

Herodotus, the Old Sappho and the Newest Sappho

Giulia Donelli

University of Bristol, UK

Abstract This paper focuses on Herodotus' mention of Sappho in the *Histories* (2.134-5). Through the analysis of some of the extant sources on the involvement of her brother Charaxus with the *hetaira* Doricha/Rhodopis, it advances an interpretation of Sappho's fr. 55 V as relevant to the affair. It then draws attention to Herodotus' description of courtesans, in the same context, with the poetic term αἰδῖμος. The adjective occurs only once in Homer, in the self-deprecating words that Helen speaks to Hector (*Il.* 6.354-8). Such Homeric echo might be understood as triggering an allusion to Sappho's own treatment of Helen in fr. 16 V: Helen's behaviour in that poem in fact closely matches no one other's than Charaxus' own. The possibility that Herodotus might be engaging with more than one Sapphic poem in this context finds a parallel in his engagement with Pindar's poetry in 3.38, where, it has been argued, he 'contaminates' two distinct Pindaric intertexts (fr. 169a and 215 S.-M.). The contamination of thematically linked poems might in turn suggest, in both cases, symptomatic reperformances as possible contexts for Herodotus' reception of Greek lyric poetry.

Keywords Herodotus. Sappho. Rhodopis. Homer. Pindar.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 2 Herodotus' Version (2.134-5): Rhodopis, Aesop, Charaxus and Sappho. – 3 Doricha: Ancient Sources, Modern Readings. – 4 Homer's Helen, Sappho's Helen and Herodotus' *Hetairai*. – 5 Herodotus and Pindar. – 6 Conclusions.



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

Peer review

Submitted	2020-08-07
Accepted	2020-11-16
Published	2021-06-30

Open access

© 2021 | Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License



Citation Donelli, G. (2021). "Herodotus, the Old Sappho and the Newest Sappho". *Lexis*, 39 (n.s.), 1, 13-34.

DOI 10.30687/Lexis/2724-1564/2021/01/001

1 Introduzione

The recent publication of new papyrological finds¹ preserving two unknown poems² by Sappho and contributing to the reading of previously known poems³ has revived interest in the passages where Herodotus refers explicitly to her figure and poetry (2.134-5).⁴ The newly discovered Brothers Poem has now provided an undoubted mention of Charaxus,⁵ and a clear allusion to his trade and travelling activity (lines 1-2),⁶ thereby confirming the Sapphic matrix of at least two elements of the Herodotean narrative. This narrative has been the object of discussion in ancient readership and modern scholarship alike. Beyond the Brothers Poem and a few texts from Sappho's corpus that do not mention Charaxus but are usually considered relevant to the matter (fr. 5, 7 and 15 V),⁷ further ancient sources refer to his squandering of money over a *hetaira*, and to his sister's reaction to the affair in her poetry, including an epigram by Posidippus (17 *HE* = 122 Austin-Bastianini), a passage in Strabo's *Geographica* (17.1.33), and one in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (13.596b-c).⁸ These three texts display points of comparison, to different extents, with Herodotus' story, but they also share a common and crucial difference from it, i.e. the name

1 The *editio princeps* of four fragments of the papyrus, belonging to the Green Collection in Oklahoma City (*P. GC. inv. 105*), is due to Burris, Fish, Obbink 2014; the fifth fragment, which belongs to a private collector in London (*P. Sapph. Obbink*), was edited by Obbink 2014. Cf. West 2014, 1. An updated version of the texts is available in Obbink 2016.

2 Referred to as the Brothers Poem and the Kypris Poem by the editor, D. Obbink.

3 Burris, Fish, Obbink 2014, 1; West 2014, 1; Obbink 2015, 3.

4 See esp. Bettenworth 2014; Burris, Fish, Obbink 2014; Ferrari 2014; Liberman 2014; Obbink 2014 and 2015; West 2014; Neri 2015; the several contributions in Bierl, Lardinois 2016; and, most recently, Kazanskaya 2019. The matter had already received scholarly attention in the first decade of the 2000s, cf. Lidov 2002; Yatromanolakis 2007.

5 Cf. e.g. Raaflaub 2016, 132-3. For evidence on the names of Sappho's brothers see Di Benedetto 1982.

6 Cf. e.g. Raaflaub 2004, 210; Tandy 2004, 188; *contra* Möller 2000, 55, 86 and *passim*, who thinks of Charaxus as more of a traveller or adventurer. The new Brothers Poem indeed encourages the identification of Charaxus as a trader.

7 On fr. 5 and 15 V cf. already Grenfell, Hunt 1898, 10; 1914, 20. Page 1955, 50 states that neither fr. 5 nor fr. 15 V represent "the poem to which Herodotus alludes". See also Aloni 1983, 28 and 1997, 20-1 (on fr. 7) and 22-3 (on fr. 15); Caciagli 2011, 256-8; Ferrari 2014, 4-5 (on fr. 5 V) and 9-10 (on fr. 15 V). Lidov 2002, 223-5 denies any connection of fr. 7 or fr. 15 V with Doricha, though he accepts a possible involvement of Charaxus in fr. 5 V (2002, 225-6). The newly published papyrus suggests the likely, though partial, relevance of fr. 5 and 15 to the Herodotean story, cf. Burris, Fish, Obbink 2014, 6. Lardinois 2016, 172 argues for the possible relevance of fr. 3, 7, 9 and 20 V to the story of Charaxus and Doricha.

8 Other sources include Diodorus 1.64.14 (on which see Lidov 2002, 215-16); Plinius *Nat. Hist.* 36.82; the *Epistula Sapphus*, 15.63-8 (whose Ovidian authorship is debated, cf. D'Alessio 2018, 84-5, and the bibliography there quoted; see also the discussion in Kazanskaya 2019); *Vit. Sapph. P.Oxy.* 1800 fr. 1 (= fr. 252 V); *Suda* P 211 Adler.

of the *hetaira*, who is called Doricha instead of Rhodopis in all three. These sources, together with the new fragments of Sappho, provide an essential background for understanding Herodotus's engagement with the poetic tradition in this section of the *Histories*.

2 Herodotus' Version (2.134-5): Rhodopis, Aesop, Charaxus and Sappho

Herodotus introduces his narrative about the Thracian *hetaira* Rhodopis in polemical contradiction to what 'some of the Greeks say'⁹ of the pyramid that he claims to be the legacy of the Pharaoh Mycerinus and not, as these Greeks would want it, of the *hetaira* (2.134).¹⁰ He supports his case with a chronological¹¹ and an economic argument.¹² To substantiate the former, he refers to Aesop as a fellow-slave of Rhodopis under the Samian master Iadmon, and reports a Delphic story, related to the 'maker of λόγοι'¹³ (λογοποιός) that clarifies his point.¹⁴ He then moves to the second argument, supporting it with the narrative of the *hetaira*'s arrival to Egypt under the Samian master Xanthes. He relates that she was there freed, at a great expense, by Charaxus the son of Scamandronymus and brother of Sappho 'the lyric poetess'¹⁵ (μουσοποιός). Another Delphic story follows, that of Rhodopis' dedication of spits in the sanctuary as a tithe of her net worth.¹⁶ After a point on her renown all over Greece, followed by the mention of another famous *hetaira*, Archidice, Herodotus returns, in *Ringkomposition*,¹⁷ to Charaxus' involvement in the events, and refers to a relevant poem by Sappho (ἐν μέλει).

⁹ Nagy 2015 and 2018, 110, after Lidov 2002, 114, understands this as a reference to Hecataeus of Miletus.

¹⁰ On Herodotus' particularly polemical authorial persona in Book 2, see e.g. Cartledge, Greenwood 2002, 354-6.

¹¹ On the chronological issues posited by Hdt. 2.134-5 see e.g. Di Benedetto 1982, 228-30; Aloni 1983, 32 and 1997, *Cronologia* XCVII-CII and 20; Hutchinson 2001, 139; Lidov 2002, 212-13; Lloyd 2010⁷, *Introduzione* 31; Ferrari 2014, 9; Liberman 2014, 12.

¹² Yatromanolakis 2007, 317.

¹³ Powell 1938 s.v. «λογοποιός».

¹⁴ On the association and contrast between Aesop the 'fable maker' (λογοποιός) and Sappho the 'song maker' (μουσοποιός), see Kurke 1999, 223; 2011, 371; Nagy 1990, 224 fn. 54; Yatromanolakis 2007, 318. The term λογοποιός elsewhere (2.143; 5.36, 125) qualifies Hecataeus.

¹⁵ Powell 1938 s.v. «μουσοποιός». The noun rings suggestively similar to Sappho's own μοισόπολος in fr. 150 V οὐ γὰρ θέμις ἐν μοισοπόλων <δομίω> | θρήνον ἔμμεν' <...> οὐ κ' ἄμμι τάδε πρέποι.

¹⁶ Lloyd 2010⁷, 353 finds confirmation to the existence of the dedication in Athenaeus (13.596c) and in epigraphical evidence, on which cf. Jeffery 1990², 102.

¹⁷ Yatromanolakis 2007, 325.

In its intertwining the themes of prostitution, dedications and memorials, the story is well integrated in the wider context of the succession of Egyptian reigns in Book Two of the *Histories*,¹⁸ and shares with the preceding account of Kheops' kingdom in particular (2.126) the emphasis on a prostitute's aspiration to leave behind a memorial.¹⁹ Beyond being relevant to some overarching themes of the Egyptian λόγος, the story of Rhodopis is also consistent with Herodotus' larger agenda of finding ways of showing how much he knows of the history of the Greek world, more broadly than his 'official' agenda of conflict would strictly allow him to do. His focus on Easterners, and his Eastern perspective, in some sense implies that Greece itself is one of the countries for which he has to open up space when moving 'sideways' from his main narrative thread. Hence, for example, we first hear of the Spartans and the Athenians in the *Histories* because Croesus has questions about them (1.56), or we come across Pindar and his 'rightly said' statement on the rule of νόμος in the context of a test undertaken by Darius on Greeks and Callatiae (3.38). Herodotus appears to be constantly on the lookout for occasions to integrate into his narrative the massive amount of material he is in fact willing to include: his mention of Sappho could thus be seen as pertaining to this more general pattern. A closer reading of these passages, however, uncovers a broader and subtler engagement with Sappho's poetry than has hitherto been realised. To support this interpretation, a detour through other mentions of Sappho and Doricha/Rhodopis in some later ancient authors, and discussion of these passages in modern scholarship, is in order.

3 Doricha: Ancient Sources, Modern Readings

Just as Herodotus, Strabo refers to the *hetaira* while describing a pyramid (in Giza, 17.1.33),²⁰ and names Sappho in this context. He claims that the poet called her Doricha, while others call her Rhodopis. Despite remarking on the name difference, he has apparently no reservations about identifying the Sapphic Doricha with the Herodotean Rhodopis.

Conversely, Athenaeus (13.596b-c), who also attests to Sappho's use of the name Doricha for the *hetaira*, claims that Herodotus' equation of the two courtesans is in fact mistaken. To prove his point, he first refers to some lines by Cratinus, now lost from the manuscript

¹⁸ Kurke 1999, 222; Lidov 2002, 207; Yatromanolakis 2007, 315. On the assimilation of Rhodopis with the Egyptian queen Nitokris, see Lloyd 2010⁷, 352; Yatromanolakis 2007, 337; Liberman 2014, 12 fn. 32; and Nagy 2015, 2018.

¹⁹ Lidov 2002, 211; Yatromanolakis 2007, 316.

²⁰ Lidov 2002, 215; Caciagli 2011, 253; Raaflaub 2016, 131-2.

tradition of the *Deipnosophistae*, on Rhodopis' dedication of spits in Delphi (fr. 369 K.-A.); then, he quotes Posidippus' epigram on Doricha (Posidipp. 17 *HE* = 122 Austin-Bastianini), to which I shall return below.

Although Athenaeus' version brings together different sources, it is unlikely to be based on Sappho's poetry, and appears in fact to be dependent on Herodotus' account. For against his usual practice, Athenaeus refrains from quoting a Sapphic poem, but quotes Herodotus, Cratinus, and Posidippus instead.²¹ Furthermore, just like Herodotus, he refers to how Naucratis (his own hometown) usually produced beautiful courtesans, and, in his willingness to improve on his predecessor's version, he displays a rhetorical stance virtually identical to the historiographer's own: just as Herodotus claimed that the Greeks attributing the pyramid to Rhodopis do not even know who she is (2.134.2), Athenaeus speaks of Herodotus' ignorance (ἀγνοῶν). Most importantly, Athenaeus preserves the crucial and controversial piece of information that Sappho attacked *Doricha* in her poetry because of her affair with Charaxus, not her own brother:

ἐνδόξους δὲ ἑταίρας καὶ ἐπὶ κάλλει διαφερούσας ἤνεγκεν καὶ ἡ Ναύκρατις Δωρίχαν τε, ἦν ἡ καλὴ Σαπφῶ ἔρωμένην γενομένην Χαραῖξου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς κατ' ἐμπορίαν εἰς τὴν Ναύκρατιν ἀπαίροντος διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως διαβάλλει ὡς πολλὰ τοῦ Χαραῖξου νοσφισαμένην.²²

Naucratis also produced famous and exceptionally beautiful courtesans, including Doriche, who was a lover of Sappho's brother Charaxus, who sailed to Naucratis on a trading journey; the lovely Sappho abuses her in her poems for extracting a substantial amount of money from Charaxus.

This puzzling piece of information has led some scholars to read Herodotus' passage along similar lines, and thus to understand the 'someone' (μιν) against whom Sappho 'railed violently'²³ (κατεκερτόμησε) in a specific poem (ἐν μέλει) as being in fact the *hetaira*, not Sappho's brother:

Χαράξος δὲ ὡς λυσάμενος Ῥοδῶπιν ἀπενόστησε ἐς Μυτιλήνην, ἐν μέλει Σαπφῶ πολλὰ κατεκερτόμησέ μιν. Ῥοδῶπιος μὲν νυν πέρυ πέπαυμαι.²⁴

²¹ Lidov 2002, 220. See also Kazanskaya 2019, 259.

²² Ath. 13.596b-c. Translation by Olson 2012, 13.

²³ LSJ⁹ s.v. «κατακερτομέω».

²⁴ Hdt. 2.135.6. Translation adapted from Waterfield 2008².

Charaxus, after he bought Rhodopis' freedom, returned to Mytilene, and Sappho bitterly attacked him/her in one of her poems. That is all I have to say about Rhodopis.

This reading, potentially first implied in the above passage from the *Deipnosophistae*, then advanced by Smyth,²⁵ and recently revived by Obbink,²⁶ Ferrari,²⁷ and Kazanskaya,²⁸ although indeed syntactically possible in Greek, is problematic. The emphatic position of Charaxus' name in the *ordo verborum* of the sentence makes him the most likely candidate for the referent of the pronoun,²⁹ just as the context provided for the poem, specifying the 'timing' of Sappho's μέλος as following her brother's return to Mytilene, equally most naturally points to him as the object of Sappho's κερτομία.

On the other hand, Ferrari is right in remarking³⁰ that a scornful tone against Doricha does emerge in part of the Sapphic corpus (fr. 7 and 15 V), whereas no trace of a comparable tone against Charaxus survives in extant poetry. Although the recently discovered fragments of Sappho confirm and broaden our evidence concerning the name of her brother,³¹ her handling of matters relating to his activity of travelling and trading, and the importance appended, from an economic and social standpoint, to this same activity, neither of the new poems seems to fit the description of κερτομία implied in Herodotus' use of the verb κατακερτομέω in reference to her poetic production on Charaxus' affair with Doricha.³² In this respect, I advance an interpretation of a poem from the corpus of the 'Old Sappho' as possibly relevant to the affair, in light of both Herodotus' account and Posidippus' epigram.

Past hypotheses on the identification of the poem referred to by Herodotus within and outside the previously known corpus of Sappho include Fränkel's suggestion that Alcaeus' fr. 117 V would in fact be a Sapphic text of reproach to Charaxus³³ – an interpretation made impossible by the gender of the addressee, which is actually femi-

25 Smyth 1900, 252.

26 Obbink 2014, 41.

27 Ferrari 2014, 10; see also Bowie 2016, 160-1.

28 Kazanskaya 2019.

29 Liberman 2014, 2 fn. 7; Lardinois 2016, 170.

30 Ferrari 2014, 10.

31 Raaflaub 2016, 132-3.

32 Bowie 2016, 160 argues, not persuasively in my view, that Doricha is the addressee of the Brothers Poem.

33 Fränkel 1928, 275; his hypothesis is accepted by Kurke 1999, 226 fn. 10.

nine³⁴ – and Cavallini’s reading, after Diehl,³⁵ of the extremely lacunose fr. 3 V, in light of a comparison with fr. 5 V, as possibly representing the piece of poetry in question.

Another Sapphic fragment (55 V) is occasionally referred to in scholarly analyses of the Herodotean passage,³⁶ though usually only as one among other pieces of evidence³⁷ attesting to Sappho’s capability to produce poetry characterized by a “trenchant and admonitory style”,³⁸ i.e. poems whose tone could provide parallels to justify Herodotus’ use of the verb κατακερτομέω in describing her μέλος. In a recent discussion, the poem has also been mentioned as an instance of “deliberate omission of the name of the criticized person in Sappho”,³⁹ and seen as a possible parallel to the lost fragment of κερτομία against Doricha/Rhodopis which, if equally lacking an addressee, might have contributed to the instability of the *hetaira*’s name in the secondary tradition. The poem, directed against a wealthy and uneducated woman according to the sources preserving it,⁴⁰ reads as follows:

καθθάνοισα δὲ κείσηι οὐδέ ἔστι τις μναμοσύνα σέθεν
ἔσσειτ’ οὐδέ ποτ’ <εἰς> ὕστερον· οὐ γὰρ πεδέχης βρόδων
τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας· ἀλλ’ ἀφάνης κὰν Αἶδα δόμῳ
φοιτάσης πεδ’ ἀμαύρων νεκύων ἐκπεποταμένα.⁴¹

But when you die you will lie dead, and no memory of you will ever survive afterwards, since you have no share in the roses of Pieria. But once flown away you will wander among the obscure dead, invisible even in the house of Hades.

The hypothesis that the addressee of fr. 55 V may be Doricha/Rhodopis has not been formulated in previous scholarship. Speculative as

³⁴ Liberman 1999, *Introduction* LXXXVIII.

³⁵ Cavallini 1991, 105-9, after Diehl 1935², 220.

³⁶ Aloni 1997, 72; Yatromanolakis 2007, 333; Martin 2016, 116-17. For discussion of the fragment, see Yatromanolakis 2006, 2009, 218.

³⁷ Aloni 1997, 66-9 on fr. 71, 95, 155 V.

³⁸ Yatromanolakis 2007, 333. Martin 2016, 119-20 interprets, not persuasively to me, the Brothers Poem as iambic, i.e. as mocking Larichus. On the “tradition of Sappho the *iambopoios*” see most recently Kazanskaya 2019, 259.

³⁹ Kazanskaya 2019, 271 and 272.

⁴⁰ Cf. Plut. *Con. Praec.* 146a πρὸς τινα πλουσίαν; *Quaest. Conv.* 646e-f Σαπφοῦς λεγούσης πρὸς τινα τῶν ἀμούσων καὶ ἀμαθῶν γυναικῶν κτλ.; Stob. 3.4.12: πρὸς ἀπαίδευτον γυναῖκα.

⁴¹ Sapph. fr. 55 V. I follow Tedeschi 2015, 45, in adopting Spengel’s correction (οὐδ’ ἔστι τις) and Grotius’ conjecture (οὐδέ ποτ’ <εἰς> ὕστερον) in lines 1-2. Translation adapted from Rayor 2014, 52.

they may be, however, there appear to be some grounds to advance such an interpretation, both in light of Herodotus' passage on the *hetaira*, and of Posidippus' epigram on Doricha. If this interpretation is accepted, there is a hitherto unexpected subtlety in the way Herodotus is exploiting and alluding to his lyric source's poetry in these passages of the *Histories*.

First of all, Herodotus' narrative emphasizes how being remembered was a specific concern of Rhodopis, most clearly expressed in her desire to leave a memorial of herself in the form of an offering to the Delphic sanctuary (2.135.3). This makes a possible point of comparison with Sappho's attack in fr. 55 V, for it turns, precisely, on the poet's firm belief that, once dead, there shall be no recollection of the woman (fr. 55.1-2 V). Given the importance that Rhodopis seems to have attached, at least in Herodotus' narrative, to leaving a memorial of herself, Sappho's invective, by addressing this very point, would indeed be most effective if directed against her.

The reason for the doom of oblivion foretold by Sappho to the woman is readily stated: she has no share in the 'roses of Pieria' (fr. 55.2-3 V), an expression usually taken to refer to the poetic activity of the poet and her entourage,⁴² an activity thus invested with eternalizing power.⁴³ But to state that someone will not be remembered in a poem that at the same time claims poetry to have eternalizing powers is something of a (arguably self-conscious) contradiction. In this respect, Posidippus' epigram on Doricha (17 HE = 122 Austin-Bastianini) becomes relevant, for it appears to play precisely on the contrast between the disappearance and consequent oblivion of Doricha's bodily condition, and the eternity achieved by her name thanks to Sappho's eternal poetry:

Δωρίχα, ὄστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κόνις ἦν ὃ τε δεσμὸς
χαίτης ἢ τε μύρων ἔκπνοος ἀμπεχόνη,
ἢ ποτε τὸν χαρίεντα περιστέλλουσα Χάραξον
σύγχρους ὀρθρινῶν ἦψαο κισσυβίων.
Σαπφῶναι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν 5
ῶδις αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες
οὔνομα σὸν μακαριστόν, ὃ Ναύκρατις ὦδε φυλάξει
ἔστ' ἂν ἦ Νείλου ναῦς ἐφ' ἄλδος πελάγη.⁴⁴

Doricha, your bones have long been dust, along with the band
you wore in your hair, and the perfume-breathing shawl

⁴² Cf. e.g. Aloni 1997, 100-1. For Pieria as the place of birth of the Muses, cf. Hes. *Th.* 52f. and Sapph. 103.8 V.

⁴³ Cf. Tedeschi 2015, 45.

⁴⁴ Posidipp. 122 Austin-Bastianini. Translation by Olson 2012, 13.

in which you once enfolded the graceful Charaxus,
flesh to flesh, and took hold of early-morning cups of wine.
But the white columns of Sappho's lovely ode 5
still endure and will endure, proclaiming
your blessed name, which Naucratis will preserve
so long as ships sail forth from the Nile into the sea.

If fr. 55 V was a poem of invective against Doricha/Rhodopis, Posidippus' epigram could be read not only, with Yatromanolakis, as "an intertextual response" playing on the contrast between its ostensible praise "and Sappho's negative poetic reaction to the affair",⁴⁵ but also as a poem wittily bringing into relief, precisely, the 'contradiction' implied in the Sapphic model.⁴⁶

Finally, Sappho's point on the woman's lack of sharing in the roses of Pieria (fr. 55.2-3 V) could, once again, be regarded as most effective if addressed against Doricha/Rhodopis, i.e. against someone whose nickname, 'rosy-faced', had to do precisely with (evidently a different kind of) roses.

Indeed, neither of the two secondary sources who cite the fragment identify the addressee of the poem as Doricha/Rhodopis, but speak only, rather generically, of a wealthy and uneducated woman.⁴⁷ However, from Sappho's perspective at least, this description could certainly fit the *hetaira* who fleeced her brother in Egypt. Though the formulation of both Plutarch and Stobaeus is quite vague, the hypothesis that both only had access to an excerpt of the poem is not one necessary to my argument: perhaps some form of a wordplay on the name Rhodopis⁴⁸ was present in the text, but became progressively less accessible or apparent with time, or perhaps Herodotus thought it to be there, and for that reason linked the two *hetaira* figures of Rhodopis and Doricha.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Yatromanolakis 2007, 327.

⁴⁶ This interpretation is based on an 'ironic' reading of the adjective φίλη in line 6, cf. Gow, Page 1965, 2: 498; Gambato 2001, 1527. The attribute, referred to Sappho's φίλη, is otherwise difficult to reconcile with her criticism of the *hetaira* as attested by sources; *contra* Lidov 2002, 225. Caciagli 2011, 253 understands the adjective as expressing affection, or as a possessive.

⁴⁷ Cf. fn. 40 above.

⁴⁸ On the implications of the speaking names 'Doricha' and 'Rhodopis' see Stein 1856, 296-7 (suggesting that Rhodopis was a nickname for Doricha); Aloni 1983, 32 and *ibid.* fn. 75; Aloni 1997, 20-1 (suggesting that Doricha was Rhodopis' nickname, from δῶρα); Liberman 2014, 12, after Bergk 1872, 374 fn. 192 and Kenrick 1841, 172.

⁴⁹ Rhodopis is epigraphically attested as a proper name in a manumission decree from Delphi (*Fouilles de Delphes* III 4.486), while Doricha occurs only here. Caciagli 2011, 254 connects Herodotus' preference of the name Rhodopis over Doricha to SEG 13.364, a lacunose dedicatory inscription which in Mastrokostas' reconstruction (1953, 635-42) reads: τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνέθε|κε Ῥοδ[ῶπις] δεκάταν. Jeffery 1990², 102-3 accepts

Further circumstantial grounds, in support of the hypothesis that Doricha/Rhodopis might in fact have featured prominently as a target of invective in Sappho's corpus,⁵⁰ may be detected in Herodotus' qualification of another *hetaira*, Archidice, as being *also* αἰδοίμιος, i.e. such *after* Rhodopis (τοῦτο δὲ ὕστερον ταύτης); Rhodopis herself had been immediately earlier described as κλεινή:

Φιλέουσι δὲ κῶς ἐν τῇ Ναυκράτι ἐπαφρόδιτοι γίνεσθαι αἱ ἑταῖραι. Τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ αὕτη, τῆς περὶ λέγεται ὅδε ὁ λόγος, οὕτω δὲ τι κλεινὴ ἐγένετο ὡς καὶ οἱ πάντες Ἕλληνες Ῥοδώπιος τὸ οὐνομα ἐξέμαθον, τοῦτο δὲ ὕστερον ταύτης ἑτέρη τῇ οὐνομα ἦν Ἀρχιδίκη αἰδοίμιος ἀνά τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐγένετο, ἥσσον δὲ τῆς προτέρης περιλεσχίνευτος.⁵¹

For some reason, courtesans in Naucratis are particularly beguiling. Not only was there the one we have been talking about, who became so famous that all Greeks are familiar with the name of Rhodopis, but there was also another one later, called Archidice, who became infamous throughout Greece, although she is less notorious than Rhodopis.

The “marked denotation”⁵² of the poetic terms κλεινή and αἰδοίμιος, extremely rare in prose,⁵³ leads Yatromanolakis to argue that, for his narrative in 2.134-5, Herodotus relied on “stories orally transmitted in men's meeting-places and sympotic gatherings”.⁵⁴ In what follows, I propose to elaborate on this argument, in the attempt to uncover the implications of Herodotus' choice of these “high poetic words”,⁵⁵ especially αἰδοίμιος, for the qualification of Rhodopis and Archidice, as far his engagement with and reception of the poetic tradition is concerned.

the reconstruction; Raaflaub 2016, 128-9 is sceptical. On archaeological evidence for Rhodopis' dedication see Kurke 1999, 224 fn. 4.

50 As indeed suggested by Herodotus' formulation in Hdt. 2.135: πολλὰ κατεκερτόμησέ μιν.

51 Hdt. 2.135.5. Translation adapted from Waterfield 2008².

52 Yatromanolakis 2007, 324.

53 Kurke 1999, 224.

54 Yatromanolakis 2007, 325. For the hypothesis that the trader fleeced by some prostitute of Aphrodite was a traditional kind of song, see Aloni 1983, 32 and 1997, 21. For the male symposium as a context of performance of Sappho's songs, see Bowie 2016 and Nagy 2016, 455.

55 Kurke 1999, 224.

4 Homer's Helen, Sappho's Helen and Herodotus' *hetairai*

The adjective *αοίδιμος* seems to work in the Herodotean passage on multiple levels. In its application to Archidice – who, as far as we know, was not the subject of any poetic treatment – it takes on a meaning closer to ‘infamous’ than to ‘celebrated in song’. In its application to Rhodopis – who is also implicitly qualified as *αοίδιμος*, for Archidice is described as such *after* her – the meaning of the adjective shifts instead much closer to that of ‘celebrated in song’, for she is to be identified, according to Herodotus, with the *hetaira* involved in the affair with Charaxus that caused Sappho’s *κερτομία*, referred to immediately afterwards.

But, as Kurke points out, the term *αοίδιμος* “has a significant poetic pedigree”,⁵⁶ occurring only once in Homer, in the words that Helen speaks to Hector in a self-deprecating context:

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν εἴσελθε καὶ ἔζεο τῷδ' ἐπὶ δίφρῳ
 δᾶερ, ἐπεὶ σε μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν
 εἴνεκ' ἐμεῖο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἄτης,
 οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον, ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω
 ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' αοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι.⁵⁷

But come now, enter in, and sit on this chair, my brother, since above all others has trouble encompassed your mind because of shameless me, and the folly of Alexander; on us Zeus has brought an evil doom, so that even in days to come we may be a song for men that are yet to be.

Herodotus' description of courtesans, in an Egyptian setting, with the term *αοίδιμος* might well amount to a sarcastic allusion to the Iliadic antecedent,⁵⁸ where the term is used by Helen, a figure emphatically connected to Egypt in Herodotus' own account (2.113-20).⁵⁹ This potential hint at *Il.* 6.354-58 thus triggers an assimilation of Rhodopis and Helen, most suitable in light of Helen's traditional placement, in Greek literature, “in a discourse of blame and praise”.⁶⁰ It is in fact to Sappho's *blame* poetry that Herodotus is referring to in 2.135 (πολλὰ κατεκερτόμησε). In the blame tradition Helen fig-

⁵⁶ Kurke 1999, 225. See also Yatromanolakis 2007, 324 fn. 172, referring to Homeric parallels for the use of *αοίδιμος*.

⁵⁷ Hom. *Il.* 6.354-58. Translation by Murray 1924, 301.

⁵⁸ Kurke 1999, 225 fn. 8 supports her reading by pointing to the occurrence of the term in Simonides' Plataea poem (fr. 11.13 W²).

⁵⁹ Helen indeed refers the term both to herself and to Paris.

⁶⁰ Segal 1998, 63; Worman 1997, 166.

ures as “the destroyer of men and social order”,⁶¹ a characterization that indeed befits the figure of the ‘famous courtesan’, be it Archidice (explicitly described as ἀοίδιμος) or Doricha/Rhodopis (implicitly characterized as ἀοίδιμος).

But Herodotus’ allusion to the Iliadic Helen in a passage referring to Sappho’s poetry may well evoke also the Lesbian poet’s own treatment of the figure in her poetry,⁶² in particular in fr. 16.1-12 V:

οἱ μὲν ἰππήων στρότον, οἱ δὲ πῆσδων
οἱ δὲ νάων φαῖσ’ ἐπ[ί] γᾶν μέλαι[ν]αν
ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν’ ὄτ-
τω τις ἔραται·

πά]γχι δ’ εὔμαρες σύνετον πόησαι 5
π]άντι τ[ο]ῦτ’, ἅ γὰρ πόλυ περσκέθουσα
κᾶλλος [ἀνθ]ρώπων Ἑλένα [τὸ]ν ἄνδρα
τὸν [αρ]ιστον

καλλ[ίτοι]σ’ ἔβα ἕ Τροῖαν πλέοι[σα
κωὺδ[ε] πα]ίδος οὐδὲ φίλων το[κ]ήων 10
πᾶ[μ]παν] ἐμνάσθ<η>, ἀλλὰ παράγ<α>· αὔταν
]σαν⁶³

Some say an army of horsemen, others
say foot soldiers, still others say a fleet
is the finest thing on the dark earth.
I say it is whatever one loves.

Everyone can understand this - consider 5
that Helen, far surpassing the beauty
of mortals, left behind
the best man of all

to sail away to Troy. She remembered
neither daughter nor dear parents, 10
as [Aphrodite] led her away

Here Helen, *par excellence* the most beautiful and desirable woman, is chosen to demonstrate the point that ‘the most beautiful’, τὸ κάλλιστον, is ‘what one desires’ (fr. 16.3-4 V). She is thus depicted as

⁶¹ Segal 1998, 63.

⁶² The Sapphic Helen is herself built on the Homeric model, cf. Segal 1998, 66-7; Blondell 2010, 375.

⁶³ Sapph. 16.1-12 V. Translation by Rayor 2014, 33.

a desiring agent who, leaving her husband and having no thought of her child and parents,⁶⁴ embarks on a ship heading to Troy.

This behaviour of Sappho's Helen closely matches no one other's than Charaxus' own: just as Helen embarked on a sea journey (that from a Herodotean perspective even led her to Egypt!), following the object of her desire and taking in no account her familial bonds, so Charaxus travelled to Egypt on a ship, and pursued his desire for Doricha/Rhodopis, having no consideration of the economic and social consequences suffered by his family because of the affair.⁶⁵

Kurke underlines the repeated emphasis on wealth featuring in Herodotus' narrative of the Rhodopis and Charaxus affair (2.135);⁶⁶ a comparable, repeated emphasis on the riches stolen, together with Helen, by Paris from Menelaus emerges also in the long excursus on Helen's stay in Egypt (2.114-19).

The Herodotean allusion to Helen is thus relevant to Doricha/Rhodopis as much as to Charaxus. To Charaxus, because Sappho's own description of Helen's behaviour in fr. 16 V matches his in almost every detail. To Rhodopis, because she embodied the destruction of men and familial bonds, just as Helen traditionally did; she was connected with 'great wealth' accumulated in Egypt, again like Helen was in the Herodotean narrative; and she was extremely beautiful, of a beauty qualified by Herodotus with an attribute, ἐπαφρόδιτος, that is an *hapax legomenon* in the *Histories*, and a term etymologically connected to Aphrodite. This might not be a coincidence: earlier in the Egyptian λόγος, Aphrodite herself had been identified with Helen, as Herodotus conjectured that the temple of the 'foreign Aphrodite' in Memphis was in fact a temple of Helen, daughter of Tyndareus:⁶⁷

Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ Πρωτέος ἱρὸν τὸ καλεῖται Ξείνης Ἀφροδίτης. Συμβάλλομαι δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν εἶναι Ἑλένης τῆς Τυνδαρέω, καὶ τὸν λόγον ἀκηκῶς ὡς διαιτήθη Ἑλένη παρὰ Πρωτεί, καὶ δὴ καὶ ὅτι Ξείνης Ἀφροδίτης ἐπώνυμόν ἐστι· ὅσα γὰρ ἄλλα Ἀφροδίτης ἱρά ἐστι, οὐδαμῶς Ξείνης ἐπικαλεῖται.⁶⁸

Inside Proteus' precinct is a sanctuary sacred to 'the Foreign Aphrodite'. I have come to the conclusion that the person it is sacred to

64 On the motif of forgetfulness, see Tedeschi 2015, 26.

65 The opening lines of the newly discovered Brothers Poem indeed voice the family's hopes and anxieties over Charaxus' return with a "full ship".

66 Kurke 1999, 223.

67 On connections between Aphrodite and trade, see Aloni 1983, 30; between Aphrodite and the Doricha affair, see Neri 2015, 65 fn. 93; between Aphrodite and Helen in Sappho's poetry, see Blondell 2010, 373.

68 Hdt. 2.112. Translation by Waterfield 2008².

is Helen the daughter of Tyndareus, not only because I am aware of the story that Helen spent some time in Egypt with Proteus, but also, and in particular, because the sanctuary is called the sanctuary of the Foreign Aphrodite; no other sanctuary of Aphrodite is called ‘foreign’.

The extant Sapphic corpus does not attest to a parallelism between Helen and Doricha,⁶⁹ and although, hypothetically, it might have been established in some of the lost poems, this is not a necessary assumption – nor a likely one after all, for Sappho’s attitude towards Helen is usually positive, whereas her attitude towards Doricha is at least ambiguous. Herodotus’ text, however, is capable of triggering this assimilation on its own, as encouraged by the Egyptian context, the topic and its poetic relevance.⁷⁰

Herodotus’ engagement with the poetic tradition here thus stretches beyond a single Sapphic μέλος of reproach to Charaxus: he is evoking a broad spectrum of tradition, comprising Homeric epic (*Il.* 6.354-58), Sappho’s own engagement with Homeric epic (fr. 16 V), and Sappho’s poetry on the affair (including, possibly, fr. 55 V).

The hypothesis that, in constructing his narrative, Herodotus might have contaminated different poetic sources on related themes could lend some support to Yatromanolakis’ argument that the historian would here be relying on oral traditions handed down “in men’s meeting-places and sympotic gatherings.”⁷¹ For the performance, in a ‘chain’ or sequence, of thematically linked songs is a well-known aspect of, precisely, sympotic practice.⁷² While the shared position in the narrative of Herodotus’ mention of Sappho and his other references to lyric poetry has been remarked upon,⁷³ in what follows I devote special attention to the case of his naming of Pindar (3.38). In that context, the nature of Herodotus’ quasi-quotation of fr. 169a S.-M. also allows for speculation on the possibility that sympotic

⁶⁹ Kurke 2016, 252-62 detects clues, in the Brothers Poem, for the identification of Charaxus and Larichus with the Dioscuri, and proposes, “most speculatively”, that the first-person speaker of the poem might thus be aligned with Helen. I do not find this interpretation persuasive.

⁷⁰ For a “hidden” verbal echo from a Pindaric poem (fr. 121.4 S.-M.) elsewhere in Herodotus’ narrative (Hdt. 5.21.1) see Donelli 2016, 28-31, and Vannicelli 2013, 72-3.

⁷¹ Yatromanolakis 2007, 325. For the hypothesis that the trader fleeced by some prostitute of Aphrodite was a traditional kind of song, see Aloni 1983, 32; 1997, 21. For the male symposium as a context of performance of Sappho’s songs, see Bowie 2016; Nagy 2016, 455. For discussion of the difficulties involved in reconstructing a “sympotic Sappho” see most recently Caciagli 2019.

⁷² On the sympotic practice of *metapoiesis* see e.g. Vetta 1980 and 1983, esp. 30-3; for “sympotic chains”, see e.g. Ferrari 1987, 177-97; Rossi 1983, 41-50; Colesanti 2011, 8; Cazzato, Prodi 2016; Liberman 2016; etc.

⁷³ Kazanskaya 2019, 268, after Verdin 1977, 63-5 and Rotstein 2010, 194-6.

reperformances might represent a potential scenario for his reception of the poem.⁷⁴

5 Herodotus and Pindar

Pindar is named in a well-known passage from Book Three:

Ὅς δὲ οὕτω νενομίκασι τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους οἱ πάντες ἄνθρωποι, πολλοῖσι τε καὶ ἄλλοισι τεκμηρίοισι πάρεστι σταθμώσασθαι, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῷδε. Δαρεῖος ἐπὶ τῆς ἑωυτοῦ ἀρχῆς καλέσας Ἑλλήνων τοὺς παρεόντας εἶρετο ἐπὶ κόσῳ ἂν χρήματι βουλοῖατο τοὺς πατέρας ἀποθνήσκοντας κατασιτέεσθαι· οἱ δὲ ἐπ' οὐδενὶ ἔφασαν ἔρδειν ἂν τοῦτο. Δαρεῖος δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα καλέσας Ἰνδῶν τοὺς καλεομένους Καλλατίας, οἱ τοὺς γονέας κατεσθίουσι, εἶρετο, παρεόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ δι' ἑρμηνέος μανθανόντων τὰ λεγόμενα, ἐπὶ τίνι χρήματι δεξαίατ' ἂν τελευτῶντας τοὺς πατέρας κατακαίειν πυρί· οἱ δὲ ἀμβώσαντες μέγα εὐφημείην μιν ἐκέλευον. Οὕτω μὲν νυν ταῦτα νενομίσται, καὶ ὀρθῶς μοι δοκίει Πίνδαρος ποιῆσαι, “νόμον πάντων βασιλέα” φήσας εἶναι.⁷⁵

There is plenty of other evidence to support the idea that this opinion of one's own customs is universal, but here is one instance. During Darius' reign, he invited some Greeks who were present to a conference, and asked them how much money it would take for them to be prepared to eat the corpses of their fathers; they replied that they would not do that for any amount of money. Next, Darius summoned some members of the Indian tribe known as Callataie, who eat their parents, and asked them in the presence of the Greeks, with an interpreter present so that they could understand what was being said, how much money it would take for them to be willing to cremate their fathers' corpses; they cried out in horror and told him not to say such appalling things. So these practices have become enshrined as customs just as they are, and I think Pindar was right to have said in his poem that custom is king of all.

Here, Herodotus concludes his argument that only a madman would make νόμοι the object of derision by closely echoing the wording of

⁷⁴ I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for suggesting the possibility that, in the case of Sappho's poetry, Herodotus might even have relied on a collection of her poems. This hypothesis, albeit speculative, is made attractive by consideration of the poems' arrangement in Sappho's Alexandrian edition: both fr. 16 V and the Brothers Poem belonged to Book I, cf. e.g. Neri 2015, 71-2; Obbink 2015.

⁷⁵ Hdt. 3.38. Translation by Waterfield 2008².

a line, arguably the opening statement, of a partly preserved Pindaric poem, known as fragment 169a S.-M.:⁷⁶

Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς
θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων
ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον
ὑπερτάτῃ χειρὶ. τεκμαίρομαι
ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος.⁷⁷
κτλ.

Nomos, the king of all, of mortals and immortals, guides them as it justifies the utmost violence with a sovereign hand. I bring as witness the deeds of Heracles...

The line was popular in antiquity, and was arguably very early perceived as easily 'exportable', as suggested by its numerous quotations in later sources.⁷⁸ Its meaning, both in the context of the poem and in the Herodotean passage, has been the object of much scholarly discussion.⁷⁹

Most importantly for my present purposes, it has been observed how Herodotus' engagement with Pindar's poetry is not, as it may appear at first sight, here limited to the quasi-quotation and explicit endorsement of the statement: the relationship between the two texts is much subtler. Though Herodotus explicitly refers only to a single line of the poem, the broader narrative context points to his acquaintance with the following lines too. As seen by both Gigante and Ferrari,⁸⁰ the very strategy of preceding the quotation of the Pindaric 'motto' with a proof based on a test, i.e. a τεκμήριον, amounts to a counterpart to Pindar's presentation of the statement as the re-

⁷⁶ See West 2007, 114, after Rosén, 1987, *Praefatio* XXI, on how another allusion to this Pindaric poem might be identified in Hdt. 5.8. See Gigante 1956, 21 on Hdt. 8.140 β (καὶ γὰρ δύναμις ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βασιλείος ἐστὶ καὶ χεὶρ ὑπερμήκης) as also possibly concealing an echo of fr. 169a S.-M.

⁷⁷ Pind. fr. 169a.1-4 S.-M. Translation slightly adapted from Race 1997, 401-2.

⁷⁸ Cf. Payne 2006, 173. The same Pindaric poem is partially quoted by Callicles in Plato's *Gorgias* 484b and 488b; see also *Leg.* 3.690b, 4.714, 10.890a; *Prot.* 337d. On the relationship between Plato's works and this Pindaric poem, cf. e.g. Pini 1974; Payne 2006. Other sources for the Pindaric text include Arist. *Rhet.* 1406a.22; Chrysipp. 314 SVF; Plut. *Dem.* 42.8; Plut. *ad princ. inerud.* 3.780c; Dio Chrys. 75.2; Clem. Alex. *Str.* 1.181.4, 2.19.2; Orig. *In Cels.* 5.34; Stob. 4.5.77; Lib. *Decl.* 1.87; the Pindaric scholia to *Nem.* 9.35a Drachmann; Ael. *Ar. Or.* 45.52-3 and 2.229. A full list of sources is found in Turyn 1952, 350-2.

⁷⁹ Cf. e.g. Gigante 1956 and 1966; Pavese 1968 and 1993; Castagna 1971; Lloyd-Jones 1972; Pini 1974; Angeli Bernardini 1976; Gentili 1977; Humphreys 1987; Ferrari 1991; Kyriakou 2002; Thomas 2000, 102-34; Payne 2006; more recently Kingsley 2018, 43.

⁸⁰ Gigante 1956, 113; Ferrari 1991, 77.

sult of his own inferences, as signalled by the poet's use of the verb τεκμαίρομαι.

Herodotus is thus to some extent 're-writing' Pindar: he inverts the order of the "proof" or "inference" and the gnomic statement, making the latter an effective conclusion to his argument rather than its bold opening. He is also, contextually, giving a new spin to the meaning of the statement: as convincingly argued, again, by Gigante and Ferrari,⁸¹ the overall meaning of the Herodotean passage comes in fact much closer to that of another Pindaric poem:⁸²

ἄλλ᾽ αἰδ' ἄλλοισιν νόμιμα, σφετέρᾳ
δ' αἰνεῖ δίκαν ἀνδρῶν ἕκαστος.⁸³

Customs vary among men, and each man praises his own way.

The nature of Herodotus' quasi-quotation of Pindar's fr. 169a S.-M., and his contamination of two separate but thematically linked Pindaric poems might suggest sympotic reperformances as a likely context of reception, and thus the symposium as the ultimate background to this passage.⁸⁴ For in sympotic reperformances, "the parts of the poem that had the greatest appeal for [...] secondary performers and their audiences were the gnomic, ethical passages",⁸⁵ that is, precisely, the kind of passage Herodotus selects for his quotation here. Likewise, his deliberate application of the γνώμη to an entirely different context,⁸⁶ and his contamination of two different but thematically re-

⁸¹ Gigante 1956, 112, quoting also as a further parallel *Sept.* 1070-1; Pini 1974, 190; Ferrari 1991, 75-6; Kingsley 2008, 48.

⁸² Note, with Pavese 1968, 55, that Pindar's fr. 215 "[...] far from being a sophistic expression of relativism, emphasizes the binding character of the received custom in a given circle".

⁸³ Pind. fr. 215.1-2 S.-M. Translation by Race 1997, 423.

⁸⁴ Arguably, Herodotus would have accessed lyric poetry through both public and private performances and reperformances. Lucian's reference (*Herodotus* or *Aëtion* 1-2) to his recitation of the *Histories* before audiences at Olympia locates him at an obvious venue of performance of epinician poetry. In the course of his likely sojourn in Athens, Herodotus could hardly have avoided lyric performances: Aristophanic comedy provides evidence that lyric poetry was surely circulating there, and known well enough to be made the object of parody (cf., with Currie 2004, fn. 28, Irigoin 1954, 14-16; Gentili et al. 2012⁵, *Introduzione* 72-3; Hutchinson 2001, 427-8; see further Hubbard 2004). As for evidence internal to the *Histories*, although Herodotus never refers explicitly to choral performances, he does seem to refer to epinician poetry (Hdt. 5.102), and he surely describes a symposium involving contests over music and speaking (cf. Hdt. 6.129 Ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δέιπνου ἐγένοντο, οἱ μνηστήρες ἔριν εἶχον ἄμφι τε μουσικῇ καὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἔς τὸ μέσον) a flute player, and dancing.

⁸⁵ Currie 2004, 54.

⁸⁶ Ford 2002, 147; Payne 2006, 165. Kingsley 2018 50ff. argues that "Herodotus creatively reconfigures the hypotext in pursuit of a sophisticated compositional technique

lated Pindaric poems, could reflect the sympotic practice of engaging in the performance of a catena of thematically related songs.⁸⁷

6 Conclusions

I have sought to contribute to discussions on Herodotus' reception of lyric poetry by suggesting that, when referring to Sappho's poetry in the Egyptian λόγος, he engages with a spectrum of tradition that is broader than a single Sapphic poem of reproach to Charaxus. It is my hope that having suggested a broader scope for the extent and nature of this engagement might, in turn, contribute some support to previous hypotheses on the possible sympotic origins of Herodotus' version of the story.

The case of Herodotus' engagement with Pindaric poetry in particular presents elements of parallel to that of his reference to Sappho, and might serve as a useful *comparandum* even beyond speculations on the possible sympotic background to both passages. Herodotus' choice to incorporate a quasi-quotation of the Pindaric statement at the conclusion of an argument, to confirm and prove his own line of reasoning, speaks to the intellectual authority that the poet carried in the historian's eyes, and his claiming of a similar authority for himself.⁸⁸ In the case of Sappho, Herodotus introduced the story of Rhodopis in the first place to respond, polemically, to other Greek narratives on the pyramid of Mycerinus. It has been argued that these might ultimately go back to Hecataeus of Miletus.⁸⁹ By responding to alternative, arguably prose accounts, through a complex engagement with the poetic tradition – involving the exploitation of an iconic poet figure, an iconic mythological figure, different poetic sources, and poetic vocabulary – Herodotus presents himself as a self-constituted successor to epic and lyric poetry, and as an interlocutor in his own right in the developing tradition of intellectual authority.

that interlaces the content of Pindar's *melos* and historical action".

⁸⁷ Cf. fn. 67 above.

⁸⁸ Remarkably, Pindar is introduced in the narrative only as Πίνδαρος, without any further connotation: no patronymic, ethnic, or any other attribute describing his poetic activity, as opposed to all the other instances in which a lyric poet is named, cf. Hdt. 1.12 Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ Πάριος, 1.23 Ἄριονα τὸν Μηθυμαῖον... ἐόντα κιθαρωδὸν κτλ., 1.29 Σόλων ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος, 2.135 Σαπφοῦς τῆς μουσοποιού, 2.177 Σόλων δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, 3.121 Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν Τήιον, 5.95 Ἀλκαῖος ὁ ποιητῆς, 5.102 Σιμωνίδεω τοῦ Κηίου, 5.113 Σόλων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, 7.6 Λάσου τοῦ Ἐρμιονέος, 7.228 Σιμωνίδης ὁ Λεωπρέπεός. This suggests the popularity of the poet and the poem, but arguably also reflects the stature he held to Herodotus. On how "Herodotus' historical method is enriched by his status as a thoughtful and creative reader of melic poetry", see Kingsley 2018, 39.

⁸⁹ Cf. fn. 9 above.

Bibliography

- Aloni, A. (1983). "Tra eteria e tiaso: i gruppi aristocratici di Lesbo tra economia e ideologia". *Dialoghi di Archeologia*, 3(1), 21-35.
- Aloni, A. (1997). *Saffo. Frammenti*. Firenze: Giunti.
- Angeli Bernardini, P. (1976). "Eracle mangione: Pindaro, fr. 168 Snell-Maehler". *QUCC*, 21, 49-52.
- Bergk, T. (1872). *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*. Bd. 1. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Bettenworth, A. (2014). "Sapphos Amme: Ein Beitrag zum neuen Sapphogramm (Brothers Poem)". *ZPE*, 191, 15-19.
- Bierl, A. (2016a). "'All You Need is Love': Some Thoughts on the Structure, Texture, and Meaning of the Brothers Song as well as on Its Relation to the Kypris Song (P.Sapph.Obbink)". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 302-38.
- Bierl, A. (2016b). "Sappho as Aphrodite's Singer, Poet and Hero(ine): The Reconstruction of the Context and Sense of the Kypris Song". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 339-52.
- Bierl, A.; Lardinois, A.P.M.H. (eds) (2016). *The Newest Sappho: P.Sapph.Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, frs. 1-4*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Blondell, R. (2010). "Refractions of Homer's Helen in Archaic Lyric". *AJPh*, 131, 349-91.
- Boehringer, S.; Calame, C. (2016). "Sappho and Kypris: 'The Vertigo of Love' (P.Sapph.Obbink 21-29; P.Oxy. 1231, fr. 16)". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 353-67.
- Bowie, E. (2016). "How Did Sappho's Songs Get into the Male Sympotic Repertoire?". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 148-66.
- Burris, S.; Fish, J.; Obbink, D. (2014). "New Fragments of Book 1 of Sappho". *ZPE*, 189, 1-28.
- Caciagli, S. (2011). *Poeti e società: comunicazione poetica e formazioni sociali nella Lesbo del VII/VI secolo a.C.* Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Caciagli, S. (2019). "Sympotic Sappho? The Recontextualization of Sappho's Verses in Athenaeus". Currie, B.; Rutherford, I. (eds), *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext*. Vol. 5 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 321-41.
- Cartledge, P.; Greenwood, E. (2002). "Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Popularity". Bakker, E.J.; de Jong, I.; van Wees, H. (eds), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston; Cologne: Brill, 351-71.
- Castagna, L. (1971). "Pindaro fr. 169 Sn.³: interpretazione e proposta di datazione". *SIFC*, 43, 173-98.
- Cavallini, E. (1991). "Due poetesse greche". De Martino, F. (a cura di), *Rose di Pieria*. Bari: Levante, 97-135.
- Cazzato, V.; Prodi, E.E. (2016). "Introduction". Cazzato, V.; Obbink, D.; Prodi, E.E. (eds), *The Cup of Song. Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-16.
- Currie, B.G.F. (2004). "Re-performance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes". Mackie, C. (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context*. Leiden; Boston; Cologne: Brill, 49-69.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2018). "Poeta, personaggio e testo nell'epistola di Saffo a Faone", *MD*, 81, 83-101.
- Di Benedetto, V. (1982). "Sulla Biografia di Saffo". *SCO*, 32, 217-30.
- Diehl, E. (1935²). *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Donelli, G. (2016). "Herodotus and Greek Lyric Poetry". Liotsakis, V.; Farrington, S. (eds), *The Art of History. Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman His-*

- tiography*. Berlin, de Gruyter, 11-36. Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 41.
- Ferrari, F. (1987). "Sulla ricezione dell'elegia arcaica nella silloge teognidea: il problema delle varianti". *Maia*, 39, 177-97.
- Ferrari, F. (1991). "Dileggio e rispetto dei νόμιμα nel fr. 215 M di Pindaro". *AAPel*, 67, 71-82.
- Ferrari, F. (2014). "Saffo e i suoi fratelli e altri brani del primo libro". *ZPE*, 192, 1-19.
- Fränkel, E. (1928). "Review of Lobel (1925)". *GGA*, 6, 257-78.
- Gambato, M.L. (2001). "Libro XIII". Canfora, L. et al. (a cura di), *Ateneo. I Deipnosophisti: I dotti a banchetto*. Roma: Salerno Editrice, 1393-581.
- Gentili, B. (1977). "Eracle 'omicida giustissimo'. Pisandro, Stesicoro e Pindaro". Gentili, B.; Paioni, G. (a cura di), *Il mito greco = Atti del Convegno Internazionale* (Urbino, 7-12 maggio 1973). Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Biz-zarri, 299-305.
- Gentili, B. et al. (2012⁵). *Pindaro. Le Pitiche*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Gigante, M. (1956). ΝΟΜΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ. Napoli: Edizioni Glaux.
- Gigante, M. (1966). "Nuovi resti dell'ode Pindarica: ΝΟΜΟΣ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ (P.Oxy. 2450)". *Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Milano 2-8 Settembre 1965). Milano: 286-311.
- Gow, A.S.F.; Page, D. (1965). *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grenfell, B.P.; Hunt, A.S. (1898). *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part I. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Grenfell, B.P.; Hunt, A.S. (1914). *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part X. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Hubbard, T.K. (2004). "The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Re-performance, Written Texts". Mackie, C. (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context*. Leiden; Boston; Cologne: Brill, 71-94.
- Humphreys, S.C. (1987). "Law, Custom and Culture in Herodotus". *Arethusa*, 20, 211-20.
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2001). *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irigoin, J. (1954). *Histoire du texte de Pindare*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Jeffery, L.H. (1990²). *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and Its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kazanskaya, M. (2019). "Indirect Tradition on Sappho's *kertomia*". Currie, B.; Rutherford, I. (eds), *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext*. Vol. 5 of *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 257-76.
- Kenrick, J. (1841). *The Egypt of Herodotus. Being the Second and Part of the Third Books of His History*. London: Taylor.
- Kingsley, K.S. (2018). "Justifying Violence in Herodotus' *Histories* 3.38: Nomos, King of All, and Pindaric Poetics". Bowie, E. (ed.), *Herodotus: Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston: de Gruyter, 37-58.
- Kurke, L. (1999). *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold. The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kurke, L. (2011). *Aesopic Conversations. Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue and the Invention of Greek Prose*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kyriakou, P. (2002). "The Violence of Nomos in Pindar's fr. 169a". *MD*, 48, 195-206.

- Lardinois, A.P.M.H. (2016). "Sappho's *Brothers Song* and the Fictionality of Early Greek Lyric Poetry". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 167-87.
- Lieberman, G.L. (1999). *Alcée. Fragments. Tome I*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Lieberman, G.L. (2014). "Reflections on a New Poem by Sappho Concerning Her Anguish and Her Brothers Charaxos and Larichos". Paper delivered at F.I.E.C., Bordeaux, August 2014. English Translation by P. Ellis. <http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/Fragments/Lieberman.FIEC.Bordeaux.2014.pdf>.
- Lieberman, G.L. (2016). "Some Thoughts on the Symposiastic Catena, *Aisakos*, and *Skolia*". Cazzato, V.; Obbink, D.; Prodi, E.E. (eds), *The Cup of Song. Studies on Poetry and the Symposium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 42-62.
- Lidov, J.B. (2002). "Sappho, Herodotus and the 'Hetaira'". *CPh*, 97, 203-37.
- Lloyd, A.B. (2010⁷). *Erodoto. Le Storie. Libro II*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1972). "Pindar Fr. 169". *HSCP*, 76, 45-56.
- Martin, R.P. (2016). "Sappho, Iambist: Abusing the Brother". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 110-26.
- Möller, A. (2000). *Naukratis. Trade in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murray, A.T. (1924). *Homer. "Iliad". Books 1-12*. Cambridge (MA); London: Harvard University Press.
- Nagy, G. (1990). *Pindar's Homer. The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nagy, G. (2015). "Herodotus and a Courtesan from Naukratis". *Classical Inquiries: Studies on the Ancient World from CHS*. <http://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/herodotus-and-a-courtesan-from-naucratis/>.
- Nagy, G. (2016). "A Poetics of Sisterly Affect in the *Brothers Song* and in Other Songs of Sappho". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 449-92.
- Nagy, G. (2018). "Herodotus on Queens and Courtesans of Egypt". Bowie, E. (ed.), *Herodotus: Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston: de Gruyter, 109-22.
- Neri, C. (2015). "Il *Brothers Poem* e l'edizione alessandrina (in margine a P.Sapph.Obbink)". *Eikasmos*, 26, 53-76.
- Neri, C.; Cinti, F. (2017). *Saffo. Poesie, frammenti e testimonianze*. Santarcangelo di Romagna, Rusconi.
- Obbink, D. (2014). "Two New Poems by Sappho". *ZPE*, 189, 32-49.
- Obbink, D. (2015). "Provenance, Authenticity, and Text of the New Sappho Papyri". Paper delivered at the Society for Classical Studies Panel: "New Fragments of Sappho", New Orleans, 09.01.2015. <https://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/Fragments/SCS.Sappho.2015.Obbink.paper.pdf>.
- Obbink, D. (2016). "The Newest Sappho: Text, Apparatus Criticus and Translation". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 13-33.
- Olson, S.D. (2012). *Athenaeus. The Learned Banqueters. Books XIII-XIV*. Cambridge (MA); London: Harvard University Press.
- Page, D.L. (1955). *Sappho and Alcaeus. An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pavese, C.O. (1968). "The New Heracles Poem of Pindar". *HSCP*, 72, 47-88.
- Pavese, C.O. (1993). "On Pindar fr. 169". *HSCP*, 95, 143-57.
- Payne, M. (2006). "On Being Vatic: Pindar, Pragmatism, and Historicism". *AJPh*, 127, 159-84.

- Pini, G. (1974). "Sul Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς di Pindaro, (fr. 169 Sn.4)". *SIFC*, 46, 185-210.
- Powell, J.E. (1938). *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raaflaub, K.A. (2004). "Archaic Greek Aristocrats as Carriers of Cultural Interaction". Rollinger, R.; Ulf, C. (eds), *Commerce and Monetary System in the Ancient World. Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 197-217.
- Raaflaub, K.A. (2016). "The Newest Sappho and Archaic Near-eastern Interactions". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 127-47.
- Race, W.H. (1997). *Pindar. Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Rayor, D.J. (2014). *Sappho. A New Translation of the Complete Works*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosén, H.B. (1987). *Herodoti Historiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Rossi, L.E. (1983). "Il simposio greco arcaico e classico come spettacolo a se stesso". *Spettacoli conviviali dall'antichità classica alle corti italiane del '400 = Atti del VII Convegno di Studio* (Viterbo, 27-30 maggio 1982). Firenze: Olschki, 41-50.
- Schlesier, R. (2016). "Loving, but not Loved: The New Kypris Song in the Context of Sappho's Poetry". Bierl, Lardinois 2016, 368-95.
- Segal, C. (1998). *Aglaia. The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides and Corinna*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smyth, H.W. (1900). *Greek Melic Poets*. London: Macmillan.
- Stein, H. (1856). *Herodotos*. Bd. 1, *Buch I und II*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Tandy, D. (2004). "Trade and Commerce in Archilochos, Sappho and Alkaios". Rollinger, R.; Ulf, C. (eds), *Commerce and Monetary System in the Ancient World. Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 183-94.
- Tedeschi, G. (2015). *Saffo. Frammenti. Antologia di versi con introduzione, testo, traduzione, commento*. Trieste: EUT.
- Thomas, R. (2000). *Herodotus in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turyn, A. (1952). *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vannicelli, P. (2013). *Resistenza e intesa. Studi sulle guerre persiane in Erodoto*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Vetta, M.V. (1980). *Teognide. "Elegie", libro II*. Roma: In aedibus Athenaei.
- Vetta, M. (1983). *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica: guida storica e critica*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Waterfield, R. (2008²). *Herodotus. "The Histories"*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- West, S. (2007). "Herodotus Lyricorum Studiosus". *Palamedes*, 2, 109-30.
- West, M.L. (2014). "Nine Poems of Sappho". *ZPE*, 19, 1-12.
- Worman, N. (1997). "The Body as Argument: Helen in Four Greek Texts". *ClAnt*, 16, 151-203.
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2006). "A Lyric Epos". *Hellenica*, 56, 381-8.
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2007). *Sappho in the Making. The Early Reception*. Cambridge (MA); London: Harvard University Press.
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2009). "Alcaeus and Sappho". Budelmann, F. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 204-26.