

THE TRANSMISSION, GENRE, AND METRE OF SAPPH. FR. 104A V.

Abstract: This article aims to offer a comprehensive re-appraisal of Sappho's fr. 104a by addressing three fundamental difficulties posed by it. First, this article retraces the complex transmission of the fragment and establishes the authority of the various testimonies. Second, it analyses the genre of the original composition and challenges the prevalent view that the fragment derives from an epithalamium. Third, it discusses the metre of the fragment and especially the relationship of the two lines to each another.

Keywords: Sappho, Epithalamia, Lesbian Dialect, Aeolic Verse

Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρηρις ὅσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ' Αὔως,
φέρηρις οἶν, φέρηρις αἶγα, φέρηρις ἄπυ μᾶτερι παῖδα.¹

Transmission

Sappho's fr. 104a is transmitted in a passage in Demetrius' treatise *De elocutione* as an example for the rhetorical device of ἀναφορά,² in a scholium on Euripides' *Orestes* to illustrate that Sappho offered 'something like an etymology' of the name ἔσπερος,³ and in nine entries in Byzantine etymological collections in

1) All references to fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus are from the edition of E.-M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam 1971.

2) Demetr. Eloc. 141 (codd. Par. Gr. 1741 [P], Marc. Gr. Z 508 coll. 844 [M]): χαριεντίζεται δέ ποτε καὶ ἐξ ἀναφορᾶς, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑσπέρου, "Ἔσπερε, πάντα φέρηρις," φησί, "φέρηρις οἶνον, φέρηρις αἶγα, φέρηρις ματέρει παῖδα." καὶ γὰρ ἑνταῦθα ἡ χάρις ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως τῆς "φέρηρις" ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀναφερομένης.

3) Σ Ε. Or. 1260 Schwartz (codd. Marc. Gr. Z 471 coll. 765 [M], Par. Gr. 2713 [B], Taur. B.IV.13 [C]): καὶ ἡ Σαπφὴ δὲ οὕτως τὸν ἔσπερον ἀστέρα εἶπε, τρόπον τινὰ ἐτυμολογούσα τὸ ὄνομα, "Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαίνολις (φαινόλης Β) ἐσκέδασ' Αὔως". 'C' is the siglum assigned to cod. Taur. B.IV.13 by A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*, Urbana Il. 1957; Schwartz used 'T'.

support of various etymologies (see below). An additional quotation is found in the treatise *De Sapphonis dialecto*, attributed to Gregory of Corinth, the twelfth-century author of *De dialectis*.⁴ As this treatise is generally considered a modern forgery, its testimony may here be neglected.⁵

The relationship of these various testimonies and the authority of their readings pose a number of fundamental difficulties. Demetrius, writing in the first or second centuries AD,⁶ had direct access to an edition of Sappho, which he frequently quotes. In contrast, neither the Byzantine scribes of annotated editions of Euripides nor the compilers of the lexica had access to such an edition.⁷ Here, one or several intermediary sources need to be assumed, and the authority of these sources affects the value of their readings. Identifying such sources is notoriously complicated, especially for the etymological lexica. In the case of Sapph. fr. 104a, however, a close inspection of the various entries may yield some conclusions.

The *Etymologicum Genuinum*, compiled in the second half of the 9th century,⁸ presents the oldest compilation. Here, the Sapphic

4) Ed. J. Petzholdt, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, Leipzig 1839, 84–5: τὸ ὑ τῷ ᾧ προστίθησιν ἐπιφερομένου φωνήεντος: οἶόν ἐστι τὸ αὖως ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄως ἤγουν ἤως. ἔσπερε πάντα φέρεις, ὅσα * * * ἐσκέδασ' αὖως.

5) Cf. H. L. Ahrens, *Literarischer Betrug*. Gregorius Corinthius de dialecto Sapphonis, *RhM* 1, 1842, 275–7.

6) On the controversial dating of Demetrius, cf. the discussion in: A. Dihle, *Zur Datierung der Schrift des Demetrius Über den Stil*, *RhM* 150, 2007, 298–313 with further literature.

7) The sixth-century P^{Berol.} 9810 is the latest trace of an edition of Sappho. A reference to Sapph. fr. 117 by Nicetas Choniates (*Or.* 5 p. 43.25–8 Van Diäten), dated 1186 AD, is copied from *Heph.* 4.2 p. 14 Consbruch; cf. my comments in: *The text and author of Sapph. fr. 117 V.*, *Mnemosyne* 70, 2017, 658–65, 662 with further literature.

8) The precise dating depends on the question of whether or not *Et. Gen.* presupposes the existence of Photius' *Lexicon*. R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*, Leipzig 1897, 60–2 argues that it does, though he revokes this view in *Etymologika*, *RE* VI 1, 1907, 807–17, 813. More recently, C. Theodoridis, *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon I*, Berlin 1982, XXXV–LX contends that *Et. Gen.* refers to the *Lexicon*, whereas K. Alpers, *Marginalien zur Überlieferung der griechischen Etymologika*, in: D. Harlfinger / G. Prato (edd.), *Paleografia e codicologia greca*, Alessandria 1991, 523–41, 525–6 argues that Photius merely edited a manuscript of *Et. Gen.* between 858 and 872 AD.

fragment is first quoted to illustrate the etymology of ἔσπερος from ἔσω περᾶν:

Et.Gen. s.v. ἔσπερος p. 129 Miller (codd. Vat. Gr. 1818 [A], Laur. S. Marci 304 [B]):⁹ ἔσπερος· ἔσπερος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῶι ἴσταται ἀστήρ' (Il. 22.318). εἶτε ὁ καιρὸς εἶτε ὁ ἀστήρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσω περᾶν τὰ ζῶα ποιεῖν καὶ παυσόμενα ἢ ὁ πέρας τῆς ἐώας φέρων· Σαπφῶ δὲ ἐτυμολογεῖ οἶον· Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ'· Αὖως, φέρεις οἶον (φ. οἶ. om. A), φέρεις οἶνον, φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις ἄπιον μητέρι παῖδα'.

A similar entry is encountered in the twelfth-century *Etymologicum Magnum*:

EM s.v. ἔσπερος p. 384.1–4 Kallierges: ἔσπερος· ἔσπερος ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῶ ἴσταται ἀστήρ' (Il. 22.318). καὶ ἐσπέρα· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσω ποιεῖν περᾶν τὰ ζῶα ἀναπαυσόμενα· ἢ ὁ πέρας τῆς ἔω φέρων. Σαπφῶ, Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαινόλις ἐσκέδασ'· αὖως'.

The entry in the *Magnum* is evidently derived directly from the corresponding entry in the *Genuinum*. Differences that exist between the two are the result of abridgment in the *Magnum*.¹⁰ This may also explain why the entry in the *Magnum* does not contain the second line of fr. 104a, as the first line appears to have sufficed for illustrating the etymology in question.¹¹

The *Genuinum* also refers to the first line of the fragment in an entry on αὖως to demonstrate the relationship between Hesperus and Eos:

Et.Gen. α 1438 Lasserre-Livadaras (codd. AB, see above):¹² αὖως· ἢ ἠώς, τουτέστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, οὕτως λέγεται παρὰ Αἰολεῦσι· Σαπφῶ· ἴπνια Αὖως' (Sapph. fr. 157) καὶ Ἔσπερε, πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαινόλης ἐδέκδασ'· Αὖως' (καὶ – Αὖως om. B).

9) Cf. also C. Calame, *Etymologicum Genuinum*. Les citations de poètes lyriques, Rome 1970, no. 71. Both Miller and Calame print incomplete versions of the entry. The text offered here has been checked against a digitised copy of cod. Vat. Gr. 1818 fol. 154rv.

10) On this practice, cf. Reitzenstein (n. 8) 53: "Bei den Etymologica und Rhetorika ist fast jeder Schreiber zugleich Recensent, und fast jeder streicht, was ihm überflüssig dünkt."

11) By a similar process, in the entry in the contemporary Et.Sym., the Sapphic quotation is omitted all together, cf. Et.Sym. ε 843 Baldi: ἔσπερος· εἶτε ὁ καιρὸς εἶτε ὁ ἀστήρ οἶον· ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῶ ἴσταται ἀστήρ' (Il. 22.318)· ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔσω περᾶν τὰ ζῶα ἀναπαυσόμενα· ἢ ὁ πέρας τῆς ἐώας φέρων·

12) Cf. also Calame (n. 9) no. 25.

This entry re-occurs again in the *Magnum*:

EM α 2138 Lasserre-Livadaras, p. 174.44–9 Kallierges: αῤῥως· ἡ ἡός, τουτέστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, οὕτω λέγεται παρ' Αἰολεῦσι· Σαπφώ· 'πότνια Αῤῥως'· καὶ 'Ἔσπερε, πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαινόλις ἐδέκδασ' Αῤῥως'.

It also features in the twelfth-century *Etymologicum Symeonis*:

Et.Sym. α 1596 Lasserre-Livadaras: αῤῥως· ἡ ἡός, τουτέστιν ἡ ἡμέρα. Σαπφώ, 'πότνια αῤῥως', καὶ, 'Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαινόλις ἐσκέδασ' αῤῥως'.

As with the entry on ἔσπερος, it seems clear that the entry on αῤῥως in the *Genuinum* served as a source for the corresponding entries in the *Magnum* and *Symeonis*. Here, too, abridgment can be observed, though the second line of fr. 104a is omitted already in the *Genuinum*.

The first line of the Sapphic fragment is also quoted in three entries of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, compiled at some point in the tenth or eleventh centuries.¹³ A first quotation is found in a rather corrupt entry on ἔσπερα, where it serves to illustrate a derivation from ἔσω περᾶν:

Et.Gud. s. v. ἔσπερα p. 2.538 De Stefani (cod. Barb. Gr. 70 [d]):¹⁴ ἔσπερα· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσω περᾶν πάντα τὰ ζῶα καὶ καθεύδειν, καὶ σαφῶς εἰς πέρας πάντα φέρειν. ἢ τῆς ἔφας πέρας ἤγουν πλήρωμα. καὶ εἰς τὸ Οὐψέ.

Another quotation is encountered in an entry on ἡός, in support of the derivation of the name ἡός from ἔως. Corruption makes this quotation almost unintelligible:

Et.Gud. s. v. ἡός p. 254 Sturz (cod. Gud. Gr. 29–30): ἡός· τὸ πρωῖνὸν φῶς τῆς ἡμέρας. ἦτοι ὅτι ἔως ταύτης ἡ νύξ, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξίεναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πρὸς τὰ οἰκεία ἔργα αὐτῶν, ὅσα φαινόλης ἐσκέδασεν ἄνθρωπος.

A similar degree of corruption can be observed in a third reference in the *Gudianum*, in an entry on ὀψία, where the purpose of the quotation is not entirely clear:

13) On the dating of Et.Gud., cf. K. Alpers, Die Etymologiensammlung im Hodegos des Anastasios Sinaites, das Etymologikum Gudianum (Barb. Gr. 70) und der Codex Vind. Theol. Gr. 40, JÖByz 34, 1984, 55–68, 62–3, and id. (n. 8) 539. The dating of the original compilation depends on the dating of the manuscript that appears to be the original archetype, i. e. cod. d.

14) Cf. also Reitzenstein (n. 8) 158–9.

Et. Gud. s. v. ὀψία p. 446 Sturz (cod. Gud. Gr. 29–30): ὀψία ἦν, παρὰ τὸ ἄψ ἰέναι ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων· καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον κατάστημα πρῶτα δὲ λέγεται, παρὰ τὸ προίεναι ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα· Σαπφώ, ‘φέσπερε πάντα φέρω ὅσα φαίνονται ἐσκέδασ’ ἠώς’.

The relationship of the *Gudianum* to the *Genuinum* is not as straightforward as that of the *Magnum* and *Symeonis*. The entries on ἠώς and ὀψία have no direct correspondent in the *Genuinum*, suggesting that they may be derived from different sources. The entry on ἔσπερα exhibits some resemblance in argument and phrasing with the entry on ἔσπερος in the *Genuinum*. However, there are also important differences (e. g. καθεύδειν) that make it seem more likely that the *Genuinum* and the *Gudianum* derived their entries on ἔσπερος and ἔσπερα respectively from a common source.¹⁵

For the identification of this source, the entry on ἔσπερα in the *Gudianum* offers valuable information. In the upper margin of the relevant page of cod. d (fol. 70r), a secondary hand offers another entry on the term ἔσπερα:

Σελεύκου. ἔσπερα· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσω περᾶν τὰ ζῶα καὶ καθεύδειν, καὶ Σαπφώ ‘Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρων, ὅσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ’ αὔωσ’. οἱ δὲ ὅτι εἰς πέρας ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἢ ὅτι ἔπεται τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου αὐγῇ.

It is evident that this entry presents an improved version of the entry found in the main text. It appears that its scribe had direct access to the original source of the *Gudianum* for the entry on ἔσπερα, and that he consulted this source after the corrupt version in the main text had been written. In light of this, the reference to Seleucus, the famous grammarian active during the reign of Tiberius,¹⁶ deserves attention. Seleucus is a well-known source of the etymological lexica. The *Gudianum* contains sixty-one attributions of entries to Seleucus, some in the main text, some in the margins.¹⁷ Many of these

15) In general, cf. also K. Alpers, Difficult problems in the transmission and interrelation of the Greek etymologica, in: G. Xenis (ed.), *Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos*, Stuttgart 2015, 293–314, 300–1.

16) On Seleucus, cf. S. Matthaios, Greek scholarship in the Imperial era and late antiquity, in: F. Montanari et al. (edd.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship I*, Leiden 2015, 184–296, 285–6. The best edition continues to be E. A. Duke, *The grammarian Seleukos of Alexandria: an edition of the fragments*, Diss. Oxford 1969. I am indebted to Elizabeth Duke and Stephanos Matthaios for commenting on earlier versions of this article.

17) Reitzenstein (n. 8) 157–65.

entries correspond to entries in the *Genuinum*, where Seleucus is almost never named as a source. The reference in the upper margin of the *Gudianum* therefore suggests that the entry on ἑσπέρα in the *Gudianum*, and consequently that on ἑσπερος in the *Genuinum*, are derived from a Seleucean source.

The precise nature of such a source is difficult to determine. One question concerns the context in which Seleucus might have quoted the Sapphic fragment. The phrasing of the entries in the lexica suggests a commentary. Seleucus is said to have written commentaries on ‘almost every poet’.¹⁸ However, there is no direct evidence for a work on Sappho.¹⁹ The fact that Il. 22.318 is quoted at the beginning of the entry on ἑσπερος in the *Genuinum* might suggest that this entry is based on a Seleucean comment on that line.²⁰ Seleucus was particularly famous for his commentaries on the Homeric epics, which earned him the epithet Ὀμηρικός.²¹ However, it is equally possible that the compiler of the *Genuinum* added this line himself, especially since it is not quoted in the *Gudianum*.²²

Similar uncertainty is cast over the ways that Seleucus reached the lexica. Whether or not the compilers had access to an edition with Seleucus’ comments in the margin would depend largely on the text in question.²³ For the *Iliad*, this could perhaps be assumed, even though the extant scholia on 22.318 show no trace of the Sapphic fragment or even of the etymology of ἑσπερος from ἔσω περᾶν.²⁴ A different process of transmission was assumed by Richard Reit-

18) Sud. σ 200: ἔγραψε ἐξηγητικά εἰς πάντα ὡς εἰπεῖν ποιητήν.

19) Cf. Duke (n. 16) 47.

20) Cf. Duke (n. 16) 258. In a private correspondence, Elizabeth Duke has distanced herself from this view.

21) Cf. Sud. σ 200: Σέλευκος, Ἀλεξανδρέυς, γραμματικός, ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ὀμηρικός. Cf. also M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich 2001, 47–50.

22) Indeed, εἴτε ὁ καιρὸς εἴτε ὁ ἀστήρ would make an odd explanation of a line calling Hesperus κάλλιστος ... ἀστήρ.

23) On the use of annotated editions in Et.Gen., cf. Reitzenstein (n. 8) 47, K. Alpers, *Eine byzantinische Enzyklopädie des 9. Jahrhunderts*, in: G. Cavallo et al. (edd.), *Scrittura, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio I*, Spoleto 1991, 235–69, 240–5.

24) Σ bT Il. 22.318: ἑσπερος: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑσπέρα ἑσπερος, τὸ δὲ ἑσπέρα παρὰ τὸ τῆς ἔω πέρας εἶναι. As Duke (n. 16) 258 points out, this etymology is presupposed at the end of the entry on ἑσπέρα in Et.Gud. (οἱ δὲ ...).

zenstein, who observed that many of the entries attributed to Seleucus in the *Gudianum* also appear, often verbatim, in a collection of etymological *Eclogae* preserved in the tenth-century codex Baroccianus 50. Reitzenstein argued that the compilers of the *Genuinum* and the *Gudianum* had access to an earlier, more complete version of these *Eclogae*, where Seleucus' etymological comments and glosses were collected in alphabetical order.²⁵ As for Sappho's fr. 104a, the *Eclogae* in their present form do not contain an entry on ἔσπερος or ἔσπερα, which makes it impossible to determine whether the entries on these terms in the *Genuinum* and *Gudianum* are in fact derived from this collection. However, the *Eclogae* do contain an entry on ἦώς, where part of the Sapphic fragment is quoted, and which seems to be the model for the *Gudianum*'s entry on ἦώς (see above):

Ecl. η 7 = An. Ox. 2.444.16–19 Cramer: ἦώς· ἦτοι ὅτι ἡ νύξ ἕως ταύτης,
ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ διεξιέναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· σαφῶς ὅσα φαινῶλης ἔσκέδασ'
αὐώς·.

This entry illustrates that the *Eclogae* had a text of the Sapphic fragment available, which in an earlier form of the collection may have been more substantial, and that the *Gudianum* received this text from the original *Eclogae* at least in one place. This lends some weight to the argument that the entries on ἔσπερος / ἔσπερα are also derived from a collection of Seleucus' etymologies, either from a more complete version of the *Eclogae* or from a similar collection. It should be stressed, however, that the lexica may have received Seleucus' quotation of the Sapphic fragment by various means, both in annotated editions and in collections.

Regardless of the precise context in which Seleucus referred to Sappho, and of the ways that he reached the lexica, his role in the transmission of the fragment is in itself significant. There is good reason to assume similar origins for the scholium on Euripides' *Orestes*. The shared etymological focus of the entries in the lexica and in the scholium already suggests that they may be part of the same tradition. Moreover, the scholium is preserved in two of the oldest manuscripts of Euripides (codd. MB),²⁶ the scholia of which

25) Reitzenstein (n. 8) 189–90.

26) On the dating of M and B, cf. Turyn (n. 3) 84–5 and 87–8 respectively, J. Diggle, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes*, Oxford 1991, 5, J. Cavarzeran, *Scholia in Euripidis Hippolytum*, Berlin 2016, 23, 30.

are generally considered to be old and reflect the scholarly activity of Hellenistic and Imperial times.²⁷ Thus, while there is no sufficient evidence to suggest that the scholium goes back to Seleucus himself,²⁸ its origins are to be located in the same intellectual milieu in which Seleucus was active.

This assessment of the testimonies of Sappho's fr. 104a has consequences for the constitution of the text. In line 1, for instance, Demetrius preserves the form φέρεις (or φέρηις²⁹), whereas the nine entries in the lexica and the scholium preserve the form φέρων. Quantitatively, therefore, Demetrius' reading would seem to be inferior. Moreover, since the text of the scholium and the Byzantine lexica is likely to originate in Alexandria during the late Hellenistic and Imperial times, it enjoys a certain authority. However, since the entries in the lexica and the scholium are all part of a single tradition, the value of their reading is equal to that of Demetrius. Corruption is as likely to have occurred in the transmission of the Seleucean model as it is in the transmission of Demetrius' treatise. In fact, Demetrius' reading offers distinct stylistic advantages. With φέρεις (φέρηις), the two lines would form two independent sentences that are connected asyndetically. The asyndeton would serve a causal purpose.³⁰ After an effective and somewhat enigmatic statement ('Hesperus, you return everything that Eos scattered'), the second sentence would offer an explanation through a series of examples ('[For] you return the sheep, you return the goat ...'). The focus would here rest on the first sentence. With φέρων, in contrast, this relationship would not be expressed. The participle would be part of the invocation ('Hesperus, O returner of everything that Eos scattered'),³¹ and the second line would constitute the main

27) Cf. Turyn (n. 3) 19, E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Oxford 2007, 32.

28) Cf. also Duke (n. 16) 52.

29) On the form, cf. E. Lobel, *Alkaiou μέλη*, Oxford 1927, XXVII n. 2, E.-M. Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, Berlin ²1958, 164.

30) In general, cf. R. Kühner / B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache II*, Hannover and Leipzig 1898, 2.344–5. For Sappho, cf. fr. 94.2–3 with E. Tzamali, *Syntax und Stil bei Sappho*, Munich 1996, 309–10, 311–12.

31) On participle phrases as part of hymnic invocations, cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913, 166–8. For hymnic invocations to Hesperus, cf. e. g. Bion fr. 11, *Catul.* 61.1–75.

clause ('you return ...'). Here, the focus would be on the second line. Though the absence of a wider context renders a decision difficult, φέρειε (φέρηιε) seems to produce a more coherent and more attractive interpretation than φέρων.³²

Genre

Since the earliest editions of Sappho, it has been assumed that fr. 104a originates from an epithalamium. The reason for this assumption is a parallel in a Catullan epithalamium (62.20–3):

*Hesperie, quis caelo fertur crudelior ignis?
qui natam possis complexu auellere matris,
complexu matris retinentem auellere natam,
et iuueni ardenti castam donare puellam.*

Unlike the Catullan passage, the second line of the Sapphic fragment as it is transmitted (n. b., only) in Demetrius and the entry on ἔσπερος in the *Genuinum* does not contain the notion that Hesperus removes a daughter from her mother at her wedding day. Instead, the transmitted text seems to state that Hesperus returns a daughter to her mother (φέρεις μάτερι παῖδα). To introduce the Catullan sentiment into the Sapphic fragment, Theodor Bergk took recourse to conjecture.³³ He argued that a corruption in the *Genuinum* (φέρεις ἄποιον μητέρι παῖδα) might reflect an original reading and restored from it the sequence φέρεις ἄπυ ματέρι παῖδα. This ἄπυ, it seems, is to be interpreted as a postponed preverb of φέρεις in tmesi.³⁴

32) φέρειε (φέρηιε) was first printed by C. J. Blomfield, *Sapphonis fragmenta*, *Museum Criticum* or, *Cambridge Classical Researches* 1, 1813, 1–31, 22. Among recent editors, φέρων is printed by E. Lobel, *Σαπφοῦς μέλη*, Oxford 1925, 46, E. Lobel / D. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, Oxford 1955, 86, and D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric I*, Cambridge Mass. 1982, 130; cf. also D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford 1955, 121.

33) Cf. T. Bergk, *Poetae lyriici Graeci III*, Leipzig 1882, 122. Bergk did not print the second line of fr. 104a in any form in the first three editions.

34) P. Thieme, *Jungfrauengatte: Sanskrit kaumārah patiḥ – Homer. κοῦρίδιος πόσις – Lat. maritus*, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 78, 1963,

Though Bergk's conjecture has been accepted by all recent editors, the insertion of ἄπυ and the wider notion that it attempts to restore are confronted with difficulties. It is not at all clear that the corruption ἄποιον in the *Genuinum* reflects an original reading. It might have entered the text as a marginal gloss intended to address the confusion between φέρεις οἶνον and φέρεις οἶον earlier in the line. Moreover, since tmesis with a postponed preverb is rare in Greek poetry and unparalleled in Sappho,³⁵ φέρεις ἄπυ introduces a difficult form. Further problems are posed by the logical sequence of the fragment. Line 2 is connected to line 1 as a series of examples of entities returned by Hesperus after Eos scattered them (see above). If, in the third of these examples, the daughter were not returned to her mother (φέρεις) but removed from her (ἀπυφέρεις), this sequence would be disrupted.³⁶ It is also doubtful that Demetrius would have considered a sequence φέρεις ... φέρεις ... (ἀπυ-) φέρεις an instance of anaphora.

The difficulties involved in introducing a Catullan sentiment into the text should prompt greater caution against adducing Catullus 62 as a parallel for Sappho's fr. 104a.³⁷ It is possible that Catullus adopted his Sapphic model creatively. Or the notion that Hesperus removes the daughter from her mother on her wedding day may have featured later in Sappho's song.³⁸ Or Catullus drew on an-

161–248, 224 = Kleine Schriften II, Wiesbaden 1971, 426–512, 489 entertains the possibility that ἀπύ is a preposition with the dative. However, this construction, which is restricted to Arcado-Cypriot (cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik I*, Munich 1934, 88), is without parallel in Sappho or Alcaeus, where ἀπύ always takes the genitive; cf. e. g. Sapph. fr. 68a.1, 96.27–8, 98a.11, 101.3, Alc. fr. 34A.15, 58.21, 115a.6, 130b.21, 322, 345.1, 350.7.

35) Cf. Kühner / Gerth (n. 30) 1.530 with Il. 2.699 (ἔχεν κατά), 7.425 (νίζοντες ἄπο), 12.195 (ἐνάριζον ἄπ'), 17.91 (λίπω κατά), Od. 5.196 (ἐτίθει πάρα), Pi. O. 1.49 (τάμον κατά), 3.6 (ζευχθέντες ἔπι). For normal tmesis in Sappho, cf. fr. 42.2 (πὰρ δ' ἴεισι), 48.2 (ὄν δ' ἔφυσας, conj.), 100 (ἀμφὶ δ' ... ἐτύκασσεν), 168B.3 (παρὰ δ' ἔρχετ').

36) Some interpreters (e. g. M. Treu, Sappho, Munich 1954, 254 and Tzamali [n. 30] 389–91) consider this disruption a witty instance of ἀπροσδόκητον, but there is no parallel for this particular kind of humour in Sappho. ἀποφέρειν can also mean 'to return' (cf. LSJ s. v. II), which would avoid the logical difficulties. However, the formal aspects continue to pose problems.

37) Cf. similarly L. Perelli, *Il carme 62 di Catullo e Saffo*, RFIC 78, 1950, 289–312, 301.

38) Cf. similarly Page (n. 32) 121 n. 1.

other poem, Sapphic or not, now lost. If the Catullan parallel is less significant than it might at first appear, the entire attribution to the epithalamia is called into question. Unlike other fragments (e. g. fr. 113, 116), fr. 104a is nowhere explicitly quoted as originating from an epithalamium. Nor is there any unmistakable reference to the wedding in the fragment itself.³⁹ Hesperus can be invoked in a variety of evening activities.⁴⁰ *πάϊς* may elsewhere refer to the bride,⁴¹ but here, in juxtaposition with *μάτερι*, it seems to denote first and foremost a child, irrespective of age or sex. In fact, the first two examples of Hesperus' activity in line 2 speak against an epithalamic provenance. The return of sheep and goats after a day out on the field constitute recurrent events taking place every evening. It is hard to see how such an event might provide a background for an event as singular as the wedding ceremony. A less complicated reading would be that, just as sheep and goats return from the fields, children return to their mothers after a day's activity, be it in school, at play, or at work.

The recurrence of these events might offer a criterion for identifying alternative contexts of performance. Among the events taking place recurrently in the evening and accompanied by musical entertainment, the symposium offers an attractive candidate. Recent scholarship has effectively demonstrated that the symposium is a likely context for the performance of many of Sappho's songs.⁴² Sappho, or her poetic voice, is here seen as the singer of her

39) Similar considerations apply to fr. 104b (*ἀστέρων πάντων ὁ κάλλιστος*), which is thought to originate from the same song as fr. 104a. Himerius quotes this line not in his wedding speeches, but in two addresses to the proconsul Basilius (Or. 46.8 p. 188 Colonna, 47.17 p. 195 Colonna).

40) At Mel. AP 12.114 = 75 Gow-Page, for example, Hesperus is invoked because he signals the re-union of lover and beloved; at Bion fr. 11, he is asked to shine on a group of shepherds as one of them sings of his love. Sapph. fr. 117B a (*Ἔσπερ' ὑμήνων*) appears to be epithalamic, but there are severe uncertainties about this fragment. T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, Leipzig² 1853, 692 prints *Ἵμεν' Ἵμήνων* (followed by Keil ad loc.), though in app. he suspects that the whole fragment might be an ad hoc forgery by Sacerd. Gramm. Lat. 6.517.4 Keil.

41) Cf. Sapph. fr. 113. Cf. also C. Calame, *Les noms de la femme dans les poèmes de Sappho*, *Eugesta* 3, 2013, 6–24, 8–11.

42) Cf. esp. E. Bowie, *How did Sappho's songs get into the male sympotic repertoire?*, in: A. Bierl / A. Lardinois (edd.), *The Newest Sappho*, Leiden 2016, 148–64.

own songs, accompanied by dancers, among male symposiasts and female hetaerae.⁴³ Fr. 104a would fit seamlessly into such a setting. Hesperus would be hailed as the deliverer of sympotic peace and unity after the day's struggles and affairs. The tranquil images of sheep and goats returning from the fields and children returning to their mothers would serve as three metaphors for the vespertine re-union in the andron.⁴⁴ It needs to be stressed, however, that this argument is not intended as a confident attribution of Sappho's fr. 104a to sympotic poems, but as a prompt to caution against tacitly presupposing an epithalamic provenance.

Metre

The second line of fr. 104a has often been subjected to rather substantial alterations, for instance:

φρεις οἶν, φρεις αἶγα, φρεις μάτερι παῖδ' ἀγαπάταν)
(Ahrens)⁴⁵

αἶγα σὺν οἶν τε φέρεις, σὺν φέρεις καὶ ματέρι παῖδα
(Hartung)⁴⁶

43) Cf. also the observation of R. Schlesier, *Atthis, Gyrinno, and other hetairai*, *Philologus* 157, 2013, 199–222 that most of the names of Sappho's companions evoke the names of hetaerae.

44) C. F. Neue, *Sapphus Mytilenaeae fragmenta*, Berlin 1827, 78–9 once advanced a sympotic interpretation of the fragment based on a defense of the reading οἶνον, which is found instead of ὄϊν in the manuscripts of both Demetrius and the *Genuinum*. However, there can be no doubt that, next to αἶγα, ὄϊν is the correct word and that the sequence OIN was wrongly assumed to involve an abbreviated ending -ON. The correction ὄϊν is first found in J. Kessel (Caselius), *Phalereus sive de elocutione liber*, Rostock 1585 = C. Horne, *Ioannis Caselii opera* I, Frankfurt 1633, 78–300, 200, who reports that, during a visit in Rome in 1565, he saw it noted in an edition of Demetrius in the library of Paulus Manutius. The same correction was proposed independently by Fabius Benevolentius ap. F. Orsini (Ursinus), *Carmina novem illustrium feminarum* [...], Antwerp 1568, 287. On the form ὄϊν, rather than Attic contracted οἶν, cf. Hamm (n. 29) 29.

45) H. L. Ahrens, *De Graecae linguae dialectis* II, Göttingen 1843, 545.

46) J. A. Hartung, *Die griechischen Lyriker* VI, Leipzig 1857, 104.

οἶν σὺν φέρεεις τε καὶ αἶγα φέρεεις καὶ ματέρι παῖδα
(Koechly)⁴⁷

αἶγα φέρηις καὶ οἶν τύ, φέρηις τ' ἄπυ μάτερι παῖδα
(Bowra)⁴⁸

αἶγα φέρεεις ἔπερόν τε, φέρεεις ἄπυ μάτερι παῖδα
(Floyd)⁴⁹

All of these alterations are motivated by metrical considerations.⁵⁰ Regardless of whether line 1 is printed with φέρων or φέρηις, it can only be interpreted as an epic hexameter.⁵¹ The conjectures printed here present attempts to restore the same metre also in line 2. The underlying assumption is that, since comparable hexameters in Sappho are only found in stichic repetition (e.g. frs. 105a, 105b), the same has to apply also in fr. 104a.

However, all of these conjectures constitute severe interventions in the text that cannot be accounted for by the usual modes of transmission. A particular objection that affects all of these conjectures is that they are compelled to remove φέρεεις (φέρηις) from the initial position, as this iambic word cannot be accommodated at the beginning of a hexameter.⁵² This operation is highly problem-

47) H. Koechly, Über Sappho [...], in: Akademische Vorträge und Reden I, Zürich 1859, 154–217, 198. P. Sandin, Verbal repetition in Sappho, *Hermes* 142, 2014, 225–39, 235 recently tried to revive Koechly's reading, without any awareness of the difficulties highlighted here.

48) C. M. Bowra, Zu Alkaios und Sappho, *Hermes* 70, 1935, 238–41, 240.

49) E. D. Floyd, Sappho's word for 'sheep', 104A.2 (L.-P.), *CR* 18, 1968, 266–7.

50) More obscure are the intended scansions of G. Hermann, Über die Behandlung der griechischen Dichter bei den Engländern [...], *Wiener Jahrbücher* 54, 1831, 217–70, 266 = *Opuscula* VI, Leipzig 1835, 70–141, 135 (καὶ γὰρ οἶν σὺν φέρεεις, φέρεεις αἶγα, φέρεισθα δὲ ματρὶ παῖδα) and H. L. Ahrens, *De Graecae linguae dialectis* I, Göttingen 1839, 265 ((...) φόρεεις οἶν, αἶγα φόρεεις, μάτερι παῖδα φόρεεις).

51) This hexameter cannot be interpreted as 'Aeolic' hexameter (○○–υυ–υυ–υυ–υυ–x = ph^{3d}), since Ἔσπερε cannot fill the first two positions of the pherecratean.

52) Bergk (n. 33) prints φέρεεις οἶν, φέρες αἶγα, φέρεεις ἄπυ ματέρι παῖδα, apparently assuming that this hexameter may have a short princeps. For the few epic examples of short princeps syllables, cf. M. L. West, *Homer's metre*, in: I. Morris / B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, 218–37, 231 with further literature. Even if this scansion were unproblematic, the random change from φέρεεις to φέρες and back renders his line unattractive.

atic, because Demetrius explicitly quotes fr. 104a as an instance of ἀναφορά of φέρεις. Elsewhere in Demetrius, and throughout Greek rhetorical writing, ἀναφορά and ἐπαναφορά refer to repetitions of words at the beginning of subsequent cola or sentences.⁵³ It would be inexplicable why Demetrius would refer to line 2 as ἀναφορά of φέρεις if φέρεις were not in the initial position of the line. This consideration, in fact, renders the restoration of an epic hexameter, in any form, unattainable at the outset. Consequently, the hexameter of line 1 must here be combined with a different line.

According to the objections raised above against the insertion of ἄπυ, this line emerges as φέρηρις οἶν, φέρηρις αἶγα, φέρηρις μάτερι παῖδα (υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ). This line can be interpreted as an iambic prefix and a pherecratean with a choriambic expansion (ia ph^c).⁵⁴ Alternatively, if ἄπυ is inserted, the line emerges as φέρηρις οἶν, φέρηρις αἶγα, φέρηρις ἄπυ μάτερι παῖδα (υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ). This line would constitute an iambic prefix and a pherecratean with two dactylic expansions (ia ph^{2d}). Though neither period is attested elsewhere in Sappho or Alcaeus, both are conceivable by the known conventions of Aeolic versification.⁵⁵ A crucial question is whether a combination of an epic hexameter

53) Cf. Demetr. Eloc. 61, 268 (ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχήν) with P. Chiron, Un rhéteur méconnu. Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère), Paris 2001, 188. Other definitions are found at [Longin.] Subl. 20.1–2, Hermog. Id. 1.12 p. 302.13–14 Rabe (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μέρος τοῦ λόγου ... κατ' ἀρχάς), Alex. Fig. 1.14 p. 20.30–1 Spengel (ὅταν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματος δύο ἢ πλείω κῶλα ἄρχηται), 2.3 p. 29.13–25 Spengel, Phoeb. Fig. 1 p. 46.21–2 Spengel (πλειόνων στίχων ἢ κῶλων ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν ἀρχή), Tib. Fig. 29 p. 72.27–8 Spengel (ὅταν δύο καὶ πλειόνων κῶλων κόμματα ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς λέξεως ἄρχηται), Hdn. Fig. p. 96.31–2 Spengel, Zonae. Fig. 25 p. 164.30–1 Spengel (πλειόνων κῶλων ἢ ῥημάτων ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς λέξεως ἀρχομένων συνεκδοχή), Anon. Fig. 24 p. 181.15–16 Spengel (κῶλων πλειόνων ἢ ῥημάτων ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς λέξεως ἀρχομένων). Cf. also H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Munich 1960, 318.

54) U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker, Berlin 1900, 72 also considers φέρεις οἶν an iambic unit, but he interprets it as a separate line (cf. also the text printed by C. Gallavotti, Saffo e Alceo I, Naples 1956, 126). However, there seems to be little basis for dissecting this logical unit. Fr. 111 offers no parallel, since here the iambic line ὑμῖναον forms a self-sufficient meshmynium.

55) For ph^c, cf. Sapph. fr. 151. For ph^{2d}, cf. Sapph. fr. 115, 136. For iambic prefixes or suffixes to expanded Aeolic cola, cf. Sapph. fr. 155 (.ia hag^d), Alc. fr. 401B a (gl^d ia).

with such an Aeolic period is acceptable, or whether it is so inconceivable that line 2 has to be obelised, as is done, for instance, by Lobel and Page.⁵⁶

Comparable combinations have no unambiguous parallel in Sappho or Alcaeus.⁵⁷ Parallels may, however, emerge if fr. 104a is placed in its wider musical context. Some features of the fragment exhibit a distinct connection with popular traditions of song. Figures of verbal repetition, like ἀναφορά, are among the most common rhetorical devices employed in popular song.⁵⁸ Caesura after the initial iambic unit in line 2 creates the impression of a simple improvised rhythm.⁵⁹ If φέρηις is printed, the asyndeton would make the succession of sentences sound rapid and somewhat unpolished. The presence of these features is no coincidence. If fr. 104 originates from an epithalamium, it would be connected through the wedding ceremony with traditions of popular wedding songs. If it originates from a sympotic song, it would be connected with traditions of short impromptu songs delivered by the participants of symposia, the so-called *scolia*.⁶⁰

It is often observed that other specimens of Greek popular traditions of song, like the anonymous songs collected among the *Carmina popularia*, appear to enjoy a distinct metrical license that sets them apart from their more constrained counterparts transmitted under the names of individual poets.⁶¹ Here, lines of various kinds are combined in ways that often defy the usual dichotomy of stichic and strophic. The Samian *Eiresione* (Vit. Hom. 467–80), for instance, is unique in that it combines twelve hexameters with

56) Cf. Lobel / Page (n. 32) 86.

57) Cf., however, The text and metre of Sapph. fr. 114 V., *Mnemosyne* 72, 2019, 1–11, where I argue that fr. 114 combines 3cho ba with 3tr –.

58) Cf. F. Pordomingo, La poesía popular griega, in: O. Pecere / A. Stramaglia (edd.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, Cassino 1996, 463–80, 471, C. Neri, *Sotto la politica*, *Lexis* 21, 2003, 193–255, 197.

59) Sappho and Alcaeus tend to avoid caesura here; cf. J. Irigoin, *La structure des vers éoliens*, *L'Antiquité Classique* 25, 1956, 5–19.

60) Cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, Giessen 1893, 2–13, A. E. Harvey, *The classification of Greek lyric poetry*, *CQ* n.s. 5, 1955, 157–75, 162–3. The collection of Attic *scolia* (Carm. Conv. frr. 884–908 Page) display a remarkable metrical homogeneity, but this is unlikely to reflect a universal practice.

61) Cf. e.g. Pordomingo (n. 58) 473–5, Neri (n. 58) 197–8.

two iambic trimeters. Particularly instructive is the Rhodian *Che-
lidonisma* (Carm. Pop. fr. 848 Page), which combines, depending on
the interpretation,⁶² eleven Aeolic or Ionic cola with eight iambic
trimeters in an astrophic composition.

The parallel of the Samian *Che-
lidonisma* is highly suggestive
for the metre of Sappho's fr. 104a. It opens the path to an interpre-
tation of the fragment as an astrophon modelled on similar astropho-
characteristic of popular song. On this interpretation, the combi-
nation of an epic hexameter with an Aeolic period presents no in-
surmountable difficulty.

Conclusion

In lieu of a summary of the preceding arguments, I offer the
following text of Sappho's fr. 104a, which may not be substantially
different from that found in Voigt's edition but which, I hope, pro-
vides a firmer foundation for further study:

Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρησι ὅσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ' Αὔωσι·
φέρησι ὄϊν, φέρησι αἶγα, φέρησι μάτερι παῖδα.

Köln

Felix Meister

62) Lines 1–11 are traditionally interpreted as reiziana (⏏–⏏⏏–×). M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, 147 considers them ionics (⏏⏏–⏏⏏–×). See now also F. Budelmann, *Greek Lyric*, Cambridge 2018, 257–8.