from antiquity, would be impossible in any case, I suggest instead that each reading allows us to see these three female authors seeking an authentic lexicon and definition for their role within a male dominated realm, a performative, processual enacting of the self, as women and as authors, through the layering of language and the assumption of a subversive mask which enacts and creates multiple meanings.

Sappho μουσοπόλος

Sappho is unusual amongst the female authors of ancient Greece, not only because she provides us with the largest sample size of female-authored poetry, but also because she was well-known enough to be recognised (and labelled) as an author in her own right by male authors in later periods (see Appendix for a comprehensive list).³⁶ While no external evidence survives as to what Sappho's male contemporaries might have called her, fragment 106 LP provides a useful way to show that Sappho was aware of the issues at stake in deploying authorship terminology and the subtleties of performing a gendered authorial identity. In this fragment, she speaks of a Lesbian ἀοιδός or 'bard' – using precisely that term which Ford noted above provides the standard formulation for 'poet' in the archaic period:³⁷

πέροχος, ὡς ὅτ' ἀοιδὸς ὁ Λέσβιος ἀλλοδάποισιν

(Sappho Fr. 106 LP)

Superior, as the Lesbian singer to those of other lands

(tr. Campbell)

Unfortunately, given the fragmentary condition of much of Sapphic transmission, the jury is out as to whom Sappho is referring, or if, indeed, she is referring to anyone in particular. Most commentators take it for granted that she is speaking here of a particular personality, with Terpander as the most popular candidate for Sappho's subject.³⁸

I would suggest that perhaps Sappho might be using the grammatical masculine here, not in the referential sense, but as a generic masculine³⁹ – reinforced by her usage of the

generalising ὡς ὅτ' ('as when') – to refer, less to a particular Lesbian poet and more to 'der alten, ruhmreichen Sangestradiation auf Lesbos,'⁴⁰ of which she, naturally, is a part. (A better translation of the fragment might then read, 'superior, as Lesbian singers are to those of other lands.')

In gendered languages which make use of the generic masculine (of which ancient Greek is one), 'grammatically masculine nouns have a wider lexical and referential potential ... [they] may be used to refer to males, groups of people whose gender is unknown or unimportant in the context, or even female referents.'⁴¹ Of course, Sappho herself, being both from Lesbos and a poet, would fit both the qualifications necessary to come under the generalising umbrella of ἄοιδος ὁ Λέσβιος – and it would only be her sex as a woman that would be hidden within the generic masculine due to the lexical 'invisibility of feminine/female expressions.'⁴² If my reading is right, this would make this fragment of Sappho's a very interesting example of an ancient female poet appropriating a generic masculine-gendered term to describe the tradition of which she is a part, and the earliest instance of any reference by a female poet to her own profession. A female poet singing about women in a poet's voice that shifts between feminine and masculine identities within a predominantly masculine sphere, playing with linguistic gender, would seem to hint at precisely that kind of performativity of the gendered self which we saw outlined by Butler above.⁴³ Either way – whether ἄοιδος ὁ Λέσβιος is a specific personality or a representative of the masculine-gendered tradition to which Sappho herself belongs – what is certain is that Sappho clearly does not lack a vocabulary for authorship. It is simply gendered male.

But on closer inspection it may be seen that even this is not entirely true. Fragment 150 LP is, at first glance, a cryptic example of Sapphic lyric with a troubled textual transmission⁴⁴:

οὐ γὰρ θέμις ἐν μοισοπόλων <δόμῳ>
 θοῆγον ἔμμεν' < > οὐ κ' ἄμμι πρέποι τάδε

1 δόμῳ Hartung (obl. Page 132) : οἰκία

(Sappho Fr. 150 LP)

for it is not right in the house of those who serve the Muses
 that there should be lamentation... That would not be fitting for us.

According to Maximus of Tyre, who preserved the fragment for us, Sappho is addressing her daughter here, leading most scholars to the conclusion that the δόμος ('house') spoken of here is Sappho's own.⁴⁵ The specific textual problem revolves around the line-ending of the first line of the fragment, which has come down to us as the unmetrical οἰκία, and the restoration of the central portion of the second line.⁴⁶ But irrespective of the solution to the problem of the text, it is the noun that precedes it, μοισοπόλων, that is of interest to our project. As we have seen above, later male authors label Sappho with a whole range of terms, from ἀοιδόπολος to Μούσα to μουσοποιός (see Appendix), but not once in any other author's description of Sappho's status as poet do we get the fertile combination of the prefix μουσ- and the suffix -πόλος; indeed, this is the first time that the word occurs in the entire corpus of Greek literature.⁴⁷ Moreover, if we take the δόμος here to be her own, then Sappho is using μοισοπόλων here to *refer to herself*.⁴⁸ So why does Sappho choose to use this specific noun here – one of the only clear instances where she is referring to herself and her poetry?

Various interpretations have been put forward as to what μοισοπόλος might refer,⁴⁹ from a 'professional musician' (Alex Hardie)⁵⁰ to a 'cultic association' (Giulia Lanata) to 'a place of education' (Anne Burnett).⁵¹ A brief analysis of the etymology of the word, however, and its literary resonances, serves to show that the clues to its interpretation may rest within the noun itself. Surveying the usage of the -πόλος suffix ('one who busies him/herself about something,' from the verb πέλομαι) in extant ancient Greek literature, it becomes clear that the word seems to suggest a sense of *physical proximity*, an actual rather than a metaphorical (i.e. status-based) attendance (for example, αἴπολος ['goatherd'], βουπόλος ['cowherd'], ἐπίπολος ['companion'], μητροπόλος ['mother-helper'] or ναοπόλος ['temple overseer']).⁵² -πόλος thus seems to suggest an active element of 'overseeing,'⁵³ an engagement with the prefix of the noun that specifically constructs the person named as a participant in the province of their attendance.

An interesting point of comparison to the semantic range of μοισοπόλος is provided by Herodotus, who, as we saw, calls Sappho μουσοποιός (Hdt. 2.135), the 'music-maker' – on first glance, a close substitute for Sappho's μοισοπόλος. But there are some important

differences between the two. The suffix -ποιός in Herodotus' noun, 'maker' (from ποιέω) – a typical example of the classical ποιεῖν cognates in action – has a significant impact on the translation of the prefix μουσ-: μουσ- here must mean 'music', in the abstract sense which the noun Μοῦσα can also denote.⁵⁴ The alternative meaning of Μοῦσα as 'Muse', as real, embodied goddesses, cannot be retained whilst at the same time making sense of -ποιός: to put it crudely, one can make music, but not Muses. The noun thus translates more or less straightforwardly as 'music-maker,' taken by most translators of Herodotus to mean 'poet' or 'lyric poet.'⁵⁵ Translations of μουσοπόλος in Sappho, on the other hand, range from Rayor and Lardinois' 'those who serve the Muses'⁵⁶ to Powell's 'the Muses' servants'⁵⁷ to Hardie's 'those who busy themselves with the Muses,' which, given the observations made above, seems to capture the sense of the -πόλος suffix most closely.⁵⁸ Despite their differences in attempting to render -πόλος into English, however, it is clear from all these translations that Sappho's μουσοπόλος entertains the interpretative possibility of reading the μουσ- prefix as referring to the Muses, as well as the abstract 'music': the combination of physical proximity and active engagement suggested by -πόλος retains the sense both of service to a real deity and of occupation with the craft of music.⁵⁹ Herodotus was, of course, writing after Sappho, and in a context where, as we have seen, -ποιός nouns were becoming more and more common in the description of authorship; but what the comparison makes clear is the interpretative richness of Sappho's epithet.⁶⁰ μουσοπόλος subtly retains the ambiguity of the noun Μοῦσα and suggests a more intimate connection between female poet and goddess than Herodotus' more prosaic noun allows.

There is another layer to the interpretation of μουσοπόλος, one which shows Sappho interacting directly with her poetic forebears and which gives the noun a distinctly literary flavour. The proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* is an important and much-studied passage, in which the poet lays claim to a direct connection to and inspiration by the Muses.⁶¹ Towards the end of the proem he makes a particularly interesting statement for our inquiry⁶²:

... ἀοιδὸς
Μουσᾶων θεράπων κλέεα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων
ὑμνήσῃ μάκαράς τε θεοῦς, οἳ Ὀλύμπῳ ἔχουσιν ...

(Hes. *Theog.* 99-101)

... a poet,
servant of the Muses, sings of the glories of the men of old
and the blessed gods, who hold Olympus...

Having taken the audience of the *Theogony* through the speech and appearance of the Muses, Hesiod now provides an exact definition of what he understands the function of the male bard (ἄοιδός, 99) to be: a servant of the Muses (Μουσάων θεράπων, 100). But what exactly does it mean to be a Μουσάων θεράπων? And does it carry any more interpretative weight than a simple epithet?

Gregory Nagy's analysis of the meaning of Μουσάων θεράπων in the *Theogony* is helpful here. Nagy suggests that Μουσάων θεράπων at *Theog.* 100 can be understood both by comparison to Patroclus' status as a 'ritual substitute' for Achilles in the *Iliad*, and, more broadly, to the status of all the Achaean warriors as θεράποντες Ἄρηος.⁶³ There seem to be two strands to this argument: on the one hand, the θεράπων is unique in his ability to act as a ritual substitute for a single person/entity; on the other, precisely because he is *only* a substitute, he also becomes a generic force who can be replaced. 'Whereas the generic warrior is the "therápōn of Ares",' Nagy concludes, 'the generic poet is the "therápōn of the Muses".'⁶⁴ The θεράπων thus by definition holds a secondary position (Nagy notes that its prevailing meaning in the *Iliad* is 'warrior's companion' and 'attendant'): as he shows with reference to Patroclus and Achilles' relationship, 'Patroklos and [Achilles] are equivalent warriors, so long as Patroklos stays by his side; once he is on his own, however, the identity of Patroklos as warrior is in question.'⁶⁵ This combination of privileged access to a higher power and formal inferiority of status is confirmed by the semantic range of the noun θεράπων, which denotes, variously, 'henchman,' 'attendant,' 'squire,' 'servant' and 'worshipper.'⁶⁶

And the context of the poem of the *Theogony* would suggest just that: Hesiod is not a companion of the Muses, but rather a worshipper who prays to the Muses from afar for inspiration (104). The physical distancing and separation of the poet from the Muses is emphasised throughout: whereas the δώματα of the Muses are mentioned three times in the poem (63) (twice in the formulaic phrase Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι [75, 101]), the

adjective Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες twice (25, 52) and Ἐλικωνιάδες once (1), the Μουσάων θεράπων (100) is placed in sharp contrast at the beginning of the line with the θεούς, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν at the end of the following line (101). (Indeed, the poet's first meeting with the Muses occurs in a deliberate position of subordination, both in terms of his status as a shepherd, and geographically, Ἐλικῶνος ὑπο ζαθέοιο ('under holy Helicon', Hes. *Theog.* 23)). The implication of the gap between the θεράπων and the θεοί whom he serves is clear.⁶⁷

If we return to Sappho and the μουσοπόλος, we see that the position here is quite different. Rather than implying formal inferiority or generic replaceability in a relationship to a higher power, the -πόλος suffix of Sappho's μουσοπόλος emphasises proximity, engaged activity and a dynamic of care and guardianship towards the Muses.⁶⁸ Moreover, Sappho enacts and performs her understanding of this relationship with the Muses on the stage of the feminine space of the δόμος ('house') surrounded by at least one and possibly more female 'attendants of the Muses', as she herself makes clear: οὐ γὰρ θέμις ἐν μουσοπόλων δόμῳ ('for it is not right ... in the house of those who serve the Muses' [emphasis mine]). As a woman, the δόμος is her assigned province – indeed, it is the province of all the women of her family, as the fragment, which Maximus of Tyre tells us is addressed to herself and her daughter, shows.⁶⁹ Whilst the Μουσάων θεράπων in Hesiod is distanced from the Muses and places himself as a shepherd upon the mountain as a delineation of his status as generic poet and ritual worshipper, then, Sappho deliberately transfers her understanding of the interrelationship between her gender and her authorship to the feminine, enclosed stage of the δόμος. Simultaneously, and no less importantly, she translates the singular Μουσάων θεράπων into a community of (at least two) female μουσοπόλοι who, together, take part in the intimate project of caring for and engaging with the Muses.⁷⁰ The δόμος thus becomes the sacred space, metaphorical or not, in which women can perform their identity by singing their own poetry in their own voices, vouchsafed by their privileged relationship with the Muses.

Whilst Herodotus, then, labels her as a music-maker, and Hesiod plays a complicated game of proximity and distance from the Muses, Sappho puts herself on the level of Hesiod – and then changes the rules of the game. Creating her own vocabulary and poetic terminology,⁷¹ she invents a language for female authorship that plays upon male tropes and embellishes

them with uniquely female spaces and relationships, ambiguous, hidden and many-layered, to construct a self-definition that is uniquely and incontrovertibly her own.

Eurydice λόγων μήτηρ

We have heard of Sappho, but what of Eurydice – and why include her here? Eurydice I of Macedon’s reputation as a poet is, as often, in proportion to the number of fragments that survive. We have only one extant poem belonging to her, quoted in Plutarch’s *Moralia* and recorded thus in the standard edition⁷²:

Εὐρυδίκη Ἱεραπολιήτις τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκε
Μούσαις εὖιστον ψυχῇ ἐλούσα πόθον.
γράμματα γὰρ μνημεῖα λόγων μήτηρ γεγαυῖα
παίδων ἠβώντων ἐξεπόνησε μαθεῖν.

(Plut. *De lib. ed.* 14b-c)

Eurydice of Hierapolis dedicated this
to the Muses when she fulfilled the longing for knowledge in her soul.
For she, delighted mother of thriving sons, laboured
to learn letters, the remembrance of speech.

Eurydice of Macedon was born around 410 BCE. She was the granddaughter of a king of Lyncestae in northern Greece, wife of the king of Macedon, Amyntas III, and (as we see in the epigram above) mother of three sons, each of whom became the king of Macedon. Indeed, one of them was Philip II, father of Alexander the Great, thus making Eurydice Alexander’s grandmother.⁷³ But it is not her impressive pedigree that earns her a place here; it is her writing, which, as she tells us, she laboured hard to learn (γράμματα γὰρ μνημεῖα λόγων ... ἐξεπόνησε μαθεῖν).

Let us look a little more closely at the epigram itself to unpack why it is of importance to the study of female authorship terminology. On the surface of things, the dedicatory inscription falls unequivocally into the category of a standard votive offering: the incorporation of the name of the dedicator and the gods to whom it is given are both standard votive fare.⁷⁴ There are some other pieces of information given, in addition to Eurydice’s name. The first is Eurydice’s motherhood, and the description of her ‘thriving sons’ (παίδων

ἡβώντων); the second, the fact that she learnt to read and write, ‘labour[ing] to learn letters, the record of speech.’⁷⁵ Plutarch records the epigram as an example of Eurydice’s model status as a mother, educating herself in order to pass it on to her sons; though as Plant notes, ‘Eurydice speaks only of the benefits of the learning for herself.’⁷⁶ And indeed, there are many ways in which the epigram presents Eurydice in the light of model womanhood. Her status as a mother – consistently emphasised as the ideal role for a woman in the ancient world⁷⁷ – is foregrounded, and her willing compliance to her task emphasised with the participle γεγαυῖα (‘delighted’). Her fertility and ability to produce many children is suggested in the plural παίδων, whilst the fact that they have all reached adulthood – another hallmark of the ideal mother – is explicitly pointed out with the participle ἡβώντων, which literally translates as ‘having achieved adulthood’ or ‘being in the prime of life.’⁷⁸

And yet Plant’s observation above, that Eurydice’s focus here seems to be placed explicitly upon the benefits of learning for herself, suggests that there is more going on. The two aspects of her personality – her womanhood, and her writing – are in fact deeply implicated in the structure of the poem, with the sub-clause μήτηρ γεγαυῖα / παίδων ἡβώντων embedded across a line-break within the main clause, γράμματα γὰρ μνημεῖα λόγων ... ἐξεπόνησε μαθεῖν. The effect is as if the two are so deeply implicated in one another that they cannot be separated.

The juxtaposition of the two clauses creates a particularly interesting collocation at its heart which serves to define Eurydice’s attitude towards her poetry, and which allows us to begin to comprehend her understanding of her relationship to writing. At the very centre of the clause, framed by a rhyming noun and perfect participle, we have the collocation λόγων μήτηρ: ‘mother of words.’ The line-break between μήτηρ and παίδων ἡβώντων makes this juxtaposition particularly hard to miss, and it would be an easy mistake to make, upon first reading the epigram, to assume that the two – the noun μήτηρ and the genitive plural λόγων placed right beside it – belong together.

So why does this matter? I want to suggest that Eurydice is performing a version of literary gender here that implicates her female authorship with her motherhood, a central feature of Hélène Cixous’ later description of ‘écriture féminine’: ‘a woman is never far from “mother”

... there is always within her at least a little of that good mother's milk. She writes in white ink.⁷⁹ And yet the association between motherhood and female authorship is by no means a modern one: in fact, a fragment from a play by a contemporary of Eurydice's shows that the connection between motherhood and 'letters' had already been forged, in a suggestive literary parallel to Eurydice's text. The fragment comes from Antiphanes, an Athenian comic poet who began writing in the early 380s BCE, in his (now lost) comedy *Sappho*. In this particular fragment, Sappho is presented as posing a riddle:

ἔστι φύσις θήλεια βρέφη σῶζουσ' ὑπὸ κόλποις
 αὐτῆς, ὄντα δ' ἄφωνα βοῆν ἴστησι γεγωνόν
 καὶ διὰ πόντιον οἶδμα καὶ ἠπείρου διὰ πάσης
 οἷς ἐθέλει θνητῶν, τοῖς δ' οὐδὲ παρούσιν ἀκούειν
 ἔξεστιν κωφὴν δ' ἀκοῆς αἴσθησιν ἔχουσιν.

(K-A fr. 194 = Ath. 10.450e-f)

There is a female being that hides in her womb unborn children,
 And although the infants are voiceless they call out
 Across the waves of the sea and over the whole earth to whomever
 they wish, and people who are not present
 And even deaf people are able to hear them.

(tr. Prins)

This is the riddle – what, then, is the solution? The answer, Antiphanes' Sappho goes on to say, is a written letter (ἐπιστολή):

θήλεια μὲν νῦν ἐστι φύσις ἐπιστολή,
 βρέφη δ' ἐν αὐτῇ περιφέρει τὰ γράμματα
 ἄφωνα δ' ὄντα ταῦτα τοῖς πόρρω λαλεῖ
 οἷς βούλεθ' ἕτερος δ' ἂν τύχη τις πλησίον
 ἐστῶς ἀναγιγνώσκοντος οὐκ ἀκούσεται.

(K-A fr. 194 = Ath. 451a-b)

The female being is a letter,
 And the infants she carries are the letters of the alphabet: Although they are
 voiceless they can speak to people far away,
 To whomever they wish; and if some other person happens to be
 Standing near the one who is reading, he will not hear them.

(tr. Prins)

As Yopie Prins points out, 'the riddle revolves around ἐπιστολή as a feminine noun: the female creature is an epistle, containing inside of itself letters of the alphabet that will speak to the reader who voices them. These letters are figured as infants born into speech, and the

letter bearing them (in all senses of the word) as a female body about to give birth.’⁸⁰ In addition to demonstrating a contemporary connection between motherhood and ‘letters’, however, there are also several striking similarities between Eurydice’s epigram and ‘Sappho’s’ answer to the riddle. The second line of ‘Sappho’s’ response in particular, βρέφη δ’ ἐν αὐτῇ περιφέρει τὰ γράμματα, shares similarities with the third and fourth lines of Eurydice’s epigram: the mirroring of βρέφη and γράμματα at line-start and end in Antiphanes is echoed in the pairing between Eurydice’s γράμματα at the start of the third line (note the same word) and παίδων at the start of the fourth.

Within this framework, then, we can begin to read Eurydice’s epigram as playing into a contemporary associative imagery connecting motherhood and writing. Rather than positing her learning and writing as a constraint of her position as a woman, valid only inasmuch as it is passed onto her children,⁸¹ I want to suggest that the collocation λόγων μήτηρ at the heart of the inscription subtly hints at the fact that it is precisely Eurydice’s femininity and motherhood that qualifies her for a deep and enduring (ψυχῆ) connection to literature. This is only reinforced by the fact that her dedication is to the Muses, female goddesses who, as we have seen through the example of Sappho, were presented as intimately connected to the female literary project.⁸² Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the plural noun μνημεῖα next to the collocation λόγων μήτηρ, and in close proximity to the mention of the Muses, implicitly recalls the mother of the Muses themselves, Mnemosyne (Μνημοσύνη, cognate with μνημεῖα).⁸³ Just as Mnemosyne mothered the Muses, goddesses of literature and poetry, so Eurydice, too, is the λόγων μήτηρ. The words of the poem itself literally inscribe the dedication into a genealogy of memory and motherhood that goes back to the Muses, Mnemosyne and beyond through the connection of motherhood and authorship – the bearing of children, and the production of words.⁸⁴

Eurydice’s poem, short as it is, thus serves to define female authorship in a subtle, multi-layered text that allows for multiple meanings. On the surface of the inscription, Eurydice denotes herself as a good mother who has learned letters to educate her sons, articulating the values and desires expected of a woman. In another layer, her poem opens up a discourse on femininity, motherhood, creativity and its relationship to literature and authorship. And at the

deepest layer, reading the μνημεία-function of Eurydice's γράμματα as a connection to Mnemosyne, the mother of the Muses, the dedicatory inscription itself becomes a claim to a connection with the Muses that is deeply implicated in motherhood, language, and memory. As Susan S. Lanser puts it in reference to the coded speech of the female voice,

the 'feminine style' of the surface text, that 'powerless', non-authoritative term called 'women's language,' here becomes a powerfully subversive mask for telling secrets to a woman under the watchful eyes of a man ... it deliberately adopts a 'feminine' position that is exaggerated into subversion by exposing the mechanisms of its own abjection.⁸⁵

Eurydice's poem, in other words, conforms on one level to the expected literary ambitions of a woman, and, on another level, contains within itself an entirely different meaning and voice that can only be read by the knowing reader who is able to read between the lines to the subversive connection of motherhood, Muses and memory.⁸⁶

Nossis ἀηδονίς

Let us move now to our final female author: Nossis. Nossis was born around 300 BCE in the Greek colony of Locri in southern Italy.⁸⁷ She fared better than Eurydice in her poetic afterlife: Meleager of Gadara included some of her poetry in his *Garland*, Herodas ridiculed her in his sixth mime as 'the daughter of Erinna,' and Antipater of Thessalonica placed her amongst the nine poets who deserved to rival the Muses. Despite the fact that only twelve of her epigrams survive, they are enough to give us an idea of Nossis' 'woman-centered, erotically charged world' and Sapphic poetics.⁸⁸ As Marilyn Skinner observes, 'we cannot, of course, term [her] perspective "feminist" in any modern sense, but [Nossis] does concur with modern feminist thought in advocating the transcendent importance of women's experience – of intimate bonding, especially the bonding of mother and daughter; of physical desire and sensual enjoyment; of affectionate contact with divinity; and not least, of the immediate aesthetic pleasure imparted by the woven, sculpted, painted or written artifact.'⁸⁹ Nossis' third epigram, in particular, pays tribute to her mother and grandmother's influence in her literary upbringing and education, hinting strongly at 'an alternative cultural environment set apart, to

some degree, from the male-dominated public order.’⁹⁰ Her poems are, then, a promising site indeed for looking at notions of female authorship.

Whilst all Nossis’ epigrams are interesting in their own right, it is the tenth epigram I want to focus on particularly here⁹¹:

καὶ καπυρὸν γέλασας παραμείβεο, καὶ φίλον εἰπὼν
ῥῆμ’ ἐπ’ ἐμοί. Ῥίνθων εἶμι ὁ Συρακόσιος,
Μουσάων ὀλίγη τις ἀηδονίς, ἀλλὰ φλυάκων
ἐκ τραγικῶν ἴδιον κισσὸν ἐδρεψάμεθα.

(Nossis 10 = *Anth. Pal.* 7.414)

Laughing out loud pass by and say a friendly
word to me. I am Rhinthon of Syracuse,
a tiny nightingale of the Muses, but from my tragic
farces I plucked my own ivy.

(tr. Plant)

The epigram is spoken in the voice of Rhinthon of Syracuse,⁹² a Hellenistic dramatist who composed tragic burlesques (φλυάκων...τραγικῶν),⁹³ imitating an epitaph for the poet whereby the passerby is addressed and asked to stop beside the tomb.⁹⁴ On one level, of course, this can be read as a conventional epitaphic epigram, a tribute (as Oliver Taplin sees it) from Nossis to her fellow poet Rhinthon.⁹⁵ The statement ‘Ῥίνθων εἶμι’ thus acts as the stock epitaphic assertion of identity, as we saw above in the inscription dedicated by Eurydice. So why choose Rhinthon for this act of homage? Marilyn Skinner suggests that Nossis sees herself as identifying with Rhinthon, a poet who engaged with a so-called ‘inferior’ form who nevertheless won fame and approval for his work (in the form of Dionysiac garlands: ἀλλὰ φλυάκων / ἐκ τραγικῶν ἴδιον κισσὸν ἐδρεψάμεθα). Their shared Hellenistic aesthetic of smallness and purity (ὀλίγη), as Skinner points out, is represented in the form of the small, female nightingale: ‘Nossis 10 is therefore a literary manifesto in which the figure of Rhinthon, the hyperfeminine *aêdonis*, fronts for the author, who tacitly professes her own allegiance to that emerging principle of Hellenistic taste that renounces magnitude and high seriousness in favor of a deft and playful textual finesse.’⁹⁶ In a subtle turn, the ἴδιον in the ἴδιον κισσὸν thus serves to bind the two poets together: on the surface, Rhinthon claims in the epigram that he achieved recognition from his tragic burlesques; simulatenously, Nossis, by identifying herself with him and by writing an

epigram that binds them together, gains her *own* ‘garland’ (emphasised by the insertion of ἴδιον) from the implication of her work with his ‘tragic burlesques’ (φλύάκων / ἐκ τραγικῶν).

And yet there is an unusual feature to Nossis’ use of the term ἀηδονίς which suggests that she is doing more than simply paying tribute to Rhinthon by identifying with her fellow poet. Marilyn Skinner has suggested that, by adding the feminine -ίς suffix to the already grammatically feminine noun ἀηδών (‘nightingale’) in apposition to Rhinthon’s name, Nossis hyper-feminises an attribute which is allegedly supposed to belong to the male poet Rhinthon. By doing so, Nossis creates a double grammatical female-ness to the noun that ‘call[s] attention to the female poetic presence behind the male mask.’⁹⁷ The fact that Nossis is enacting Rhinthon, and that she is hiding/revealing her identity through the performance of her own gender/identity, is further suggested both by her frequent self-naming elsewhere in the surviving corpus of her work (Nossis names herself three times within the twelve remaining epigrams),⁹⁸ and in her pervasive use of a distinctly feminine ‘personalized authorial voice’⁹⁹ – implying that the reader is meant to be well aware that it is Nossis speaking behind the fictive Rhinthon. As Kathryn Gutzwiller argues, ‘the voice heard in the epigrams once they have been gathered into a poetry book, far from being the anonymous voice of traditional dedicatory style, now seems to emanate from a single personality.’¹⁰⁰ Taking Gutzwiller’s argument a step further, Jackie Murray and Jonathan Rowland suggest that the pervasive presence of many masculine-voice epigrams within Nossis’ surviving works suggests that this interplay and deconstruction of masculine and feminine voices was a conscious theme in Nossis’ work. Describing Nossis’ voice as ‘simultaneously masculine and feminine,’ they suggest that her ‘transgendering’ of her vocality serves to problematise divisions between masculine/feminine gender and authorship.¹⁰¹ Nossis is thus not only identifying with Rhinthon in this epigram – she is also *performing* him, in a process which thereby calls attention to the performativity of the self, of the gendered voice, and of authorship itself.

So much for the context and interpretation of what Nossis is doing in this epigram – what of the search for the semantics of female authorship? To look at how Nossis may have

performed and interpreted/labelled her authorship, we need to focus in on the term ἀηδονίς even further. The figure of the nightingale, as has often been noted, recurs as a trope for song and poetry in Greek literature:

Many poets described themselves as students of the nightingale or as the nightingale itself (e.g. Alc. fr. 25; Bacchyl. 3,97; EpGr 628; Anth. Pal. 7,44). Thus for philosophers, (Democr. B 154 Diels; Chamaeleon in Ath. 9,390a), the nightingale became the inventor of song. In the Hellenistic era, the names of the nightingale were even used as a synonym/allegory for ‘song’ (Callim. Epigr. 2,5) and ‘poetry’ (Palladas, Anth. Pal. 10,92,2).¹⁰²

But the nightingale is particularly interesting here for its recurrent association with female song, and specifically, female lament – chiefly stemming, as Nicole Loraux points out, from the depiction of the nightingale in the myth of Procne.¹⁰³ The myth relates that Procne was turned into a nightingale after her sister, Philomela, was assaulted and mutilated by her husband, Tereus. Though Tereus cut out Philomela’s tongue so that she could not tell of the crime he had committed, Philomela relayed the story to her sister by weaving the tale into a tapestry. The two women then killed Itys, Procne’s son by Tereus, and were transformed into birds – Procne into a nightingale, and Philomela into a swallow.¹⁰⁴ Procne’s tale figured as a trope throughout ancient Greek literature (and beyond), from Homer’s *Odyssey* to Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* to Sophocles’ lost *Tereus*,¹⁰⁵ as an example of female lament, with the nightingale’s song thought to figure as Procne’s constant lament for Itys – and of course, as Gail Holst-Warhaft has shown, in ancient Greek literature, culture and society lament was deeply connected to the female voice as ‘an art of women’.¹⁰⁶ Loraux traces the trope of the nightingale’s connection to female lament through Penelope in the *Odyssey* to the Danaids in Aeschylus’ *Suppliant Women*, to Electra, Antigone, and Cassandra, suggesting that the extraordinary generativity of the symbol of the nightingale for women suggests that it is ‘as if all feminine roles, with the exception of that of a mother, can be explained by referring to the figure of the nightingale’.¹⁰⁷

Here, then, Nossis is not only calling on a trope that is associated with poetry and song; she is utilising one that is specifically connected to *women’s* song and women’s roles in the articulation and delineation of her authorship. This is, I would suggest, only heightened by the explicit connection of the nightingale here to the Muses with Μουσάων ... ἀηδονίς – a phrase which occurs nowhere else in the entire corpus of Greek literature –¹⁰⁸ as we have seen

Sappho and Eurydice doing in a subtle attempt to reclaim a female genealogy of literary authorship.¹⁰⁹ Simultaneously, the tragic resonances of the nightingale suggest that Nossis here, in her performance of Rhinthon, is engaging in her *own* tragic farce (as we saw above in her appropriation of the ἴδιον κισσόν), appropriating Rhinthon's area of expertise as a writer of tragic farces.¹¹⁰ Nossis thus both invokes 'traditional' male assumptions about female song as expressed in tragedy through the figure of the nightingale, performing them beneath the mask of the male voice, while simultaneously replacing it with her own hyperfeminised vision of female gender and its relationship, both to the Muses, and to authorship as a whole.

In order, however, to fully appreciate the extent to which Nossis is playing here with the complication of the male/female voice and its relationship to authorship, we need to dig deeper to unpack the etymology of ἀηδονίς ('nightingale'), the feminised form of ἀηδών. The etymology of the word, which takes its root from ἀείδω, 'I sing' (see LSJ s.v. ἀηδών), in fact suggests that the noun *literally* means 'singer' (or 'songstress,' as Liddell and Scott have it) – and, more importantly, that it can be connected etymologically to the noun ᾄοιδος ('bard'),¹¹¹ the term used, as we have seen, by Homer and the archaic poets, including Sappho.¹¹² This is not mere speculation, as we have evidence that the connection between ἀηδών and ᾄοιδος was already formulated in antiquity. In the *scholia* on the Hesiodic fable of the nightingale of the hawk in *Works and Days* 202-213, the scholiast explicitly connects Hesiod to the figure of the nightingale: καλῶς οὖν ἑαυτὸν ἀηδόνι ἀπήκασε – μουσικὸν γὰρ τὸ ὄρνεον ('[Hesiod] compared himself to the nightingale with good reason – for the bird is musical').¹¹³ The musicality of the bird, as well as its etymological similarity to ᾄοιδος, leads the scholiast to make a double connection between Hesiod, the bard, and the bird. By a similar logic, the hyper-feminised noun ἀηδονίς might be seen as equivalent here to 'female bard'. The line in the epigram of Nossis thus might be better translated as: 'I am Rhinthon of Syracuse, / a *songstress* of the Muses' [emphasis mine]. This is not only an additional drawing out of the paradox enshrined in the contrast between the hyper-femininity of the suffix of ἀηδονίς and Rhinthon's masculinity, ventriloquised by Nossis. It also, at another level, draws attention to Nossis' poetic mask, emphasising the femininity of the female poet behind the 'male' statement. Even more importantly, it hints, perhaps for the first

time in extant Greek literature, at a potential lexicon for female authorship that is both cognate with the masculine ᾄοιδοϛ and which comments on the deep association between nightingale imagery and female speech.

Nossis' ἀηδονίϛ, with its overt femaleness, its referentiality to male figurations of female speech genres, and its linguistic and literary connection to ᾄοιδοϛ, thus has the potential for interpretation as 'female author' in a canonical sense, equivalent to the terms used for male authorship – as we saw was hinted at above in the generic masculine of Sappho's ᾄοιδοϛ (Fr. 106 LP). In Nossis' epigram, however, the term is wrapped instead in layers of irony in a 'now you see it, now you don't' play of metaphor and performed identity in which female authorship is both hinted at and hidden under the rich interpretative mask of the nightingale. Just as we saw Eurydice coding her speech in a double layer, with images of femininity enacted for male eyes on the surface, and a deeper, more subversive claim for authorship inscribed beneath, so here we see Nossis playing up the hyper-feminised nightingale whilst, at the same time, subtly and at a deeper level laying claim to a connection between song, performance, and female authorship that rivals even that of Homer and the bards themselves.

Thus Nossis beats Rhinthon at his own game, turning an epitaph for the male poet into an enunciation of her own poetic ability and aims. The Μουσαίων ὀλίγη τις ἀηδονίϛ becomes a symbol for Nossis and female poetry itself, slighted as small by male poets but easily capable of singing her own tune; silenced by the male voice, but capable of transformation through performance into female-gendered speech; and just as good as the male dramatists at making a tragic pun or two.

Conclusion

It is important to stress, as I did at the outset, that the sample size for female-authored literature in ancient Greek is inescapably small in comparison to male-authored texts; and yet the conclusions we can draw, even from a close analysis of these three poets, are nevertheless interesting and suggestive, and open up important avenues onto a discussion around female authorship terminology in ancient Greek that are productive in their own right. We have seen

Sappho draw attention to her service to the Muses (μουσοπόλος); Eurydice punning on the idea of a ‘mother of words’ (λόγων μήτηρ); and Nossis taking on the mask of the ‘nightingale’ (ἀηδονίς). In a world in which the harsh reality was that women were far less likely than men to achieve the status of authorship, the terminology available for the description of authorship unavoidably reflected the cultural *status quo* and, as we have seen, shifted to emphasise male authoriality. But it is precisely this linguistic-cultural atmosphere which makes the study of female authorship terminology in the ancient world such a fertile site of recovery; because in the absence of a pre-defined vocabulary for female authorship, we are able to actually watch the process by which female authors envisioned their engagement with notions of literary production and authorship, and their construction of a vocabulary for and between themselves.

In the absence of norms of female authorship, then, we begin to see what really matters for female authors as they struggle to come up with a language that defines their literary projects. We see them utilising language as a subversive mask for female self-definition, performing the role of the male poet or the dutiful mother whilst simultaneously outlining and defining their poetic projects. We see them weaving subtle connections between the figures of the Muses, motherhood, and creativity, emphasising proximity to the Muses as the special province of the female μουσοπόλοι, associating motherhood with Memory, and connecting female poetry through the nightingale’s lament to the goddesses of song. We gain a privileged insight into their response to the male-centric authorial models established by Homer and Hesiod; we see how they juggle the expectations of a society that saw motherhood as a woman’s sole purpose with their desire to produce literature; and we watch as they adopt the mask of a male poet to explore the connection between gender, authorship and voice. More than anything, it is through relationship – to their poetic communities, their families, their roles in society, and their male counterparts – and in the performative, processual enacting of the self, as women and as authors, that these female poets define and construct their understanding of their authorship, not simply through the descriptive force of what they do. It is a language of intertext that they create, in which metaphor is used to define and throw assumptions about reality into perspective. Gendered authorship thus becomes a communal,

shared experience – a process of engagement, self-construction, and continuous interrelationship and change, where the terms for authorship are as varied, and as distinctive, as the women who created them.

APPENDIX

Female Authorship Terminology

Sappho

Of herself:

μοισοπόλος LP 150

By male authors (in Campbell (ed.), *Greek Lyric I: Sappho and Alcaeus*)

Note: * labels terms for women poets that are included within generic masculine plurals.

ἀοιδοπόλος	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 7.17 = Laurea i Gow-Page
ἀοιδός	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 7.14 = Antipater of Sidon xi Gow-Page
λυρική	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 7.17 = Laurea i Gow-Page
*λυρικός	Comment. Melamp. Seu Diomed. in Dion. Thrac. (p. 21 Hilgard)
*μελοποιός	Dion. Hal. <i>Comp.</i> 19 (vi 5 Usener-Radermacher)
*μετρικός	Menander, <i>On Display Oratory</i> (9.132, 134s. Walz, 3.333, 334s. Spengel)
Μούσα	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 7.14 = Antipater of Sidon xi Gow-Page <i>Anth. Pal.</i> 9. 506 (quoting Plato)
μουσοποιός	Herodotus 2.135
*ποιητής	Dion. Hal. <i>Dem.</i> 40 (v214ss. Usener-Radermacher)
ποιήτρια	Aelian, <i>V. H.</i> 12.19 (p. 135 Dilts) Athenaeus 10. 450e (ii 479 Kaibel) Strabo Geography 17.1.33 Galen 4.771 Pausanias Description of Greece 8.18.5
<i>poeta</i>	Eusebius, <i>Chron.</i> Ol. 45. 1 (p99 Helm, ii 93 Schöne)
ψάλτρια	<i>Suda</i> Σ 108 (iv 323 Adler) (of the ‘second Sappho’)

Eurydice

μήτηρ Plut. *De lib. ed.* 14b-c

Nossis

Of herself:

ἀηδονίς 10 = *Anth. Pal.* 7.414

By male authors:

θηλύγλωσσος *Anth. Pal.* 9.26.7 (by Antipater of Thessalonica)

WORKS CITED

- Alford, R. (1987), *Naming and Identity* (New Haven).
- Aloni, A. (1997), *Saffo: Frammenti* (Florence).
- Alter, A. (2013), *Drunk Tank Pink* (New York).
- Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie (eds.) (2011), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* (Berlin/Boston).
- Austin, J. (1975), *How to Do Things with Words*, 2nd ed. (Oxford).
- Bagnall, R. and R. Cribiore (2006), *Women's Letters From Ancient Egypt, 300 BC-AD 800* (Ann Arbor).
- Bakker, E. (ed.) (2009), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs* (Cambridge).
- Barnard, S. (1978), 'Hellenistic Women Poets', *CJ* 73 (3), 204–13.
- Bassanese, F. (1989), 'What's in a Name? Self-Naming and Renaissance Women Poets', *Annali d'Italianistica* 7, 104–15.
- Beard, M. (2014), 'The Public Voice of Women', *LRB* 36 (6), 11-14.
- Beecroft, A. (2010), *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China* (Cambridge).
- Behme, T. D. (2007), *Norms of Authorship in Ancient Greece: Case Studies of Herodotus, Isocrates, and Plato* (Minneapolis).
- Bing, P. (1988), *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen).
- Bing, P. and J. Bruss (eds.) (2007), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden).
- Black, S. and C. Juhn (2000), 'The Rise of Female Professionals: Are Women Responding to Skill Demand?', *The American Economic Review* 90 (2), 450–55.
- Blondell, R. (2010), 'Refractions of Homer's Helen in Archaic Lyric', *AJPh* 131 (3), 349–91.
- Bowman, L. (1998), 'Nossis, Sappho and Hellenistic Poetry', *Ramus* 27 (1), 39–59.
- (2004), 'The "Women's Tradition" in Greek Poetry', *Phoenix* 58 (1-2), 1–27.
- Budelmann, F. (ed.) (2009), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge).
- Burnett, A. (1983), *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (Cambridge MA).
- Butler, J. (1988), 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: an Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory', *Theatre Journal* 40 (4), 519-31.
- (1999), *Gender Trouble*, 2nd ed. (London/New York).
- Calame, C. (1977), *Les Chœurs De Jeunes Filles en Grèce Archaique I: Morphologie, Fonction Religieuse Et Sociale* (Rome).
- (1996), 'Sappho's Group: An Initiation Into Womanhood', in Greene (1996), 113–24.
- Calhoun, G. (1938), 'The Poet and the Muses in Homer', *CPh* 33 (2), 157–66.
- Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton).
- Campbell, D. (ed.) (1982), *Greek Lyric, Volume I: Sappho and Alcaeus* (Cambridge MA).
- Carey, C. (2009), 'Genre, Occasion and Performance', in Budelmann (2009), 21–38.
- Carney, E. (2000), *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman).
- Carroll, J., S. Levinson and P. Lee (eds.) (2012), *Language, Thought, and Reality*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge MA).
- Carson, A. (1980), 'The Justice of Aphrodite in Sappho Fr. 1', *TAPhA* 110, 135–42.
- (2009), *If Not, Winter* (New York).
- Case, S. (1990), *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre* (Baltimore).
- Cavallo, G. (1995), 'Donne Che Legono, Donne Che Scrivono', in R. Raffaelli (ed.), *Vicende e Figure Femminili in Grecia e a Roma* (Ancona), 517–26.
- Ceccarelli, P. (2013), *Ancient Greek Letter Writing: A Cultural History (600-150 BC)* (Oxford).
- Chandler, A. (1934), 'The Nightingale in Greek and Latin Poetry', *CJ* 30 (2), 78–84.
- Cheshire, J. (1985), 'A Question of Masculine Bias', *English Today* 1 (1), 22–26.
- (2008), 'Still a Gender-Biased Language?' *English Today* 24 (1), 7–10.
- Chrystal, P. (2013), *Women in Ancient Rome* (Stroud).
- Cixous, H. (1976), 'The Laugh of the Medusa', *Signs* 1 (4), 875–93.
- Clay, J. S. (1980), 'Sappho's Hesperus and Hesiod's Dawn', *Philologus* 124, 302–5.
- Cole, S. (1981), 'Could Greek Women Read and Write?' In Foley (1981), 219–46.

- (2004), *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space* (Los Angeles).
- Corbett, G. (1991), *Gender* (Cambridge).
- D'Alessio, G. (1994), 'First-Person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39 (1), 117–39.
- Danielewicz, J. (1990), '“Deixis” in Greek Choral Lyric', *QUCC* 34 (1), 7–17.
- Davies, M. (1988), 'Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Hand-Book', *CQ* 38 (1), 52–64.
- de Looze, L. (1991), 'Signing Off in the Middle Ages: Medieval Textuality and Strategies of Authorial Self-Naming', in A. Doane and C. Pasternack (eds.), *Vox Intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages* (Madison), 162–82.
- Degani, E. and G. Burzacchini (1977), *Lirici Greci* (Florence).
- Diehl, E. (1940), 'Fuerunt Ante Homerum Poetae', *RhM* 89: 81–114.
- Dion, K. (1983), 'Names, Identity, and Self', *Names* 31 (4), 245–57.
- duBois, P. (1997), *Sappho Is Burning* (Chicago).
- Durante, M. (1976), *Sulla Preistoria Della Tradizione Poetica Greca. Parte Seconda: Risultanze Della Comparazione Indoeuropea* (Rome).
- Edmunds, L. and R. Wallace (eds.) (1997), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore).
- Farrell, J. (2002), 'Greek Lives and Roman Careers in the Classical Vita Tradition', in P. Cheney and F. De Armas (eds.), *European Literary Careers* (Toronto), 24–46.
- Ferrari, F. (2010), *Sappho's Gift: the Poet and Her Community*, tr. B. Acosta-Hughes and L. Prauscello (Ann Arbor).
- Foley, H. (ed.) (1981), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York).
- Ford, A. (1994), *Homer: the Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca).
- (2002), 'The Origin of the Word “Poet”', in *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton), 131–57.
- Fortson, B. (2010), *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Oxford/Malden MA).
- Fowler, D. (1989), 'First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects', *MD* (22), 75–122.
- Fowler, R. (1983), '“On Not Knowing Greek:” the Classics and the Woman of Letters', *CJ* 78 (4), 337–49.
- Furiani, P. (1991), 'Intimità e Socialità in Nosside di Locri', in F. De Martino (ed.), *Rose Di Pieria* (Bari), 179–95.
- Gentili, B. (1988), *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*, tr. A. Cole (Baltimore).
- Gentner, D. and S. Goldin-Meadow (2003), *Language in Mind* (Cambridge MA).
- Gigante, M. (1974), 'Nosside', *PP* 29, 22–39.
- Gold, B. (1987), *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Raleigh).
- Gow, A. and D. Page (1965), *The Greek Anthology* (Cambridge).
- Greene, E. (1994), 'Apostrophe and Women's Erotics in the Poetry of Sappho', *TAPhA* 124, 41–56.
- (ed.) (1996), *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches* (Berkeley).
- (2008), 'Masculine and Feminine, Public and Private, in the Poetry of Sappho', in J. Blevins (ed.), *Dialogism and Lyric Self-Fashioning: Bakhtin and the Voices of a Genre* (Selinsgrove), 23–45.
- Gubar, S. (1981), '“The Blank Page” and the Issues of Female Creativity', *Critical Inquiry* 8 (2), 243–63.
- (1984), 'Sapphistries', *Signs* 10 (1), 43–62.
- Gutzwiller, K. (1997), 'Genre Development and Gendered Voices in Nossis and Erinna', in Y. Prins and M. Shreiber (eds.), *Dwelling in Possibility: Women Poets and Critics on Poetry* (Ithaca), 202–22.
- (1998), *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Los Angeles).
- Hallett, J. (1996), 'Sappho and Her Social Context', in Greene (1996), 125–42.
- Hardie, A. (2005), 'Sappho, the Muses, and Life After Death', *ZPE* 154, 13–32.
- Hellinger, M. and H. Bussmann (2001), *Gender Across Languages: the Linguistic Representation of Women and Men* (Amsterdam).
- Helms, W. (2013), *Symbolic Capital and the Performativity of Authorship: The Construction and Commodification of the Nineteenth-Century Authorial Celebrity* (Lincoln).

- Hemelrijk, E. (1999), *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Élite From Cornelia to Julia Domna* (London/New York).
- Holst-Warhaft, G. (1992), *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature* (London).
- Hünemörder, C. (2006), 'Nightingale', in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World: Vol 9* (Leiden/Boston), 749-751.
- Hutchinson, G. (2013), *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford).
- Irigaray, L. (1985), *This Sex Which Is Not One* (Ithaca).
- Jong, E. (1980), 'The Artist as Housewife', in E. Hedges and I. Wendt (eds.), *In Her Own Image* (New York), 115-20.
- Joplin, P. (2002), 'The Voice of the Shuttle Is Ours', in L. McClure (ed.), *Sexuality and Gender in the Ancient World* (Oxford), 259-86.
- Kaplan, J. and A. Bernays (1999), *The Language of Names* (New York).
- Kern, E. (1961), 'Author or Authoress?', *Yale French Studies* 27, 3-11.
- Klinck, A. (2001), 'Male Poets and Maiden Voices: Gender and Genre in Pindar and Alcman', *Hermes* 129 (2), 276-79.
- (2008), *Woman's Songs in Ancient Greece* (Montreal).
- Koller, H. (1965), 'ΘΕΣΠΙΣ ΑΟΙΔΟΣ', *Glotta* 43, 277-85.
- Kranz, W. (1949), *Geschichte Der Griechischen Literatur* (Leipzig).
- Kurke, L. (2000), 'The Strangeness of "Song Culture": Archaic Greek Poetry', in O. Taplin (ed.) *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective* (Oxford), 58-87.
- (2010), *Aesopic Conversations* (Princeton).
- Lanata, G. (1996), 'Sappho's Amatory Language', in Greene (1996), 11-25.
- Lanser, S. S. (1992), *Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice* (Ithaca).
- Lardinois, A. (1996), 'Who Sang Sappho's Songs?', in Greene (1996), 150-72.
- (2001), 'Keening Sappho: Female Speech Genres in Sappho's Poetry', in A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton), 75-92.
- Lardinois, A. and L. McClure (eds.) (2001), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton).
- Lattimore, R. (1962), *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana).
- Lefkowitz, J. (2014), 'Aesop and Animal Fable', in G. Campbell (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life* (Oxford), 1-23.
- Lefkowitz, M. (1963), 'Τῷ Καὶ Ἐγώ: the First Person in Pindar', *HSPH* 67, 177-253.
- (1981), *Heroines and Hysterics* (London).
- (2012), *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore).
- Lefkowitz, M. and M. Fant (eds.) (2005), *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation*, 3rd ed. (Baltimore).
- Lidov, J. (2002), 'Sappho, Herodotus, and the "Hetaira"', *CPh* 97 (3), 203-37.
- Lord, A. (2000), *The Singer of Tales*, S. Mitchell and G. Nagy (eds.) 2nd ed. (Cambridge MA).
- Lutwack, L. (1994), *Birds in Literature* (Gainesville).
- Maslov, B. (2009), 'The Semantics of Ἀοιδός and Related Compounds: Towards a Historical Poetics of Solo Performance in Archaic Greece', *ClAnt* 28 (1), 1-38.
- McClure, L. (2009), *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama* (Princeton).
- Meyer, D. (2007), 'The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in the Hellenistic Epigram', in Bing and Bruss (2007), 185-210.
- Mikalson, J. (2010), *Ancient Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- Minchin, E. (1995), 'The Poet Appeals to His Muse: Homeric Invocations in the Context of Epic Performance', *CJ* 91 (1), 25-33.
- (2011), *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World* (Leiden).
- Minton, W. (1960), 'Homer's Invocations of the Muses: Traditional Patterns', *TAPhA* 91, 292-309.
- Monella, P. (2005) *Procne e Filomela: Dal Mito Al Simbolo Letterario* (Bologna).

- Morgan, K. (1993), 'Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ', *CPh* 88 (1), 1–15.
- Morgan, T. (1998), *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge).
- Most, G. (2007), *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia* (Cambridge MA).
- Murray, J. and J. Rowland (2007), 'Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram', in Bing and Bruss (2007), 211–32.
- Murray, P. (1981), 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101, 87–100.
- (2005), 'The Muses: Creativity Personified?', in E. Stafford and J. Herrin (eds.), *Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium* (Aldershot/Burlington VT), 147–59.
- Nagy, G. (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore).
- (1996), *Poetry as Performance* (Cambridge).
- (2007a), 'Lyric and Greek Myth', in R. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology* (Cambridge), 19–51.
- (2007b), 'Did Sappho and Alcaeus Ever Meet?', in A. Bierl, R. Lämmle and K. Wesselmann (eds.), *Literatur Und Religion* (Berlin/New York), 211–69.
- Nauck, A. (1964), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 2nd ed. (Hildesheim).
- Notopoulos, J. (1938), 'Mnemosyne in Oral Literature', *TAPhA* 69, 465–93.
- Obbink, D. (2011), 'Vanishing Conjecture: The Recovery of Lost Books from Aristotle to Eco', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford), 20–49.
- (2014), 'Two New Poems by Sappho', *ZPE* 189, 32–49.
- Page, D. (1979), *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford).
- Parker, A. and E. Sedgwick (eds.) (1995), *Performativity and Performance* (New York/London).
- Parker, H. (1993), 'Sappho Schoolmistress', *TAPhA* 123, 309–51.
- Peirano, I. (2014), '“Sealing” the Book: Sphragis as Paratext', in L. Jansen (ed.) *The Roman Paratext* (Cambridge), 224–42.
- Petusi, A. (ed.) (1955), *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Milan).
- Plant, I. (ed.) (2004), *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome: An Anthology* (Norman).
- Poland, F. (1909), *Geschichte Des Griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig).
- Pomeroy, S. (1975), *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves* (New York).
- (1984), *Women in Hellenistic Egypt* (Detroit).
- Powell, J. (1993), *Sappho, a Garland* (New York).
- Pratt, L. (1995), 'The Seal of Theognis, Writing, and Oral Poetry', *AJPh* 116 (2), 171–84.
- Prins, Y. (1996) 'Sappho's Afterlife in Translation', in E. Greene (ed.), *Re-reading Sappho: Reception and Transmission* (Berkeley), 36–67.
- (1999), *Victorian Sappho* (Princeton).
- Pucci, P. (1998), *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer* (Lanham).
- Race, W. (1997), *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments* (Cambridge MA).
- Railton, S. (1991), *Authorship and Audience* (Princeton).
- Rayor, D. and A. Lardinois (eds.) (2014), *Sappho* (Cambridge).
- Rissman, L. (1984), *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho* (Hildesheim/Zurich/New York).
- Rosenmeyer, P. (1997), 'Her Master's Voice: Sappho's Dialogue with Homer', *MD* 39, 123–49.
- (2006), *Ancient Greek Literary Letters: Selections in Translation* (Abingdon/New York).
- Schmitzer, U. (2007), 'Authors,' in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly: Antiquity* (Leiden), 399–403.
- Szczesny, S., F. Moser and W. Wood (2015), 'Beyond Sexist Beliefs: How Do People Decide to Use Gender-Inclusive Language?', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 41 (7), 1–12.
- Scott, J. (1990), *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* (New Haven).
- Segal, C. (1989), 'Archaic Choral Lyric', in P. Easterling and B. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Volume 1, Greek Literature* (Cambridge), 165–201.

- Skinner, M. (1989), 'Sapphic Nossis', *Arethusa* 22, 5-18.
- (1993), 'Nossis Thelyglossos: the Private Text and the Public Book', in E. Greene (ed.) *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Norman), 112–38.
- (2009), 'Aphrodite Garlanded: Eros and Poetic Creativity in Sappho and Nossis', in N. Rabinowitz and L. Auanger (eds.), *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World* (Austin), 60–81.
- Snyder, J. (1991a), 'Public Occasion and Private Passion in the Lyrics of Sappho of Lesbos', in S. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History* (Chapel Hill/London), 1–19.
- (1991b), *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome* (Bristol).
- (1997), *Lesbian Desire in the Lyrics of Sappho* (New York/Chichester).
- Spentzou, E. and D. Fowler (eds.) (2002), *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature* (Oxford).
- Stehle, E. (1981), 'Sappho's Private World', *Women's Studies* 8 (1-2), 47–63.
- (1997), *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece* (Princeton).
- Svenbro, J. (1984), *La Parola e Il Marmo: Alle Origini Della Poetica Greca* (Torino).
- Taplin, O. (1993), *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase Paintings* (Oxford).
- Taran, S. (1979), 'The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram', *Columbia Studies in Classical Thought* 9, 132–49.
- Theodorakopoulos, E. (1997), 'Closure: the Book of Virgil', in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge), 155–66.
- Thomas, R. (1992), *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- Trendall, A. and T. Webster (1971), *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London).
- Treu, M. (1963), *Sappho* (Munich).
- Veremans, J. (2006). 'La Sphragis Dans Les Amores d'Ovide: Une Approche Stylistique Et Rhétorique', *Latomus* 65 (2), 378–87.
- Vivante, B. (ed.) (1999), *Women's Roles in Ancient Civilizations: A Reference Guide*. (Westport/London).
- Voigt, E. (1971), *Fragmenta: Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam).
- Walsh, G. (1991), 'Callimachean Passages: the Rhetoric of Epigram in Epigram', *Arethusa* 24, 77-106.
- West, M. (2002), 'The View From Lesbos', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Epea Pteroenta: Beiträge Zur Homerforschung* (Stuttgart), 207–19.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, von, U. (1913), *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über Griechische Lyriker* (Berlin).
- (1919), 'Lese Früchte', *Hermes* 54 (1), 46–74.
- Williamson, M. (1995), *Sappho's Immortal Daughters* (Cambridge MA).
- Winkler, J. (1981), 'Gardens of Nymphs: Public and Private in Sappho's Lyrics', in Foley (1981), 63–89.
- (1990), *The Constraints of Desire* (New York/London).
- Winkler, M. M. (1987), '“Tuque Optime Vates”: Musaeus in Book Six of the Aeneid', *AJPh* 108 (4), 655–60.
- Woodbury, L. (1952), 'The Seal of Theognis', in M. White (ed.), *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood* (Toronto), 20–41.
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2009), 'Sappho and Alcaeus', in Budelmann (2009), 204–26.

NOTES

1. The idea for this paper was developed after hearing a lecture given by Tim Whitmarsh at the Oxford TORCH Lecture on Gender, Literature and Culture, 'What is Women's Writing?,' at Oxford University on 9th May 2014. My sincere thanks go to Emily Greenwood, Gregory Nagy, Tim Whitmarsh, Irene Peirano Garrison and Joshua Billings for their insightful comments and advice, as well as to the anonymous referees at *Ramus* for their extremely helpful feedback; any remaining errors are my own.

2. On linguistic relativity, where different linguistic structures are seen as defining individuals' experiences (known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis), see the collected works of Benjamin Lee Whorf in Carroll, Levinson, and Lee (2012), especially 173-204. For a recent overview of the field, see Gentner and Goldin-Meadow (2003), and for a popular account of the importance of names in constructing experience, see Alter (2013), 7-25.

3. On the connection between naming and identity, see Alford (1987), Dion (1983), Kaplan and Bernays (1999).

4. Black and Juhn (2000), 450.

5. Jong (1980), 117; see also 12n. below.

6. Hellinger and Bussmann (2001), 7, and, more recently, Sczesny, Moser and Wood (2015); see also Corbett (1991), Kern (1961) on grammatical gender more broadly.

7. Cheshire (1985), Cheshire (2008). There is still a certain *aporia* in scholarly circles, particularly as regards Sappho: whilst Dirk Obbink calls Sappho 'the poet' in his 2014 article on the 'new Sappho' (Obbink [2014], 34), for example, in 2011 he labelled her 'the poetess' (Obbink [2011], 33; compare also Hardie [2005]). By way of comparison, in a recent radio programme on Radio 4's *In Our Time*, Melvyn Bragg introduced Sappho thus: 'Where Homer was the poet, Sappho was the poetess' (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b05pqsk4>, broadcast 09:00 on 09/04/2015 Radio 4). For a similar formulation in Wharton's introduction to his edition of Sappho, see Prins (1999), 59.

8. Diehl (1940), Durante (1976), Ford (1994), 90-130, Ford (2002), 131-157, K. Morgan (1993), Svenbro (1984), M. M. Winkler (1987).

9. See further pages 2-3 below.

10. See Schmitzer (2007), 400. Beecroft (2010), 17 summarises the different categories of authorship attribution in ancient Greek literature: 'In ancient Greece, texts come with varying kinds of claims of authorship. Some, such as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, are unambiguously attributed to a named author, although they contain no unambiguous internal markers of authorship and although nothing can be said with certainty concerning the man to whom they are attributed. Some, such as the remainder of the so-called Epic Cycle in Greece, are attributed to one or more completely unknown individuals, with competing attributions for the same text. Some, such as the poetry of Archilochus or Sappho, are composed in something like a consistent authorial persona, even though we know next to nothing about the man (or woman) behind the name. Some, such as the poetry of Pindar, come to us in a recognizable style and with an occasional content so specific that the poems themselves must date to a specific historical context. Finally, there are named authors without texts attached to their names.' On *sphragis* see below, 12n.; on the poetic *Lives*, see Farrell (2002), M. Lefkowitz (2012).

11. My definition of authorship in ancient Greek literature owes much to that given by Donald Behme in his unpublished dissertation, *Norms of Authorship in Ancient Greece* (Behme 2007), 10. For another definition of authorship in ancient Greece, see Beecroft (2010), 16, on which see below, 31n.

12. For comparative analyses of strategies of authorial self-naming in time periods and cultures outside those of ancient Greece and Rome, see de Looze (1991) and Bassanese (1989). Note, however, that de Looze and Bassanese focus on the self-naming of the poet as either word-play (Bassanese) or a form of signature (de Looze). The use of self-naming as signature (*sphragis*) in antiquity has been copiously addressed: see, for example, Peirano (2014) for a general survey, and Prins (1999), 8-13 (on Sappho), Pratt (1995) and Woodbury (1952) (on Theognis), Race (1997), 297 n.5 (on Pindar), D. Fowler (1989) and Theodorakopoulos (1997), esp. 161f. (on Virgil), Veremans (2006) (on Ovid), etc. The project here differs in scope and perspective, focusing specifically on the terminology used by female authors to describe their own authorship, instead of/alongside the use of their name as signature. See further 35n. below.

13. See further p.17 below.

14. The relationship between male poet and female Muse has undergone a significant amount of scrutiny in recent years, particularly in the light of feminist scholarship. Some scholars have seen the Muse as a figure for women's disempowerment, an explicit refusal of agency to the female figure by the transferral of inspiration to the male bard, and a complicit agent in the silencing of female voices: see, for example, Gubar (1981), Joplin (2002), and Spentzou and Fowler (2002). For an attempt to 'reclaim' the Muse as a positive figure for women's artistic production, see Murray (2005).

15. On the relationship between male bard and female Muse, invoked from Homeric epic on, see, inter alia, Calhoun (1938), Ford (1994), Minchin (1995), Minton (1960), Murray (1981), Pucci (1998), esp. 44f. In terms of male authors connecting female poets to the Muse, the most salient example in this context is Sappho, who is often named as the tenth Muse or as a devotee of the Muses in antiquity; see *Anth. Pal.* 7.14, 7.407, 9.66, 9.189, 9.506, and see further the Appendix.

16. Note that there is, of course, a difference between what male authors called women writers and what women called themselves. In this paper, I am interested in what women writers called themselves; male terminology for female poets and the difference between their two semiotics, as well as the terminology that

male authors used to apply to themselves in contrast/comparison to that applied to women, will be explored in another, forthcoming paper.

17. See Ford (2002), and see further 60n. below.

18. See the well-known passage from *Odyssey* 17, in which Eumaeus lists the male bard (ἄοιδος, 385) amongst a list of ‘skilled craftsmen’ (δημοεργοί, 383). The full passage is quoted below: τίς γὰρ δὴ ξείνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν / ἄλλον γ’, εἰ μὴ τῶν οἱ δημοεργοὶ ἔασι, / μάντιν ἢ ἰητήρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων, / ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἄοιδόν, ὃ κεν τέληρσιν ἀείδων; (*Od.* 17.382-385). See also *Il.* 24.720, *Od.* 3.270, 3.267, 4.17, 8.87 etc., and Hes. *Theog.* 95, 99; *Op.* 26. On the epic bard, see Ford (1994), 90-130 and Gold (1987), 15-17; on the semantics of the term ἄοιδος, see Koller (1965) and Maslov (2009).

19. Ford (2002), 137, esp. 23n.

20. Ford (2002), 154.

21. Ford (2002), 157.

22. Ford (2002), 294; see also 134, ‘By the fourth century, writers on poetry enjoyed a range of generic terms formed from this suffix to name composers of dithyrambs, elegies, iambics, comedies, and fables or stories (διθυραμβοποιός, ἐλεγειοποιός, ἰαμβοποιός, κωμωδοποιός, and μυθοποιός).’

23. See further the Appendix to this paper. Terms applied by male authors to female authors are, in alphabetical order: ἀοιδόπολος (of Sappho, *Anth. Pal.* 7.17); ἀοιδός (of the Muse [*E. Rh.* 386], Sappho [*Anth. Pal.* 7.14]); λυρική (of Sappho [*Anth. Pal.* 7.17] and Corinna [*Suda* K 2087]); μελοποιός (of Sappho [*Lucian Imagines* 18, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 19] and Corinna [*Heraclides of Miletus, Grammar*]); μετρική (of Sappho, Menander, *On Display Oratory* [9.132, 134s. Walz, 3. 333, 334s. Spengel]); Μοῦσα (of Sappho, *Anth. Pal.* 7.14, 9. 506); μουσοποιός (of Sappho, *Hdt.* 2.135); ποιητής (of Sappho, Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 40 [v214ss. Usener-Rademacher]); ποιήτρια (of Sappho, Strabo *Geography* 17.1.33, Galen 4.771, Pausanias *Description of Greece* 8.18.5, Aelian V. H. 12.19 [p. 135 Dilts], Athenaeus 10. 450e [ii 479 Kaibel]; of Corinna, *P. Oxy.* 2438 col. ii); ὕμνοποιός (of the Muse, *E. Rh.* 651); ψάλτρια (of Sappho, *Suda* Σ 108 [iv 323 Adler] – though note here this is in reference to the ‘second Sappho’).

24. The fragmentary condition of Sappho is the most well-known example of the ‘gaps’ in our knowledge of female literary production; see Gubar (1984), 46f.

25. Plant (2004), 1 and 1n. The count of female writers of Greek is mine, based on the list of attested women writers of the Greco-Roman world in Plant’s *Anthology* (Plant [2004], 243-249), and includes only non-legendary women.

26. In the archaic period, we find the culture of female silencing perhaps most clearly illustrated in Telemachus’ silencing of Penelope (*Od.* 1.358-9), on which see Beard (2014). Compare Thucydides’ famous rendition of Pericles’ funeral speech: τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως μὴ χεῖροσι γενέσθαι ὑμῖν μεγάλη ἢ δόξα καὶ ἢς ἂν ἐπ’ ἐλάχιστον ἀρετῆς πέρι ἢ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ἢ (*Thuc.* 2.45.2); we might compare Soph. *Aj.* 293, γυναῖ, γυναῖξὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγῇ φέροι. Much later, in his *Moralia*, Plutarch makes a similar observation: δεῖ δὲ μὴ μόνον τὸν πῆχυν ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τὸν λόγον δημόσιον εἶναι τῆς σώφρονος, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν ὡς ἀπογύμνωσιν αἰδεῖσθαι καὶ φυλάσσεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτός: ἐνοράται γὰρ αὐτῇ καὶ πάθος καὶ ἦθος καὶ διάθεσις λαλούσης (*Plut. Mor.* 142c-d). Other sources are given in M. Lefkowitz and Fant (2005). See especially Lardinois and McClure (2001) and McClure (2009) on female silencing in classical Athens, and also R. Fowler (1983), 338, M. Lefkowitz (1981), 1.

27. This, of course, increased over time: Cole (1981) provides a clear discussion of the development of female literacy in ancient Greece, whilst Chrystal (2013), 66-81, Hemelrijk (1999) and T. Morgan (1998) are good introductions for Hellenistic Greece and Rome. As ever, the lack or disappearance of a woman’s tradition of writing in the ancient world is precisely what prevents us from knowing if there really was one, and literacy proves just as hard to trace; however, Cole’s formulation, that ‘literacy is not universal in antiquity, that the level of literacy varies from place to place and from time to time, but that in all places women are less likely to be literate than men’ (Cole [1981], 219) provides a useful starting point. On the papyrological evidence and broader context of women’s reading and writing, see Bagnall and Cribiore (2006), Cavallo (1995).

28. The question of the ‘femaleness’ of the voice in ancient women poets has centred mostly around Sappho, although Marilyn Skinner’s work on Nossis (Skinner [1993]) has covered similar ground: see especially Lardinois (2001), and Carson (1980), Greene (2008), Greene (1994), J. Winkler (1990), 165.

29. See above, 25n. This differs from the performance of female characters in male-authored texts by female performers (e.g. choral lyric of Alcman), or male performers impersonating the female voice (the male actors playing female characters in Athenian tragedy and comedy); on which see Lardinois and McClure (2001) and Stehle (1997).

30. The topic of oral performance in archaic and classical Greece, both epic and lyric, has burgeoned in the last fifty years: see in particular, amongst the many works of scholarship addressing this issue, Athanassaki and Bowie (2011), Bakker (2009), Carey (2009), Calame (1977), Edmunds and Wallace (1997), Kurke (2000), Lord (2000), Minchin (2011), Nagy (1996) and Nagy (2007a), Stehle (1997). On the relationship of women to oral performance, see Klinck (2008), Kurke (2000), Thomas (1992), Snyder (1991b), xif. and Stehle (1997), 71-118. Bing (1988) is the classic analysis of the transition from oral performance to the written texts of Hellenistic Alexandria; see further Cameron (1995).

31. On the performativity of authorship, see Railton (1991), 3-22 and Whitney Helms’ unpublished dissertation, Helms (2013). Beecroft’s ‘scenes of authorship’ (Beecroft [2010], 1 and 1 n.2) come closest to identifying the performativity of authorship in ancient Greece, although he does not explicitly theorise them as such; see also Beecroft (2010), 16 for a definition of authorship that comes close to my own, though Beecroft’s

emphasis is placed more on the context of composition and/or performance. On re-performance and the question of the ‘I’ of choral lyric, see 36n. below.

32. Butler (1988), 519f. The connection between performativity and gender is elucidated by Judith Butler in her important volume, *Gender Trouble* (1999), expanding on her 1988 article, ‘Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: an Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory.’ See further Case (1990), 251-330, and A. Parker and Sedgwick (1995): 5f.

33. Stehle (1997), 11. See also Murray and Rowland (2007), 211.

34. Austin (1975), 61.

35. The texts (and authors) were chosen after an extensive survey of surviving female-authored texts in Plant (2004), looking specifically for the presence of substantive nouns describing authorship (which therefore meant the exclusion both of instances of *sphragis*, as in Nossis, and non-substantive poetic reflexivity, as in Corinna). Note that it is often said periphrastically that women ‘wrote’, e.g. (of Sappho) γέγραφεν δὲ βυβλίῃ ἐννέα μὲν λυρικά, ἐλεγείων δὲ καὶ ἄλλων? ἔν (P. Oxy. 1800 fr.1, in Campbell (ed.) *Greek Lyric 1*: 4, or (of Sappho) ποιήσεως χάριν (Strabo, *Geog.* 13.2.3 (iii) 65s. Kramer) (Campbell 8). These instances have not been analysed here, as the project at hand focuses on uncovering the terminology used substantively by women to address their own authorship. See also 12n. above, which further outlines my approach.

36. It is important to note here that the extent to which we can see Sappho as the sole authorial voice in her poems is not unambiguous, given the ongoing debate about her performance context; the so-called *Sapphofrage*, the question of the extent to which Sappho’s compositions were sung as monody, choral lyric, or were entirely written, is still far from resolved. Lardinois (1996) in particular gives a concise and thoughtful analysis of the current state of the debate over Sapphic performance; he suggests that Sappho’s poetry was performed mostly in public, either by a singing and dancing χορός or by a soloist in concert with a choral performance (170). Opinions range from Denys Page’s assertion that ‘there is nothing to contradict the natural supposition that, with [the] one small exception [of *epithalamia*], all or almost all of her poems were recited by herself informally to her companions’ (Page [1979], 119) to Judith Hallett’s more cautious suggestion that ‘many of Sappho’s fragments thought to be personal, autobiographical statements might in fact be part of public, if not marriage, hymns sung by other females’ (Hallett [1996], 141). On the performance context of choral lyric, see in particular Athanassaki and Bowie (2011), Calame (1977), Carey (2009), Davies (1988), Nagy (2007a), Segal (1989), Stehle (1997), Yatromanolakis (2009). On the performance context of Sappho, see, *inter alia*, Calame (1996), Gentili (1988) esp. 216-222, Kurke (2000), Lardinois (1996), Nagy (2007b), H. Parker (1993), Snyder (1991a). On the much-studied use of the first person in choral lyric (particularly Alcman and Pindar), see D’Alessio (1994), Danielewicz (1990), Davies (1988) esp. 54f., Klinck (2001), Lardinois (1996), M. Lefkowitz (1963).

37. The text is taken from Campbell (1982).

38. Treu (1963), 223.

39. Rayor and Lardinois (2014), 129. On the grammatical features of the generic masculine, see Hellinger and Bussmann (2001), 9f.

40. Treu (1963), 223.

41. Hellinger and Bussmann (2001), 9.

42. Hellinger and Bussmann (2001), 10.

43. See above, p.4f.

44. The text is taken from Campbell (1982).

45. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913), 73, Kranz (1949), 88, Burnett (1983), 211.

46. See Page (1979), 132n1: ‘The gloss οἰκία on ἐν μοισ. has ousted a word (prob. not δόμοι, *sim.*); πρόποι τὰδε is changed to τὰδε πρόποι for the sake of the metre; it may be that further change is required to restore the same metre to both lines.’ See also Lardinois (1996), 155. Page (1979), 132n1 refutes the replacement δόμοι, which Lardinois (1996), 155 and Voigt (1971), 140, on the other hand, accept. Most critics, as shown above, agree that, whatever the solution to the troubled line-end, the phrase ἐν μοισοπόλων (as Lardinois [1996], 155n25 points out) ‘means by itself “in the abode of the servants of the Muses”’. For other readings of this fragment, see Hardie (2005), 14-17 and 20-22, who reads the fragment as an interdiction from the poet against mourning on her death; Lanata (1996), 14; Page (1979), 133; Snyder (1997), 118.

47. It is therefore possible that Sappho may have coined the term herself. The noun occurs 25 times in the corpus of ancient Greek literature (the count is discrete, i.e. I do not include quotations of epigrams in other sources already included in the count – hence the discrepancy with the TLG’s count of 42), and 21 times excluding post-classical sources. The sources were searched using the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/index.php>. See further 50n. below.

48. This would then be equivalent to saying ἐν ἡμῶν οἰκία, with μοισοπόλων acting as a substantive for the first person plural. See 45n.

49. I have chosen to use the Attic spelling of μοισοπόλος (Aeol. μοισοπόλος) in the main text of the article to avoid confusion.

50. μοισοπόλος occurs elsewhere in an inscription referring to a theatrical group, ‘the distinguished synod of artist-musicians’ (ἑσθλή τεχνιῶν μοισοπόλων σύνοδος, *IG* vii.2484; see Poland [1909], 206f.); at Eur. *Alc.* 444-47 to refer to professional citharoedists – leading Hardie (2005), 15 to speculate that μοισοπόλος ‘was an East Greek coinage applied to professional musicians, perhaps given later currency at Athens by Hellanicus’ – and at *Phoen.* 1499-1501, to refer (again) to professional threnodists. See also Degani and Burzacchini (1977), 185, who state that μοισοπόλος becomes ‘[un] semplice equivalente di ποιητής, solo meno prosastico’, and Lardinois (1996), 155, Calame (1977), 367.

51. Lanata (1996), 14; Burnett (1983), 211. Other scholars who favour the cultic reading of *μουσοπόλοι* include Degani and Burzacchini (1977), 185, Gentili (1988), 84, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913), 73, 78. Contra Page (1979), 139f.: ‘we have found, and shall find, no trace of any formal or official or professional relationship between [Sappho and her companions]: no trace of Sappho the priestess, Sappho the president of a cult-association, Sappho the principal of an academy.’

52. I am grateful to Egbert Bakker for pointing out that the *πολ-* formations are all from the IE root *k-el(H)-, which originally had the meaning ‘move, twist, turn’ (see further Fortson [2010], 130). This became weakened in ancient Greek *πέλω/πέλομαι* (‘be’, ‘be constituted’), but was retained with derived words in the agricultural or ritual sphere (*αἰπόλος*, *βούκολος*, *θειοπόλος*, *ιεραπόλος*, *μελισσοπόλος*, *μουσοπόλος*, *οιοπόλος* and so on). A full list of nouns formed with the *-πόλος* suffix (conducted via LSJ and the TLG online) is provided here for reference: *ἀγνο-πόλος* (making pure), *αἴπολ-ος* (goatherd), *ἄκρο-πόλος* (high-ranging), *ἀμφίπολος* (busy; handmaid; attendant of gods), *ἀοῖδο-πόλος* (busied with song; poet), *ἄπολος* (immovable), *βου-πόλος* (tending oxen), *δικασ-πόλος* (one who gives law; a judge), *δί-πολος* (twice-ploughed), *ἐπίπολος* (companion), *ιερα-πόλος* (chief priest), *ιερο-πρόσπολος* (sacred attendant, priest), *ἵππο-πόλος* (herding horses), *ἱεροπόλος* (priest or priestess), *μακρό-πολος* (long), *μαντι-πόλος* (frenzied, inspired), *μελισσο-πόλος* (keeping bees), *μετεωρο-πόλος* (busy self with high things), *μητρο-πόλος* (tending mothers), *μουσο-πόλος* (serving the Muses, poetic), *μυρο-πόλος* (busy about scented oils, selling unguents), *ναο-πόλος* (dwelling or busied in a temple; overseer of a temple), *νεκρ-ηπόλος* (having to do with the dead), *νυκτι-πόλος* (roaming, by night), *οιο-πόλος* (tending sheep), *οἰωνο-πόλος* (one busied with cries or flight of birds, an augur), *ὄρεο-πόλος* (haunting mountains), *περίπολος* (going the rounds, patrolling; watchman; attendant), *πρόπολος* (servant that goes before one, attendant, minister), *πρόσπολος* (servant, attendant, handmaid), *θαλαμήπολ-ος* (attendant in a chamber, lady's maid), *θειο-πόλος* (minister), *θεμιστοπόλος* (ministering law and right), *θεο-πόλος* (priest), *θεο-πρόσπολος* (priest), *θυηπόλος* (performing sacrifices, diviner, priest), *συμπερί-πολος* (fellow watchman), *τετρά-πολος* (ploughed four times), *τρι-πολος* (ploughed three times), *ὑμνο-πόλος* (composing songs of praise; poet), *ὑψι-πολος* (soaring on high).

53. A good example of this is the noun *δικασπόλος* (‘judge’), which clearly suggests ‘one who oversees the law’.

54. It is interesting and productive to compare Herodotus’ choice of *μουσοποιός* for Sappho with his use of *λογοποιός* to refer to Aesop (Hdt. 2.134) and Hecateus (2.143, 5.36, 5.125). Joel Lidov’s note in his article, ‘Sappho, Herodotus, and the “Hetaira”’ is of particular importance: ‘Hartog treats *musopoios* and *logopoios* ([in reference to Aesop] and in Herodotus’ references to Hecataeus) as two species of *mythopoios*, *mythos* always being unreliable in Herodotus. But although *-poios* may be pejorative, given the prominence of the contrast between poetry and *logos* in the Helen digression (2.112-20, where the Egyptian version is always a *logos*, but the Greek version is only a *logos* in 118.1.1, when it is not attributed directly to Homer), and considering the emphasis on *logos* throughout Book 2, that contrast cannot be written out of [the Aesop] passage. Poetry is intimately connected with *mythoi*; *logoi* are not, and may or may not be reliable’ (Lidov [2002], 212n18). On the significance of the noun *λογοποιός*, see further Kurke (2010), 371f.

55. Macaulay (1890) has ‘lyric poet’; Godley (1920) has ‘poetess’.

56. Rayor and Lardinois (2014), 81; also favoured by Snyder (1997), 118. Contrast Carson (2009), 303, who translates as simply ‘in a house of the Muses’.

57. Powell (1993), 6.

58. Hardie (2005), 14.

59. This is in direct opposition to Hardie, who fails to notice the distinctly personal flavour of the *-πόλος* suffix (Hardie [2005], 14f.); his observation, however, that the ritual phrase *οὐ γὰρ θέμις* ‘helps us to hear both “music” and “Muse” in *μοισοπόλων*’ is helpful (Hardie [2005], 15). It may be of significance here that Sappho was later known as the tenth Muse: see Williamson (1995), 14-18.

60. Note that Ford (2002), 132f. observes that, although less common given the fragmentary nature of archaic poetry, there are at least two occurrences (in Solon and Theognis, respectively) of the use of the verb *ποιεῖν* in the sense of ‘making song’ which suggest that there may be ‘pre-classical evidence, albeit isolated, for a widespread connection of “making song”’ (Ford [2002], 132). This is suggestive, at the very least, of the fact that the vocabulary of *ποιεῖν* and its cognates for song-making and authorship may have been available to Sappho.

61. Aloni (1997), 248 also makes this connection; see also Ferrari (2010), 147. On the relationship between Sappho and Hesiod, see Clay (1980), West (2002), 215. On Sappho’s engagement with Homer, which has been much more extensively explored, see Blondell (2010), duBois (1997), 98-126, Rissman (1984), Rosenmeyer (1997), Snyder (1997), 63-77.

62. The text is taken from Most (2007).

63. Compare also Archilochus fr. 1, *εἰμὶ δ’ ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίου ἄνακτος / καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος* (‘I am the servant of lord Enyalios and skilled in the lovely gift of the Muses’, tr. Gerber).

64. Nagy (1979), 293.

65. Nagy (1979), 292.

66. See LSJ s.v. *θεράπων*.

67. Note also that the effect of the Muses’ song is explicitly said to occur within the halls of Olympus, with *δῶματα* repeated twice within three lines: *γελά δέ τε δῶματα πατρὸς / Ζηνὸς ἐριγδοῦπιον θεῶν ὅτι λειριοέση / σκιδναμένη: ἦχε δὲ κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου / δῶματά τ’ ἀθανάτων* (*Theog.* 40-43) [emphasis mine].

68. Compare Page DuBois' analysis of Sappho's unusual intimacy with Aphrodite, another female goddess, at DuBois (1997), 24, 80.

69. See, in particular, Stehle (1981) and J. Winkler (1981). See also Snyder (1997), 58: 'just as Sappho fragment 2... creates a private "female" space in the description of the sanctuary to which Aphrodite is invited, so [fragment 94] constructs a private world of intimate physical sensuality that can be recalled – again and again – through song'. On the symbolic, gendered space of house and temple in ancient Greece, see Cole (2004), Pomeroy (1975), 79-83.

70. On Sappho's closeness to the Muses as a means of justifying her poetic project, see Snyder (1997), 118. For the Muses in Sappho more generally, see Hardie (2005), in particular n.10.

71. Note that this is the first time that the word μουσολόγος appears in extant Greek literature; see above, 47n.

72. On the text, see Plant (2004), 44 and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1919), 71f. The text quoted here is that given at Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1919), 71. As Wilamowitz notes, William Paton corrected Εὐρυδίχη Ἰεραπολιήτις in line 1 to Εὐρυδίχη Ἴρρα πολιητίσι, that is, 'Eurydice daughter of Irras, dedicated this to the Muses of the city', which Plant in turn corrects to Εὐρυδίχη Σίρρα on the basis on inscriptions discovered at Vergina, suggesting that Eurydice was the daughter of Sirras of Lyncestis.

73. On Eurydice's background, see Carney (2000), 38-50.

74. Mikalson (2010), 14f.

75. On the evidence for female literacy in the Hellenistic world, see Cole (1981) and Pomeroy (1984); see also 27n. above.

76. Plant (2004), 44. The full text of the Plutarch passage reads: 'We ought therefore to try every appropriate means of disciplining our children, following the example of Eurydice. She was an Illyrian and a complete barbarian, but late in life she became involved in education because of her children's studies. The epigram she set up to the Muses provides adequate documentation of her love for her children' (tr. M. Lefkowitz and Fant [2005], 166). Compare Quintilian's similar statement, given on the same page in M. Lefkowitz and Fant (2005): 'As for parents, I should like them to be as well educated as possible, and I am not speaking just of fathers. We know that Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, contributed greatly to their eloquence...'

77. Pomeroy (1975), 84-6, Vivante (1999), 239. Xen. *Oec.* 7.10f., cited at M. Lefkowitz and Fant (2005), 101, provides an example: '“Tell me, woman, have you thought yet why it was that I took you and your parents gave you to me? That it was not for want of someone else to spend the night with – this is obvious, I know, to you too. Rather, when I considered for myself, and your parents for you, whom we might take as the best partner for the household and children, I chose you...”' Compare also the portrayal of Euphiletus' relationship with his wife at Lys. 1.6, the purpose of which is considered fulfilled after the birth of their son (quoted at Pomeroy [1975], 81f.): 'Athenians, when I decided to marry, and brought a wife to my house, for a while I was inclined not to bother her, but neither was she to be too free to do as she wished. I watched her as much as was possible, and took my duty as a husband seriously. But when my son was born, I began to trust her, and put all my possessions in her hands, presuming that this was the greatest proof of intimacy.'

78. See LSJ s.v. ἠβᾶω.

79. Cixous (1976), 881.

80. Prins (1996), 47. On Antiphanes' *Sappho*, see further Ceccarelli (2013), 244-257 and Rosenmeyer (2006), 24-26.

81. See 76n. above. For ancient sources on the dangers of female education, see M. Lefkowitz and Fant (2005), 31-34.

82. And indeed, the Muses are directly connected to Eurydice by the pairing of the two nouns at the beginning of the lines of the first distich (Εὐρυδίχη ... Μούσαις).

83. See Hes. *Theog.* 53-80.

84. Murray (2005), Notopoulos (1938).

85. Lanser (1992), 11; see also Irigaray (1985), 76-78.

86. For a similar reading of the 'hidden transcripts' behind 'powerless' voices, see Scott (1990).

87. There is some contention around the date; see Gow and Page (1965), 2.434.

88. Skinner (1993), 128. The majority of the current bibliography on Nossis either focuses on her relationship to Sappho or her specifically female voice and context: for the former, see Barnard (1978), 210, Bowman (1998), Gow and Page (1965), 2.442, Skinner (1989) and Skinner (2009), Taran (1979), 148n34 etc.; on the latter, Furiani (1991) and Skinner (1993). On Nossis' Hellenistic context, see Gigante (1974), and on her relation to the epigrammatic genre, Gutzwiller (1998). For a full survey of recent bibliography on Nossis, see Bowman (2004), 1 n.1.

89. Skinner (1993), 129.

90. Skinner (1993), 115. For 'the peculiarly female timbre of Nossis' voice', see Skinner (1993), 112.

91. *Anth. Pal.* 7.414. The text is taken from Gow and Page (1965).

92. See Gow and Page (1965), 2.441f.

93. On the vase paintings which are our only evidence for what these tragic farces might have consisted of, see Taplin (1993), 48-52, and Trendall and Webster (1971), 117-144.

94. Plant (2004), 63. As Bowman (1998), 40 points out, the conventions of the epigrammatic epitaph were well established by the time of Nossis. See further Walsh (1991) and, in particular, Lattimore (1962), 230-237 and Meyer (2007), 191 for the motif of epitaphs appealing to passers-by.

95. Taplin (1993), 49.

96. Skinner (1993), 124.

97. Skinner (1993), 124.
98. See Snyder (1991b), 77: ‘unlike Anyte, who chooses to remain absent as a first-person character in her verse, Nossis presents herself by name in three of her epigrams, creating a vivid persona of a woman who celebrates the delights of Eros and who proclaims herself a follower of the poetic tradition of Sappho.’
99. Gutzwiller (1997), 219.
100. Gutzwiller (1997), 219.
101. Murray and Rowland (2007), 213.
102. Hünemörder (2006), 750.
103. Loraux (1998), 57-65.
104. I cite the Greek version of the myth here; the later Latin poets reverse the story to suggest that Procne became the swallow and Philomela the nightingale; see Loraux (1998), 57 n.2 and Lutwack (1994), 1. On the nightingale motif in ancient Greek and Roman literature, see Chandler (1934), Hünemörder (2006), Lutwack (1994), 1-16, Monella (2005).
105. *Od.* 19.518-523, Aesch. *Ag.* 1142-1148.
106. Holst-Warhaft (1992), 1.
107. Loraux (1998), 60.
108. The phrase ‘nightingale of the Muses’ appears in only one other instance in ancient Greek literature, in a fragment of Euripides’ *Palamedes* quoted in Diog. Laert. 2.44.5 (see also fr. 588 Nauck):
 ἐκάνειτ’ ἐκάνετε τὰν
 πάνσοφον, <ὦ Δαναοί,>
 τὰν οὐδὲν ἀλγύνουσαν ἀηδόνα μουσῶν [emphasis mine]
 which Hicks translates: ‘Ye have slain, have slain, the all-wise, the innocent, the Muses’ nightingale.’ Interestingly, the phrase does occur again in an inscription at *IGUR* iii.1342.1-2: τὴν Μουσέων χαρτίεσσαν ἀηδόνα, τὴν μελίγηρον / Αὔκταν (translated by Hutchinson as ‘the graceful nightingale of the Muses, the honey-voiced Aucta’; see further Hutchinson [2013], 320). Much more common, however, is the trope of the poet (especially lyric) described as nightingale (with the qualifying ‘of the Muses’ omitted): see, for example, Bacchyl. *Ep.* 3.98 Κηΐας ἀηδόνοσ (‘the Cean nightingale,’ of himself), Thgn. 938.1 Οὐ δύναμαι φωνῆι λίγ’ ἀειδέμεν ὡσπερ ἀηδῶν (‘I cannot sing sweet and clear like the nightingale,’ tr. Edmonds), etc. The rarity of the occurrence of the collocation Μουσῶν ἀηδῶν hints at the significance in Nossis’ choice of the phrase, and particularly, the importance of her emphasis on her connection to the Muses.
109. Compare epigram 11, where she calls herself Μούσαισι φίλαν.
110. See 93n. above. There is even further significance in the fact that Nossis has chosen to write this poem in the form of elegiac couplets, which are never used in tragedy, suggesting the complete appropriation of Rhinthon into her own voice; whilst the nightingale is programmatically associated with elegy – see Monella (2005). The nightingale thus also becomes a sign of Nossis’ own generic/gender-transformative power.
111. Also derived from ἀείδω, see LSJ s.v. ᾄτιδος.
112. See 18n. above.
113. See the *scholia* on Hes. *Op.* 202a, in Petusi (1955), 75. See further J. Lefkowitz (2014), 7f.