Sappho and her Brothers, and other Passages from the First Book
Franco Ferrari

Translated from the Italian by Chiara Mecariello

1. Waiting for Charaxus

If Sappho was born around 640/630, as according to the generally unanimous ancient chronology, then the first of the new poems recently published by D. Obbink (Obbink 2014) reflects, by referring to her younger brother Larichus as not ‘a man’ yet, a situation datable to around 620/610, before the poetess’s departure for the Sicilian exile around 600.

Charaxus (the eldest of Sappho’s brothers according to P.Oxy. 1800 fr. 1.1-35 = Sapph. T 252) has already set out to export Lesbian wine to Naucratis (Herodot. 2.135, Strab. 17.1.33, Athen. 13.596b-c etc. = T 254). The Egyptian port-of-trade had been flourishing for some decades on the eastern bank of the Canopic branch of the Nile after Chios, Tecte, Phocaia, and other ionic poleis promoted it around 655 BCE. At that time, however, Naucratis was not yet a Greek polis as Herodotus defines it in 2.178, when he mentions Amasis’ favours to the Greeks.

Larichus was a cup-bearer in the Prytaneion of Mytilene, and was often praised by his sister for this rôle (Athen. 10.425a πολλαχοῦ Λάριχον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐπαινεῖ ὡς οἰνοχοούντα ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ τοῦ Μυτιληναίου, cf. Eust. Il. 1205.17ff., schol. T Il. 20.234 = T 203).

* I wish to warmly thank Lucia Prauscello and Martin West (who also allowed me to consult his article for ZPE (West 2014) before publication) for precious and diverse suggestions, proposals, objections, which they gave me in a series of emails started slightly after Obbink’s ‘preliminary version’ appeared online in January 2014 (some of their most specific contributions are indicated by their name and an asterisk). Valuable help also came from Daniela Colomo, curator of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, who rigorously checked, on my request, some fragments of P. Oxy. 1231, housed in the Bodlean Library at Oxford.

1 Cf. Euseb. Chron. p. 99b Helm (Hieron.): Ol. 45.1 = 600/599 Sappho et Alcaeus clari habentur. (Armenian version) Ol. 46.2 = 595/594, Suda c 107 (= T 253) γεγονυ ἀκατά τὴν μῆς Ἡλείαν (Ol. 42 = 612/609) ὥσ τε καὶ Ἀλκαῖος ἦν καὶ Στηγέμορος καὶ Πιττακός, Strab. 13.2.3 and Marm. Par., ep. 35 = FrGrHist 239 A 36 (T 251). The year mentioned in the latter inscription for Sappho’s Sicilian exile is that of the archonship of the first Critias. It falls between 605/604, to which the previous entry refers, and 591/590, to which the following entry refers. The years 595/594 to 592/591 are ruled out because they can be associated with archons other than Critias. On the general reliability of the data preserved in the Marmor Parium vis-à-vis Sappho’s biography see Jacoby 1904, 100-2; on the possibility that the data common to Eusebius and the Marmor Parium derive from the peripatetic Phanias of Eresus see Mosshammer 1977, 125.

2 That Larichus was younger than Sappho is not explicitly stated in any source, but can be reasonably argued from Sappho’s singing of him when he still was a cup-bearer in the prytaneion of Mytilene, and is now confirmed by her wish that he become ‘a man’.

3 Quotations of passages and testimonies of and on Sappho and Alcaeus are always from the edition of E.-M. Voigt (Voigt 1971), unless otherwise stated.
Here are the text and translation of the new poem (P. Sapph. Obbink, ll. 1-20), which is entirely and almost perfectly preserved apart from one or more initial stanzas belonging to the previous column. The deviations from Obbink’s edition only regard the possible corruption of a word in l. 14 and a different syntactical interpretation of the opening sentence, plus some punctuation details:\(^4\)

ἀλλ’ ἄι θρύλησθα Χάραξον ἐλθην
ναὶ σὺν πληία, τὰ μὲν, οἴομαι, Ζεὺς
οἴδε εὕμπαντές τε θέοι, σὲ δ’ οὐ χρὴ
tαῦτα νόησθαι

ἀλλά καὶ πέμπτην ἦμε καὶ κέλεθαι
πόλλα λίσσεθαί βασίληαν Ἡραν
ἐξίκεθαί τυίδε σάν ἄγοντα

νάα Χάραξον
κᾱμὲ ἐπεύρην ἀρτέμεας· τὰ δ’ ἀλλα
πάντα δαμώνεσσιν ἐπιτρόπομεν·

εὐδιαὶ γὰρ ἐκ μεγάλαν ἄηταν

αἴσια πέλονται.

τῶν κε ἴλησην ἱλιόμηκας Ὀλύμπῳ

δαμ浔ν’ ἐκ πόνων ἐπ’ ἀρην ἦδη

περτρόπιν, κῆνοι μάκαρες πέλονται

καὶ πολύλιβοι·

κἀμεᾳ, σαὶ κε τὰν κεφάλαν ἀέρρη
Λάριχς καὶ δῆ ποτ’ ἁνηρ γένηται,

καὶ μᾶλ’ ἐκ πόλλαν βαρυθυμίαν κεν

αἴσια λύθειμεν.

... but you keep repeating that Charaxus has arrived
with his ship full, something that, I believe,
Zeus and all the gods know, but not about this
should you be concerned,

but only about sending me off and inviting me to raise
many supplications to queen Hera, that
Charaxus may come here steering
his ship unharmed

\(^4\) In presenting the texts I will not reproduce all the underdots below uncertain letters, which are scrupulously used in the editions of Obbink and of Burris, Fish and Obbink (BFO), and explained in their palaeographical apparatuses. I will only reproduce those below letters whose reading is really doubtful, also considering the context and the possible presence of other witnesses (what is of uncertain reading in one of them may be not uncertain in another one). This will allow us to focus more easily on the really problematic parts.
and find us women safe and sound: the rest, let’s entrust it all to the gods, for calm suddenly follows great storms.

Those whose fortune the king of Olympus wants finally to reverse for the best, far from pains, those become happy and very prosperous.

We too, if Larichus were to raise his head and finally to become a man, would be all of a sudden freed from many heavinesses of heart.

In l. 2 τὰ μὲν may well be in apposition with what precedes; thus, there is no reason to insert a full stop after πλήματι although it is followed by upper stop in the papyrus (the upper stop can be interpreted as end of Kurzcolon, not end of sentence).

οἴσμαι is parenthetical and so it must be between commas.

In l. 5 καὶ cannot mean ‘especially’ (compared to what?) but has a limiting function (‘only’), as in Hom. Od. 1.58 ἵμῳ καὶ κατην ἀποθεώσκοντα νοήσαι. For βασίληαν Ἡραν (l. 6) cf. Pind. Pae. *21.11 ἵνα βασίλειαν Ὀλυμπίων. The epithet seems to confirm the mention of Hera in the marginal scholium ad 15 in P. Oxy. 2165 fr. 1 col. i (τὸ τῆς Ἡρας), referring to τεῖχος βασιλήιον in the text, see Liberman 1999, I, 62f. This is a very lacunose poem, Alc. fr. 130a, yet placed between Alc. 129 and 130b, two passages both set in the panlesbian Heraion of Mesa.

In l. 14 I believe we should accept West’s correction (2014) ἐπ’ ἄρην for the papyrus’ ἐπάρωγον (ἐπάρωγον post correctionem; ἐπάρηγον ante correctionem). To this suggestion Obbink 2014, 44 objects [p.3] that it ‘requires understanding δαίμον in a radically different sense from 10’, but the objection is weak, given the transition from the plural to the singular (for δαίμων ‘destiny’ or ‘fortune’ see LSJ s.v. I 2, to which I would add Pind. Ol. 13.28 Ξενοφώντος εὗθυνε δαίμονος οὖρον and the Orphic line (OF 5.2 τί) in P. Derv. col. 8.5 ἀλκήν τ’ ἐν χείρεσσι [λ]άβ[ε]ν κ’ αἰ δαίμον[α] κυδρόν, for whose interpretation I refer to Ferrari 2013, 61f.). With ἐπάρωγον, on the contrary, we would be forced to have δαίμον governed not by περτρόπην (=περιτρέπειν) but by βόλληται, as Obbink’s translation itself shows: ‘of whomever the King of Olympus wishes/ a divinity as helper now to turn them/ from troubles’. In fact, τῶν κε βόλληται βασίλεια Ὀλύμπω... περτρόπην can only mean ‘those of whom the King of

5 [The Italian has feminine adjectives, presumably taking ‘us’ to refer to the (female) speaker and the addressee (v. 1: her mother, as argued below) only, although ἀρτέρας, ‘safe and sound’ (accusative plural adjective) is common, allowing grammatically for females and/or males; cf. below p. 3: ‘finding his loved ones safe and sound’, where the Italian has masculine adjectives, allowing for both males only, and males and females together—Translator’s note.]
Olympus wish to reverse’ (cf. adesp. TrGF 547.4 ὁ περιέτρεπεν ἣ χρόνος τις ἢ φθόνος), and so both δαίμον as ‘daemon’ and ἐπάρωγον become impossible.

How can the addressee of the poetess’s words say that Charaxus has come back with his ship full if only Zeus and the other gods may know of such a return? His return, if had really happened, must have been known not only to the gods, but to whoever in Mytilene had looked at the harbour (or one of the harbours, if we also take into account the secondary port facing the Anatolic coast). Obbink is inclined to give ἔλθην in l. 1 an atemporal meaning (‘the infinitive... represents an original subjunctive or optative in indirect statement: “you are always chattering that Charaxos should come”, or ‘chattering “May Charaxos come” (or “chattering for Charaxos to come”, or just ‘chattering: “Charaxos come”)’, but this contradicts the general rule according to which, ‘when the optative and infinitive stand in indirect discourse, each tense represents the corresponding tense of the same verb in the direct discourse’ (Goodwin 1889, §126). Actually the aorist infinitive ἔλθειν governed by a verbum dicendi entails an evident projection towards the past in Pind. Py. 1.52 φαντὶ δὲ... ἔλθειν, Aesch. Pe. 440, Ag. 634f. πῶς γὰρ λέγεις χειμῶνα ναυτικῷ στρατῶι | ἔλθειν, Eur. Med. 530 λόγος διελθεῖν. Obvious exceptions are verbs indicating hope, expectation, will, promise, threat, oath, possibility, those, that is, which already contain an implicit reference to the future, and the passages quoted by Obbink to legitimate a purely ‘aspectual’ interpretation of the infinitive belong to this class of verbs (Alc. fr. 69.3ff. α’ κε δυνάμεθα... | eis πόιν ἔλθην and Aesch. Ch. 138 ἔλθειν δ’ Ὀρέστην δεύμπ... | κατεύχομαι so).

Perhaps an explanation of this unusual temporal perspective lies in αἱ θερμήθεσα: the adverb αἱ (= ἄξι) underlines the inanity of the statement (a real return should be announced once for all, not repeatedly) and θρυλέω refers to a rumeur, murmure, a rabâcher (Chantraine, DELG, p. 443). It is similar to but more colourful than λαλέω, and thus it can denote a solipsistic vaniloquence, a pointless fantasising along the line of the two passages quoted by Obbink: Eur. El. 910 θρυλοῦε’ α’ γ’ εἰπεῖν ἥθελον κατ’ ὀμμα σῶν (Electra, in solitude, repeats to herself what she imagines to say to Orestes) and Aristoph. Eq. 348 (Paphlagon attempts oratorical training) τὴν νῦκτα θρυλῶ καὶ λαλῶν ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς σεαυτῶι.

On the contrary - the lyric ‘I’ objects - Charaxus’ return (τὰ μὲν 2, recalled by ταύτα 4) is known only to Zeus and the other gods. It is a possibility that can be promoted only by addressing Queen Hera (patroness of navigation, she favoured the return of the Atreids, as fr. 17 tells). To Hera Sappho herself wishes to be invited to turn so that Charaxus may really ‘arrive here’. Not necessarily loaded with goods, however, but, in a sort of correction of ναὶ εὐχ πλήσαι of l. 2 (for which, with *Prauscello, cf. Hom. Od. 15.446 νῦς πλείσθαι βιότοιο, with his ‘ship safe’ (l. 7f. καύν... νά), and finding his loved ones safe and sound (ἀρτέμες, cf. Hom. Od. 13.421. ἀμύμονα δ’ οἴκοι ἀκοίτημ | νοστήσας εὐροίμαι εὐν ἀρτεμέεσσι φίλοισιν). If this, and only this,

---

6 An interesting comparison, highlighted by *Prauscello, is that with Hom. Od. 14.119 Ζεὺς γάρ που τὸ γε οἶδε καὶ ἀδελφὸς θεῖος ἄλλοι (Obbink 2014, 43 quotes only Hom. Il. 3.308 and Od. 15.523). The context here (a dialogue between Eumaeus and the false beggar concerning Odysseus’ affairs) shows affinities with our passage.

7 Prauscello correctly notes the similarity of the Odyssean context, in that ‘in these lines Odysseus clearly distinguishes between, on the one hand, having obtained the φιλά δῶρα from the Phaeacians (= Sapph. υψί εὐχ πλήσαι; obviously in Od. the goods do not derive from trade but are xenia) and the convoy (this is presented as already happened in
is what one should ask Hera, ‘the other things’ (τὰ δ’ ἀλλὰ 9) - good and bad fortune, health and prosperity (πολύολβοι in l. 16), in other words the fortunes of the family in its entirety and not just those of Charaxus - must be entrusted to the power of gods (cf. Hor. Carm. 1.9.9 permitte divis cetera) and to Zeus’ possible will to reverse a currently compromised situation in a positive way. In this context, it is no more a matter of supplicating a certain god, but of committing oneself to the rhythm of things dictated by the gods, not a matter of praying but of hoping.

At the turning point marked by τὰ δ’ ἀλλὰ 9, the speech shifts from Charaxus’ return to a more general reflection on the human condition; κάμινε in l. 17 connects this to the topic of Sappho’s and her addressee’s situation. Charaxus’ return, entrusted to the supplication of Hera, is now out of focus: good luck and prosperity can appear suddenly, and independently of what the elder brother is doing (indeed, it is probably better to leave him alone!), thanks to the help of Zeus and, on a more realistic level, to the maturation of the adolescent Larichus. So ‘we too’, with the help of the gods, would be suddenly (αἴψα 20, cf. αἴψα 12) freed from many troubles.

Only Sappho’s mother (Kleis, cf. P. Oxy. 1800, fr. 1.1-35 = Sapph. T 252 and Sud. c 107 = T 253) can feel involved, at least as much as Sappho herself, in Charaxus and Larichus’ affairs, even more so if we consider that the poetess’s father must have died when Sappho was a child ([Ovid.] Her. 15.61f. sex mihi natales ierant, cum lecta parentis / ante diem lacrimas ossa bibere meas). Kleis junior is also excluded for chronological reasons.8

Now that the elder brother Charaxus is away on business and Larichus has not become an adult yet, the two women, the mature mother and the young Sappho, deprived of a masculine centre of authority within the aristocratic οἶκος (despite the openness of Lesbian society to the female world, the οἶκος still had to gravitate around a man), are - or at least feel - in a condition of social and economical uncertainty (πόνοι and βαρυθύμαι are mentioned, for which cf. fr. 58.15 augmented by P. Köln XI 429: βάρυς δὲ μ’ ὁ θύμος πεπόηται).

Perhaps exacerbated by the pressures of the public voice, the mother keeps repeating, in a sort of compulsive fantasy, that the elder son has come back with the ship loaded with goods (spices, fabrics...) traded for wine. Her daughter tries to bring her back to reality by inviting her to shift her attention from the thought of the return of an enriched Charaxus to that of the return of Charaxus simply alive and, later in the poem, from Charaxus to Larichus.

Without a father and without an elder brother, the teenager Larichus, in daily contact with the adults of the aristocratic society of Mytilene to whom he pours drinks at the symposia, is

8 Obbink (2014, 41) puts forth other possibilities - Charaxus’ lover (Dorica/Rhodopis or another one), the speaker’s group, Sappho herself - but he considers the identification with the mother more likely. Further, as Obbink himself notes (2014, 40), the beginning of the new text overlaps to a certain extent (in any case sufficient to make the connection certain) with P. Oxy. 2289 fr. 5, which also contains remains of two lines of the previous strophe (...) λα[.] and ...) εὐ[.] respectively). Therefore, it is very likely that cf. μὰ τερ (with West 2014) stood here, the trace after εὐ being congruent with α. And fr. 9, already partially preserved by P. Oxy. 2289 fr. 4 and now augmented by P. GC. inv. 105 fr. 1, where we read μὰ τερ, ἕρταν in l. 3 (suppl. BFO), also belongs to a speech about a festival addressed by Sappho to her mother.
ashamed and lowers his head humiliated, like the fatherless Astyanax in his mother’s imagination in Hom. Il. 22.491 πάντα δ’ ύπεμνήμυκε ‘and bows the head completely’.

The daughter’s somewhat therapeutic and didactic intervention also aims to promote the younger brother to new leader of the family.

2. Fr. 5 auctum

It is impossible to tell whether rumors on the relationship between Charaxus and Dorica had already started circulating when the poem was composed. On the contrary, Charaxus’ faux pas and a social censure are mentioned in a poem addressed to the Nereids before his return to Lesbos. Here Sappho also alludes to the troubles from which she and her family hope to be freed.

The text of fr. 5 preserved in P. Oxy. 7 and (for ll. 15 and 17-18) P. Oxy. 2289 fr. 6, has been augmented by P. GC. inv. 105 fr. 3 col. ii 10-29 published by Burris, Fish and Obbink but is still full of thorny textual problems. The solution of the problems in ll. 10-19 may benefit from a collage of the contributions of the three above-mentioned witnesses (= Fig. 1) obtained by inserting into the major fragment (P. Oxy. 7) the readings of the other two (underlined) in the handwriting of the former.

πότνιαι Νηρίδες, ἀβλάβη[ν μοι τὸν καςίγνητον δ[ό]τε τυιδ’ ἱκεθα[i κόττι ὀωθι θύμοι κε θέλη γένεθαι κήνο τελέσθην, 4
ὀσσα δὲ πρόοι ἀμβροτε πάντα λὐσα[i καὶ φιλοιοὶ φοίτι χάραν γένεθαι κῶνιαν ἔχθροι, γένοιτο δ’ ἄμμιν μηδάια μηδ’ εἰς, 8
κῆρ όνειδις[μ’ εἰςαῖω[ν] τὸ κ’ ἐν χρώ(λ) ὅτ’ ἐμ[α] ἐπαγ[ορί]αι πολίταν, 16
ούκ ὀνε[κτα κατ]θεμ[ἐν]α κάκαν [ , ], [ , ], [ , , , , , , , , , , , , ]

9 For the phrase ‘to raise one’s head’ cf. Hom. Il. 10.80, Soph. OR 22-4, Eur. Tro. 98f.
Revered Nereids, grant me that my brother may come here unhurt, and what he desires in his heart to happen, |\(^4\) (grant) that this may come true, and the mistakes he once made, that he may wipe them all out, and may he be reason of joy for his loved ones, of pain for his enemies (but let |\(^8\) nobody be so to us), and that he want to make his sister more honoured, and that he may free from painful torments those whose hearts |\(^{12}\) he exhausted before—he himself suffering—as they heard the blame that biting him on the raw could have hit him very badly with the citizens’ censure. But he understood it |\(^{16}\) slightly after, and will understand even more if again he realises how much a good name counts among mortals. But you, august Kypris, having eliminated unbearable things, . . . from sad |\(^{20}\) . . .

| | [p.6]
The new papyrus allowed the recovery of the first word of the ode (πότνιαι). Elsewhere πότνιαι is said of the Eumenids (Soph. OC 84), Demeter and Kore (ibid. 1050, Aristoph. Th. 1049), the Moirae (ibid. 700), but the Genetyllides of Aristoph. Th. 130 are also nymphs, and Thetis is indicated as πότνια μητὴρ in Hom. Il. 18.35.

In ll. 7-8 the new papyrus confirms the supplement μηδάμα proposed by F. Blass (he also thought of μήποτα) in the editio princeps of the papyrus ap. Grenfell and Hunt 1898, 10-3, cf. Alc. fr. 129.16 μηδάμα μηδ’ ἐνα τῶν ἑταῖρων. πήμα had often been supplemented instead (πήμα τι Mulbegat-Holler 1927). The meaning is then ‘may nobody ever be [sc. a grief] to us’ (Page 1955, 46f.), with a parenthetical phrase aiming to prevent a possible reciprocity for the
second part of the wish just expressed (may he be a reason of pain for his enemies without any enemy being a cause of pain for us).

In l. 11 BFO’s reconstruction δαίμονος κόσμοι makes the development of the speech very chancy, without relying, apart from an uncertain omicron, on any contribution of the new papyrus. The problems remain the same debated in the past, in particular the impossibility to connect τοίς to the feminine gen. pl. ὄνια unless we start from οὐροεις and emend it, with West 2014, to ὁτ(τ)οις (ὁττις in Lesbian was considered ‘common’ gender in the grammatical tradition, cf. Sud. 970 παρ’ Αἰολεύσι τὸ ὁτ(τ)ίνα κοινὸν ἔστι κατὰ γένος).

I believe Di Benedetto (1982) is right in understanding the relative τοίς, with ellipsis of the demonstrative, as equivalent to τοῦτος οἶς, ‘those to whom’. In this way the heart, the soul, or something of the sort, that Charaxus ‘brought low’ was that of his φιλοί, not his own. Considering the position of the omicron preserved in the new scrap, Di Benedetto’s παρλύοι (now παρλύοιο) is plausible as well (cf. Pind. Ol. 2.51f. τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν... δυσφροναν παραλύει). On the contrary, Diel’s ἐκλύοιο, flawless as to the meaning, would be too short.

ὁμοίως, F. Bucherer’s successful supplement at the beginning of l. 12, may be slightly too long. On the contrary, αὐτοκ, which has the same number of letters but shorter length, would mark the opposition between the pain that Charaxus inflicted to his loved ones and the pain he caused to himself.

A promising solution for the object of ἐδαίμωνα had already been found by Blass with κηρ (κέαρ, ὥς ἐκαρ), ‘heart’, at the beginning of l. 13 (perhaps one can suggest it also in fr. 96.17 κ[η]ρ (δ’ ἄσαι βόρυςται). In this case, the enjambement, as those of Κύριοι in fr. 15.9 and τὰν κάλαν in fr. 22.13, underlines the syntactical continuity between adjacent strophes.

Blass’ supplement ὁνειδικὺμα after κηρ (the term is attested in Herodot. 2.133.2; ὁνειδικος occurs in Sapph. fr. 3.5) is appropriate to the context and agrees particularly with ἐπαγγέλ[ίας] in the following line (dat. sg., not nom. plur., as the longum of the papyrus indicates). Lobel’s supplement is virtually [π. 7] certain, cf. Pind. fr. 122.6 M. ἄνευ ζῆν ἑπαγγέλιας, likewise alluding to a possible collective censure, and Hesych. ε 4065 ἐπαγγέλλοιον ἔχειν ἐπίμωμος ἔστι. The traces right after the initial lacuna were interpreted as µ by Blass and they are actually compatible with a slightly cursive µ like that of ἔμβροτε in l. 5.11

For ll. 13ff. BFO, on the contrary, on the grounds of an unpublished suggestion by Lidov, imagine that in the near future a rehabilitated Charaxus may hear the sound (κροῦμα, ‘stroke’, at the beginning of l. 13) of millet grains (κῆροςκος) dropped (to the ground?) for their rhythmic sound in a symposiac context. However, τοικεγχρω of P. Oxy. 7 had been brilliantly solved by Blass as τὸ κ’ ἐν χρώμῳ. The phrase ἐν χρῶμῳ (‘on the skin’, ‘on the raw’, ‘down’ to the skin’), primarily pertaining to the metaphor of shaving and the razor’s edge, is well attested. We can

10 The doubt raised by Hamm 1957, § 116b, on the grounds of the fact that the group -ήγορος, -ηγορια, -ηγορεύω, -ηγορέω is unattested before Pindar and Aeschylus is weak if one considers that huge loss of archaic literature, and if it was true that ‘aus inneren Gründen kann das isolierte Wort (nur ἐπηγορέω Hdt.) erst gebildet worden sein, als die Gruppe fest war’, then we should call into question the occurrence in Pindar.

11 Lobel 1921, 165 prefers λ, which seems to me incompatible with the very first trace after the lacuna.
quote in particular Soph. _Aj._ 786 ἔμει ὑπὲὶ γὰρ ἐν χρῶι τοῦτο (‘this shaves close to the skin’, in P. J. Finglass’ translation).

At the beginning of l. 14 Blass suggested κέρρον ἤλ’, and certainly κέρρον (att. = κεῖρον) would match ἐν χρῶι very well in the sense of ‘close shave’ (cf. Herodot. 4.175.1, Pherecr. fr. 35 K.-A., Xen. _Hell._ 1.7.8, Diocl. fr. 182.34 Van der Eijk, Theophr. _Char._ 10.14, Plut. _Lyc._ 16). As to ἤλ’, Blass understood it as impf. of ἔλλω (= ἔιλω, ἔιλεω, ἔιλλω) = ‘retained’, on the grounds of Hesych. ε 2149 ἔλλειν ἔλλειν, κατέχειν, but this meaning does not fit the context and has no parallels. Moreover, in Lesbian ἤλ’(e) is the aor. of ἤλε = ἔιλε (αἱρέω), cf. Sapph. fr. 71.3 ἤλεο. But precisely ἤλε = ἔιλε is a plausible solution, indicating a blame that ‘seized’, ‘hit’ Charaxus with the weapon of public censure (cf. Hom. _Il._ 3.446 and 16.725, Plat. _Theaet._ 142b and see _LSJ_ s.v. αἱρέω Λ II a ‘come upon, seize’).12

On the other hand, the sequence κέρρον ἤλ’ would be about one letter too long; also, in the literary tradition blame, gossip, envy, discord, anger, do not usually ‘shave’ as razors, but ‘bite’ the heart or the θυμός or the φρένες like dogs or snakes (Hom. _Il._ 5.493 δάκε δὲ φρένας ἔκτορι μῦθος, 7.301, 24.129, Hes. _Op._ 451, Eur. _Med._ 110, _Hipp._ 1313 etc.). This emerges in particular from Pind. _Py._ 2.53 φεῦγεν δάκος ἄδινον κακεγορίαν: note also the strong affinity between κακεγορίαν and Sappho’s ἐπαγορία. And δάκον fills the lacuna appropriately and renders the ‘bite of gossip’ imagery, although other possibilities remain open, such as κνίδου ‘scratching’, ‘scraping’, and therefore ‘tormenting’ (cf. Pind. _Ne._ 5.32 τοῖο δ’ ὀργάν κνίζουν αἵπτεινοι λόγοι).13

The function of the particle κ(ε) in the phrase τὸ κ’ ἐν χρῶι(ν) still requires explanation. It seems problematic in connection with an ind. impf. or aor., since at first sight it is not clear how the citizens’ censure could be an unreality or potentiality in the past for Charaxus (the whole sentence is built on the impf. of l. 12).

|| [p.8]

Lobel 1921, 165, who evidently saw the problem without stating it, supposed that the scribe of P. Oxy. 7 wrote ΚΕΓ meaning κάγ (= καὶ ἐν), but the function of the supposed καὶ is unclear. A further problem is that in Lesbian καὶ + ἐν gives κῆν.14

---

12 The only alternative, at least within a reconstruction that includes a participle at the beginning of l. 14, would be ἄλλα (att. with Lasserre 1989, 187. But this would require to correct the papyrus’ ἔιν ἰατ’ to δηῦτ’ in l. 15 with Lobel) for obvious syntactical reasons (more on this below). West 2014 suggests νῦν ἐπὶλα’(e), leaving out a participle (‘would now be plucking me to the raw’), but me is not easy to imply and the present perspective seems to reappear only in l. 17f.

13 To be sure, once we rule out κέρρον for space reasons, the razor metaphor connected to ἐν χρῶι is replaced by a mixed metaphor or an imagery in which the verb indicates ‘suffering’ in general and the idea of the razor is just hinted at. In any case, we should consider that ἐν χρῶι is not only used in association with κεῖρον or κεῖρεω vis-à-vis the razor (literally or metaphorically), but can also indicate simple proximity or contiguity, as in Thuc. 2.84.1 ἐν χρῶι παραπλέοντες and Plut. _Theaet._ 27.1 μάχην συνήγαγον ἐν χρῶι.

14 One could speculate that κε already had the same iterative function as ἔν + ind. impf. or aor. in passages such as Soph. _Ph._ 290 and 295, Herodot. 3.119.3, Thuc. 7.71.3, Plat. _Ap._ 22b (Goodwin 1889, § 162 and 249), but postulating for Sappho a usage that does not appear before Attic tragedy and Ionic prose is problematic.
On the other hand, κε could reflect a progression from the isolated ὀνειδίκη to the public ἐπαγορία, parallel to that from reality to potentiality in the past: Charaxus suffered and made others suffer as they heard a blame that could have tortured him on the raw with the fellow-citizens' censure, but ... (with the unreal protasis substituted by a δέ-clause explaining the reason why the possibility just glimpsed had not become true).

In l. 15, regarding their own supplement οὐ[κ ἀ]λλῳς, BFO believe that ‘it is difficult to make sense out of “indeed ever not otherwise” or “indeed once not otherwise” (or perhaps “not in vain”), but likely neither ἦ nor οὐ[κ ἀ]λλῳς were the original readings.

The line, as West 2014 suspected, must have started with αἱ ποτ’, ‘if ever in the past’, ‘more than ever’ (cf. Sapph. 1.5 αἱ ποτα κατέρωσα, Alc. 38a.11 and 208A.3). The decipherment of the first traces before π is uncertain (they are compatible with both η and α), but a crucial observation is that the supposed ἦ ‘does not extend quite far enough to the left to align with the line-beginnings below’ (West).

Secondly, as can be observed on the collage in Fig. 1, the supplement οὐ[κ ἀ]λλῳς would be one letter too long, and further there is no reason to interpret the small oblique trace before λως as λ rather than α. Hence, inevitably, not οὐ[κ ἀ]λλῳς but the frequent (from Aesch. Eu. 458) οὐ [κ]άλλως, euphemistic allusion to the gravity of the damage that Charaxus could have suffered.

Further, in the second half of l. 15 δ’ indicates the beginning of a new clause, unless we accept Lobel’s emendation δηνῦτ’ (1921, 165), not included in Lobel-Page (1955). However, the scribe (or diorthotes) of P. Oxy. 7 is very precise in writing Δ’ΑΥΤ’ even if it remains uncertain whether it stands for δ’ αὐτ(ε) or δ’ αὐτ(ο). Alc. fr. 6.1 τοδ’ αὐτε κύμα is the only occurrence of the simple adverb αὐτε in Aecolic poetry, while Sappho often uses δηνῦτε as ‘again’ (1.15, 16. 18, 22.11, 83.4, 127, 130.1, and cf. also Alc. 303Ab.14). However, the choice mostly depends on the nature of the predicate in ἥπει.

Regarding the latter, BFO thought of [ἐκό]νηκε (= εἰκάνηκε, impf. of the unattested εἰκ-ἀν-ήκω), with an anomalous μ before vowel (in Sappho we always find εἰκ except in fr. 44.23 and 26) and a meaning based on the unprovable equivalence of [ἐκό]νηκεν... οὐδ’ ἐν and the Herodotean (2.104) ὥς οὐδὲν ἀνήκει (‘it comes to nothing’, ‘it demonstrates nothing’). West 2014 has instead proposed again Lobel’s supplement [ἐκό]νηκε (1921, 165; a form of aror of εὐνήμα registered in the grammatical tradition for Alcaeus [fr. 408] and Anacreon [fr. 130 P.]: Et. Gen. A et B p. 129 Miller = EM 385.9f.). He translates it with ‘understood’, and renders the whole sentence with ‘but it was not long before he came to realize it’. And that ἕκνυκε is really the right word, and precisely in this meaning (and not the one, prevalent in Homer, of ‘heard’, ‘perceived’), seems confirmed by the presence of a form of γιγνώκεω at the beginning of l. 18. But what Charaxus realised was not, I believe, the pain he inflicted to his sister, as West suggests with the above mentioned supplement (n. 11) νῦν ἐτιλ’λ’ in l. 14, but the risk that he himself had faced by exposing himself to public censure.

In l. 17, considering its position in P. Oxy. 2289, fr. 6, ]εο[ must have been, as West notices, close to ]οναξ[, and precisely one letter far from it: ]οναικ[ε]. Therefore, it becomes
almost inevitable, and it is in line with the ideological significance of the poem, to go back to Lasserre’s κ[λ]έος (1989, 187f.; cf. fr. 44.4 and 65.9), preceded by καὶ τι (perhaps to be corrected with West to καὶ τι = καὶ ἐτι) μᾶρ[λα]ν (Hammerstaedt ap. BFO) αι: ‘and even more (will he understand it) if . . .’.

In l. 18 the start with γνωσι [15] retrieved thanks to the new papyrus, and the traces of two letters, tiny but compatible with οι[, before ]v in P. Oxy. 7, point to the reading γνώσει[τ’ ἀψ] οι[ον]. So: ‘. . . and what else to desire if he realizes again how valuable good reputation is among mortals?’ (γνώσει[τα]i already West; for || [p.9] the elision c fr. 55.2 ἐσετ’ οὐδέ, for ἀψ fr. 34.2), cf. Eur. Med. 34ff. ἕγνωκε... | οἴον, Plat. Men. 95a ἕαν ποτε γνωκτε οἴον ἑκτίν τὸ κακῶς λέγειν.

In ll. 19-20 BFO’s ὁνε[κτον (cf. Alc. fr. 76.9 and 12) is too long unless we find - and it does not seem easy - a different supplement from Blass’ κατ[θεμένα (strangely not registered by Voigt): so ὁνε[κτα (= att. ἄνεκτά) as substantival neuter (cf. Soph. Ant. 282 λέγεις γάρ οὐκ ἄνεκτά) connected to κατ[θεμένα, while the adjective sg. fm. or gen. pl. fm. κάκαν and the noun connected to it must have been governed by another verb (perhaps an imperative).\)

The frames of the two odes on Charaxus are very different: in fr. 5, Sappho’s and her group’s well-being seems to depend entirely on his return, in the new poem the hope for his reappearance in Mytilene is entrusted to a supplication to Hera, while the liberation from the present angst is linked, with some impatience, to a change of perspective, with Larichus who could finally become a ‘man’.\)

On the contrary, the preoccupation for the social discredit caused by Charaxus’ behaviour is common to the two songs: a censure explicitly indicated in fr. 5.14 with ἐπαγγ[ορ]αί πολίταιν, only implicit in the new poem in the need for Larichus to raise his head (again) while he is in contact with the city’s aristocracy.

3. Dorica and fr. 15

If our considerations on Sappho’s chronology are correct, the situation presupposed in fr. 5 excludes the identification of the Dorica mentioned (and attacked) by Sappho with the Herodotean Rhodopis, whose ἀκμή the historian places during the long reign of Pharaoh Amasis (568-526, Herodot. 2.134.2). The identification of the two hetairai had already been contested by Athen. 13.596b-c, when he remembered that ‘the beautiful Sappho accuses Dorica in her poetry (διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως διαβόλῳ) to have stripped her brother Charaxus of a big fortune after becoming his lover, when he sailed off to Naucratis for commercial purposes’. He adds that Herodotus calls her Rhodopis ‘ignoring that she is a different person from Dorica’, and that ‘she also dedicated the famous spits at Delphi, which Cratinus mentions in these lines (lacuna).

---

15 For [ BFO remark: ‘left side of round letter with horizontal ink connecting at mid-level: ι or θ suggested’.
16 Another possibility is to interpret κάκαν, with West 2014, as a noun (acc. sg. or gen. pl.).
17 For the strong connotation of ἄνήρ cf. Hom. Il. 5.529 ἄνερες ἐκέ. Herodot. 7.210.2 πολλοί μὲν ἄνθρωποι... ὀλίγοι δὲ ἄνδρες, Eur. El. 693 ἄνδρα γίγνεσθαι εἰ χρή (similarly said by a woman of her brother).
It is hard to disagree with Wilamowitz (1913, 19 n. 1) when he states that Herodotus’ identification of the two hetairai is ‘ein Beweis, wie die Personen der sapphischen Gedichte in die Novelle gezogen wurden’. An epigram by Posidippus (122 A.-B.), quoted by Atheneus himself in the same context, confirms the localisation of the liaison at Naucratis, but calls the hetaira only Dorica. He not only does not mention Sappho’s accusations towards her brother, but considers the same hetaira as a woman who could avail herself of the fame granted to her by the ‘shining speaking columns’ (l. 6 αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σεληνές) of Sappho’s ode, and thus enjoy a good name even after centuries (l. 7 οὖνομα σὸν μακάριστον).

The only way to identify Dorica and Rhodopis would be to adopt the late chronology (about fifty years later) that J.K. Beloch (1890 and 1913, 362-4) suggested not only for Sappho, but also for Alcaeus, Pittacus and other figures of the archaic period. However, the grounds for this alternative chronology are extremely fragile and have been rightly contested (Page 1955, 154-61, Liberman 1999, I, XV n. 23). We only need consider that Beloch did not hesitate to use the alleged meeting with Croesus (who reigned from 560 BCE) told by Herodotus (1.27.2) for the dating of Pittacus: an anecdote in which Herodotus himself mentions Pittacus as an alternative to Bias, and which belongs to the literary genre of apophthegmata and dialogues between sages and tyrants (Asheri 1988, 279).

According to Lidov (2002, 219-22) Herodotus’ references to the love story between Charaxus and Rhodopis/Dorica would be based on the lost comedy of Cratinus to which Atheneus alludes (although the quotation from Cratinus has been lost in the manuscript tradition). However, Atheneus only mentions Cratinus to say that the comic poet cited Rhodopis while referring to the iron spits she dedicated at Delphi (a historical datum confirmed by a Delphic inscription, SEG 12.364). After all, the comedies entitled after Sappho or Phoön of which we know all belong to Middle Comedy (Amphis, Antiphanes, Ephippus, Timocles) or New Comedy (Diphilus), except for Ameipsias (at any rate not older than Aristophanes). So, an influence of Cratinus on Herodotus vis-à-vis the poetess’s biography is unlikely.

Another aspect considered by Lidov deserves a reconsideration. He noted the oddity of the fact that according to Atheneus Sappho attacked Dorica for having squandered Charaxus’ fortunes, while Herodotus, on the contrary, seems to consider Charaxus himself the target of Sappho’s attacks: 2.135.6 ἐν μέλει Σαπφώ πολλὰ κατεκερτόμη ἔστε. According to Lidov, ‘Atheneus or his source, in haste or misled by a condensed quotation, must have misunderstood the antecedent of the gender-neutral Ionic pronoun in Herodotus’ concluding phrase, κατεκερτόμη μοι’.

A mocking tone towards Dorica, within a prayer to Aphrodite asking her to disappoint the hetaira’s boasting hopes, emerges in fr. 15 and perhaps also in fr. 7 (Δωρίς Lobel in l. 1), where Sappho must have talked about ‘having to pay a price for arrogance’ (ὁφλικτή τάμη μοι).

---

18 The encomiastic tone of the epigram is well explained if it was commissioned to the poet of Pella on the occasion of the erection of a commemorative monument for the hetaira, to which ὁδός in l. 7 deictically alludes.

19 [Ovid.] Heroid. 15.676 only refers to Charaxus’ hatred for his sister due to her exhortations: me quoque, quod monui bene multa fideliter, odit; / hoc mihi libertas, hoc pia lingua dedit.
On the contrary, no derision of Charaxus whatsoever appears in any extant passage or testimony. The simplest conclusion is that Herodotus' μεν, as already hypothesised by Smyth 1900, 252 and now also by Obbink 2014, 41, really refers to Dorica, not to Charaxus, and that Athenaeus takes up the Herodotean information but transfers it from Rhodopis to Dorica because he finds it confirmed in Sappho's work.

Herodotus places the composition of the ode containing the invective against Rhodopis after Charaxus' return from Naucratis to Mytilene. This is in line with the presumable link of fr. 15 with a new trip of Charaxus to Egypt through a hopefully successful navigation (ἐυπλοῖο[ν] ἄδων ἁταίρις ἓταται Δωρίς μὴ λύσαί μίναν ναυβάται, ἡπείρος τῆς ἀρηστον νότον τὴν πόσθεν ποιον χάριν ψευδότον ἠθέλει).

Here is the text of fr. 15 with the insertion of P. Oxy. 1231 fr. 3 (= a) at the level of P. Oxy. fr. 1 col. i 5-8 (=b 5-8). The insertion was proposed by Hermann Fränkel (1928, 267f.) but is not accepted by Lobel-Page.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b} & \quad \text{[a μάκα][ρα} \quad \text{εύπλοο [ατόσκα[} \\
\text{a} & \quad \text{]} \\
\text{a} & \quad \text{ός} \\text{ς de προς}[\delta\nu]βροτε κή[να λύσαι} \\
\text{~ ναυβάταις}[\alpha][νεμί[ος ~] ~] \\
\text{~ πῶυν] τύχαι λίμενος κλ[ατο]} \\
\end{align*}
\]


|| [p.11]

... blessed...
... good navigation...

... 4

---

20 I-P prefer, although just in the apparatus, Lobel's ἵκανην to this plausible supplement. But the so-called corretio Attica is a well-attested phenomenon in Aeolic poetry (Marzullo 1958, 87-98, Gentili 1984b), and in particular an example of corretio before labial + liquid can be found in Sapph. fr. 16.19 ἀπλοῖοι.

21 For a discussion of the possible remains of κρητομία in the extant fragments on Charaxus' affairs see Cavallini 1991, 99-116.
and the mistakes he made in the past, those to wipe off
. . . to the sailors the wind . . .
. . . with the favour of fate . . . of the harbour . . .

O Kypris, and may Dorica\textsuperscript{22} find you harsher, nor may she boast saying
that he returned for the second time, longed for.\textsuperscript{23}

The perspective of a new trip to Naucratis explains the final wish that Dorica may not boast to
have reactivated the erotic pattern conveyed by $\text{η\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma}$, ‘you arrived’, attested in Sappho fr. 48
$\text{η\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma}$, ευ δ’ (Lobel: και codd.) ἐπόησασ and already found in Homer (cf. Hom. \textit{Il.} 3.428 and see
Di Benedetto 1982, 8-12 = 2007, 808-12).

Voigt, despite accepting at least part of the textual arrangement suggested by Fränkel for
fr. 5, in the apparatus expresses the same doubts as Lobel-Page on the central supplements for ll.
5-7 (‘$\text{λιμεν\nu\voc{c}}$ in 7 verum (et valde incerta με), tum [σιμ] in 5 spatio nequaquam sufficit’).
However, an accurate autoptic revision of P. Oxy. 1231 fr. 1 and 3 by Daniela Colomo has
shown that these doubts are not justified, as also emerges from my digital reconstruction (Fig. 2).\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} For a defense of the supplement $\Delta\\omega\rho\iota\chi\alpha$ in fr. 15.11 against Lidov’s objections see Yatromanolakis 2007, 330-2.
\textsuperscript{23} I briefly discussed the possible supplements for l. 11f. in Ferrari 2007, 150 n. 2 (= 2010, 159 n. 23). Now we must
add that $\Delta\nu\mu\varepsilon\rho\omega\nu$, whose only certain occurrence in Aeolic poetry so far were Alc. fr. 73.11 and fr. 117b.30, has
appeared in Sappho as well (P. GC.inv. 105, fr. 2 col. ii 14 = Sapph. fr. 17.6). And for the phrase πόθεινος $\text{η\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma}$ I
would recall also Eur. \textit{IT} 515 και μήν ποθεινός γ’ $\text{η\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma}$. \textit{Hel.} 540 ως ποθεινός ού μόλις, Men. \textit{Asp.} 10 ποθεινόν
ηκοῦν’ οίκαδε (with P. Ingrosso’s note).
\textsuperscript{24} Colomo in particular notes that ‘fr. 3 has been positioned on the left of col. i fr. b in the frame, according to
Fränkel’s proposal, but this fr. b is now slightly sloping rightwards, which makes the lacuna in fr. 5 appear slightly
larger’. She also notes that Fränkel’s reconstruction seems confirmed by the observation of the fibres, since ‘a fibre can
be distinguished immediately under $\text{ο\epsilon\theta}$ of fr. 3, continuing on fr. b after the lacuna, under $\beta\rho\o$’.
The two texts refer to each other (and each line could really have been the fifth of the other ode); they quote each other ‘à la manière d’un “pour mémoire’” (Lasserre 1989, 198), but with the novelty, in fr. 15, of a deictic [p.12] indicating absence (κῆνα) instead of a quantitative indication (πάντα). Now that Charaxus is leaving on a new trip, all the wrongs once done are distanced in a remote past, recalled for the last time to be consigned to oblivion.

Finally, the anonymous commentator of P. Oxy. 2506 fr. 48 col. iii 1-35 (fr. 213A, h) dealt with a poem in which perhaps all three of the poetess’s brothers were featured, and certainly Larichus and Erigyios. The text is extremely lacunose. A preoccupation for Erigyios’ clothes (and therefore social prestige) emerges from the lemma of l. 40f. Ἐρί-|γυιος πέρ ἐμιμάτ[ω]ν. Furthermore, the commentator describes Sappho as οἰκουρός and φίλουργος and writes that the poetess said something about her brothers, in the same poem or another (l. 44f.). The word
οἰκουρός seems to reflect a role of surveillance (perhaps temporary) and protection of the interests of the οἰκὸς which well corresponds to the attitude of the lyric I in the first of the new poems published by Obbink (cf. Hippocr. Epid. 6.8.33 ἐν Ἀβδήρωι Φαέθουσα ἢ Πυθέου γυνὴ οἰκουρός and Idomen. FGrHist 338 F 14 ύστερον δὲ καὶ οἰκουρόν αὐτὴν ἐποιήσατο).

4. The Ship of fr. 20

Contrary to what is sometimes maintained (Milne 1933, Lasserre 1989, 200f., but see the right objections of Aloni 1997, 36-7), no clue seems to emerge to a reference to Charaxus’ affairs in fr. 20.

The coincidence between λίμνεος κρέτας in l. 5 and Hor. Carm. 1.14.2f. fortiter occupa / portum suggests that the passage focused on a ship that was trying to reach the dry land (κατί χέρω 10 and χέρω 21). As Giorgio Pasquali (1920, 21) clarifies in his analysis of Horace's text, ‘a ship, in bad conditions due to the tempest, has nevertheless almost made it to the mouth of the harbour with great effort, but a new fury of wind and waves suddenly pushes it back to the high sea’.

Something also survives of the two stanzas corresponding to ll. 8-15:

|έλοιι, ναυται | ]
|μεγάλαις ἀήταις |
|α κάπτι χέρω | ] 11
|μοθεν πλέοι ] |
|δὲ τὰ φόρτι, εἰκ[
|νατιμ' ἐπεί κ, [ |
| ] 15

For l. 9 Voigt quotes Hom. Il. 15.624ff. (violent wave hitting the sail, wind howling around the hull, sailors panicking) and for τὰ φόρτια (l. 13) Alc. 73.1 πᾶν φόρτι[ό]ν (and cf. also fr. 208a.14). For the end of the same line nobody seems to have considered the supplement εἰκ[ε] in the sense of παρείκει, ‘it is possible’, followed by an infinitive (‘to save’ or sim.) in the first section of the following line (cf. fr. 31.7-8 ως με φώναι - | c' οὐδ' ἐν ἔτ' εἰκει and Hom. Il. 18.520 δῇ εφίσι εἰκε λοχή[σαί]). It would be part of a realization that now it is not (οὐ)δὲ;) possible to avoid that the merchandise ends up shot out into the sea.25

---

25 Treu 1954, 188-9 already thought of εἰκε, but in the meaning of ‘they collapse’, ‘they fall out’ (‘über Bord schon geht unseres Schiffes Ladung’). However, the subject of the verb in this case should be not the merchandise but the shrouds (cf. Alc. fr. 208a.9 V.).
Further, ἐλοις ναῦται in l. 8 recalls Theogn. 673 ἄντλεῖν δ′ οὐκ ἔθέλουσιν, and on this grounds we can hypothesize e.g. νᾶα δ′ ἄντλην οὐκ ἔθ]ἐλοις ναῦται (οὐκ ἔθ]ἐλοις already Diehl). 26

To sum up, the passage seems to offer, although very fragmentarily, another piece of the mosaic forming the famous topos of the allegory of the ship (studied in particular by Gentili 1984, 307-34).

|| [p. 13]

5. Without the Aid of Aphrodite

In the second of the poems published by Obbink, whose remains partially overlap with those of Sapph. fr. 26 preserved by P. Oxy. 1231, fr. 16, we find a cri du coeur, one of those emotional outbursts for which the poetess from Mytilene is especially famous. Not being able to receive the help of the goddess of love when one would like to keep her/his passion hidden causes an anxiety similar to a retching (the ‘nauseas’ of Sappho fr. 1.3 ἀςαίς μηδ’ ὅνιαι, and cf. fr. 3.7 ἀςαίο and perhaps 96.17 in Zuntz’s reading); even more so if Ἐκριπρις, “mistress’” does not restrain the lover’s passion but foments it with a desire that bends the knees like Eros relaxes the limbs (λυσιμέλης, Sappho fr. 130.1).


...]νεερ [.][ai 8

] έε, θέλω[
] το παθή[
] αυ, ἐγω δ’ εμ’ [αύται 12
tοῦτο σύνοδα 8]

]β[ρ]ότοις[.] [ ]
]ναμ[.]
] [.] [.

2 supplævi 3 ως] supplevi (χ̄ως West) || πάθ[ος] West || καλ[υψαμ] post West (καλ[υψαμ] supplevi 4 μηδ’]


26 For ἄντλην cf. also Alc. fr. 6.3.
How could one not experience inner distress repeatedly, mistress Kypris, whomever you do not favour, when he/she utterly wants to conceal his/her passion, nor refrain?

Among wavy tossings you keep torturing me with desire that, alas, already bent my knees, but I believe that the gusts will not overcome the stays if . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

The poem starts with a heated reprimand, like Glaucus' to Hector (Hom. Il. 17.149 πῶς κε σὺ χείρονα φῶτα σαύδεσαι μεθ' ὀμλον;) or Odysseus' to Polyphemus (Hom. Od. 9.351. Σχέτλει, πῶς κέν τις σε καὶ ὑπερεν ἄλλος ἱκοίτο | ἀνθρώπων πολέων;).

In l. 2, for Κύπρι δέ σιποιν' cf. Eur. Med. 632 ὡ δέσποιν', Hipp. 117 δέσποινα Κύπρι and 415 = 522 ὡ δέσποινα ποντία Κύπρι, Charit. 3.2.12 = 5.10.1 δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη, Apul. Met. 8.25 Venus domina.

|| [p.14]

The indicative φιλήθσα (for the form cf. fr. 129.2), supplemented by West as well, is paralleled in Sappho fr. 1.23 αὶ δὲ μῇ φίλει, fr. 31.2-3 ὡττε̣ . . . ἰςδάνει.

For the φιλία of Aphrodite towards a mortal, here denied (Obbink's supplement [δ]ὴ entails the double occurrence of δὴ in two lines and does not agree well with the presumed sense of the following clause), cf. Hom. Il. 5.423 τοὺς νῦν ἔκπαγγα φιλῆς, Archil. fr. 112.11 Ἀφροδίτῃ (δὴ) φιλος, Himer. fr. 182 τὴν μὲν Ἀφροδίτῃ φιλεῖ. Fr. 129b ἢ τιν' ἄλλον (τίνα μᾶλλον Page) ἀνθρώπων ἐμεθέν φιλῆθσα; seems to refer to an interrupted relationship of φιλία between a man and a god (Aphrodite herself?).

In l. 3 for temporal ὡς + opt. to indicate repeated action cf. Herodot. 1.17.1 ὡς δὲ ἕις τὴν Μιλήσιην ἀπίκοιτο.

West 2014 notes that after πα, made certain by P. Oxy. 1231, fr. 16, the traces suggest θ, not α (Obbink, on the contrary, proposes to read and supplement πάλην κάλ[ε][ς]ι at the end of the line), and that almost nothing remains of the two following letters: hence πάθ[ος] καλ[ύ]πτην 'to conceal the passion’ (but the aorist is preferable to the present since it is common in similar
generalizing sentences, cf. for example Pind. Py. 4.145 f. ἐὰν τις ἐξήρανε πέλει | ὁμογόνως αἰδῶ καλύψαι). This introduces a motif found in the Theognidean Syllolge (l. 1343 τῆς ὁμορμαί σύν κρύσα) and in Eur. Hipp. 139 κρυπτωὶ πάθωι and 394 κρύπτειν νόσουν, Antiph. fr. 232 K.-A., Men. Mis. 361 (Sandbach), Ov. Her. 12.37 quis enim bene celat amorem?

In l. 4 ὀνέχησθα (= ἄνεχεις) ‘you refrain’, ‘you restrain’ (West), as in Hom. Il. 23.426 ἄλλῳ ἄνεχ’ ἱππο του, Theogn. 26 οὐθ’ ὄσων οὔτε ἄνέχων.

In l. 5, for ἐπόλοις (Hammerstaedt), cf. Soph. OR 231, Ph. 271, Eur. El. 1241, Or. 994 etc., for δαίζω referring to inner suffering Hom. Od. 13.320 φρεύω ήσιν ἕχων δεδαίγμενον ἤτορ (West 2014).

In l. 6 for γόν(α) cf. fr. 58.15 γόνα δ’ οὔ φέροις (vis-à-vis the old age) and Hom. Od. 18.212 τῶν δ’ αὐτῶν λύτο γούνατ’, ἔρωι δ’ ἀρα θυμόν ἔβελθην (the example has been adduced by West*, who then opted for γόνωμ’ = γουνούμαι, γουνάζομαι).

At the end of the line the upper traces of ἐγ’ seem recognisable instead of ἐν’ suggested by Obbink.

In l. 7, for the use of λαίλαψ in a comparison or metaphor, cf. Hom. Il. 11.306 and 747, 12.375, 16.384, 20.51; if the supplements are correct, there is a clear, iconic congruence with the κάλοι of l. 5.

After ἡμάς[ K. Tsantsanoglou’s (ap. Obbink 2014) successful supplement [φ]αύ’ ‘I believe’, rather than ‘I say’), compatible with the traces of P. Oxy. 1231, fr. 16.7 ] μ’ οὐ προ[, seems too short at first sight, but we must consider that the letter φ was on the kollesis, and so the scribe might have encountered a rough spot or irregularity in the surface of the papyrus to be avoided (this explains the anomalous spacing between τ and κ and κ and ε in l. 17, and between μ and α in l. 23).

In the tiny scrap placed in the right-hand lower area, the traces visible in the interlinear space above ]περή[ are to be understood not as ‘parts of a suprascript iota after ] σφ’, but as ‘ghost-traces’ (offsets) that remained stuck to the scrap before its detachment. The scrap was ‘originally folded over left’, as Obbink explains, and can be ‘ranged up to two or three letters’ (but why not a few more?) or also immediately next to προ[. If there was no space in between, as in the image attached to the editio princeps, we obtain the expected choriamb but the sequence would be hard to decode (οὐ προπερή[), otherwise we must take ]περή[ as the first two syllables of the final bacchic and insert two syllables scanned as short-long after προ (οὐ προ[’ ”] περή[’ ”). For the end of the line West* (who later adopts a different solution) suggests περή[νη, future infinitive of περίμη = ὑπερήμη ‘overcome’, ‘pass’ (cf. Hom. Od. 8.198 οὕτι τις Φαίηκων τὸν γ’ ἵεται οὖδ’ ύπερήθη αὐτῷ ‘no one of the Phaeacians will reach this, or cast beyond it’, said of the discus thrown by Odysseus). In my opinion it might have been preceded by προ[τόνοις (acc.), ‘stays’ (the fore-ropes that keep the main mast upright), meaning that the ship escapes the gusts of the tempest and cannot break the stays, unlike in Hom. Od. 12.409 οὗ τις ἰστοῦ δὲ προπτόνους ἔρημος ἀνέμιοι οὐελλα | ἀμφοτέρους. In Alc. fr. 208a.9 too, one of the signs of the imminent shipwreck is the loosening of the ἀγκονναί, the stays (= ἀγκοιναὶ, cf. 20
Hesych. a 550 ἀγκοῖναι [ἀγκόλαι cod.] ... σχοινία ικτοῦ), Bergk’s correction for ἀγκυραῖ transmitted by the fragment source (Heraclit. All. 5). The correction is supported by the marginal scholium in P. Oxy. 2297 (Page 1955, 187). || [p. 15] On the contrary, Agamemnon is compared to a ‘stay that saves the ship’ in Aesch. Ag. 897 and the saving Dioscuri must have appeared along the stays in Alc. fr. 34.10. And the Thracian crane grants the poet a safe navigation gliding along the stays in Posid. 22.4 Ά.-Β. καρά προτόνων ἥγεμονεοι γέρανος.

In l. 8, with ἔμπρθαι (middle-passive infinitive of εἴργω/εἴργνυμι, as δέχθαι for δέχομαι, cf. Hom. Od. 10.241 ἔμπρθατο) hypothesised by Obbink and αἱ κε[υ] at the beginning of the line, Sappho might have said that the storm would not have overcome the stays if it had been restrained ...

6. Under Hera’s Wing (fr. 17)

Fr. 17 V., partially known from PSI II 123, ll. 3-12, P. Oxy. 1231 fr. 1 col. ii 2-21 and P. Oxy. 2289 fr. 9, is now substantially augmented by another scrap of P. GC. inv. 105 (fr. 2 col. ii 9-25).
Nearby let your favour blow towards the attendants of the Muses, honoured Hera, and towards the festival that the kings, Atreids, made desired by you (i.e. made desirable to you), after facing great endeavours, firstly around Ilium and then when they came ashore here, for they could not have found the right route before turning to you and Zeus, protector of the suppliants, and the attractive son of Thyona.

But now, O queen, we too, look!, are celebrating these holy and beautiful rites according to the old usage, and the crowd of virgins . . . and women around . . . the measures of the clamours . . .

. . .

. . .

to be . . . o Hera, to arrive.

As to the incipit, BFO note that ‘any reconstruction should avoid the mistake made by early editors, of taking πλάςιον in line 1 as describing motion, as observed by Lidov 2004, 390-3, as well as taking it with a dative’ and on this premise they suggest μ[ελπο]μένοις (‘by/with/for those dancing’) to fill the first lacuna.

Two palaeographical remarks go against this supplement: (1) in the witness that preserves the entire sequence πλάςιον δὴ μ[,] namely PSI II 123 (which shows a regular handwriting and an excellent state of preservation), there is too much blank space after the final μ not to see traces of a hypothetical ε (this does not apply, say, to σ, whose graphical extent is smaller); (2) after the lacuna, on the right of two puzzling traces which could belong to a single letter, we see a letter which seems identifiable with λ (not by chance does West 2004 write λαοις).

This suggests μ[οιοιτ]όλοις (plural accusative, which agrees with the absence of a sign of elision in the papyrus). Sappho uses this compound for herself and her circle in fr. 150.1 οὐ γὰρ
Here too the plural may have indicated Sappho, composer and performer of the song, together with the members of a female chorus that was in charge of accompanying it with dance (without excluding the possibility of a chorus singing and dancing at the same time).

For the end of the line, BFO restore the imperative ἄγεθω and link to it as a subject τε χάρις εὔρηκα (suppl. Wilamowitz) in l. 2: ‘let your charming festival be celebrated’. But their own diplomatic description shows that right after the lacuna of l. 2 only the first sigma is plausible, while for the following letter only some traces of ink ‘at top right and bottom of line’ are given as certain, and the description of what follows εορτάτω suggests the reading εορτάτω rather than εορτάτω.

On these grounds, I would think of ἄγεθω ‘let it blow’ in l. 1 (which would reproduce a common image of archaic epic: Hom. Cerc. 276 περὶ τ’ ἀμφί τε κάλλος ἄντο, Hes. Th. 583 χάρις δ’ ἐπὶ πάσιν ἄντο, fr. 43a.74 M.-W. χαρίει τ’ ἀπὸ εἴδος ἄντο, Sc. 8 τοῖς ἅπθ’ οίον τε πολυχρύσου Αφροδίτης) and in l. 2 χάρις εὔρηκα τ’ εορτάτων: a desire that Hera’s favour may blow nearby towards the attendants of the Muses and towards the festival that . . .. The adverbial πλάσιον, as in Hom. Il. 4.329 and Od. 20.106, defines the space of the ceremony like δεύτη does at the beginning of fr. 2.

|| [p. 17]

The indications at the beginning, as Calame 2009, 3-8 already suggested before the publication of the new papyrus, must have had a pragmatic function like the indicative present πόθεν in l. 11. They are of the same kind as those first person plural present indicatives in Pindar such as ἀναπαλότιζομεν in Py. 6.2 or αὐξόμεν in Is. 4.62, which refer to an ongoing ceremony (Krummen 1990, 41-4): the poetess must have presented herself as the director of a public festival, like in the initial exhortation to the παϊδεῖς in the ode of the old age augmented by the Cologne papyrus (fr. 58.11f.).

---

27 I discussed the contextualisation of this passage in Ferrari 2007, 136-40 = 2010, 143-47.
28 ‘After τ left hand part of triangular letter, then after a slight gap in papyrus (large enough for right side of ι, but may have originally been closed) at mid line wide horizontal or slightly sloping diagonal, as of middle of ι or tail of α’.
29 BFO hypothesise a lacuna of four letters here, which they fill with ἄγεθω. However, we must consider that a clear run of a few millimetres has occurred on the papyrus, which has caused the separation of two strips of the scrap, as shown also by the now abnormal dimensions of the π of ἀπελήθη in l. 5 (found precisely on the run). Actually, the letters in the lacuna must be three rather than four (Lidov’s ἄγεθω would be too short in any case).
30 With εχε referring to the first accusative as well, like in Pind. Is. 7.41f. ἰκαλος ὑγίας ἐς τὸν μόρθουν | σιῶνα and Aesch. Ph. 492f. Μαγνητικὴν δὲ γαϊάν ἐς τὸν Μακεδόνον / χώραν ἀφικόμεθ’ (unless we emend δὴ to δὴ τ’ ι, cf. fr. 16.9 ἰβα’ ι).
For ll. 3-4 BFO consider several exegetical possibilities stemming from the preliminary choice between ἀράταν as ind. impf. dual or as verbal adjective. However, the first exegesis they propose, τάν ἀράταν Ἀτρείδαι πόησαν τ' οἱ βασίλες 'which the Atreids prayed for [vowed?], and the kings performed’ not only postulates the absence of temporal augment (possible but rare in Sappho and Alcaeus), but, more importantly, requires to accept a distinction between the Atreids and unspecified ‘kings’ of Lesbos, who should have taken part in the Trojan enterprise with the Atreids, even though the island is indicated as part of Priam’s reign in the Iliad (24.543-45).

However, the editors prefer ἀράταν as a verbal adjective but understand Ἀτρείδαι as a dative: ‘. . . which, prayed for by the Atreid, the kings caused to be performed’. An odd scene derives from this, in which an unspecified Atreid (Menelaus) goes ashore in Lesbos, prays to obtain a festival dedicated to Hera, and the local ‘kings’ who accompanied him organise it for him promptly. But, above all, if Menelaus is not accompanied by his brother and the kings are from the island, how could Sappho have said, of both him and them at the same time, that ‘they could have not found the route’ (l. 7f.) had they not visited the insular triad? Where should have the kings of Lesbos gone, having just returned home from the Trojan war? BFO do not consider the seemingly simplest interpretation, that is ‘. . . the festival that the kings sons of Atreus made’ (not ‘performed’; nor “caused to be performed’) ‘desired by you’, with τοι = τοι (cf. 31.2, 63.2, 137.1, Alc. 119.1) and thus writing, with West 2014, πόησαν τοῖ (not πόησαν τοί), and with ἀράταν ... τοῖ in line with Hom. Od. 19.404 πολυάρητος δέ τοί ἔστι and Cer. 220 πολυάρητος δέ μοί ἔστι.

With their prestige of conquerors of Troy and, presumably, with the richness of their offerings, the Atreids must have increased the value and importance of an existing local cult.

To be sure, as Voigt noted in her apparatus on l. 3, ‘sec. Hom. (g 130ff.) Agamemnon in insulam L. non venit’. In the third book of the Odyssey Nestor tells that there was firstly a heated bicker between the two Atreids (Menelaus exhorts all the Acheans to sail off, Agamemnon wants to delay the departure to dedicate hecatombs to Athena), so that the following day, at dawn, half of the army sails off, the other half remains at Ilium with Agamemnon. Then, at Tenedos, a few sail back to Troy (among them Odysseus) and only some (with Nestor and Diomedes) continue the navigation. Menelaus catches up with them at Lesbos while a discussion is going on about the route to follow: ‘whether to sail north of rocky Chios towards the island of Psyria, keeping it on the left, or south of Chios, passing close to windy Mimas’ (3.169-72). Thus, after ‘cutting the sea’ towards Euboea and precisely towards Cape Gerestus in direction south-west (and thus after choosing the faster but also more dangerous route), on the fourth day Diomedes and his companions land in Argos and Nestor sails on up to Pilos arriving safe and sound. Menelaus, on the other hand, goes through the strait between Chios and the mainland and proceeds southwards along the Anatolian coast, but after turning west collides against the Cretan promontory near Gortyna and loses most of his ships. Finally, the wind drags him to Egypt (see Di Benedetto 2010, 34-6).
Agamemnon’s return is recounted by Menelaus in the fourth book of the poem, but it is a calm and uneventful journey (l. 512f.) thanks to Hera’s protection, until things become more difficult (l. 519ff.) due to a storm that affects his fleet at Cape Malea.32

|| [p.18]

The divergence from the *Odyssey* can be explained by the many variants that must have proliferated around the traditions of the stories which in Sappho’s time had perhaps already become the *Nostoi* ascribed to Agias of Trezene. In particular, as to the initial movements of Agamemnon and Menelaus, the account of Apollodor. *epit.* 6.1-30, which agrees with the summary of the *Nostoi* included in Proclus’ *Chrestomathy*, gives details on Agamemnon unparalleled in the *Odyssey*: he lands at Tenedos (where, on the contrary, only the half of the army which was in disagreement with him arrives according to *Od*. 3.159) and then a storm breaks out in the offing of Tenedos (one of the Cyclades, never mentioned in the *Odyssey*). It affects everyone but Neoptolemos (stopped by Thetis).

In Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* too (ll. 615-80) Agamemnon and Menelaus leave Ilium together and only later, in blue water, are separated by a violent storm (χειμων 649). Their leaving together, and without quarrels, can make us think, rather than of an innovation of the Athenian poet, of the reception of a traditional branch similar or identical to that known to Sappho (see Caciagli 2011, 154-55).

In l. 9, for μετέρχομαι in the meaning of turning to a god in order to pray or supplicate him, cf. Eur. *Ba*. 712f. τὸν θεὸν ὑπὸ νῦν ψέγει | εὐχαίτιν ἄν μετῆλθεν.

In l. 11, if BFO’s reading ἔρσα is correct, we can think of a parenthetical ὡρα, 'look!' (cf. Archil. fr. 105.1 θλαῦκ’, ὡρα, Aesch. Ch. 924, Eu. 254, Soph. El. 945, OC 117, Eur. *IT* 67, IA 1412), combined with a cultic epithet taken up from l. 2, e.g. νῦν δὲ κ[ὦμες, πότντι.] ὡρα, πόμην. In l. 13 the noun to which the phrase ἄνγνα καὶ κά[λ(α) ὡργία ταύτ’, ὀ δ’ ἄρχλος.

For l. 16 the editors note that ‘if μέτρ’ is correct and refers to the “measures” of song or chant, it long anticipates the next known use as such (at Arist. *Nub*. 638’), but an occurrence prior to Aristophanes is in Pind. *Pac*. 6.121f. ὄι ἱήτε νῦν μέτρα παιηό-|ν[ων. Further, BFO suspect that ‘some form of ὀλολύσδω belongs here in the adonaean, e.g. μέτρ’ ὀλ[を中心]. Actually, the correspondence with some pieces of fr. 44 (the sequence of l. 14f. ἐπ[ἐ]βαίνε δὲ παῖς ὀχλός | γυναίκων τ’ ἀμα παρθενίκαι[ν] τ’ ἀπ[α]λ[θεία]φύρουν on the one hand, the reference to the ritual scream in γυναίκες δ’ ἐλέλυσεν of l. 31 on the other hand) and with the mention of the same ritual scream in Alc. fr. 130b.20 ἵπα[τι ὀ]λολύγας ἐναυσίας33 make the hypothesis very likely in general terms. However, in Lesbian the correct form of the verb ὀλολύζω was ἐλέλυσεν (cf.

---

32 The storm at Cape Malea is hard to explain if it is true that Agamemnon was heading to Argos: the study of Brillante 2005 is devoted to this problem, and followed by a series of contributions by other scholars (27-133).
33 The ode is set in the same scene as Sapph. fr. 17 and Alc. fr. 129, the panlesbian Heraion of Messa probably located in the north-western area of the Kalloni gulf and sacred to the triad Zeus-Hera-Dionysus. On the relationship between this τάμενος and the poetry of Sappho and Alceus see most recently Caciagli 2010.
not the initial letter of the line. The remains of what the coronis shows to be the final adonian of the ode (l. 20) in P. Oxy. 1231 fr. 1 col. ii, namely \[?\] πρ’ ἀπίκε\[\],\(^{34}\) supplemented by Milne with \[?\] ἡρας, ἀπίκε[θαι], can now suggest, after the publication of the first poem of P. Sapph. Obbink, that the reference to the supplication to Hera in ll. 5–9 concerned the ceremony of which the invocation of Hera in fr. 17 was integral part: notice the strict correspondence between \[?\]ρ’, ἀπίκε[θαι] and P. Sapph. Obbink 6f. ήρας | ἡρας (and cf. also fr. 5.2 τυίδ’ ἱκεθα[
](i)). This coincidence is unlikely to be due to chance. It suggests, again, in the context of what we may call ‘the cycle of Charaxus’, the use of para-formulaic locations in a verbal mosaic underlining the connection between some of these poems, and thus activating in the audience the memory of lyric moments already proposed on other occasions.

| [p.19] |
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