

LUIGI BATTEZZATO

THE STRUCTURE OF SAPPHO'S BOOKS:
METRE, PAGE LAYOUT, AND THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN POETRY BOOK

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 208 (2018) 1–24

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE STRUCTURE OF SAPPHO'S BOOKS: METRE, PAGE LAYOUT, AND THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN POETRY BOOK

Introduction¹

The present paper argues that the edition of Sappho that surfaces in book fragments from antiquity is coherent and was coherently designed.² This coherence is evident not only in the metrical arrangement but also in the editorial layout (especially in the use of *παράγραφοι*); this in turn allows us to draw conclusions on the authorship of fragment 44a Voigt and on the metrical arrangement of Book 4.³

The first section of the paper discusses evidence about ancient editions, starting from P.Colon. inv. 21351 + 21376. It analyses layout and metre in Sappho's Books 1–3 as known to us from papyrus evidence and ancient discussions. The section argues that our papyrus evidence matches statements by Hephaestion on the evolution of editorial layout in antiquity.

The second section discusses the attribution of P.Fouad 239 (Sappho F 44a Voigt = Alcaeus fr. 304 in Lobel and Page 1955).⁴ Metre, content and language suggest an attribution to either Alcaeus (as argued by Lobel and Page) or Sappho (as argued by, e.g., Voigt and Bonanno). The editorial layout provides a new strong argument in favour of the hypothesis that P.Fouad 239 was part of Book 2 of an ancient edition of Sappho.

The third section of the paper discusses metre and layout of Book 4 in Sappho's ancient edition(s). On the basis of editorial layout, it argues that Book 4, in the standard edition reflected in the surviving post-Alexandrian papyri, was not metrically homogeneous.

Section 4 discusses the arrangement of Books 5–7; section 5 analyses the evidence on the order of poems in Book 8 and/or in the book of *Epithalamia*, with special attention to P.Oxy. 2294 = Sappho F 103.

The final section (section 6) discusses the ordering of poems in ancient editions of Archilochus, Hipponax and Theocritus, especially in relation to metrical criteria. It claims that Theocritus, Callimachus and Horace imitated Hellenistic ordering criteria of poetry books of archaic poetry, and in particular the ordering criteria used in Sappho's books; this is especially clear in Horace's collection of *Epodes*.

1. Ancient editions of Sappho; page layout and metre in Sappho, Books 1–3

1.1 Ancient editions of Sappho and the *παράγραφος*

A *παράγραφος* is a horizontal stroke below the first letters of a line.⁵ In papyri of Sappho and Alcaeus, it is employed to mark end of strophe. This sign is already used for this purpose in the oldest papyrus of Sappho, P.Colon. inv. 21351 + 21376, from the third century BC. This Cologne papyrus may be earlier than Aristot-

¹ I delivered talks based on this paper at various institutions. I must thank audiences at Ohio State, Pisa, Roma Tor Vergata, Berkeley, Innsbruck, and the respective organisers of the events, B. Acosta-Hughes, G. W. Most, E. Dettori, D. J. Mastronarde, and O. Wenskus, for their invitation and comments; L. Kurke and E. Oliensis also made useful observations. G. B. D'Alessio, L. Prauscello and G. Ucciardello discussed this paper with me and offered many valuable suggestions. I alone am responsible for any remaining errors of fact or judgment. This piece of research was supported by the Università degli Studi del Piemonte Orientale.

² P.Colon. inv. 21351 + 21376 gives us a glimpse of early, pre-Alexandrine ordering and editorial principles. For a discussion see below, section 1.1, and n. 7; section 6.4.

³ For an excellent overview of the Alexandrian edition of Sappho see Prauscello forthcoming-a, arguing that our extant evidence comes from a single ancient edition; see also Prauscello forthcoming-b. The most important earlier discussions include Page 1955: 112–26, Yatromanolakis 1999, Liberman 2007, Lidov 2009: 106–11, Acosta-Hughes 2010: 92–104, Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXIV–XXVIII and LXVII–LXX.

⁴ Reference is made to the fragment numbers of Voigt 1971 (F for 'fragments', T for 'testimonia') unless indicated otherwise.

⁵ On the various usages of *παράγραφοι* in ancient papyri, see Battezzato 2009a, Martinelli 2009, Schironi 2010: 16, 78, Schironi 2016, with further references.

phanes of Byzantium (c. 258/55–180 BC), who is often credited with the invention of the παράγραφος.⁶ The poems of Sappho transmitted in this papyrus are metrically uniform but are ordered in a way that does not match the order found in later papyri of Sappho. Moreover, the papyrus includes poems by Sappho and a poem by an unknown later author. These characteristics show that the Cologne papyrus was an anthology.⁷ It also shows that Sappho's poems were arranged on the basis of a metrical criterion even before the Alexandrian edition that we can reconstruct from later fragments.⁸

The metre of the Sapphic lines in this fragment is very simple: couplets of acephalous hipponacteans with double choriambic expansion:

^hipp^{2cho} x – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – –

Two identical lines make up a strophe, and the end of each strophe is marked by the παράγραφος. This is clearly visible on several lines: 2, 4, 6, 8, 14, 16, 18 and 20. The presence of παράγραφοι in this anthology shows that παράγραφοι were commonly used to designate strophe end in Sappho, possibly even before the Alexandrian edition(s) of her poems. This poem was later included in book 4 of the ancient edition of Sappho (see below, section 3).

Some modern scholars suggest that Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 258/55–180 BC) edited Sappho;⁹ others favour Aristarchus (ca. 216–145 BC) as editor;¹⁰ other consider it possible that both Aristophanes and Aristarchus produced an edition of Sappho.¹¹ We know for sure that Aristophanes and Aristarchus both edited Alcaeus.¹² As Liberman and Prauscello note, Hephaestion speaks of ‘the current edition of Anacreon’, which suggests (but does not prove) that more than one edition was known to him.¹³ As for Sappho, we do not know whether our papyri of her poems dating from late Hellenistic and Imperial times (e.g. P.Oxy. 1787) derive from an edition by Aristarchus or Aristophanes of Byzantium or by another scholar. They all apparently derive from the same Hellenistic edition: no conflicting editorial principles appear in the papyrus texts of Sappho that came down to us. The paper aims to show that the organisational principles and editorial practices apparent in the ancient evidence are consistent and coherently designed.¹⁴

1.2 Sappho, Book 1 and the alphabetic order

Book 1 is metrically homogeneous: all poems in the book are Sapphic odes. P.Oxy. 1231 fr. 56 = F 30 Voigt preserves the end of the book, and includes an annotation stating that the book had 1320 lines (i.e. 330

⁶ See Irigoin 1952: 47; the sign was mentioned before the Hellenistic age, but its metrical value is associated with the work of Aristophanes: Pfeiffer 1968: 179 and 186.

⁷ For discussions of the papyrus and of the ordering principles see Gronewald and Daniel 2004a, Gronewald and Daniel 2004b, Di Benedetto 2004, Di Benedetto 2005, West 2005, Di Benedetto 2006, Yatromanolakis 2008, Ferrari 2010: 193–4, Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXX and n. 62, 327 and 331.

⁸ Liberman 2016: 61–2 leaves open the question on the nature of this papyrus but stresses the metrical (and thematic) arrangement. See also below, section 6.4, on Theocritus.

⁹ In favour of Aristophanes as editor of Sappho see Pfeiffer 1968: 205 and Dale 2015: 25 n. 25.

¹⁰ See Yatromanolakis 1999: 180 with n. 4: ‘Unfortunately there is no evidence for Sappho. We only know that for Alcaeus an edition by Aristarchus replaced an earlier one by Aristophanes (see Sappho T 236 Voigt). However, this does not necessarily entail that Sappho's poems were similarly edited twice; although Aristophanes was well known for his edition of lyric poetry, it is not certain how many of the lyric poets he edited.’ Prauscello forthcoming-a clearly shows that the inference that both Aristophanes and Aristarchus edited Sappho is plausible, but by no means necessary.

¹¹ Liberman 1999: vol. I, XLVI–XLVII with n. 148; Liberman 2007: 42–3; Prauscello 2016: 53 n. 1.

¹² See Sappho T 236 Voigt; Pardini 1991: 258; Porro 1994: 3–4; Liberman 1999: XLVII n. 148; Liberman 2007: 41; Yatromanolakis 1999: 180 n. 4; Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXIV–XXV.

¹³ See Heph. *Poëm.* 4.8 (Consbruch 1906: 68, lines 22–5, and 69, lines 1–2); Kehrhahn 1914: 481–92; Liberman 1999: XLVII n. 148; Porro 2016: 22–3 and n. 11, where Haslam suggests that Hephaestion is simply contrasting the edition known to him with other metrical arrangements hypothesised by him or other scholars; Prauscello forthcoming-a.

¹⁴ Yatromanolakis 1999, Yatromanolakis 2008 and Pernigotti 2001: 12–14 suggest that different editorial principles can be detected in fragments of Sappho, but see Prauscello forthcoming-a and Prauscello forthcoming-b.

stanzas). In Book 1, παράγραφοι consistently mark the end of strophe: see e.g. F 30 Voigt and the 'Newest Sappho'.¹⁵

Lobel suggested that poems in the first and fourth book were ordered alphabetically;¹⁶ he had only few pieces of evidence for this suggestion, but the 'newest Sappho' fragments clearly confirmed this. We now have a series of poems whose first word start with omicron, followed by poems whose first word start with pi. It is clear that the alphabetic arrangement was based on the first letter only; it is not clear how poems beginning with the same letter were ordered, but they were not ordered on the basis of the alphabetical order of the second (third, etc.) letter, as in ancient and modern vocabularies.¹⁷

Some scholars observed that the poems from Book 1 starting with omicron and pi are overwhelmingly concerned with family matters, esp. with Sappho's relationship with her brothers. They suggested that this is not simply a matter of chance, and that in fact Book 1 was arranged thematically, and that within each section (e.g. a section on Aphrodite, a section on family relationships, and so on) the alphabetic arrangement was adopted.¹⁸ This seems more difficult: the alphabetical order has the purpose 'to make it easy to find a poem of which one remembered the incipit'.¹⁹ The combination of thematic and alphabetic order defeats that purpose. However, the biggest problem for this theory is that the alphabetically-ordered published series of poems is not completely homogeneous from a thematic point of view: F 15 mentions Doricha, and was probably about family matters; it was followed by F 16, which begins with omicron, and discusses love; F 5, about family matters, beginning with π, came after F 16; it was followed by the 'Brothers poem', again about family matters. It seems unlikely that a thematic 'love' section, including F 16, was placed between two sections on family matters, and that the love section started with omicron.²⁰ The alphabetic order was used in Book 4 as well.²¹ The thematic ordering principle may have been applied within poems that begin with the same letter. The first poems of Books 1 and (probably) 2 were placed in that position for thematic and aesthetic reasons, not in virtue of the alphabetic principle.²²

1.3 Metre and παράγραφοι in Sappho, Books 2–3

All poems in Book 2 of Sappho are in Sapphic pentameters:

g|^{2da} || g|^{2da} |||
 x x – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ ∩ ||
 x x – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ ∩ |||

Each strophe contains two metrically identical lines. Heph. *Ench.* 7.7 (= Consbruch 1906: 23, lines 14–16 = T 227 Voigt = fr. 49 Campbell) states:

τῶν δὲ ἀκαταλήκτων τὸ μὲν πεντάμετρον καλεῖται Σαπφικὸν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάσῦλλαβον,
 ᾧ τὸ δεῦτερον ὄλον Σαπφοῦς γέγραπται.

¹⁵ See Burris, Fish and Obbink 2014: 2: 'Each stanza is marked at the left margin by a paragraphus after the fourth, short line (adonaeon), except at the end of a poem, where this is replaced by a decorated (i.e. 'forked') paragraphus or diplo obelismene (functioning as a coronis)'. See also the images in e.g. Burris, Fish and Obbink 2014: 38–9.

¹⁶ Lobel 1925: xv.

¹⁷ Cfr. Lobel 1925: xv; Dale 2015; Obbink 2016b: 41–4.

¹⁸ See Neri 2015; Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXXV n. 38.

¹⁹ West 2014: 1.

²⁰ For the order of poems as preserved in the fragments of the ancient edition transmitted by the recently published papyri, see Obbink 2016a.

²¹ Cf. Lobel 1925: xv; Liberman 2007: 50, who lists F 59, 62, and 63 Voigt (but in fact F 59.1 is probably not the first word of a poem; the Cologne papyrus demonstrated that the poem started at F 58.23); Obbink 2016b: 41–5; Dale 2015.

²² See Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXV–XXVI, with further references. For possible thematic ordering principles in other books see Neri 2013: 26 and Neri 2014: 22–3 n. 76.

Among the acatalectic types (of Aeolic dactylic verse), the pentameter is called the Sapphic fourteen-syllable; the entire second book of Sappho is written in this metre.²³

This statement is corroborated by P.Oxy. 1232 and P.Oxy. 2076. These two papyri date from the 3rd century AD, and transmit Sappho's famous poem on the wedding of Hector and Andromache (F 44 Voigt). The scribe of P.Oxy. 2076 marked the final line with a κορωνίς, and wrote 'Sappho's poems, book 2' after it, thus signalling that the preceding line was the last one in Book 2. The poem is in Sapphic pentameters (g1^{2da}), which corresponds to Hephaestion's statement.²⁴

All poems in Book 3 were in Greater Asclepiadeans:

g1^{2cho} || g1^{2cho} |||
 x x - u u - - u u - - u u - u ~ ||
 x x - u u - - u u - - u u - u ~ |||

Each strophe contained two metrically identical lines, as in book 2. Heph. *Ench.* 10.6 (= Consbruch 1906: 34, lines 11–13 = T 229 Voigt) writes:

τὸ δὲ ἀκατάληκτον καλεῖται Σαπφικὸν ἑκκαίδεκάσύλλαβον, ᾧ τὸ τρίτον ὄλον Σαπφοῦς γέγραπται, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ Ἀλκαίου ἄσματα.

The acatalectic (antispastic tetrameter) is called Sapphic line of 16 syllables; the entire third book of Sappho, and several poems by Alcaeus are written in this metre.

Hephaestion, writing in the 2nd century AD, in addition to providing unambiguous evidence on the metrical organisation of Books 2 and 3, also discusses the editorial presentation of the books. He states that, in 'older copies', a παράγραφος was written after each couplet in Books 2 and 3; however, in his time, copies of Sappho's Books 2 and 3 did *not* have παράγραφοι signalling the end of each couplet (Heph. *Poëm.* 1.2 = Consbruch 1906: 63, lines 15–24 = Sappho T 228 Voigt = T 30 Campbell):

Κοινὰ δὲ συστηματικά, ἅπερ καὶ ὁ κατὰ στίχον γεγράφθαι φάσκων ὑγιῶς ἂν λέγοι καὶ ὁ κατὰ σύστημα, ὡς τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον Σαπφοῦς. διὰ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις κατὰ δύο ὀρᾶν παραγεγραμμένον ἕκαστον ἄσμα, καὶ ἔτι διὰ τὸ μηδὲν εὐρίσκεσθαι ἀριθμοῦ περιττοῦ, κατὰ συστήματα νομίζομεν αὐτὰ γεγράφθαι· πάλιν δέ, τῷ ὅμοιον ἑκάτερον εἶναι τῶν ἐν τῇ δυνάδι στίχων, καὶ τῷ δύνασθαι τὴν ποιήτριαν κατὰ τύχην τινὰ ἀρτίου πάντα ἀριθμοῦ πεποιηκέναι, φαίη τις ἂν κατὰ στίχον αὐτὰ γεγράφθαι.

The 'common' stanza forms are those which could equally well be described as written line by line and stanza by stanza, e.g. Books 2 and 3 of Sappho. For since in the ancient copies we see each song marked with the 'paragraphos' every two lines and there is no example of an odd number of lines, we reckon that they were composed with the same stanza as the unit; on the other hand, since each of the lines in the couplet is identical and it might have been by accident that Sappho made all the songs consist of an even number of lines, one might argue that they were composed with the line as the unit.²⁵

This statement too is corroborated by papyrus evidence. Both P.Oxy. 1232 and P.Oxy. 2076, from the 3rd century AD, containing partially overlapping sections of F 44 Voigt (the wedding of Hector and Andromache) lack παράγραφοι; as mentioned above, the colophon in P.Oxy. 2076 attests that this poem came from the second book of Sappho.

It is important to stress that the lack of παράγραφοι is not simply a matter of oversight: παράγραφοι are absent in two distinct manuscripts, roughly from the same age, and over a conspicuous number of lines

²³ Translation Campbell 1982: 95, adapted.

²⁴ The poem transmitted by P.Fouad 239 is in Sapphic pentameters (g1^{2da}): see below, section 2.

²⁵ Translation Campbell 1982: 29–31.

(24 line beginnings in P.Oxy. 1232; 12 line beginnings in P.Oxy. 2076).²⁶ Omission of παράγραφοι, as Hephaestion stated, was a standard practice in the Imperial age, for Books 2 and 3.

When did people stop marking couplets with παράγραφοι in Books 2 and 3? This omission appears to have been standard, and it applied to Books 2 and 3 only (not, for instance, to Book 1, where παράγραφοι are consistently marked after each strophe). It is very likely that the omission in Books 2 and 3 was a deliberate policy, probably designed to simplify the presentation.

One might suppose that the practice of writing παράγραφοι was present in Aristophanes' edition of Sappho (if he ever prepared one) and was abandoned in Aristarchus' edition (if he ever prepared one). However, this would mean that παράγραφοι in Books 2 and 3 were in use for a very short time indeed. Moreover, why would Hephaestion refer to Aristophanes' edition as 'ancient copies'? He is not likely to have had direct access to that edition, and if he (or his source) had had access to it, he would have certainly mentioned that Aristophanes adopted that practice.

Alternatively, one could suppose that 'ancient copies' refers to pre-Hellenistic copies, and that Alexandrian scholars abolished παράγραφοι in Books 2 and 3.²⁷ This seems to run counter the practice of Alexandrian scholars, who extended and systematised the use of critical signs. In addition, Hephaestion is talking about Books 2 and 3: it is extremely unlikely that an edition of Sappho divided into numbered books existed before the Hellenistic age. Finally, it is very unlikely that Hephaestion had access to or information on pre-Hellenistic books, or that he felt the need to discuss them in a book about 'critical signs', which were the hallmark of Alexandrian critical editions.

One can conclude that Hephaestion or his source had access to 'ancient copies' but that it was not possible for him to assign these copies to the editorial activity of any specific scholar. It is likely that the practice of these 'ancient copies' was that of an Alexandrian edition (or of *the* Alexandrian edition). The practice of writing παράγραφοι in Books 2 and 3 of Sappho was discontinued at some point during the Hellenistic or early Imperial age, and Hephaestion's text describes a practice that corresponds to what we find in papyri of Sappho dating from the Imperial age.

2. P.Fouad 239: Sappho or Alcaeus?

P.Fouad 239 is a 3rd century AD papyrus containing a number of lines which are probably in Sapphic pentameters. P.Fouad fr. (a) contains lines ending in:

] - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ ∩ ||

P.Fouad 239 fr. (b) contains lines beginning as:

× × - ∪ ∪ - [

We have a type of glyconic with dactylic expansion. All lines have the same metrical shape. The simple g^{1da} (Sappho F 130 Voigt) is too short: if the metre was g^{1da}, it would be very difficult to find supplements providing acceptable syntax and meaning in the first column. The line pher^{2da} is attested (see Alc. F 367 and 368) but does not fit the metre of fr. (a). The metre g^{3da} would fit both fragments but gives a very long line and is not attested in archaic Lesbian lyric.

We are left with g^{12da}: Sappho's Book 2 was written in g^{12da} || g^{12da} |||; Alcaeus too used this strophe (see e.g. F 141).

²⁶ See the detailed discussion of these practices in Fassino and Prauscello 2001: 9–19 and Prauscello 2006: 189–202. Prauscello 2006: 193 noted that 'P.Oxy. 2076 does represent a philologically accurate product (cf. the presence [...] of marginal scholia) and thus its lack of paragraphoi is somewhat puzzling'. The lack of παράγραφοι is in fact to be considered the regular practice for papyri of this age, as attested by Hephaestion. Prauscello 2006: 194 contrasts this with the practice of papyri of Alcaeus: F 38a Voigt (same metre; παράγραφοι are regularly placed every two lines); 50 and 44 Voigt (g^{12cho}: παράγραφοι are regularly placed every two lines). Prauscello 2006: 189–96 offers an excellent discussion of strophes of the type g^{12da} || g^{12da} ||| and g^{12cho} || g^{12cho} ||| in Lesbian lyric, and of ancient metrical interpretations of these strophes.

²⁷ See Yatromanolakis 1999: 194–5: Hephaestion's remark 'alludes to early collections of Sapphic poetry that were still extant in his day'. See also below, section 6.4.

In fact, Lobel and Page provide very plausible supplements that work well with $g1^{2da}$: see esp. col. I 2–4 below. The combination of these elements strongly suggests that the metre used was the strophe $g1^{2da} \parallel g1^{2da} \parallel$:

x x – u u – u u – u u – u u ~ ||
x x – u u – u u – u u – u u ~ |||

This is the text of the fragment:

a (col. I)

[]σανορες.[
[Φοίβωι χρυσοκό]μαι τὸν ἔτικτε Κόω .[
[μίγεις(α) Κρ]ονίδαι μεγαλωνύμω(ι)
[Ἄρτεμις δὲ θέων] μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμοσε
κεφά]λαν, ἧϊ πάρθενος ἔσσομαι 5
]ων ὀρέων κορύφαισ' ἔπι
]δε νεῦσον ἔμαν χάριν·
ἔνευσ]ε θέων μακάρων πάτηρ·
ἐλαφάβ]ολον ἀγροτέραν θέοι
]σιν ἐπωνύμιον μέγα· 10
]ερος οὐδάμα πίλναται
].[.]...μαφόβε[.]ἔρω

b (col. II)

...
εμμ[
καί.[
ρ.ε.[
ω...[
Μοίσαν ἀγλα[5
πόει καὶ Χαρίτων[
βραδίνους ἐπεβ.[
ὄργας μὴ ἴπιδάθε.[
θγάτοισιν· πεδ' χ[
]δαλίω[10

a (col. I)

(golden-haired Phoebus), whom the daughter of Coetus bore, having lain with Cronus' son, (god of the high clouds,) whose name is great; but Artemis swore the (gods') great oath: '(By your) head, I shall always be a virgin (unwed), (hunting) on the peaks of the (lonely) mountains: (come,) grant this for my sake.' (So she spoke and) the father of the blessed gods (nodded his consent); and gods (and men) call her (the virgin, shooter of deer,) huntress, a great title. Love (loosener of limbs,) never approaches her ...

b (col. II)

... glorious (gifts) of the Muses ... makes ... and of the Graces ... slender ... not to forget the anger ... mortals ... share ...²⁸

²⁸ Text from Voigt 1971 and translation from Campbell 1982, both slightly adapted. Campbell accepts a number of e.g. supplements, inserted in parenthesis. For a re-assessment of the text of the poem, with some new plausible supplements, see Benelli 2017: 244–61. Benelli, like Lobel and Page and other editors, takes $g1^{2da} \parallel g1^{2da} \parallel$ as the metre of the fragment.

This fragment is published as Sappho F 44a by Voigt and as Alcaeus fr. 304 by Lobel and Page 1955. The text was famous in antiquity. As many scholars note, Callimachus, *Hymn to Artemis*, 6 δός μοι παρθενίην αἰώνιον, ἄππα, φυλάσσειν imitates this poem (col. i, 5 ἄϊ πάρθενος ἔσσομαι).²⁹ The most perceptive reading of the pattern of allusions traces the importance of this model for Callimachus.³⁰ The language is clearly that of Lesbian lyric.

The poem must be attributed either to Sappho or Alcaeus. Which one of the two? Lobel and Page 1952: 3 first admit that 'The choice between the two cannot be made on the evidence available'. They go on to argue that Alcaeus was the author on the basis of a very weak linguistic argument; they observe that

'col. ii.11, if correctly read, provides an example of the use of paragogic ν to make position; Alcaeus has several examples, Sappho none (except in the modal particle κεν) of this metrical expedient.'³¹

This point is invalid: Sappho F 30.4 ἀείδοσ[ι]ν φ[ι] provides a secure parallel. Bowie collects all the evidence and offers convincing arguments to support the conclusion that 'there is no essential difference in the usage of the νy ephelcystic by Sappho and Alcaeus: both use it in verbal and nominal forms to make position, and both use it in the modal particle'; the νy ephelcystic was probably 'a metrically convenient borrowing from Ionic' (i.e. Ionic epic).³² Lobel himself introduced another instance of νy ephelcystic by conjecture in Sappho fr. 103.12 Lobel and Page 1955 = F 103.9 Voigt (a very likely conjecture that he himself rejected on the basis of his own strictures against the use of νy ephelcystic in Sappho).³³

The linguistic argument is thus useless to determine authorship.³⁴

The allusion to epic language and situations (see e.g. Zeus' nod: compare col. i 7 νεῦσον ἔμων χάρην with *Il.* 1.514 κατάνευσον) are characteristic of both Alcaeus and Sappho.³⁵

The content suggests that Sappho is likelier than Alcaeus: one should note the focus on a female goddess and on the theme of virginity (cf. fr. 114 Lobel and Page 1955 = F 114 Voigt). However, it is possible to imagine contexts in which Alcaeus could narrate a similar myth. Other arguments based on the content of the poem are very weak.³⁶ In a subtle paper, Bonanno pointed out some thematic affinities of our fragment with a passage of Theognis (1288–94) which, as Bonanno showed, echoes Sappho's F 1; there are however no specific verbal echoes of Sappho F 44A Voigt in Thgn. 1288–94, and the author could combine two different literary models.³⁷

In conclusion, many scholars admit that the arguments from content and language are not decisive:

Bonanno 1990: 107 'gli argomenti interni, di ordine stilistico e strutturale [...] non permettono l'inequivoca attribuzione del frammento all'uno o all'altro poeta';
Lieberman 1999: XCII 'les arguments avancés par Treu [...] et G. M. Kirkwood³⁸ [...] en faveur de la "Saffcità" de ces fragments me paraissent, sans être déterminants, avoir un certaine force persuasive';

²⁹ Lobel and Page 1952: 3.

³⁰ Acosta-Hughes 2010: 127–30.

³¹ Lobel and Page 1952: 3.

³² Bowie 1981: 101–3; the quotations are from page 103. See also Voigt 1971 ad F 30.4; Treu 1979: 162; Benelli 2017: 247.

³³ See Lobel 1951: 25; Page 1955: 118 n. 2; both Lobel and Page resist the correction φόβασι(ν), but it is very simple and restores the metre. Lobel's alternative suggestion φόβας {ι} is less plausible. See the arguments of Voigt 1971: 114–15 *ad loc.*, who prints φόβασι(ν).

³⁴ See Treu 1979: 162; Treu 1954: 172; Kirkwood 1974: 266–7 n. 73. Treu 1979: 161–4 and Benelli 2017: 246–9 argue in favour of Sappho as author of the poem, on the basis of content and style.

³⁵ On Homeric echoes, esp. for epithets, see e.g. Broger 1996 *passim*, esp. 304. For Sappho see Rissman 1983.

³⁶ Kirkwood 1974: 146 claims that 'there is not the slightest trace of the moral intensity and dramatic contrast that characterize Alcaeus's known myth-poetry'. This is very subjective; in any case, the choice of perpetual virginity is morally very intense.

³⁷ See Bonanno 1990: 108–12.

³⁸ Lieberman refers to Treu 1979: 161–4 and Kirkwood 1974: 145–6.

Neri (in Neri and Cinti 2017: 316) ‘il frammento andrebbe forse meglio rubricato tra quelli *incerti auctoris*’;

Acosta-Hughes 2010: 128 ‘The question is unresolved.’

There is another argument that can be advanced: editorial layout. The layout in fact offers a strong argument that can help to assign the fragment to Sappho.

First of all one should observe that P.Fouad comes from a ‘scholarly’ edition: it includes scholia (e.g. in col. I 11 *πίλναται* is explained as *προσπελάζει*), accents, and (probably) marks signalling long vowels.³⁹

The papyrus, however, has no *παράγραφοι*. The absence of *παράγραφοι* is a new and strong argument in favour of the attribution of P.Fouad 239 to Book 2 of Sappho. The metre is compatible with an attribution to Alcaeus, but P.Fouad 239 cannot come from a papyrus of Alcaeus, unless it is from an exceptionally careless one.

Papyri transmitting the poems of Alcaeus regularly inserted *παράγραφοι*, and for a good reason: Alcaeus’ edition was not ordered by metre (see Pardini 1991: 260–66). Each book included poems in disparate meters, and with stanzas having different numbers of lines (as in the *Odes* of Horace: see e.g. Lyne 2005a). In Alcaeus, *παράγραφοι* were important to help readers of a collection of poems in disparate meters, and with strophes of different length. Readers were faced with poems written in strophes of two, three or four lines: they needed guidance. This is why *παράγραφοι* are regularly placed after end of stanza in papyri containing texts of Alcaeus, even if the two lines making the strophe are metrically identical. The absence of *παράγραφοι* from Books 2 and 3 of Sappho caused readers no problems: all lines are metrically identical (like sequences of hexameters or iambic trimeters). The absence of *παράγραφοι* from the text of Alcaeus would make it very difficult for readers to understand the metre.

For instance, *παράγραφοι* are used to mark end of strophe in Alcaeus in these two-line stanzas:

in Sapphic pentameters (corresponding to Sappho, Book 2) (gl^{2da}): Alcaeus F 38 (P.Oxy. 1233)

in greater Asclepiadeans (corresponding to Sappho, Book 3) (gl^{2cho}): Alcaeus F 44? and 50 (P.Oxy. 1233)

in other types of two-line stanzas: see e.g. Alcaeus F 113 (P.Berol. 9569), 299 (P.Oxy. 2303).

Of course, *παράγραφοι* are accidentally omitted in papyri of Alcaeus:

F 43.2 and 4 = P.Oxy. 1233 fr. 2 col. II lines 18 and 25. The scribe omitted one or two *παράγραφοι*.

F 64 = P.Oxy. 1360 fr. 4 col. II lines 1–8. The scribe omitted one or two *παράγραφοι*.

F 66.4 = P.Oxy. 1360 fr. 1 line 4. The scribe omitted one *παράγραφος*, after a 4-line stanza.

F 122.4 = P.Oxy. 1788 fr. 12 col. II line 4. The scribe perhaps omitted one *παράγραφος*. On the attribution to Alcaeus see Porro 2004 and Lentini 2007. The metrical variety, combined with the regular use of *παράγραφοι* in the papyrus, also suggests Alcaeus.

F 287 b 6 = P.Oxy. 2301 fr. 3 b line 5. The scribe omitted one *παράγραφος*.

F 302 b 3 = P.Oxy. 2304 col. II line 7. The scribe omitted one *παράγραφος*.

P.Fouad 239 (3rd century AD) cannot come from an edition of Alcaeus, unless from an extraordinarily negligent one. One would need to assume that the scribe omitted four *παράγραφοι*. No parallel for such a number of mistakes is to be found in any other papyrus of Alcaeus. There is only one case of similar remissness, but it occurs in Sappho, and in a much later and very careless manuscript, Berlin parchment 9722, dating from the 6th–7th century AD.⁴⁰ The scribe of that manuscript omitted 6 *παράγραφοι* in F 95. The scribe also omitted several *παράγραφοι* in fragments F 94 and 97. The papyrus has no accents, no signs of vowel length, no punctuation marks, and no scholia, and the text is often corrupt.⁴¹ This looks

³⁹ Lobel and Page 1952: 1, on col. II 7: ‘above the α of *μοισαν*, a vestige compatible with the start of a horizontal stroke, *μοισάν* probable.’

⁴⁰ See Schubart 1902: 196 (6th–7th century AD); Schubart and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1907: 11 (7th century AD); Lobel and Page 1955: ix (7th century); Liberman 2007: 52; *LDAB* 3901 (‘AD 550–650’) (see <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?quick=3901>, last accessed December 2017).

⁴¹ Schubart 1902: 197.

Hamm raised an important objection in 1954, observing that some fragments apparently present a regular pattern (two long lines followed by a short one) that suggests the presence of three-line stanzas.⁴⁵ Many scholars discussed the reconstruction of P.Oxy. 1787, offering very different reconstructions of the texts, and proposing to join previously separated fragments.⁴⁶ Many argued in support of Hamm, following her line of approach, and claimed that the book included three-line stanzas.⁴⁷ Prauscello thoroughly revised the papyrological evidence for the presence of three-line stanzas and argued that the papyrological evidence is inconclusive. She writes (Prauscello 2016: 69–70):

If we have to take stock of what I have argued so far, the overall evidence, at least in the present state of our imperfect knowledge, does not require a three-line stanza of $\wedge\text{hipp}^{\text{xc}} \parallel \wedge\text{hipp}^{\text{xc}} \parallel \wedge\text{hipp}^{\text{x-lc}}\parallel$ for Sappho's 86 (= P.Oxy.2166d (1)). Fr. 64a (= P.Oxy.1787 fr. 17) and 73a (= P.Oxy.1787 fr. 11) remain the likeliest candidates (with a succession of quatrains to three-line stanzas in the case of 64a), but alternative explanations cannot entirely be ruled out for them either. Fr. 65 (= P.Oxy.1787 fr. 4), in the absence of further evidence, must remain *sub iudice* and thus a possible candidate for the three-line stanza hypothesis. [...] The possible polymetry of book 4 is a reasonable guess and future findings may well confirm it, yet the data here gathered suggest that for some frgs. of P.Oxy.1787 more caution is necessary.

Several scholars noted that Hephaestion indirectly provides a clue in favour of the hypothesis that Book 4 was not metrically homogeneous. In the text quoted at the beginning of this section, Hephaestion (Consruch 1906: 36, lines 15–16) says that Sappho ‘often used this metre’; he does not say that ‘the entire fourth book of Sappho is written in this metre’, as he does for the metres of Book 2 and 3.⁴⁸

One can advance another argument. P.Oxy. 1787 regularly presents *παράγραφοι* after each couplet, even if the lines are metrically identical. Why would one need *παράγραφοι* if all poems in the book were in the same metre, and all lines were metrically identical? No *παράγραφοι* are used in the metrically homogeneous Books 2 and 3, according to Hephaestion and (for Book 2) in the practice of papyri from the 2nd or 3rd century AD (P.Oxy. 1232 and 2076) (see above, section 1.3). This is not simply an argument *e silentio*. It is a matter of coherence. As in the books of Alcaeus, the presence of *παράγραφοι* is necessary in polymetric books to help readers understand the strophic structure of the poems. It would be very strange if *παράγραφοι*, omitted from the metrically homogeneous Books 2 and 3 of Sappho, and present in polymetric books of Sappho (see e.g. F 94, 96 and 98), were included in a metrically homogeneous Book 4.

Moreover, if Hephaestion states that *παράγραφοι* were omitted in Books 2 and 3, he implies that they were systematically present in the other books (as they in fact are).

P.Oxy. 1787 is a careful copy, and is annotated with ‘[s]tops in the high position [...], accents, breathings, and marks of elision, quantity, and diaeresis’, as well as *παράγραφοι* marking end of strophe, and coronides marking end of poem.⁴⁹ Grenfell and Hunt 1922: 26, followed by many scholars,⁵⁰ date P.Oxy. 1787 to the 3rd century AD. Funghi and Messeri convincingly argued for a 2nd century AD date.⁵¹ This brings this manuscript even closer to the age of Hephaestion. The scribe who wrote P.Oxy. 1787 also prepared some very careful copies of texts by Pindar, which he provided with marginal notes, accents, breathings, and marks of vowel length.⁵² P.Oxy. 1787 is likely to come from a scholarly milieu and reflects the editorial practices of its age.

⁴⁵ See Hamm 1954: 455.

⁴⁶ See esp. Ferrari 2005, Ferrari 2007, Puglia 2007, Ferrari 2010: 19–23 and 55–7, Benelli 2017: 312–73.

⁴⁷ See e.g. Liberman 2007: 49, Lidov 2009: 107–8, Steinrück 2010, Benelli 2017: 323–49, Prauscello and Ucciardello 2015 and the bibliography and analysis in Prauscello 2016, Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXVI–XXVII and nn. 47–48.

⁴⁸ See Liberman 2007: 49; Prauscello 2016: 55.

⁴⁹ Grenfell and Hunt 1922: 27.

⁵⁰ Lobel 1925: xii; Lobel and Page 1955: ix.

⁵¹ See Funghi and Messeri Savorelli 1992; D’Alessio 1997: 26 n. 19; see already Lobel 1961: 31, commenting on P.Oxy. 2242. See also W. A. Johnson 2004: 26–7 and 63.

⁵² Cf. Lobel 1961: 31–78, esp. 31.

It is thus very likely that Book 4 was not metrically homogeneous. The presence of *παράγραφοι* makes it very likely that some of the poems in Book 4 were written in three-line stanzas: it is the presence of stanzas of different length that makes the presence of *παράγραφοι* indispensable for readers. This of course does not prove that poems written in three-line stanzas occur in the fragments that are preserved, but it does add plausibility to the hypothesis.

4. Page layout and metre in Sappho, Books 5–7

Before discussing the metrical organisation of Book 8, we need to review the very scanty evidence about Books 5–7.

We know that Book 5 included poems using the cola *gl ba* (T 230 Voigt) and *gl^{ho}* = Minor Asclepiadean (cf. T 231 Voigt). Caesius Bassus VI p. 258 15 ss. GLK = T 230 Voigt has this to say about the colon *gl ba*: *in quinto libro complures huius generis et continuati et dispersi leguntur*. As Liberman noted, Terentianus Maurus, *De metris* 2545–2550, VI, p. 401 GLK confirms that *et iugiter usa saepe Sappho | dispersosque dedit subinde plures | inter carmina disparis figurae*.⁵³ Liberman 2007: 53 convincingly suggests that the words *continuati* and *iugiter* allude to the use of this colon *κατὰ δίστιχον*. The cola were also used *dispersi*, that is, as Liberman argues, as part of a strophe that included different types of cola. Fortunatianus VI, p. 295, 21 GLK = T 231 Voigt comments on *gl^{ho}*, saying that *Sappho hoc integro usa est libro quinto*. Liberman takes this as indicating an usage *κατὰ δίστιχον*, reasonably assuming that *integro* corresponds to the meaning of *continuati* and *iugiter*.⁵⁴

Editors normally assign the Berlin parchment 9722 to Book 5, since it transmits fragments that include the *gl ba* colon (T 230 Voigt).⁵⁵ The poems in P.Berol. 9722 are written in three-line, not two-line stanzas:

P.Berol. 9722	
F 94	<i>gl ll gl ll gl^{da} ll</i> (8 syllables in the first line)
F 95	<i>cr gl gl gl ba ll?</i> (11 syllables in the first line)
F 96	<i>cr gl gl gl ba ll</i> (11 syllables in the first line)

Liberman 2007: 54 suggests that poems were arranged on the basis of metre (Berlin parchment, F 94, 95 and 96): ‘Ici le critère serait le caractère tristique ou “trilinéaire”’. In fact the fragments in the Berlin parchment (fr. 94–96) are ordered according to the length of the first line (first 8, then 11 syllables).

We have other fragments that we can plausibly assign to Book 5, but we do not know whether they preceded or followed the fragments of the Berlin parchment in the ancient edition:

F 97	metre uncertain
F 98	<i>gl ll gl ll cr gl ll</i>
F 100	metre uncertain
F 101	<i>gl ll gl ll gl^{da} ll?</i> (Athenaeus: ‘Sappho in the fifth book’)
F 101A	<i>gl ll hipp ll?</i>

No information is extant about Book 6.

We have one fragment from Book 7:

F 102	<i>ia gl ba ll ia gl ba ll</i> (first line: 15 syllables) ⁵⁶
-------	---

We do not know whether this poem was written in a two-line stanza (as in Books 2 and 3), or a third line (and possibly a fourth) followed.

⁵³ This source was omitted by Voigt and added by Liberman 2007: 53; see now testimony 239A Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017 and Neri’s commentary on p. 435.

⁵⁴ Liberman 2007: 53: ‘Si je ne m’abuse, il veut dire par là qu’on trouve ce vers utilisé *κατὰ δίστιχον* dans le livre V de Sappho.’ Liberman’s interpretation is accepted by Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: 435.

⁵⁵ Schubart 1902: 206; Blass 1902: 466; Liberman 2007: 52–3.

⁵⁶ See also T 232 and below, section 6.1 and n. 70.

The evidence thus does not allow us to form a clear idea of the ordering principles and metrical structure of Books 6 and 7.

5. Book 8 (Sappho F 103)? Or *Epithalamia*?

A much discussed, and very enigmatic fragment (P.Oxy. 2294), comes from Book 8 or from the book of *Epithalamia*. This text is a very fragmentary prose discussion of lyric poems which lists ten line-beginnings of poems in Aeolic. After the list (fr. 130.14 Lobel and Page 1955) of incipits, the text has an obscure letter, which may be read as $\bar{\eta}$ (i.e. 8, possibly 'Book 8') or $\bar{\iota}$ (that is 10, possibly the number of odes whose incipits are reported in the papyrus) and $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\iota\ \bar{\rho}\bar{\lambda}$], that is the indication of the number of lines (a number that could range between 130 and 139); we can presume that this was the total number of lines of these ten poems, which would then be very short (roughly ten to 14 lines each). Treu suggested that this was an anthology for a performance.⁵⁷ Yatromanolakis, Dale and Neri offer different arguments in support of the idea that P.Oxy. 2294 was an anthology of poems taken from Book 8 of Sappho,⁵⁸ if P.Oxy. 2294 listed poems included in an anthology, the book was longer than 139 lines. Liberman thinks that Book 8 of Sappho was a very short one, perhaps written on the same book roll as Book 9⁵⁹ (but why was the whole sequence not simply called Book 8?).⁶⁰

This collection of incipits was selected for reasons or purposes that we cannot recover with certainty (creation of an anthology on the basis of a thematic selection?). It can be compared to the collection of incipits found in a Michigan papyrus⁶¹ or the collection of incipits from Philodemus⁶² or the recently published Vienna epigrams papyrus.⁶³

The papyrus fragment then reports the title *Epithalamia*: the context is so lacunose that it is not clear whether this refers to the poems whose incipits were listed earlier or to other poems that followed. The first four lines quoted in F 103 are appropriate beginnings for *Epithalamia*. Dale 2011 argues that Book 8 was in fact the book of *Epithalamia*, also on the basis of these fragments. I think Liberman and Prauscello have advanced very plausible arguments in defence of the ancient evidence that attested that Sappho's edition was in nine books,⁶⁴ and that *Epithalamia* was the last one, after Book 8.

Prauscello, in a forthcoming paper, suggests that the reading $\bar{\eta}$ is to be preferred and that it should be read as a title, and supplemented as $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\bar{\eta}$ 'poems', qualified by a preceding adjective, which indicated the subcategory to which these poems belonged, e.g., $\delta\acute{\rho}\theta\rho\iota\alpha$ 'poems at daybreak', or $\delta\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha$ 'poems for the waking up' of husband and wife, as suggested by D'Alessio on the basis of ancient (sub)titles attested in the scholia on Theocritus. This hypothesis would explain why only ten poems are listed: they were a sub-section of the *Epithalamia* book. This would also solve the problem of the book number.⁶⁵

⁵⁷ Treu 1979: 168, with further references (Gallavotti and others: anthology on aesthetic grounds).

⁵⁸ See Yatromanolakis 1999: 190–91, Dale 2011: 55–67, Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXVIII and 368–70. Their arguments are not identical and diverge on some important aspects.

⁵⁹ See Liberman 2007: 58 and 61.

⁶⁰ Puglia 2008 suggested that it was an anthology made by a grammarian or a reader, but that the poems do not come from book 8; for a discussion, see Prauscello forthcoming-b.

⁶¹ See Merkelbach 1973 and now Borges in Borges and Sampson 2012: 9–35.

⁶² See Parsons 1987; Puglia 2001. For a discussion of anthologies in relation to Sappho F 103 see Acosta-Hughes 2010: 102–3.

⁶³ Maehler, Parsons and Maltomini 2015.

⁶⁴ Liberman 2007: 42–4; Prauscello forthcoming-a and Prauscello forthcoming-b. Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXV and n.35 also briefly argues in favour of nine books. For the opposite view (only 8 books of Sappho) see Lobel 1925: xiv, Yatromanolakis 1999, Acosta-Hughes 2010: 100–101, Dale 2011: 55–67.

⁶⁵ See Prauscello forthcoming-b, reporting further suggestions by G. B. D'Alessio and G. Ucciardello. Prauscello notes that if the letter is to be read as iota, one could offer the supplement $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}$ and suppose that it was preceded by an adjective indicating the subcategory to which these poems belonged. For subcategories in the epithalamian genre, G. B. D'Alessio supports his e.g. suggestions $\delta\acute{\rho}\theta\rho\iota\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$ or $\delta\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$ with reference to *schol.* in Theocr. 18 argumentum (Wendel 1914: 331 lines 14–17) $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \tau\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma,\ \acute{\alpha}\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\iota\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha,\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\nu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \nu\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$

Be that as it may, the metrical arrangement of the lines reported in P.Oxy. 2294 is the crucial point for understanding the ordering principle.

This text, unlike the Michigan, Oxyrynchus and Vienna anthological papyri, is a learned text. This is especially clear in the lines 103.16–19 (as numbered and edited by Lobel and Page 1955):

]φέρονται ἐπιγεγρα[
 ἐπιθα]λάμια
]υβλίον καὶ βέλτιο[ν
]are transmitted with the title[
 epitha]lamia
]of the book and better[

The text mentions ‘titles’, ‘transmission’ and passes a judgment (‘better’); this involves some sort of interpretation. These different pieces of information, as well as the precise count of lines, suggest a scholarly interest. It is plausible to suppose that the incipits came from a continuous section or that they are transmitted in the same order as in the edition.

Let us now examine the metre. The first poetic line looks like an Aeolic line with dactylic expansion (*not* choriambic expansion):

]εν τὸ γὰρ ἐννεπε[.]η προβ[
] – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ [

The extant remains of the other nine lines (lines 2–10) are different from line 1 and compatible with each other from a metrical point of view; this does not mean that the lines in their entirety were metrically identical. As Lobel 1951: 25 noted, it is of course possible that metrically significant variations occurred at the beginning and/or ending of the line, which are not preserved.

Lobel suggested ἀε]σατε τὰν εὔποδα νόμφαν [as a plausible reconstruction of 103.5 Lobel and Page 1955 (= F 103.2 Voigt), which would correspond to the metre \wedge hipp^{2cho} (the metre used in Book 4);⁶⁶ Lasserre offered an *exempli gratia* reconstruction of 103.2–10 Voigt (= 103.5–13 Lobel and Page 1955 = P.Oxy. 2294.5–13) as 3cho ba;⁶⁷ Puglia, also *exempli gratia*, suggested a reconstruction of 103.2–10 Voigt (= 103.5–13 Lobel and Page 1955 = P.Oxy. 2294.5–13) as \wedge hipp^{2cho}.

It would be of course very strange if these poems came from Book 8 and had the metrical scheme \wedge hipp^{2cho}, which is identical to the first line of a stanza often used in Book 4, as Lobel and Page observed.⁶⁸ If indeed \wedge hipp^{2cho} was the metre of some of these lines, one can plausibly suppose that the stanza was not made of two identical lines, as in Book 4, but that it continued in a different way.

In any case, all the lines reported in 103.2–10 Voigt (= 103.5–13 Lobel and Page 1955 = P.Oxy. 2294.5–13) present a choriambic middle section; see e.g. (in the text of Lobel and Page 1955):

5 (= 2 Voigt)] ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – []ατε τὰν εὔποδα νόμφαν [

6 (= 3 Voigt)] ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ []τα παῖδα Κρονίδα τὰν ἰόκ[ολπ]ον [

7 (= 4 Voigt)] – – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ? []ς ὄργαν θεμένα τὰν ἰόκ[ολπ]πος α[

The sequence of poems follows the same principle that governs the order of Books 2 and 3: shorter lines with dactylic expansion come first, followed by longer lines with choriambic expansion:

ἄιδουσι τινὰ δὲ ὄρθρια, ἃ καὶ προσαγορεύεται διεγερτικά. If one reads ὠίδα]ί then one needs of course e.g. ὄρθριαι or διεγερτικάι: Prauscello forthcoming-b.

⁶⁶ Lobel 1951: 25.

⁶⁷ Lasserre 1989: 62–80.

⁶⁸ Page 1955: 118 n. 1. See Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: XXVII–XVIII.

Book 2: g1^{2da} || g1^{2da} ||l | x x - u u - u u - u u - u u || (14 syllables)

Book 3: g1^{2cho} || g1^{2cho} ||l | x x - u u - u u - u u - u u || (16 syllables)

We do not know whether these poems from this book (Book 8? *Epithalamia*?) were written in strophes of 2 or 3 lines; it is plausible to suppose that the other line or lines of the strophe were not metrically identical to the first one, and that these strophes were not identical to those of Books 2 and 3. It is in any case clear that the editor of this book (Book 8? *Epithalamia*?) ordered the poems within the book in a way that corresponded to the order of Books 2 and 3.

We have no certain information on the metres of Book 9, and, as noted, some scholars doubt its very existence. Liberman and Prauscello recently pointed out that scepticism against the sources that attest the existence of Book 9 is excessive.⁶⁹ It is possible, but by no means certain that fr. 104, 105, 142 come from Book 9:

F 105b.2: 6dall (16 syllables)

- u u - - - u u - u u - u u - u u ||

πόσσι καταστείβοισι, χάμαι δέ τε πόρφυρον ἄνθος

F 142: pher^{3da} || (or 6dall) (16 syllables)

x x - u u - u u - u u - u u - u u ||

Λάτω καὶ Νιόβρα μάλα μὲν φίλαι ἦσαν ἔταιραι

If they do, and if they represent the metre of the first line of poems from Book 9, they were placed there according to the metrical principle indicated above; the last book had the longest lines (i.e. the longest first line of a type of stanza that was not sufficiently common to fill an entire book, after the metrically homogeneous Books 1–3).

6. Hellenistic and Roman books of poetry

6.1 Uniformity and heterogeneity

What type of order should an editor choose when arranging poems according to metrical order? Uniformity? Variety? Length? And what type of order should an editor choose when the poet writes his or her poems in strophes or couplets?

The evidence discussed so far showed that whoever organised Sappho's edition placed Sappho's characteristic metre in Book 1 (Sapphic strophe). Note that the first line of the stanza, as laid out in ancient manuscripts, has 11 syllables (the first three 'lines' have 11 syllables each). The editor then ordered the books according to the length of the first line. Books with strophes composed of cognate metrical elements, i.e. of Aeolic cola (Books 2: g1^{2da}: 14 syllables; Book 3: g1^{2cho}: 16 syllables; Book 4: ^hipp^{2cho}: 16 syllables) were placed first; then came books including strophes composed of non-cognate metrical elements, again starting with the shortest cola in Book 5. In Book 5 note the presence of a cretic and a baccheus in F 96 cr 3gl ba; the cretic among glyconics in F 98 gl || gl || cr gl ||; for the sequence gl ba cfr. T 230. We have no evidence for Book 6, but we find ia gl ba (15 syllables), or, as Hephaestion calls it, an 'antispastic catalectic tetrameter' at some point of Book 7, be it the beginning or the end (T 232);⁷⁰ this suggests polymetry for Book 7, and attests mixture of different cola. F 103 was probably part of Book 8 or of the *Epithalamia* book: here again we find very long first lines in Aeolic metres (^g1^{2da}? ^hipp^{2da}? ^hipp^{2cho}? Or even the mixed colon 3cho ba, as supposed by Lasserre?); it is easy to suppose that these first lines were followed, in their respective stanzas, by cola which included non-Aeolic elements such as cretic and baccheus. The rationale of the edition is thus straightforward and clear and allows readers who know the first line or lines of a poem to find it with relative ease.

⁶⁹ See above, n. 64.

⁷⁰ See Prauscello forthcoming-a ('ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἐβδόμου or ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλευτῆς τοῦ ἐβδόμου') and Liberman 2007: 54; Neri in Neri and Cinti 2017: 198–9 and 435–6 favours 'the end of Book 7'.

The edition originally used *παράγραφοι* to signal end of stanza, but the practice was discontinued at some point in the metrically homogeneous Books 2 and 3: the poems of these books were written in distichs, and *παράγραφοι* were omitted in papyri of the Imperial age.

These principles were apparently used in the editions of other archaic poets.

6.2 Archilochus

The metrical arrangement found in Sappho's books is paralleled in a papyrus fragment of Archilochus. Archilochus' famous Cologne epodes are transmitted in a 2nd cent. AD papyrus (P.Colon. inv. 7511). The papyrus, published in 1974, presents the fragments in the following order: fr. 196a, fr. 188 (according to the numbers in West 1980 and West 1989).⁷¹ For ease of reference, West did not change the order nor the numbering of fragments of his 1971 edition; in his later editions, he simply added fr. 196a (the seduction narrative), which was absent from the first edition.⁷² It is possible that the very brief fr. 196 West was also part of the same text as 196a, since metre and content are identical; fr. 196 is not transmitted by the papyrus fragment. This papyrus apparently does not use *παράγραφοι* to separate couplets. These are the metres of the poems transmitted by the papyrus:

fr. 196a West:

3ia || D 2ia || (the first line has 12 syllables, as a rule)⁷³

fr. 188 West:

4da ith || 3ia[^] || (from 16 to 18 syllables in the first line)⁷⁴

In this case too we see that the Hellenistic editors ordered poems according to the length (i.e. number of syllables) of the first line, as in Sappho. This is a very neat copy, provided with 'punctuation signs, accents, breathings, apostrophoi, some vowel-length signs and tremas';⁷⁵ many scholars consider it as taken from the Alexandrian edition of Archilochus.⁷⁶

6.3 Hipponax

P.Argent. 3 transmits Hipponax fr. 115, 116 and 117 West, in this order.⁷⁷ These texts are all in the same metre. End of poem is marked by *παράγραφος* and *κορωνίς*.⁷⁸ End of strophe is not marked. This is a learned edition (note the presence of scholia).⁷⁹ The metrical structure is:

Fr. 115: 3ia || D ||

Fr. 116: 3ia || D || (? fragmentary)

Fr. 117: 3ia || D ||

⁷¹ The papyrus provided new evidence for fr. 188 and the new text of fr. 196a. West had already published his first edition of Archilochus (West 1971) before he published the Cologne papyrus.

⁷² See West 1971; Merkelbach and West 1974; West 1980; West 1989; for a commentary see Nicolosi 2007: 137–249.

⁷³ This metre is used in Hor. *Ep.* 11.

⁷⁴ Horace does not use this metre.

⁷⁵ Slings in Bremer, Erp Taalman Kip and Slings 1987: 24.

⁷⁶ See Nicolosi 2007: 137 and n. 3. Nicolosi, on the same page, also considers the possibility that this was an anthology, but does not advance any arguments in favour of this hypothesis. On ancient editions of Archilochus see Lasserre in Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: XCII–XCIII; Rotstein 2010, 28–31; Porro 2011; Hawkins 2014: 29–31, with further references.

⁷⁷ P.Argent. 3 fr. 1.1–16 = fr. 115 West = 194 Degani; P.Argent. 3 fr. 1.17–19 = fr. 116 West = 195 Degani; P.Argent. 3 fr. 2 = fr. 117 West = 196 Degani: for details see West 1971, 1980 and 1989, Degani 1983. Degani 1983 includes these fragments among the 'dubia'. Hipponax is named in fr. 117.4 West. Some scholars (Diehl) attributed all these poems to Archilochus, implausibly (given the presence of the name of Hipponax). Others (Cantarella, Kirkwood) suggested that this was an anthology, attributing fr. 115 to Archilochus and fr. 117 to Hipponax. The anthology hypothesis seems extremely weak given the presence of scholia (see below, note 79). Anthologies are normally written as informal, not learned texts. For a survey on these questions see Nicolosi 2007: 13–27. Nicolosi 2007: 22 rejects the anthology hypothesis on the basis of content, not on the basis of the formal presentation of the papyrus.

⁷⁸ Cf. West 1989 on Hipponax fr. 116.1.

⁷⁹ See Nicolosi 2007: 37–8.

As in Sappho's Books 2 and 3, we have a series of metrically homogeneous poems, in couplets, written without *παράγραφοι* between strophes. One can suppose that a whole large section of Hipponax or perhaps even a whole book was written in this metre. Ancient sources mention at least two books of *Iambi*. We lack information about the other books.⁸⁰

If we now look at editions of Hellenistic authors, we discover (unsurprisingly) that metre was often used as an ordering criterion. We are not always able to guess whether this arrangement was planned by the authors themselves, or by editors who applied to these texts the same criteria used for archaic poets.

6.4 Theocritus

Theocritus' Aeolic poems provide the first possible piece of evidence of the impact of ordering criteria of archaic Greek lyric on Hellenistic and Roman books of poetry. The language and metre of Theocritus' Aeolic poems obviously suggest Sappho and Alcaeus as models. Modern editions print these poems after those in hexameters; the order of the editions follow that of medieval manuscripts, which is very consistent. As M. L. West put it, 'The grouping together of the Aeolic poems, and the actual order 28–31, is therefore certainly ancient, and may go back to the earliest collected edition of Theocritus' poems, perhaps to the poet himself.'⁸¹ The order, already attested in the 5th or 6th century AD (P.Antin.), is as follows:⁸²

- Theocritus 28 (25 lines): Greater Asclepiadeans, gl^{2cho} (= Sappho Book 3)
- Theocritus 29 (40 lines): Sapphic pentameters, gl^{2da} (= Sappho Book 2)
- Theocritus 30 (32 lines): Greater Asclepiadeans, gl^{2cho} (= Sappho Book 3)
- Theocritus 31 (very fragmentary: 34 lines?): probably written in Greater Asclepiadeans, gl^{2cho} (= Sappho book 3)

Poem 28, *The distaff*, stands out because of its subject matter and of the odd number of lines. It is a poem for women, and clearly alludes to Sappho for metre and language. It has an odd number of lines (25). West suggested that the order of the poems corresponded to the order of composition; he argued that the poems display a growing understanding of the metrical practices of Sappho and Alcaeus, and that only in composing poem 29 (actually, in writing the very last two lines of poem 29) did Theocritus realise that a pyrrhic base was allowed by the Aeolic poets. Not only that: according to West, only in writing poem 29 did Theocritus realise that Aeolic poets used these metres in distichs. However, this makes Theocritus a pretty poor metrical scholar. Moreover, if Theocritus had a text of Sappho provided with *παράγραφοι* (like P.Colon. inv. 21351 + 21376), it would have been very easy for him to notice that the poems were written in distichs. It is much easier to suppose that Theocritus, in imitating Sappho's poems, already used editions that did *not* have colons after each couplet.⁸³ This in turn implies the existence of an edition of Sappho in the early 3rd century BC, before the activity of Aristophanes and Aristarchus, and that already this edition lacked *παράγραφοι*. Hephaestion's remark on the presence of *παράγραφοι* in early editions of Sappho (see above, section 1.3) would thus refer to a very early Alexandrian or even pre-Alexandrian collection. However, this conclusion cannot be regarded as certain: it is always possible to suppose that Theocritus followed other models or that he simply preferred to avoid the distich structure for aesthetic reasons.

⁸⁰ For the evidence on the ancient edition (or editions?) of Hipponax, see Degani 1983: 10; Rotstein 2010: 29; Hawkins 2014: 29–31. P.Oxy. 2176 (= Hipp. fr. 118 W) is a fragment from a commentary on Hipponax: see Degani 1983: 132–42 (fr. 129–32), Degani 2007: 134–7; Slings in Bremer, Erp Taalman Kip and Slings 1987: 70–94.

⁸¹ See West 1967: 83–4 for the manuscript evidence and p. 84 for the quotation.

⁸² The papyrus does not have *παράγραφοι* in poems 28–31: see Hunt and Johnson 1930: 57–60. On the papyrus see McNamee 2007: 376–427, Acosta-Hughes 2010: 107 n. 6; Montana 2011a; Montana 2011b; Meliadò 2014; LDAB 4004 (<http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=62814>, last accessed December 2017).

⁸³ See the rather cautious statements in Fassino and Prauscello 2001: 37: 'la percezione di una struttura κατά σύστημα almeno nei pentametri eolici dei poeti lesbi va retrodatata fino a Teocrito e agli albori della filologia alessandrina'; Prauscello 2006: 212 n. 67.

Poems 29 and 30 form a clear unit, under the same title, *Paidika*. The first line of poem 29 is a clear citation of Alc. F 57, which makes the intertextual link to Alcaeus impossible to miss.⁸⁴ The theme also suggests that these poems are a recreation of archaic poems written by a male Aeolic poet: Alcaeus. It is not very surprising that, in imitating Alcaeus' poems, Theocritus wrote poems in distichs. In all editions of Alcaeus, these distichs are marked by *παράγραφοι* (see above, sections 1.3 and 2). Fassino and Prauscello noticed that, in poems 29 and 30, Theocritus does not simply write an even number of lines; he actually composes in distichs. In 29 and 30, he is careful to avoid enjambments between couplets (i.e. between an even and odd line), whereas in 28 he employed enjambments freely.⁸⁵ This is a clear sign of the metrical ingenuity of Theocritus, who recreated the metrical and musical strophic break of archaic Lyric in his recited Hellenistic poetry.⁸⁶ The Theocritus that emerges from this picture is a much more complex and plausible one than the metrical beginner imagined by West in his 1967 paper.⁸⁷

The order of poems 29–31, moreover, corresponds to that of Sappho's Book 2 and 3: first the poem in shorter lines (29: g1^{2da}, 14 syllables), then the poem(s) in longer ones (30 and probably 31: g1^{2cho}: 16 syllables). Theocritus (or his editor) follows the order of books of Sappho in ordering his *Paidika*. Or, more precisely, he follows the same, very simple, metrical criterion: metrically affine poems are ordered according to the length of the first line. As Benjamin Acosta-Hughes put it: 'the metrical ordering of Sappho's poetry conditions the ordering' of these poems.⁸⁸

Another instance of Theocritus' metrical ingenuity occurs in his *Epigram* 21.1–2:

Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ στᾶθι καὶ εἴσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητᾶν
τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος

– ∪ ∪ – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∪ || 4da + ith ||
– – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ || 3ia ||

Stop and look upon Archilochus, the ancient, the iambic, poet, whose infinite fame ...⁸⁹

The first line begins with the word 'Archilochus' and is an Archilochean, from a metrical point of view;⁹⁰ the second line begins with the word 'iambic' and is iambic. This seems to allude very clearly to the existence of the name 'Archilochean' for the structure 4da + ith, even if our first attestations for the word 'Archilochean' in this metrical sense are found in a scholium to this epigram and in commentaries on Horace.⁹¹

We cannot ascertain whether the order of Theocritus 29–31 goes back to Theocritus or was chosen by a later editor. If Theocritus imitated the order of an edition of Sappho, this would locate the edition earlier than we thought, well before the activity of Aristophanes and Aristarchus.⁹² It is also possible that Theocritus used a simple metrical criterion (length of lines) that was later used by editors of archaic poetry. We cannot know who ordered these poems in this way, but we can easily see that the ordering principles are the same as those used in Sappho's edition. We do not need to assume that the same scholar prepared editions of different poets: the principles are simple and easily imitated. It is in any case certain that the Cologne

⁸⁴ See Gow 1950 *ad loc.*; Acosta-Hughes 2010: 110–13.

⁸⁵ Fassino and Prauscello 2001: 34–5; Prauscello 2006: 208–12.

⁸⁶ Fassino and Prauscello 2001: 36–7; Prauscello 2006: 213. On music and recitation in Theocritus see Hunter 1996: 4–10.

⁸⁷ West 1967. See also Fassino and Prauscello 2001: 33 n. 65, Prauscello 2006: 208.

⁸⁸ Acosta-Hughes 2010: 109.

⁸⁹ Translation Gow 1950.

⁹⁰ The very strong hyperbaton of the first line (Ἀρχίλοχον is governed by εἴσιδε) is designed to highlight the name of the poet, who was the subject of the statue celebrated in the epigram, as well as the 'inventor' of the metre: see Gow 1950 *ad loc.* For a discussion of the epigram see also L. Rossi 2001: 323–30.

⁹¹ See the main sources in Morelli 2006: 259–60: see especially *sch.* in *Anth. Pal.* 7.664 (Morelli writes *Anth. Pal.* 7.21 by mistake) (= Stadtmüller 1899: 458 in the apparatus *ad loc.*), [Acro] in *Hor. Carm.* 1.4 (= Keller 1902: 32 lines 3–7), *Aphthon. GL VI* 163.

⁹² Gow 1950, vol. I: xxix: 'the hypothesis therefore that he [= Theocritus] was born about 300 B.C., and died or ceased to write not later than 260 B.C., though not necessarily true, would fit the extant evidence satisfactorily.'

papyrus of Sappho (P.Colon. inv. 21351 + 21376), from the third century BC, contemporary with Theocritus, arranged the poems of Sappho on the basis of metrical (strophes in the metre $\text{^hipp}^{2\text{cho}}\parallel\text{^hipp}^{2\text{cho}}\parallel$) and thematic criteria:⁹³ just like Theocritus.

6.5 Callimachus

The order of Callimachus' fr. 226–9 Pfeiffer again seems to follow the pattern that emerges from Sappho. These poems come after *Iambi* 1–13 in the Milan $\delta\iota\gamma\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of the works of Callimachus, which also lists the first line of each poem. The texts of fr. 226–9 are also transmitted by papyrus fragments. It is not possible to discuss here in detail the relation of these poems with *Iambi* 1–13. Pfeiffer influentially printed *Iambi* 1–13 as a separate work from fr. 226–9, which he designated as $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$, but several scholars consider *Iambi* 1–13 and fr. 226–9 as parts of a single book of *Iambi* which included 17 poems.⁹⁴ The order of the *Iambi* was clearly designed by Callimachus: the complex thematic and linguistic architecture of poems 1–13 has been illuminated by several studies.⁹⁵

The metrical structure of the *Iambi* conforms to the metrical principle discussed above:⁹⁶

1–4	choliamb	(stichic)	(Ionic literary language)
5	choliamb 2ia	(epodic)	(Ionic literary language)
6	3ia ith	(epodic)	(Doric literary language)
7	3ia ith	(epodic)	(Doric with Aeolic elements)
8	3ia [...]	(stichic? epodic?)	(Ionic literary language)
9	3ia 3ia?	(stichic? epodic?)	(Doric literary language)
10	3ia	(stichic?)	(Ionic literary language)
11	3ia^^	(stichic?)	(Doric literary language)
12	3tro^	(stichic)	(Ionic literary language)
13	choliamb	(stichic)	(Ionic literary language)

Iambi 1–12 are organised according to the *decreasing* length of the first and, if relevant, second line. Callimachus' ordering principle is thus similar to that used in Sappho's books, but inverted: not the short lines first, but the 'longer' or 'heavier' ones first.

The first four poems are in choliamb, i.e. iambic trimeters which have a long penultimate element instead of a light one. The first line of *Iambus* 5, an epodic poem, is identical to the first line of *Iambi* 1–4, but its second line is shorter (2ia). We then move into the 3ia territory, a line that follows the choliamb because it is 'lighter' (the penultimate element is short, not long as in the choriamb). In the 3ia group (*Iambi* 6–10), we first have epodic structures where the iambic trimeter is followed by an ithyphallic (poems 6–7). In this section the stichic poems (9–10, apparently; perhaps also 8) actually follow the epodic ones, in a mirror sequence to poems 1–5. The book then continues with poems which have a shorter first line than *Iambus* 10: *Iambus* 11, in 3ia^^, and *Iambus* 12, in 3tro^, a metre 'which some call acephalous iambic'

⁹³ See the remarks by Liberman 2016: 62.

⁹⁴ For full discussions of studies and bibliography see Acosta-Hughes 2003; Lelli 2005: 1 n. 1. For a concise survey see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2005: 29. Some scholars argue that *Iambi* 1–13 are a single book and that fr. 226–9 are a separate book of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$ or a series of separate poems: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912: 540 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$); Pfeiffer 1949: 216 ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$); Kerkhecker 1999: 271–82; Hunter 2013. Others suggest that *Iambi* 1–13 and fr. 226–9 Pfeiffer form a single unit: Cameron 1995: 163–73 (a single book); D'Alessio 1996a: 43–5 (a single book; Callimachus placed at the end of the book two 'atypical' poems); Acosta-Hughes 2002: 9–13 (the original book by Callimachus was *Iambi* 1–13; as for fr. 226–9, 'the issue cannot be closed', p. 13); Acosta-Hughes 2003 (fr. 226–9 Pfeiffer mirror the contents of *Aitia*; they were added by Callimachus or by a post-Callimachean editor); Lelli 2005: 1–6 and 13–27 (Callimachus published two editions of his *Iambi*: the first edition had *Iambi* 1–13, the second one *Iambi* 1–17, including fr. 226–9). Lyne 2005b: 16–18 suggests that Horace, writing a quasi-closural *Epode* 13 in a collection of 17 poems, alludes both to the closure of Callimachus *Iambus* 13 and to a Callimachean collection of 17 poems, mirroring an ancient debate about the structure and delimitation of the book.

⁹⁵ Kerkhecker 1999 *passim*, esp. 286–7; Acosta-Hughes 2002 *passim*. On Archilochus as a source of metrical inspiration for Callimachus in the *Iambi* see Morelli 1995.

⁹⁶ For extensive discussion and documentation see Pfeiffer 1949; D'Alessio 1996b: 577–657; Kerkhecker 1999; Acosta-Hughes 2002 *passim*.

(Heph. *Ench.* 6.2 = Consbruch 1906: 18, lines 11–12). *Iambus* 12, written in a metre that can be described as iambic trimeter curtailed at the beginning, has a longer line than 11; this leads to the concluding poem. *Iambus* 13 recalls the metre of the first poem of the collection, thus suggesting a closure of the section.⁹⁷ Horace too, in his *Epodes*, will present a last poem ‘out of sequence’, returning to the metre of the first poem of his collection.

It is reasonable to assume that Callimachus considered poem 13 the end of the book, or at least the end of a first edition or a first section of the book.

The rather mechanical metrical criterion of the length of the first line governs the general structure of the book, but is tempered with the addition of aesthetically relevant criteria: the chiasmic structure of 1–5 and 6–10 (the sequence 1–5 presents stichic poems first, with ‘longer’ or ‘heavier’ lines at the beginning; the sequence 6–10 presents stichic poems at the end), and the return to the metre of poem 1 at the end.

We have a fresh start with fr. 226–9: the metres of this new book (or of this section? or of a second edition of *Iambi*?) are rather different in character from those of *Iambi* 1–13, and the themes change drastically. Here again it is plausible to suppose that Callimachus ordered these poems as we find them in the extant papyrus fragments. Several complex thematic interactions and parallelisms have been identified by critics in fr. 226–9.⁹⁸ These thematic and semantic layers can be seen on the backdrop of a well-designed metrical progression that gives the fr. 226–9 the aspect of an edition of archaic lyric poems. The poems are arranged according to the *increasing* length (= number of syllables) of the first line, as for *Iambi* 1–12:⁹⁹

14 = 226 Pfeiffer Phalaecian (+x?)	
x x – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∥	11 syllables
15 = 227 Pfeiffer 2ia + ith (Euripidean) ¹⁰⁰	
x – ∪ – x – ∪ – – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∥	14 syllables
16 = 228 Pfeiffer Archebulean (anapaestic pentameter)	
∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∥	15 syllables
17 = 229 Pfeiffer choriambic pentameters	
– ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ∥	19 syllables

Here again the rather mechanical metrical criterion is in evidence. The metre of fr. 229 is one of the longest lines in Greek poetry, a fitting conclusion to an impressive series of poems in long lines.

6.6 Horace's Epodes

In the *Epodes*, Horace presents himself as the poet who revives archaic Greek lyric in Rome. It is not surprising that his first book of poems presents itself as an Alexandrian edition of poems by an archaic author. Horace follows the same ordering principle used in Sappho's edition, probably also used in editions of Archilochus and Hipponax. He does that with a twist.¹⁰¹ He wrote his poems as some sort of autobiographical narrative and created sophisticated thematic interactions between these different texts. In doing this, he is competing with the model of Callimachus, and with the evolution of the iambic persona portrayed by Callimachus in his *Iambi*. Several studies analyse the effect this particular order of the contents has on the reader of Horace's *Epodes*.¹⁰² As Hutchinson puts it: ‘Instead of narrative and biography the book as

⁹⁷ See Kerkhecker 1999: 267–70, 278–82; Acosta-Hughes 2002: 11–12, 60–61; Hunter 2013.

⁹⁸ See esp. Acosta-Hughes 2003 and Lelli 2005 *passim*, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2017.

⁹⁹ For the metres see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912: 540–43, Pfeiffer 1949 *ad loc.*, D'Alessio 1996b: 656–73, Lelli 2005.

¹⁰⁰ This is Hephæstion's interpretation (*Ench.* 15.17 = Consbruch 1906: 53, lines 5–11, esp. 6–7): ‘the so-called fourteen-syllable Euripidean’. P.Berol. 13417 divides the sequence as an epode: 2ia ∥ ith ∥∥ = 8 + 6 syllables (see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1912: 537–40). See also Acosta-Hughes forthcoming.

¹⁰¹ On the sophisticated recreation of archaic Greek metres by Horace see L. E. Rossi 1998.

¹⁰² See Mankin 1995: 10–12, Watson 2003: 20–26, Lyne 2005b, Hutchinson 2008: 163–6. For general readings of the *Epodes* in the iambic tradition see Oliensis 1991; Cavarzere 1992: 9–44; Heyworth 1993; Barchiesi 1994; Harrison 2001; Oliensis 1998: 64–101; T. S. Johnson 2012; Morrison 2016 with further references.

a whole offers a more self-reflexive and metaliterary sequence; here poetry, and relation to the model, and the character of the narrator are combined'.¹⁰³

But what is the ordering criterion? This is the metrical sequence of the *Epodes*:¹⁰⁴

1–10	3ia 2ia
11	3ia D 2ia
12	hex 4da^
13	hex 2ia D
14–15	hex 2ia
16	hex 3ia
17	3ia (81 lines) (shorter line: odd poem out, in final position)

Modern interpreters offer very perceptive comments on the aesthetic effects of the metrical sequence:

Mankin 1995: 11 'ten poems in a combination of iambic lines are followed by a poem (11) in which a dactylic element 'intrudes', an entirely dactylic poem (12), a mostly dactylic poem with an iambic element (13), poems containing a balance of dactyls and iambs (14, 15, 16), and finally a poem which returns to pure iambs (17).'

Lieberman 1995: 171 'les pièces 12 à 16 ont en commun le fait d'avoir comme premier élément un hexamètre dactylique. [...] Les pièces 13 à 16 s'opposent à la pièce 12, faite de distiques dont le second élément est un tétramètre dactylique catalectique, en ce que leur second élément est iambique. La pièce 13 s'oppose aux autres de son groupe en ce que son second élément est un vers asynartète; elle a en commun avec les pièces 14 et 15 le premier membre du second élément [...] De fait, l'identité du premier élément du distique a fourni le critère de rangement des pièces 1–16.'

Lyne 2005b: 12 'There is, therefore, a kind of metrical ring-composition from 11.2, where the surprise starts, through to *Epode* 13: hemiepes, iambic dimeter (*Epode* 11.2), dactylic hexameters and tetrameters, picking up the hemiepes (*Epode* 12), dactylic hexameter, iambic dimeter, and finally hemiepes again (*Epode* 13).'

Hutchinson 2008: 164 'there is division by metre: the same all-iambic combination for 1–10; an explosion of new metres, with dactylic elements, in 11–16; stichic iambs (not couplets) in 17. Callimachus' *Iambi* inspire the plain close, and the movement to new metres after the earlier poems.'

It is quite clear that the final poem conveys the sense of closure, both from a thematic and metrical point of view:¹⁰⁵ it goes back to the metre of *Epodes* 1–10, in the spirit of Callimachus' *Iambus* 13 (see above, section 6.5).¹⁰⁶ But what of the sequence 11–16? What is its ordering principle?

Horace follows the same principle of metrical arrangement used by Hellenistic editors of Sappho (and other lyric poets: Archilochus, Theocritus, Callimachus' fr. 226–9 and *Iambi*).¹⁰⁷

He starts with the epodes that present a shorter first line (3ia), combined with cognate meters (2ia) (poems 1–10). He then presents a poem that shares the same initial line (iambic trimeter) with poems 1–10 but combines it with dissimilar metres (dactyls) (3ia || D | 2ia |||) (*Epode* 11). Horace then presents a series of poems which begin with a longer initial line (hexameter), combined first with cognate (4da) (*Epode* 12) and then partially cognate meters (2ia | D) (*Epode* 13); he finally combines the hexameter with dissimilar metres (iambs), again ordered on the basis of the increasing length of the second line (given that the first

¹⁰³ Hutchinson 2008: 165.

¹⁰⁴ On the metrical structure see Mankin 1995: 14–22, Watson 2003: 43–6, with further references.

¹⁰⁵ On the metrical closure see Lieberman 1995: 171–2.

¹⁰⁶ See Lieberman 1995: 172.

¹⁰⁷ *Pace* Mankin 1995: 11 n. 41: 'It is worth noting in that H[orace]'s arrangement is quite different from that of Callimachus in his *Iamboi*.'

lines are metrically identical): *Epode* 14–15 (hex || 2ia ||) and *Epode* 16 (hex || 3ia ||). The final, non-epodic poem recalls the initial poem.

Horace presents his poems as if an Alexandrian philologist arranged them following the same principles used for ordering the unconnected poems of Sappho and other archaic Greek poets: that is, Horace presents his book as if it was made of isolated poems, which by pure chance acquire a specific meaning when ordered according to the metrical principle. By some sort of pre-established harmony, his poems, composed at different times and on different occasions, acquire a specific thematic meaning through an ordering principle that is apparently a purely metrical one. This astonishing technical virtuosity can be understood only when we understand the ordering principles of Sappho's books.

Bibliography

- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002) *Polyeideia: the Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*, Berkeley.
- (2003) Aesthetics and Recall: Callimachus frs. 2269 Pf. Reconsidered, *CQ* 53: 478–89.
- (2010) *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*, Princeton.
- (forthcoming) A Lost Pavane for a Dead Princess: Call. fr. 228 Pf.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S. A. (2017) Callimachean 'Lyric', *Trends in Classics* 9 (2): 226–47.
- Barchiesi, A. (1994) Ultime difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico: l'epodo XVII, in Comitato nazionale per le celebrazioni del bimillenario della morte di Q. Orazio Flacco (ed.), *Atti dei convegni di Venosa, Napoli, Roma, novembre 1993* (Verona) 205–20.
- Bastianini, G. and Casanova A. (eds.) (2007) *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi: 'I papiri di Saffo e Alceo': Firenze, 8–9 giugno 2006*, Florence.
- Battezzato, L. (2009a) The fragmentum Grenfellianum: Metrical Analysis, Ancient Punctuation, and the Sense of an Ending, in J. R. C. Cousland and J. R. Hume (eds.), *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp* (Leiden and Boston) 403–20.
- (2009b) The Metre and Music of Greek Lyric, in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge) 130–46.
- (forthcoming) Sappho's Metres and Music, in P. J. Finglass and A. Kelly (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Sappho* (Cambridge).
- Benelli, L. (2017) *Sapphostudien zu ausgewählten Fragmenten*, Paderborn.
- Bierl, A. and Lardinois, A. (eds.) (2016), *The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, frs. 1–4*, Leiden.
- Blass, F. (1902) Die Berliner Fragmente der Sappho, *Hermes* 37: 456–79.
- Bonanno, M. G. (1990) *L'allusione necessaria: ricerche intertestuali sulla poesia greca e latina*, Roma.
- Borges, C. and Sampson, C. M. (2012) *New Literary Papyri from the Michigan Collection: Mythographic Lyric and a Catalogue of Poetic First Lines*, Ann Arbor.
- Bowie, A. M. (1981) *The Poetic Dialect of Sappho and Alcaeus*, New York.
- Bremer, J. M., Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. v. and Slings, S. R. (1987) *Some Recently Found Greek Poems: Text and Commentary*, Leiden–New York.
- Broger, A. (1996) *Das Epitheton bei Sappho und Alkaios: eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*, Innsbruck.
- Burris, S., Fish, J. and Obbink, D. (2014) New Fragments of Book 1 of Sappho, *ZPE* 189: 1–28.
- Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton.
- Campbell, D. A. (1982) *Greek Lyric I: Sappho and Alcaeus*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Cavarzere, A. (1992) *Orazio: Il libro degli Epodi*, Venezia.
- Consbruch, M. (1906) *Hephaestionis Enchiridion cum commentariis veteribus*, Leipzig.
- D'Alessio, G. B. (1996a) *Callimaco: volume primo. Inni, epigrammi, Ecclie*, Milano.
- (1996b) *Callimaco: volume secondo. Aitia, giambi e altri frammenti*, Milano.
- (1997) Pindar's "Prosodia" and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments, *ZPE* 118: 23–60.
- Dale, A. (2011) Sapphica, *HSPH* 106: 47–74.
- (2015) The Green Papyrus of Sappho (P.GC inv. 105) and the Order of Poems in the Alexandrian Edition, *ZPE* 196: 17–30.
- Degani, E. (1983) *Hipponactis testimonia et fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- (2007) *Ipponatte: Frammenti. Premessa di Gabriele Burzacchini; aggiornamenti di Anika Nicolosi*, Bologna.
- Di Benedetto, V. (2004) Osservazioni sul nuovo papiro di Saffo, *ZPE* 149: 5–6.
- (2005) La nuova Saffo e dintorni, *ZPE* 153: 7–20.

- (2006) Il tetrastico di Saffo e tre postille, *ZPE* 155: 5–18.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L. (2005) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Fassino, M. and Prauscello, L. (2001) Memoria ritmica e memoria poetica: Saffo e Alceo in Teocrito Idilli 28–30 tra ἀρχαιολογία metrica e innovazione alessandrina, *MD* 46: 9–37.
- Ferrari, F. (2005) Contro Andromeda: recupero di un'ode di Saffo, *MD* 55: 13–30.
- (2007) 'Hai fatto la tua scelta': due storie di diserzione attraverso i papiri di Saffo, in Bastianini and Casanova 2007: 17–29.
- (2010) *Sappho's Gift: the Poet and her Community*, Ann Arbor.
- Funghi, M. S. and Messeri Savorelli, G. (1992) Lo 'scriba di Pindaro' e le biblioteche di Ossirinco, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 42: 43–62.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1950) *Theocritus*, Cambridge.
- Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. (1922) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, part XV*, London.
- Gronewald, M. and Daniel, R. W. (2004a) Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus, *ZPE* 147: 1–8.
- (2004b) Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus, *ZPE* 149: 1–4.
- Hamm, E.-M. (1954) [Review of Lobel 1951], *Gnomon* 26: 453–56.
- Harrison, S. J. (2001) Some Generic Problems in Horace's *Epodes*: or On (Not) Being Archilochus, in A. Aloni, A. Barchiesi and A. Cavarzere (eds.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Lanham, MD) 165–86.
- Hawkins, T. (2014) *Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
- Heyworth, S. J. (1993) Horace's *Ibis*: on the Titles, Unity and Contents of the Epodes, *PLLS* 7: 85–96.
- Hunt, A. S. and Johnson, J. (1930) *Two Theocritus Papyri*, London.
- Hunter, R. L. (1996) *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
- (2013) (B)ionic Man: Callimachus' Iambic Programme, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 43: 41–52.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2008) *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*, Oxford.
- Irigoin, J. (1952) *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris.
- Johnson, T. S. (2012) *Horace's Iambic Criticism: Casting Blame (iambikē poiēsis)*, Leiden–Boston.
- Johnson, W. A. (2004) *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto.
- Kehrhahn, T. (1914) Anacreontea, *Hermes* 49: 481–507.
- Keller, O. (1902) *Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora. Vol. I, Schol. AV in carmina et epodos*, Stutgardiae.
- Kerkhecker, A. (1999) *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, Oxford.
- Kirkwood, G. M. (1974) *Early Greek Monody: the History of a Poetic Type*, Ithaca.
- Lasserre, F. (1989) *Sappho: une autre lecture*, Padova.
- Lasserre, F. and Bonnard, A. (1958) *Archiloque: fragments*, Paris.
- Lelli, E. (2005) *Callimachi iambi XIV–XVII*, Romae.
- Lentini, G. (2007) P. Oxy. XV 1788: Alceo o Saffo?, in B. Palme (ed.), *Akten des 23. internationalen Papyrologien-Kongresses. Wien, 22–28 Juli 2001* (Wien) 387–91.
- Liberman, G. (1995) Un commentaire des Épodes d'Horace, *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 69: 169–85.
- (1999) *Alcée: fragments*, Paris.
- (2007) L'édition alexandrine de Sappho, in Bastianini and Casanova 2007: 41–65.
- (2016) Some Thoughts on the Symposiastic Catena, Aisakos and Skolia, in V. Cazzato, D. Obbink and E. E. Prodi (eds.), *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion* (Oxford) 42–62.
- Lidov, J. B. (2009) Meter and Metrical Style of the New Poem, in E. Greene and M. B. Skinner (eds.), *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues* (Washington, DC) 103–17.
- Lobel, E. (1925) *Σαπφουῶς μέλη. The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Sappho*, Oxford.
- (1951) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: part XXI*, London.
- (1961) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: part XXVI*, London.
- Lobel, E. and Page, D. L. (1952) A New Fragment of Aeolic Verse, *CQ* 2: 1–3.
- (1955) *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*, Oxford.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (2005a) Horace *Odes* Book 1 and the Alexandrian Edition of Alcaeus, *CQ* 55: 542–58.
- (2005b) Structure and Allusion in Horace's Book of "Epodes", *The Journal of Roman Studies* 95: 1–19.
- Maehler, H., Parsons, P. and Maltomini, F. (2015) *The Vienna Epigrams Papyrus (G 40611)*, Berlin.
- Mankin, D. (1995) *Horace: Epodes*, Cambridge.
- Martinelli, M. C. (2009) Testi musicati, testi per la musica. Ipotesi su alcuni papiri lirici, in M. C. Martinelli (ed.), *La Musa dimenticata* (Pisa) 317–54.
- McNamee, K. (2007) *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt*, New Haven, Conn.

- Meliadò, C. (2014) Il codice di Antinoe: contributi al testo e all'esegesi di Teocrito, *Seminari romani di cultura greca*, n.s. 3: 9–38.
- Merkelbach, R. (1973) Verzeichnis von Gedichtanfängen, *ZPE* 12: 86.
- Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (1974) Ein Archilochos-Papyrus, *ZPE* 14: 97–113.
- Montana, F. (2011a) Sondaggi sui *marginalia* esegetici del 'Teocrito di Antinoe' (*P. Ant.* s.n.; MP³ 1487), *Eikasmós* 22: 277–310.
- (2011b) Sul finale perduto dell'*Herakliskos* teocriteo (*Id.* 24): Eracle *adepagos?*, *RFIC* 139: 257–78.
- Morelli, G. (1995) Archil. 197 West, in B. Gentili and F. Perusino (eds.), *Mousike. Metrica ritmica e musica greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti* (Pisa–Roma) 159–72.
- (2006) *Nomenclator metricus Graecus et Latinus. Volumen I: A–Δ*, Hildesheim.
- Morrison, A. D. (2016) *Lycambae spretus infido gener / aut acer hostis Bupalò*: Horace's Epodes and the Greek Iambic Tradition, in P. Bather and C. Stocks (eds.), *Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception* (Oxford) 31–62.
- Neri, C. (2013) Olisboi e Polianattidi (Sapph. fr. 99 L.P. = Alc. fr. 303A V), *Eikasmós* 24: 11–28.
- (2014) Una festa auspicata? (Sapph. fr. 17 B. e P.GC. inv. 105 fr. 2 c. II rr. 9–28), *Eikasmós* 25: 9–25.
- (2015) Il *Brothers Poem* e l'edizione alessandrina (in margine a *P. Sapph. Obbink*), *Eikasmós* 26: 53–76.
- Neri, C. and Cinti, F. (2017) *Saffo: poesie, frammenti e testimonianze*, Sant'Arcangelo di Romagna.
- Nicolosi, A. (2007) *Ipponatte, Epodi di Strasburgo, Archiloco, Epodi di Colonia: con un'appendice su P.Oxy. LXIX 4708*, Bologna.
- Obbink, D. (2016a) The Newest Sappho: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation, in Bierl and Lardinois 2016: 13–33.
- (2016b) Ten Poems of Sappho: Provenance, Authenticity, and Text of the New Sappho Papyri, in Bierl and Lardinois 2016: 34–54.
- Oliensis, E. (1991) Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's "Epodes", *Arethusa* 24: 107–38.
- (1998) *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge.
- Page, D. L. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus: an Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*, Oxford.
- Pardini, A. (1991) La ripartizione in libri dell'opera di Alceo: per un riesame della questione, *RFIC* 119: 257–84.
- Parsons, P. J. (1987) 3724, in R. A. Coles, H. Maehler and P. J. Parsons (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: volume LIV* (London) 65–82.
- Pernigotti, C. (2001) Tempi del canto e pluralità di prospettive in Saffo, fr. 44 V, *ZPE* 135: 11–20.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949) *Callimachus. Volumen I: Fragmenta*, Oxonii.
- (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Porro, A. (1994) *Vetera Alcaica: l'esegesi di Alceo dagli alessandrini all'età imperiale*, Milano.
- (2004) Alcaeus 4: P.Oxy. XV 1788 + XXI Addenda + XXIII Addenda, in G. Bastianini, M. Haslam, H. Maehler, F. Montanari and C. Römer (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta. Pars I. Vol. 1, fasc. 1* (München–Leipzig), 106–13.
- (2011) Archilochus, in G. Bastianini, M. Haslam, H. Maehler, F. Montanari and C. Römer (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta. Pars I. Vol. 1, fasc. 1.3* (Berlin) 157–87.
- (2016) Anacreon, in G. Bastianini, M. Haslam, H. Maehler, F. Montanari and C. Römer (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta. Pars I. Vol. 1, fasc. 2.2* (Berlin) 19–25.
- Prauscello, L. (2006) *Singing Alexandria: Music between Practice and Textual Transmission*, Leiden.
- (2016) Sappho's Book 4 and its Metrical Composition: the Case of P.Oxy. 1787 Reconsidered, *MD* 76: 53–71.
- (forthcoming-a) The Alexandrian Edition of Sappho, in P. J. Finglass and A. Kelly (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Sappho* (Cambridge).
- (forthcoming-b) Sappho's Book of Epithalamia and P.Oxy. 2294 (*LDAB* 3892 = *MP3* 01455) = fr. 103 Voigt = 103 LP: a New Proposal, in C. Carey, G. B. D'Alessio and M. Alexandrou (eds.), *Song Regained* (Berlin).
- Prauscello, L. and Ucciardello, G. (2015) Sappho 88 Voigt (P.Oxy. 2290 + P.Oxy. 4411): a Re-appraisal, *ZPE* 195: 13–29.
- Puglia, E. (2001) Considerazioni bibliologiche e testuali sulla raccolta di epigrammi di POxy 3724, in M. Capasso and S. Pernigotti (eds.), *Studium atque urbanitas. Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris* (Lecce) 357–80.
- (2007) Per la ricomposizione del quarto libro dei canti di Saffo (POxy. 1787), *SemRom* 10: 17–39.
- (2008) P. Oxy. 2294 e la tradizione delle odi di Saffo, *ZPE* 166: 1–8.
- Rissman, L. (1983) *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho*, Königstein.
- Rossi, L. (2001) *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: a Method of Approach*, Leuven.
- Rossi, L. E. (1998) Orazio, un lirico greco senza musica, *SemRom* 1: 163–81.
- Rotstein, A. (2010) *The Idea of Iambos*, Oxford.

- Schironi, F. (2010) *To Mega Biblion: Book-Ends, End-Titles, and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry*, Durham, NC.
- (2016) Alcman's Semi-Choruses – in the Text ... and beyond it, *MD* 76: 33–52.
- Schubart, W. (1902) Neue Bruchstücke der Sappho und des Alkaios, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*: 195–209.
- Schubart, W. and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. (1907) *Berliner Klassikertexte V 2. Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente*, Berlin.
- Sicking, C. M. J. (1993) *Griechische Verslehre*, München.
- Snell, B. (1982) *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen.
- Stadtmüller, H. (1899) *Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea. Volumen II, pars prior, Palatinae librum VII, Plaundae librum III continens*, Lipsiae.
- Steinrück, M. (2010) Sappho und die Wahrheit (Ergänzungen zum fr. 88 V.), *QUCC* 94: 79–87.
- Treu, M. (1954) Review of: D. L. Page, *Alcman: The Partheneion*, Oxford 1951; A. Farina, *Studi del Partenio di Alcmene*, Napoli 1950, *Gnomon* 26: 168–74.
- (1979) *Sappho*, München.
- Voigt, E.-M. (1971) *Sappho et Alcaeus: fragmenta*, Amsterdam.
- Watson, L. (2003) *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford.
- Wendel, C. (1914) *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*, Lipsiae.
- West, M. L. (1967) A Note on Theocritus' Aeolic Poems, *CQ* 17: 82–84.
- (1971) *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati. Vol. 1: Archilochus, Hipponax, Theognidea*, Oxford.
- (1980) *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis*, Oxford.
- (1982) *Greek Metre*, Oxford.
- (1989) *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati. Vol. 1: Archilochus, Hipponax, Theognidea. Editio altera*, Oxford.
- (2005) The New Sappho, *ZPE* 151: 1–9.
- (2014) Nine Poems of Sappho, *ZPE* 191: 1–12.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. (1912) Neues von Kallimachos, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*: 524–44.
- Yatromanolakis, D. (1999) Alexandrian Sappho Revisited, *HSPH* 99: 179–95.
- (2008) P.Colon. inv. 21351+21376 and P.Oxy. 1787 fr. 1: Music, Cultural Politics and Hellenistic Anthologies, *Ελληνικά* 58: 237–55.

Luigi Battezzato, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Vercelli/Alessandria, Italia
 luigi.battezzato@uniupo.it