

WHAT LOBEL HATH JOINED TOGETHER: SAPPHO 49 LP

nec tempore in ullo
esse queunt duplici natura et corpore bino
ex alienigenis membris compacta

(Lucretius 5.578–80)

Despite the misgivings of a number of scholars, a recent collection has once again flatly stated that '[frg. 49] identifies Sappho's relationship quite clearly as one with a young girl'.¹ It seems time to reexamine these two lines quite clearly.

I

ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἀτθι, πάλαι ποτά

I loved you, Atthis, once long ago.

So the line stands in all modern editions. It is quoted by Hephaestion 7.7 (23.17 Consbruch) as an example of the so-called Aeolic dactylic pentameter,² ᾧ τὸ δεύτερον ὄλον Σαπφούς γέγραπται 'in which the entire second book of Sappho was written'. Following Hephaestion's and the general ancient practice for choosing examples, it is quite likely to be the opening line of Book 2. It is also quoted by Hephaestion's Scholiast A (130.3), Scholiast B (274.26), by M. Plotius Sacerdos the grammarian (third–fourth cent. A.D.; 6.5112.1 Keil) also for the metre, and by the Byzantine paroemographers Apostolius (fifteenth cent. A.D.) 8.68b and his son Arsenius 28.100 (2.449 Leutsch-Schneidewin), who probably took it from Hephaestion.³

The first thing we have to steel ourselves to is the probability that our beloved Atthis is not here at all. Instead of her name the MSS of Hephaestion read ἄτοι (A, Scholiast A; verse missing in C) or ἄτε (D, I, Scholiast B).⁴ Sacerdos presents the usual mishmash of half-understood Greek letters, which can, however, be deciphered:

¹ Thomas K. Hubbard, *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* (Berkeley, 2003), 22. Among those recently casting doubt on the joining of the two lines are H. N. Parker, 'Sappho schoolmistress', *TAPhA* 123 (1993), 323, repr. in E. Greene (ed.), *Re-Reading Sappho: Reception and Transmission* (Berkeley, 1996), 160; E. Stehle, *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, 1997), 268–9; A. Aloni, *Safo: frammenti* (Florence, 1997), 92–3; G. Tsomis, *Zusammenschau der frühgriechischen monodischen Melik: Alkaios, Sappho, Anakreon* (Stuttgart, 2001), 26–7; some of their arguments will be surveyed below. Others note the difficulties but continue to treat the lines as a unity. The new fragment, alas, adds nothing clear to our picture (M. Gronewald and R. W. Daniel, *ZPE* 147 [2004], 1–8 = 58 Voigt + P. Köln 21531). Sappho, now too old to dance, sings to παῖδες 'children' (not 'girls'). There is no news about her educational or erotic career.

² An extended glyconic: × × – – – – – × × d d d s; see M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 32.

³ Hephaestion is probably the source for Apostolius and Arsenius' quotation of Sappho 111 (though they might have got it also from Demetrius) and is definitely the source for their quotation of [Sappho] 168b V (Adesp. 976 PMG), which Arsenius was the first to assign to Sappho, and of Alcaeus 374.

⁴ For details of the MSS, see M. Consbruch, *Hephaestionis Enchiridion* (Leipzig, 1906).

ατοι is buried in A and ατει in B; while Apostolius and Arsenius unambiguously read ἄτε. Now, it is clear that all these are not independent errors for an original Ἀτθι, but rather stem from an original ἄτε in the text of Hephaestion.⁵ The familiar emendation Ἀτθι was first proposed by no less men than Thomas Tyrwhitt and Richard Bentley and has ruled unchallenged ever since.⁶

However, it is important to realize what the unaltered text of Hephaestion is recording. The metre guarantees a trochee (– ~) in this position and, with the proper Lesbian psilosis, this is ἄτε, nothing more than the regular fem. nom. of the relative pronoun ὅσ τε (we may prefer to print ἄ τε).⁷ The text accordingly reads:

ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, ἄ τε πάλαι ποταί

I used to love you, you who once long ago . . .

At first this may be something of a surprise, but the line is perfectly sensible. Indeed, the more one looks at it the more clear it becomes that Tyrwhitt and Bentley's emendation was unnecessary, and the uniform corruption they suspected unlikely.⁸ For in the very next examples given by Hephaestion (23.21, only five lines later in Consbruch), he cites Sappho 131 (130.3–4 Voigt): Ἀτθι, σοὶ δ' ἔμεθεν μὲν ἀπύχθετο / φροντίσδην, ἐπὶ δ' Ἀνδρομέδαν πόται, with Atthis' name spelled correctly in the MSS.⁹ It is unlikely (though given the vagaries of scribes, not impossible) that three branches of the manuscript tradition should mess up Ἀτθι – all in similar ways – in one place, and then all get it right five lines later.

There is bound to be a certain resistance to this new, or rather this return to the old, reading. Love of the familiar,¹⁰ respect for Bentley,¹¹ and above all a desire to keep the line self-contained, play their part.¹² We do not know where Sappho was going with

⁵ All the extant MSS go back to a single archetype (Consbruch [n. 4], xii). Scaliger had already so read the text of Hephaestion (Consbruch, app. crit.).

⁶ First recorded (according to Voigt's edn.: *Sappho et Alcaeus fragmenta* [Amsterdam, 1971]) in Laurens van Santen (Santenius), an editor of Terentianus Maurus, *C. Valerii Catulli elegia* (Leiden, 1788), 5 (ad Cat. 68.18; no mention of Bentley) and in T. Gaisford, *Hephaestionis Enchiridium* (Oxford, 1810), 42. A quotation from Terentianus Maurus, which might support the emendation, is examined below.

⁷ We should also print the regular Lesbian ποτα (so spelled in its occurrences in the papyri; rightly Blomfeld in 1813–14) instead of the (literary Doric) ποκα reported by all the sources. For the form, see E.-M. Hamm (Voigt), *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* (Berlin, 1957), 114 (§197a).

⁸ The only pre-Gaisford edition of Hephaestion I have been able to consult, J. C. de Pauw, *Hephaestionos Alexandreos Encheiridion* (Utrecht, 1726), 116, quite sensibly remarked, 'Distingendum est post σέθεν nam ἄτε πάλαι πότα a verbis sequentibus pendent, quae non adscripsit Hephaestion, unius Versus rationem habens. Viri eruditi vulgo vertunt male amabam quidem ego te quondam.'

⁹ Ἀτθι σοὶ A, Ἀτθις σοὶ DI. The αὐτοῖς σοὶ of Sch. B. (274.18 Consbruch, preserved only in the inferior MSS class Y [p, kl] is really only explicable if the scribes did not have an immediately following Ἀτθι (274.26: ἄτε) to consult. Thus, the emendation has nothing more going for it than does Bergk's change of ἔτι to Ἀτθι in the citation from Maximus of Tyre (see below).

¹⁰ G. Kirkwood, e.g., refers to 'the haunting, emotion-laden, mention of Atthis', *Early Greek Monody* (Ithaca, 1974), 138.

¹¹ For a judicious review of Bentley as a textual critic, see C. O. Brink, *English Classical Scholarship* (New York, 1985), 21–61. For the less famous Thomas Tyrwhitt (1730–1786), see J. E. Sandys, *A History Of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1903–8), 419–20.

¹² Hephaestion, like most metricians, frequently quotes single lines or parts of lines to illustrate metrical points, whether or not they make syntactic sense in themselves (see de Pauw's remarks above). Out of many examples from many poets, cf. Sappho 1.1 (complete, at least as a

this line, but Chantraine's list of the uses of ὄς τε in Homer points in possible directions,¹³ and the idea of the beloved addressed as a goddess (with an aretology?) is certainly attractive.¹⁴

Indeed, I can see only one argument against the line as it originally stood, which is that ὄς τε is a Homeric form, probably not elsewhere attested in the exiguous remains of the Lesbian poets.¹⁵ But this need not detain us, coming as it does immediately after the non-Lesbian, but equally epic, σέθεν. We are in Book 2 (43–52), whose open dactyls readily admit such Homeric forms; Sappho 44, our longest fragment, is rife with them,¹⁶ and ὄς τε is part of the general inheritance of not only the elegists but also the melic poets.¹⁷ Nor does Sappho have any problem with using other epic forms of the relative beside the Lesbian, when they are metrically convenient.¹⁸

II

σμίκρα μοι πάϊς ἔμμεν' ἐφαίνεο κάχαρις

You seemed to me to be a small and ugly child

So the standard editions. This line is quoted by Plutarch (*Amatorius*, *Mor.* 751D), by Maximus of Tyre 18.9 (231.10 Hobein, 161.251 Trapp, 233.218 Koniaris), and by the scholiast on Pind. *Pyth.* 2.78a (2.44.17–18 Drachmann).¹⁹ First, none of these authors quotes the other line, and none of them mentions Atthis. Now this is admittedly an *argumentum ex silentio*, but it is at least surprising that Plutarch, who knew his Sappho, should refer merely to 'someone who did not yet have the right age for marriage' (τὴν οὐπω γάμων ἔχουσιν ὥραν), if so famous a name stood immediately in the text in front of him.²⁰ The same is true for Maximus of Tyre, who has mentioned Atthis only a few lines previously. The most reasonable assumption is that none of the sources mentions her name because it did not appear.

vocative) at 43.13 and 20 (Consbruch); 1.5 (syntactically incomplete) at 43.22, etc. Cf. Alc. 308 (the first line of the second poem of Book 2, and incomplete) at 44.6; only Choeroboscus feels the need to go on to the next two lines, 252.15–19.

¹³ Pierre Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, vol. 2, *Syntaxe* (Paris, 1957), 240: 'habitude . . . fonction. En parlant d'une divinité . . . coutume . . . mœurs . . . comparaison'.

¹⁴ Cf. Sappho 17.3, Alcaeus 308b2. For these hymnic features, see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1923; repr. Darmstadt, 1956), 143ff.

¹⁵ There is a possible example cited by Hamm (n. 7), 109 (§192), Alc. 76.11:]τά τ' ἀνδρες δρᾶισιν ἀτάσθαλ[οι '(the things which ?) wicked men do'; given the accent as recorded in the papyrus, this must be either the rel. pron. or else a neut. pl. proparoxytone or properispomenon; Wilamowitz proposed ἄρρη]τά τ(ε).

¹⁶ Lobel started a rabbit he perhaps did not intend by labeling the dialect in these poems 'abnormal', *Alkaiou mele* (Oxford, 1927), x–xviii. All we have here is standard Lesbian in which the poet has (as every poet may) borrowed from Homer: nothing 'abnormal' about it at all. For a list of these epic features, see D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 65–8.

¹⁷ E.g., Alc. 26.3; Ibyc. 282(a).17; Anacr. 408.2; Sim. 542.39–40; Stes. S 15.2.16 in a variety of metres.

¹⁸ E.g. 17.2, 103.6 vs. 112.3, etc. See Hamm (n. 7), 108–9 (§192).

¹⁹ The edn. of H. Hobein (Leipzig, 1910) has been replaced by M. B. Trapp, *Maximus Tyrius, Dissertationes* (Leipzig, 1994) and G. L. Koniaris, *Maximus Tyrius: Philosophumena. Dialexeis* (Berlin, 1995). R is the archetype of all extant MSS. As the text of Sappho has changed so has that of Maximus. The clearest apparatus is that of A. Scognamiglio, *L'arte erotica di Socrate: Orazione XVIII, Massimo di Tiro* (Galatina, 1997).

²⁰ Cf. the same sort of anonymous reference in his quotation of Sappho 55.1–3 in *Conj. praec.* 145f–46a.

Second, it is far from certain that we have the correct form and metre of the line. Each of the three sources quotes a different version, none of them identical to the now standard text (see below on the context of each citation). So:

σμικρά μοι, παῖ, ἔμμεναι φαίνεαι κᾗχαρις (Plutarch [B, E])

You seem to me, child, to be small and graceless

σμικρά μοι παῖς ἔτι φαίνο καὶ χαρίεσσα (Maximus of Tyre [R])

You seemed to be still a small child and graceful

σμικρά μοι παῖς ἔμμεναι †φησὶ λίεο† χάρις (schol. [D, G])

φη(σιν) λεοχάρης (F)

φ λιεοχάρις (E)

φλιοχαρις (Q)²¹

Note that Maximus' text says the exact opposite of Plutarch's. Editors, beginning with Bergk in 1835, have taken Plutarch's text as a framework and tried to wedge Maximus' imperfect *φαίνο* into it.²² Bergk himself originally wanted to read two glyconics here (see below), but the imperfect has generally been accommodated to Plutarch's verse by 1) skipping the *ἔτι*,²³ 2) adding an augment,²⁴ 3) and eliding the infinitive,²⁵ resulting in our customary text:

× × — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ —
σμίκρα μοι παῖς ἔμμεν' ἐφαίνο κᾗχαρις

This turns the verse into the same expanded glyconics from Book 2 as 49a. However, Maximus' *ἔτι* and *φαίνο* (instead of *φαίνεαι*) seem to be merely padding, a misremembrance as if of a dactylic hexameter:

— — — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ —
<καὶ> σμικρά μοι παῖς ἔτι φαίνο καὶ χαρίεσσα.²⁶

²¹ σμικρά E μικρά DFGQ || μοι om. DG || παῖς om. F || φησι in G cp. dubio. See Drachmann for MSS and details.

²² Largely in part, I think, because it fits in so well with the imperfect of 49a. T. Bergk, 'De aliquot fragmentis Sapphonis et Alcaeī', *RhM* (ser. 2) 3 (1835), 212, was the first to approve Maximus' imperf., saying, 'recte ille φαίνο' but he does not say why. The text of Plutarch is always emended to follow Bergk.

²³ Or assuming that it is a mistake for ἔμμεν or ἔμμεναι. Bergk's first attempt emended ἔτι to ἄθι (see below).

²⁴ The augment is not mandatory in Lesbian poetry and is frequently omitted, especially in 'dactylic' metres; see Hamm (n. 7), 161 (§246).

²⁵ First, H. L. Ahrens, 'Alcaeī Sapphusque fragmenta', in *De Graecae linguae dialectis* (Gottingen, 1843), 543. Bergk, in the first edn. of *PLG* (1843) read ἔμμεν ἐφαίνο without elision (already in C. Barth, *Adversariorum commentariorum libri LX* [Frankfort, 1648; completed by 1624], 282) not yet knowing that ἔμμεναι is the only form of the infinitive in Aeolic.

²⁶ As a dactylic hexameter, the open φαίνο then to keep a disyllabic biceps before the bucolic dieresis; see P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, trans. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford, 1962), 59 (§84); West (n. 2), 154.

Maximus is an utterly unreliable source for both text and context (see below). He is fond of paraphrase and tends to quote from memory.²⁷ Not one of his quotations of the lyric poets is free from uncertainty in text and metre.²⁸ There is nothing to recommend his imperfect and no reason at all to force Plutarch's text to accommodate it.

It is important to realize that Plutarch's text is fine as it stands, needing only a minor adjustment: the *παῖ* (which involves hiatus or else epic correption) is easily correctable to *πάϊς*.²⁹ The opening, *σμίκρα μοι πάϊς ἔμμεναι*, as reported by both Plutarch and the scholiast, forms a glyconic (× × – ~ ~ – ~ –), and the following *φαίνεαι κάχαρις* is also the opening of a glyconic (a vowel must follow).³⁰ We can read the text just as Plutarch reports it (with the appropriate Aeolic spellings) as:

× × – ~ ~ – ~ –
σμίκρα μοι πάϊ<ς> ἔμμεναι

× × – ~ ~ <~ ~ >
φαίνηι κάχαρις

Two opening glyconics form part of the metres of Sappho 94 (gl || gl || gl^d |||) and 98 (gl || gl || cr gl |||); a run of glyconics also features in 96 (cr 3gl ba |||). These all seem to have belonged to Book 5.³¹ The text as it stands already fits a number of well-attested metres, and Plutarch is, of course, under no obligation to quote only single or complete lines.³² The metre of Book 2 is not the only choice and Plutarch's text can be reconditioned to fit with 49a only by considerable tinkering, using parts from an unreliable source. Not only, then, are 49a and 49b not from the same poem, they are not even from the same book.

III

Let us now turn to the passage which is said by some to unite the two lines, a passage of the late second/early third century A.D. grammarian Terentianus Maurus

²⁷ He very seldom quotes verbatim as Trapp's index shows. When he does he often abbreviates (cf. his text of Ar. *Ran.* 92–3 at 25.2 [211.65–6 Trapp]) or is inaccurate (cf. his text of Eur. *Phoen.* 18–19 at 40.6 [113.110–12 Trapp] or Hes. *Op.* 253 at 8.9 [69.201 Trapp]).

²⁸ Cf. his elliptical quote of Sappho 57.2; the relation of his words to the lines in the other sources consists of a single word. He is our only source for Sappho 47, 150, 155, 159, and the single words 172, 188, as well as Anacreon 402a, b, c.

²⁹ As Bergk did in citing him (212). *πάϊ/πάϊς* are generally disyllabic in epic. There are three cases of monosyllabic nom. or voc. in the Lesbian poets (S. 1.2, A. 307a, 366; uncertain but marked with diaeresis at S. 99 = A. 303Ab.1 Voigt and A. 287b.9); elsewhere nom. is disyllabic only (S. 27.4, 132.2; A. 75.7, 298.8; text uncertain at S. 113.2, A. 21.1, 25; cf. inc. auc. 31a.6).

³⁰ The 2. sg. mid. primary ending –ε(σ)αι is always contracted in Aeolic and should be written –ηι, so already in the 2nd edn. of John Davis (Joannes Davisius), *Maximi Tyrii Dissertationes* (Cambridge; completed 1728, publ. posthumously 1740); see Hamm (n. 7), 31 (§59b). The end *κάχαρις* is guaranteed both by the MSS and the sense of Plutarch's argument and supported by the second part of a gloss in Hesychius (see below).

³¹ The textually corrupt 101 (attested as from Book 5) appears to be in the same metre as 94; we may then have had a book of poems based on glyconics. See Page (n. 16), 319 (also 80–1) for metrical details.

³² Cf., for example, the partial quotation of Sappho 55.1–3 in *Conj. praec.* 145f–46a with a different partial quotation at *Quaes. conv.* 646e–f.

(2148–56).³³ Terentianus is a dull dog with one clever trick. He wrote a handbook to metre using the metres he described. Since this passage has been so misunderstood, it is best to give it in its stultifying entirety. Terentianus begins with a dactylic hexameter, then switches to the Aeolic pentameter:

Aeolicum ex isto genuit doctissima Sappho,
quod sit quinque pedum, velut hos modo perspicis.
nam primum addidit illa disyllabon, ut libet: 2150
spondeum nec enim capiti locat omnium,
sed quia est mobilis hic locus, et chorion solet
admiscere, dein quater addere dactylon,
cordi quando fuisse sibi canit Atthida
parvam, florea virginitas sua cum foret. 2155
Ille tetrametro datur ante disyllabus.

From this [dact. hex.] the most learned Sappho produced an Aeolic version

[he now switches metre]

which is made of five feet, like the ones you are looking at now.

For at the beginning she added a dimeter at will:

for she does not put a spondee at the head of them all,
but because the place is free, she also is accustomed to mix in
a trochee, then to add four dactyls,
when she sings that dear to her heart was little Atthis,
when her own virginity was in flower.

That dimeter is put before the tetrameter.³⁴

Cordi quando fuisse sibi canit Atthida / parvam, florea virginitas sua cum foret, ‘When Sappho sings that dear to her heart was little Atthis, when her own virginity was in flower.’ This simple Latin sentence seems to have caused considerable confusion.³⁵ Two things are clear: the entire claim that the two lines of Sappho are linked depends on the single word ‘small’ and that *parvam* was added at the head of the line to provide ‘that dimeter’ (*ille disyllabus*).

If Terentianus is actually recasting Sappho, his lines imply that Atthis was called ‘small’ (*parvam*/σμικρά) in the next line (or at least almost immediately). So Bowra: ‘Though the two lines probably come from the same poem, it is hard to believe that they are consecutive; for the statement that Atthis seemed to be without charm is an

³³ See C. Cignolo (ed.), *Terentiani Mauri De Litteris, De Syllabis, De Metris* (Hildesheim, 2002). The unique MS has perished and the only basis for the text is the editio princeps (Milan, 1497). See Cignolo, 1, xlv–xlvi.

³⁴ Terentius has his facts wrong, since the initial two syllables are completely free.

³⁵ E.g. B. MacLachlan, *Age of Grace* (Princeton, 1993), 64, n. 18, translates: ‘(Sappho) sings of Atthis, when she had been dear to her heart, when her maiden flowering was yet to be’, as if *quando* headed a dependent clause with an infinitive (in the context *quando* introduces the lines) and takes *foret* as real future tense (it is the standard substitute for *esset* in secondary sequence, time contemporaneous). This last is an important point: Sappho (says Maximus) was in the flower of her virginity while she was in love with Atthis. A. Lardinois, ‘Subject and circumstance in Sappho’s poetry’, *TAPhA* 124 (1994), 68, wishes to have the first reflexive (*sibi*) refer to Sappho, but the second (*sua*) to Atthis. This is (as he points out) not an impossible reading; it is merely special pleading. Reflexives can indeed on occasion refer to things other than the main sentential subject, but to have one reflexive refer to the subject of the main clause and the immediately following reflexive refer to the object ignores grammar and common sense. One need only write *eius* for *sua* to see the difference. Tsomis (n. 1), 26–7, gives an overview and rightly points that it will not do to claim that *florea* (in the peak of her beauty) and ἄχαρις (not in the peak of her beauty) both refer to Atthis.

inconsequent anticlimax after Sappho's declaration of her former love for her.³⁶ Campbell noted: 'Terentianus Maurus (*De metr.* 2154–5) suggested by his version that the lines were consecutive. One would never have guessed as much.'³⁷

In fact, we can rule this out completely. The two lines simply cannot be consecutive for the obvious – but I think so far unstated – fact that the *μέν* in 49a *ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἀτθί, πάλαι ποτά*, demands an answering *δέ*. In every single case, where the context is complete enough to judge, in both Sappho and Alcaeus, *μέν* has its answering *δέ*, and *always* in the very next clause or sentence.³⁸ The line *ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἀτθί, πάλαι ποτά* . . . simply cannot have been immediately followed by *σμίκρα μοι πάις ἔμμεν' ἐφαίneo κᾶχαρις*.

The history of the attempt to wed the two lines using Terentianus is instructive and has usually been misstated. Bergk, in his 1835 article, is frequently said to be the first to attribute these two separately preserved quotations to the same poem.³⁹ In fact, he did not. In the course of a series of emendations to the texts of the Lesbian poets, Bergk proposed rewriting what is now 49b as two glyconics: *σμίκρα μοι πάις ἔμμεναι, / Ἀτθί, φαίneo κᾶχαρις*, suspecting that Maximus' *ἔτι* concealed Atthis' name.⁴⁰ He supported his emendation by citing the other occurrences of Atthis' name in the tradition. After approving Bentley's emendation of 49a, *ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἀτθί, πάλαι ποτά*, he continues:

Ceterum hujus fragmenti hic est sensus: Amavi te quidem, non tamen usa sum flore virginitatis: nam mihi videbaris non satis esse matura: quod satis docent verba Maximi Tyrii XXIV [18.9]: *Οὐ προσιέναι φησὶν ὁ Σωκράτης Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἐκ πολλοῦ ἐρών, πρὶν ἡγήσατο ἱκανὸν εἶναι πρὸς λόγους. Σμικρά μοι παῖς ἔτι φαίneo καὶ χαρίεσσα Σαπφῶ λέγει. Recte autem Atthis parva dicitur, si quidem Terentianus Maurus ita loquitur de ea c. IV v. 2154:*

Cordi quando fuisse sibi canit Atthida
parvam, florea virginitas sua cum foret.

Quae quin ex ipsius Sapphonis carminibus hauserit, non est dubitandum.⁴¹

Bergk was rather fond of making up his own poems from the fragments. For example, he joined Archilochus 30 to Archilochus 31, despite the fact that 30 is quoted merely for the word 'rose' and 31 is said to be about a hetaira. This 'couplet',

³⁶ M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1961), 193, noting that: 'Only Terentianus Maurus . . . suggests that they are consecutive'.

³⁷ D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (New York, 1967), 276; id., *Greek Lyric I* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), 95: 'The version of Terentianus Maurus suggests that the lines were consecutive, however unlikely that may seem.'

³⁸ Only a single case where the *δέ* is even in the next sentence rather than the immediately following clause: Alcaeus 69.1 *Λύδοι μὲν . . . ὁ δ'* (69.6). So Sappho 2.2, 16.1, 31.9 (a whole series of *δέ*), 42.1, 50.1, 112.1, 112.3, 131.1 (with Atthis), 141.1, 154.1. Alc. 9.26, 69.1, 70.12, 119.9, 326.2, 326.6 (208 Campbell), 338.1, 338.5, 362.1 (if the lines were properly joined by Bergk!), 369.1. The other occurrences are fragmentary or isolated. *μέν solitarius* can occur in Homer, Pindar, and a few other cases, but this is not Aeolic practice, and emphatic with verbs is very rare (J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* [Oxford, 1954], 361(6)).

³⁹ E.g. Voigt (n. 6), 73; F. Lasserre, *Sappho: une autre lecture* (Padua, 1989), 119; Tsomis (n. 1), 26.

⁴⁰ Bergk (n. 22), 212. Again, as Maximus has used *Ἀτθί*, only a few lines before, this is not a very likely corruption. Notice what an interesting hodge-podge the ancestor of the modern text is: the first line is Plutarch, then Maximus' *ἔτι φαίneo* (converted to *Ἀτθί, φαίneo*), then back to Plutarch. It is in this indirect way that Maximus' imperfect got bunged into Plutarch's text.

⁴¹ Bergk (n. 22), 213–14. For the context in Maximus of Tyre see below.

too, has been standard in the editions ever since. In the case of these lines of Sappho, he was more conservative. In 1835, Bergk merely thought that the two fragments had the same subject, Atthis. He considered the two quotes to be in completely different metres. Maximus of Tyre is cited for the possible background to 49b (holding off from a young child)⁴² and Terentianus merely for the word *parva*. However, he was already apparently thinking along the lines he would take in his first edition of *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* eight years later (1843), for in his paraphrase of the context of 49b, he glances back at 49a (*Amavi te quidem*) and makes use of a reminiscence of Terentianus Maurus (*flore virginitatis*). Even in *PLG*, he merely places the fragments, now more or less in their familiar form, one after the other, numbering 49a as 33 and 49b as 34. Diehl followed him, numbering them now 40 and 41. Neither ever claimed the two were consecutive.

It was not until 1925 that E. Lobel put the two together under the same number as 49a and 49b.⁴³ Editors of a text wield a great deal of power over the way in which not only scholars but the general public will read for subsequent generations. Simple matters of typography and layout can have enormous effects. Lobel's decision to print Bergk's distinct fragments 33 and 34 under a single number, using only an ellipsis to indicate that the two were not continuous, has affected nearly every translator. Few have been able to resist the temptation just to skip those three inconvenient little dots.⁴⁴ Most go ahead and supply a helpful 'and', 'when', or 'while'.⁴⁵ Bergk introduced the two fragments, Lobel engaged them, and the translators have married them off.

Terentianus' lines are routinely called a 'version', that is, they are assumed to be a close paraphrase of Sappho.⁴⁶ Accordingly, we need to ask a question, which apparently has not been asked before: Is this in fact the sort of thing Terentianus Maurus does? Is he in the habit of *translating*, of quoting and recasting recognizable lines from the poets whose metres he is illustrating? The answer is no. He essays a translation exactly once in the course of 2,981 lines, and when he does so, he does so explicitly. Other than that he presents nothing but the most casual of references. Terentianus takes his metrical examples not from the Greek poets but by slicing and

⁴² Note, that *non satis matura* comes from Maximus' general evocation of a supposed Platonic context and not from Plutarch's ἀχαις, since he quotes Maximus' χαρίεσσα.

⁴³ Σαπφούς μέλη. E. Lobel, *The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Sappho* (Oxford, 1925).

⁴⁴ Among the more recent translations, only F. Ferrari, *Saffo: poesie* (Milan, 1987), 140, D. J. Rayor, *Sappho's Lyre* (Berkeley, 1991), 68 (no. 35), and P. Brunet, *Sappho: poèmes et fragments* (Lausanne, 1991), 62, have been careful enough to respect Lobel's indication that there was a gap, while Guy Davenport, significantly working from Diehl's text, treats them separately in *Sappho: Poems and Fragments* (Ann Arbor, 1965), no. 4 and no. 16; repr. in *Archilochos, Sappho, Alkman* (Berkeley, 1980). Those who have substituted a full stop or semicolon for the ellipsis include S. Q. Groden, *Sappho: Poems and Fragments* (Indianapolis, 1966), 28; B. Hughes Fowler, *Achaic Greek Poetry* (Madison, 1992), 136; J. Powell, *Sappho: A Garland* (New York, 1993), 18; M. L. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1993), 41; F. Vervliet, *Le désir: Sappho* (Paris, 1993), 18; R. Chandler, *Sappho* (London, 1998), 20; Y. Battistini, *Poétesses grecques: Sapphô, Corinne, Anytè* (Paris, 1998), 51, who adds a mysterious 'et je fus éblouie'; S. Lombardo, *Sappho: Poems and Fragments* (Indianapolis, 2002), no. 49. A. Carson, *If Not, Winter* (New York, 2002), 102–3 skips the ellipsis on the Greek side, and eschews punctuation altogether in her English.

⁴⁵ E.g. M. Barnard, *Sappho: A New Translation* (Berkeley, 1958), no. 50, under the title 'But you, monkey face'. Similarly, W. Barnstone, now using Lobel–Page, *Sappho and the Greek Lyric Poets* (New York, 1985; expanded edn.), 72 (no. 145) and (New York, 1998), 28; J. Balmer, *Sappho: Poems and Fragments* (London, 1984), 48 (no. 35); 2nd edn. (Newcastle, 1984), 48 (no. 35): 'even when I thought of you as . . .'

⁴⁶ So Campbell (n. 37, 1967), 276; id. (n. 37, 1982), 95.

dicing bits of Latin poetry (usually Virgil and Catullus). So he creates the 'dactylic tetrameter' by snipping off the hexameter at the bucolic diaeresis. And to illustrate the process, he writes (2127–30):

plurimus hoc pollet Siculae telluris alumnus:
ne Graecam immittam versum, mutabo Latinum:
'Dulce tibi pinus summurmurat, en tibi, pastor,
proxima fonticulis, et tu quoque dulcia pangis'.

This is not a bad translation of Theocr. 1.1–3, considering he wants to keep the bucolic diaeresis in place:

ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἃ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα
ἃ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίσσεται, ἀδὺ δὲ καὶ τὸ
συρίσδες·

Nowhere else does he come even close to rendering a line of Greek. His references to the Greek poets are minimal and passing.⁴⁷ The closest is to Archilochus. After citing Hor. *Epod.* 1.1–2 for iambic trimeter plus dimeter, he writes (2455–6): Archilochus *isto saevit iratus metro / contra Lycambam et filias*. This is no translation but only the most general of summaries of Archilochus' subject matter.

Thus, when Terentianus writes in an Aeolic dactylic pentameter that Sappho sings that she loved little Atthis, it seems possible that he is referring to the very line 49a, which is in that metre and probably began Book 2. However, his very next lines rather cast doubt on this (2157–62):

Ille tetrametro datur ante disyllabus.
Cetera pars versus pedibus finita duobus
tale solet colon subiungere: 'Primus ab oris'.
continuas pedes istos in carmine solos
dicitur haec eadem praeclara poetria Sappho.
figere nobis
tale licebit:

That dimeter is put before the tetrameter.
The other part of the verse [i.e. the hexameter] is contained in two feet⁴⁸
and usually adds a metrical unit like 'First from the beaches'.
The same famous poetess Sappho is said
to have connected only these feet in a song.
We will provide you
With an example:

And he proceeds to construct an epyllion out of the ends of fourteen lines of Book 1 of the *Aeneid*.⁴⁹ The 'famous poetess' Sappho did not in fact compose songs entirely out of adonics. We are forced to wonder what Terentianus actually knew of Sappho.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Archilochus: 1807, 2245, 2350, 2428; Anacreon: 2850; Callimachus: 2541; Hipponax: 2372, 2398, 2902; Sappho: 2548 and the passages discussed.

⁴⁸ After the 'tetrameter' has been sliced off, the last two feet form the adonic. Rightly, Cignolo (n. 33), 521.

⁴⁹ So too the grammar of Aelius Festus Aphthonius (or Asmonius?) incorporated into that of pseudo-Marius Victorinus: H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* (Hildesheim, 1961), 6.114, 120, 162.

⁵⁰ See 2545–64 for his discussion of the hendecasyllable, where he does not mention the adonic. It is largely pillaged from Caesius Bassus, frg. 6.79–102, Terentianus' main source.

His first line says nothing more than that Sappho loved Atthis (hardly surprising), nothing about ‘once’ or ‘long ago’ or any other clear reference to the words of 49a apart from the metre. This is not how he translated the one time he did translate. He is far more likely to be making the same kind of general allusion to subject matter, as he made when talking about the metres of Archilochus.

When we come to the second line, however, we have to ask, ‘What’s all this about Sappho’s virginity?’ It corresponds to nothing in the proposed couplet. Accordingly, J. M. Edmonds, a great fan of caulking things together with bits of verse composition,⁵¹ kindly supplied what he thought Sappho must have said:

ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἀτθι, πάλαι ποτά,
[ἄς ἔμ’ ἀνθεμόεσσ’ ἔτι παρθενία σὺ δέ]
σμίκρα μοι πᾶϊς ἔμμεν’ ἐφαίνεο κάχαρις.

I loved you, Atthis, long ago when my own girlhood was still all flowers, and you – you seemed to me a small ungainly child.

This went into his Loeb edition of 1922, whence it was dutifully translated by Willis Barnstone⁵² and Paul Roche with no square brackets in sight.⁵³

If we leave out Edmonds’ contribution, we are left with a very dubious series of links. Terentianus might be referring directly to the words of line 49a but only if we accept the emendation to Ἀτθι in 49a.⁵⁴ The only thing that then might connect this possible reference from 49a to 49b is the single word ‘small’, which is there to provide an example of a spondee to start the line.⁵⁵ We are forced to assume that Terentianus then left out all that business about ‘seemed to me’ and ‘graceless’ and ‘child’ and then padded it out with a bunch of his own stuff about Sappho’s virginity. All we are left with is the fact that Terentianus calls Atthis ‘small’ (with a suggestion that the word is Sappho’s) and that Sappho calls someone (but not Atthis and not in this metre) small. In such a case, it is clear that the lines are only a general reference to Sappho’s subject matter. She may indeed have called Atthis ‘small’ somewhere, but 49b (lacking δέ) cannot be the place.⁵⁶ She probably talked about her virginity somewhere.⁵⁷ However,

⁵¹ A practice which drew Lobel’s sharpest sarcasm; see his review of the Loeb edn., *CR* 36 (1922), 120–1 and Edmonds’ reply, *ibid.*, 159–61. Edmonds at least understood that there had to be a following δέ, and how reflexives work in Latin.

⁵² ‘I loved you, Atthis, long ago, / when my girlhood was in full flower / and you were like a graceless child’, W. Barnstone, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (New York, 1962), 69; repr. in *Sappho: Lyrics in the Original Greek* (New York, 1965), 25 (no. 26).

⁵³ P. Roche, *The Love Songs of Sappho* (New York, 1966), 115 (no. 116), reissued as recently as 1991.

⁵⁴ We must be aware of the danger of circular argument here: Terentianus refers to 49a because of the mention of Atthis; we can add Atthis to 49a because of Terentianus.

⁵⁵ It will not do to try and have Terentianus turn ἄχαρις into *floreā virginitas sua cum foret*. This is not how we have seen Terentianus translate that one time, and I do not see how he could have followed the allusive (and illusive) thread from χάρις to virginity (see below) without the benefit of the learned articles which have had to trace the labyrinth for the modern scholar. More to the point, Terentius says the exact opposite of what these scholars wish Sappho to say. Sappho, in their interpretation, says she loved Atthis *before* Atthis’ virginity was in flower; Terentius says Sappho loved Atthis, *while* her own virginity was in flower. Rightly Tsomis (n. 1), 26–7.

⁵⁶ Of course, *parvam* may be no more than Terentianus’ own padding (to provide the disyllable which he is illustrating) from the idea that both Sappho and then presumably Atthis were young when Sappho fell in love. We might be more ready to be convinced that Terentianus’ *parvam* referred to 49b, if this were the only place in Sappho where she uses the word *σμικρός*. But *σμικρ[* is in 103 A (Voigt) fr. a col. ii.1, also at the start of a line. The poem is too fragmentary for

Terentianus Maurus gives no justification for joining these two lines. His 'when Sappho sings that dear to her heart was little Atthis, when her own virginity was in flower' simply cannot be turned into 'I loved you once Atthis long ago . . . You seemed to me to be a small and graceless child.'

IV

We need to clear away three additional problems with the way line 49b has been read, all of which have a direct bearing on the interpretation (and supposed linkage) of both lines.

1. First, it is almost universally taken as if Sappho had stated that her addressee was *in fact* a little girl; that it, the line is read as if Sappho had written, 'You *seemed* graceless, when you *were* a small child.' But that is not what Sappho says at all. I hate to belabour an elementary point of grammar, but it seems necessary when Lasserre, for example, makes this very error, translating: 'Tu étais une petite fille quand tu apparus devant moi, pas encore formée'.⁵⁸ The syntax of φαίνω plus infinitive is (or should be) well known: unlike φαίνω plus participle, it means, 'I *seem*' or 'it *appears* (but may not be true) that . . .'⁵⁹ This is indeed how Sappho uses it; the man in 31 is not *in fact* a god; Sappho is not *in fact* dying. There is no point in saying about a child, 'You appear(ed) to be a child.' If we are to take Sappho at her word, there is only one sensible conclusion we can draw: the addressee was *not* in fact a child. The most reasonable reading of this line is as an insult: 'You do not look like a tall and beautiful woman. You seem to me to be a small and ugly child.'

2. The other two problems have to do with the final words κᾶχαρις. Under the heading κᾶχαρις (K 1933 = 2.450.33 Latte) Hesychius gives two separate glosses. The second part, ἡ χαρίζεσθαι μὴ δυναμένη, ἡ οὐκ εὐχαρις 'Or one [fem.] who is unable to be pleasing, or else not gracious', has been occasionally cited.⁶⁰ It explains κᾶχαρις and comes from the same exegetical tradition as Plutarch (see below) and the Scholiast to Pindar. The first explanation, however, deserves some attention. He writes: κᾶχαρις· δαγύς. καὶ πλαγγών. καὶ χρυσαλλίς, τὸ κοροκόσμιον. The word κᾶχαρις is found nowhere else, it seems, and is not listed in *LSJ* or any of the standard dictionaries. Hesychius glosses it with three words for 'doll', or 'puppet': δαγύς (Theoc. 2.110), πλαγγών (Call. *Cer.* 92), κοροκόσμιον (Apollon. *Anecdota Graeca* 1.102 Bekker, Sch. Theoc. 2.110).⁶¹ There are three possibilities here. The first and most intriguing, though not the most likely, is that Hesychius is reporting the correct text and meaning of Sappho. If κᾶχαρις is indeed a word and means what he says, then Sappho wrote, 'You seem to me to be a small child, a doll.' This fits the context nicely. It would also fit in well with a kind of poem well attested in Sappho, the satirical attack on another woman.⁶² There are two objections to this notion. Plutarch

us to say anything except that the colometry is in four lines and Gongylla is mentioned at the start of the next poem.

⁵⁷ Sappho refers to παρθένοι or παρθενία in 27, 30, 107, 114, 194; cf. 17. Frg. 24a points to a shared girlhood. See Parker (n. 1), 160.

⁵⁸ Lasserre (n. 39), 118.

⁵⁹ H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA, 1920), §2143.

⁶⁰ By the editors Voigt, Lobel-Page (ad loc.); Lasserre (n. 39), 119.

⁶¹ χρυσαλλίς, here specified as a κοροκόσμιον, is odd. Elsewhere only in the meaning of an insect's pupa or its case, it seems to have acquired the same semantics as Latin *pupa* (and hence our term).

⁶² Cf. 55, 57, 71, 90, 91, 99, 133?, 144, 155? (see below), 193, 213?; cf. Doricha in 202 and a gibe at a vain man in 138.

takes the word as κ(αὶ) ἄχαρις (and Maximus and apparently the scholiast both think it has something to do with χάρις). This, however, could be explained simply by assuming that κᾶχαρις (limited to the intimate speech of Lesbos?) had dropped from later scholars' ken and was reinterpreted as κᾷχαρις. There is also a bothersome asyndeton, but then we have no idea what followed.⁶³ The second possibility is that Hesychius is reporting a different, possibly Alexandrian, reading and interpretation of the text of Sappho. Sappho intended κᾷχαρις, but a scholiast who knew a word κᾶχαρις (or the like) saw fit to air his knowledge or else saw what he thought was an unfamiliar word and made a wild guess from context. This sort of pedantic interpretation crops up frequently in the marginalia of the lyric poets.⁶⁴ The third, and most likely, possibility is that Hesychius has got hold of a genuine Greek word, possibly from nursery speech,⁶⁵ but it has nothing to do with Sappho.

3. The testimony of Hesychius is too tenuous for us to place any reliance on him. It is probably best, therefore, to assume that Plutarch reports the correct reading. Yet a third problem still remains. It should be clear that the sentence, 'You seem to me to be a short and displeasing child', is an insult. However, there is a widespread misinterpretation of the word ἄχαρις, which stems from too ready an acceptance of what Plutarch makes a character say. This credulity in turn is supported by the preconceived notion of Sappho as an older lesbian seducing adolescent (or even prepubescent) girls. It is commonly accepted nowadays that ἄχαρις here in Sappho means 'too young to be deflowered' – it is best to be blunt so that we can see exactly what is being claimed – and that χάρις/ἄχαρις is an indicator of age. In short, people have been trying to make ἄχαρις mean the same thing as σμίκρα.⁶⁶

This consensus derives from a methodological error which should be pointed out before we go on to the passage of Plutarch which has been used as a proof text. Briefly, the method has been to examine a limited number of passages (usually confined to lyric poetry), see what words are associated with χάρις, and then say that these associations are what χάρις 'means'. The method is excellent at drawing out the overtones which various words *may* have had in *some* contexts, but the authors tend to assume that all these overtones *must* be present in *every* context. The error is to mistake connotation for denotation and association for intertextuality. To take one example, Christopher Brown follows a trail from χάρις to ὥρα to αἰδώς. He thus concludes that there is 'a certain χάρις characteristic of girls who have reached the age of marriage', that 'a look of χάρις and αἰδώς characterizes the virgin . . . χάρις fades with the loss of virginity . . . χάρις marks the nubile girl', that 'with marriage and the loss of virginity the ὥρα passes' and so in Sappho 16 'her wish is frustrated not only by distance, but the inexorable progress of female physiology'.⁶⁷

The conclusion, like the method, is demonstrably false. Obviously, youths *can* be graceful, but they need not be so; and naturally, if one is in love with a youth, one can

⁶³ Sappho can, of course, simply put nouns in apposition: 44.9, etc.

⁶⁴ Cf. schol. A on Alc. 1.49 or the testimonia for Alc. 16.4 for particularly silly bits.

⁶⁵ If genuine, there is no obvious etymology, but κᾶχαρις has the look of the reduplication common in children's language: cf. τίτθη/τίτθος, Lat. *pup(p)a*, etc.; the *a* would be short.

⁶⁶ For an example of the argument, see Lasserre (n. 39), 14, 118–21.

⁶⁷ C. Brown, 'Anactoria and the Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματα: Sappho fr. 16 Voigt', *QUCC* 61 (1989), 11, 13, 12, n. 23; 15; id., 'Ruined by lust: Anacreon, fr. 44 Gentili (432 PMG)', *CQ* 34 (1984), 41, n. 32. Similarly C. Calame, *Les Choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, (Rome, 1977), 401 = *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*, trans. D. Collins and J. Orion (Lanham, 2001), 231–2; Lasserre (n. 39), 119. Lardinois (n. 35), 69, n. 48, claims on this basis that Anactoria of Sappho 16 'has been positively identified as a young woman'.

call him/her 'graceful'. However, people other than youths are also called 'graceful'. That is, while *χάρις* obviously can be associated with youth (e.g. *Il.* 24.348 = *Od.* 10.279, Anacr. 393.3, etc.), it does not mean youth or even imply youth. The point is simply that the audience was not constrained every time an archaic poet mentioned *χάρις* to imagine someone under the age of fourteen – or let us be generous and say between the ages of twelve and twenty-one.⁶⁸

The simple fact of the matter is that *χάρις*, even when confined to its erotic sense and referring to women, is not the exclusive property of adolescents and virgins. To disprove the odd idea that *χάρις* means youth, we need notice only a few of the places in archaic poetry where wives, mothers and other non-maidens, are called 'graceful' or associated with *χάρις*. So Demeter (of all people) possesses the very *αἰδώς* and *χάρις* in her eyes that some claim mark only nubile virgins.⁶⁹ Aphrodite has a robe woven for her by the Graces (*Il.* 5.338), she is bathed by the Graces (*Od.* 8.364; *Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 61), she dances with the Graces (*Od.* 18.194; *Hom. Hymn Apoll.* 194–5), she looks like the Graces (*Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 95), but Aphrodite is no girl and no virgin. *Χάρις* herself did not lose her maiden name on becoming a wife (*Il.* 18.382).⁷⁰ Among mortals, the *χάρις* of the Ionian men, their wives and their children as they dance, is such that they seem *ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀγήρω*s (*Hom. Hymn Apoll.* 147–52). These wives and mothers (distinct from the *κούραι* of 157ff.) are not preserved in a state of nubile virginity but rather are always free from old age.⁷¹

Let us now turn to the one passage in all of Greek that supposedly supports this reading.⁷² Plutarch presents a clever and tendentious translation of a single line of Sappho, which has been swallowed whole because it fits in so well with what we already believe. The passage is worth examining with an open eye. In the dialogue *Amatorius*, as part of the general debate about whether boys are preferable to women as sex-objects, Daphnaeus argues for the superiority of having one's orgasms inside of women (751d):

*χάρις γὰρ οὖν, ὃ Πρωτόγενης, ἢ τοῦ θήλεος ὑπείξεις τῷ ἄρρενι κέκληται πρὸς τῶν παλαιῶν· ὡς καὶ Πίνδαρος ἔφη τὸν Ἥφαιστον “ἄνευ χαρίτων”*⁷³ *ἐκ τῆς Ἥρας γενέσθαι· καὶ τὴν οὖπω γάμων ἔχουσιν ὦραν ἢ Σαπφῷ προσαγορεύουσά φησιν ὅτι “σμικρά μοι, παῖ, ἔμμεναι φαίνεται κάχαρις”. ὁ δ’ Ἥρακλῆς ὑπὸ τινος ἐρωτᾶται, “βία δ’ ἐπραξας χάριτας ἢ πείσας κόρην;”*

So, Protogenes, the yielding of the female to the male was called 'a favour' (*χάρις*) by the ancients. So Pindar said that Hephaestus was born from Hera 'without favours', and Sappho addressing one who was not yet at the right age (*ῶρα*) for marriage, 'You seem to me to be small,

⁶⁸ The authors are sometimes a bit fuzzy as to when a woman's *ῶρα* was exactly (starts at menarche? over at first intercourse?) and do not hesitate to apply statements about the best age-range for Athenian boys of the fifth century directly to Lesbian girls of the seventh.

⁶⁹ *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 214–15. N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974), 227, cited in support by Brown (n. 67), 12, n. 29, in fact contradicts his contention.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Theog.* 945, where Aglaie 'youngest of the Graces' marries Hephaestus.

⁷¹ In epic, apart from women, it is Odysseus who most often has *χάρις* poured over him: *Od.* 6.229–37, 8.19, 23.162.

⁷² *TLG* 2.2738b, e.g., rightly lists this usage separately from the adjective, citing only Plutarch (and the schol. to Pindar, which derives from it), and is precise about its meaning: *Ἄχαρις, ἢ, Quae nondum per aetatem venereo obsequio est, q.d. Quae nondum viro gratificari potest.*

⁷³ On the reliability of Plutarch's character here, note that he has fused Pind. *Pyth.* 2.42, where Hera gives birth to Centaurus (not Hephaestus) *ἄνευ οἱ Χαρίτων* 'without the Graces beside her', with Hesiod's account (*Theog.* 927) of Hera giving birth to Hephaestus, *οὐ φιλότητι μίγεισα*.

child, and ill-favoured'. Heracles is asked by someone, 'Did you get the favours by force or did you persuade the girl?' (fr. trag. adesp. 402)

Such a 'favour', if taken from boys, he concludes, involves either rape (on the part of the *erastes*) or immodesty (on the part of the *eromenos*) and so would be an ἄχαρις χάρις 'an ill-favoured favour'.

Note that Plutarch's reading completely rules out joining this line with 49a. He cannot be suggesting that Sappho wrote: 'I loved you, Atthis, once long ago. You seem to me to be small, child, and ill-favoured (which really means, not yet ready to have sex with men).' Instead, all Plutarch is doing here is having a character make an extremely tendentious etymological argument, or rather, simply a dirty joke.⁷⁴ It is true that *one* of the meanings of χάρις is 'favour', and that χάρις can refer to the pleasure of sex, but Plutarch or his character puns and makes it mean 'sexual favour', as in the English, 'bestowing her favours'. But of course, this does not prove that sex with girls has more 'grace' than sex with boys (this is Daphnaeus' argument) nor that χάρις means 'sex' or more precisely 'a girl's readiness for intercourse with a man' every time it occurs.

W. S. Barrett had long ago criticized this misunderstanding of what Plutarch was up to:

Now χάρις as 'delight, gratification', can naturally be used in erotic contexts . . . but the use is not especially common . . . I add that Wilamowitz (and L.S., A. iii. 2) ought not to subsume the erotic use under 'favours granted' (they follow Plutarch, *Erot.* 751d, who alleges that χάρις in early poetry can be ἡ τοῦ θήλεος ὑπειξίς τῷ ἄρρενι). Certainly a complaisant woman χαρίζεται τῷ ἐρώντι; but the erotic χάρις is normally (as is clear above all from fr. tr. adesp. 402) not the favour granted by the woman but the delight felt by one or both of the participants.⁷⁵

Daphnaeus/Plutarch wants to use Sappho's line to prove that χάρις 'favour' means 'intercourse by men with women'. Thus he tries to make Pindar's 'without the Graces' (of Centaurus) mean 'without sexual intercourse' (of Hephaestus).⁷⁶ To keep up his argument he also twists Sappho into the desired shape so that ἄχαρις is made to mean 'unsuitable for the intercourse of men with women'. But it does not, any

⁷⁴ The purely sexual use of χάρις by itself is virtually confined to the comedians; see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (Oxford, 1991²), 160. M. Treu, *Sappho* (Munich, 1963), 193, labels Plutarch's gloss as 'allzu nüchtern erklärt'; it is not so much 'banal' as deliberately wrong.

⁷⁵ W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytus* (Oxford, 1964), 433 (on *Hipp.* 513–15). So too J. Redfield, 'Notes on the Greek wedding', *Arethusa* 15 (1982), 196: 'The wife's modesty is sexually charged; she is available to her husband and brings to him *charis*—which means (among other things) the sexual responsiveness of the mature woman (Sophocles, *Aj.* 520–22). MacLachlan (n. 35), 27, rightly captures the meaning of *Il.* 11.241–2, cited by *LSJ* and others for a purely sexual meaning: 'This of course, as often with *charis*, has sexual overtones but is an explicit reference to the material as well as the erotic interdependence of married partners. The prolonged pattern of mutual benefits, the *charis* between married partners, extends beyond the gratification of desire.' However, in her chapter on 'Erotic *charis*' (pp. 56–72) she concentrates almost exclusively on *charis* as an attribute of youth in Pindar and sympotic poetry.

⁷⁶ In fact what it means is that the birth of Centaurus was monstrous and ugly: 'He and his offspring are isolated from human society, from the Charites', so MacLachlan (n. 35), 121. Cf. also J.-P. Vernant, 'Between the beasts and the gods', in *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, trans. J. Lloyd (Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1980), 144–5 on this passage of Pind. *Pyth.* 2: '[Ixion] negates all the forms of exchange and mutual generosity called for by marriage and, in place of the mutual exchange of gifts or—to express it Greek terms—the χάρις, which is the basis for the marital bond, he substitutes the mere use of constraint'. As his union with Hera is 'devoid of *charis*', so his offspring is monstrous.

more than 'without the Graces' means 'parthenogenetically'; here, as everywhere else in Greek, *ἄχαρις* simply means, as his own use of the word shows, 'without grace, displeasing, ugly'.⁷⁷

There is a further fatal (and obvious) flaw in using Plutarch's tendentious argument to prove that *ἄχαρις* means 'not yet ready to be deflowered'. If 'χάρις marks the nubile girl',⁷⁸ then the negative must mean simply 'lacking nubile grace', whether because one had not yet reached it (too young for sex) or because one has passed it (too old for sex) or because one simply does not have it (too ugly for sex). But under the influence of Plutarch's sophistry, *ἄχαρις* has been taken by some as a virtual synonym for 'prepubescent'. Even if *χάρις* were confined to the adolescent (and it is not), the meaning of *ἄχαρις* can hardly be confined to 'below the age of nubile grace'. One need only look at the other privatives from *χάρις*: *ἀχαριστία* means 'ungraciousness', never 'immaturity' or 'deflowering'; *ἀχαριστος* and *ἀχάριτος* mean 'without grace, unpleasant', never 'immature' or 'no longer a virgin'. By this reckoning the comparative *ἀχαρισ(τό)τερος* ought to mean 'infantile' and the superlative *ἀχαριώτατος*, 'embryonic'. In short, Sappho saying that someone seems a child both small and graceless records two distinct facts about her.

Plutarch apart, how in fact does *Sappho* use *χάρις* and its derivatives? Of course, nothing prevents *χαρίεις* from being used of the beauty of a bride (108, *ὦ κάλα, ὦ χάριεσσα*; 112.3: *σοὶ χάριεν μὲν εἶδος*), but it refers not to her age, the state of her hymen, or the functioning of her uterus, but to a beautiful physical appearance. So, in 138.2, it refers to the beauty found in the eyes not of an adolescent girl but of a handsome man; in 2.2 it can be used to describe a grove of apple trees (of indeterminate age). In 27.7 *χαρίζ-ομαι* is used of the favours granted by the fellow wedding guests, favours which I doubt included sex.⁷⁹

Plutarch has his character deliberately misinterpret *ἄχαρις*. It has nothing to do with suitability for marriage or for being deflowered; it simply means 'ill-favoured, graceless, ugly'. Nor is our other legible source for this line of *Sappho* a reliable witness: Maximus of Tyre, the philosopher-orator-entertainer who wandered to Rome under Commodus. Maximus produced a show oration to prove that Socrates was doing nothing unbefitting the philosopher by declaring his love for pretty boys. To prove his point Maximus argues that all the poets (Homer, Hesiod, *Sappho*, Anacreon; he exempts Archilochus as too obscene) have spoken of love (not exactly a coherent defence, but never mind). His quotations, as we have seen, are none too

⁷⁷ The scholiast to the line of Pindar that Plutarch misuses reflects this same exegetical tradition, and may have had this particular bit of Plutarch in mind (though he uses two different proof texts); so 78a: *ἀνευ οἱ χαρίτων· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔξω συνουσίας. χαρίζεσθαι γὰρ κυρίως λέγεται τὸ συνουσιάζειν, ὥσπερ Θεόπομπος ἐν Μήδῳ* (fr. 29, 740 K) *εἰσάγει τὸν Λυξαβηττὸν λέγοντα· 'παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ λίαν μεῖράκια χαρίκεται ἢ τοῖς ἡλικιώταις'. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἰππεύσιν* (517) *ἐκ μεταφορᾶς· 'πολλῶν γὰρ δὴ πειρασάντων αὐτὴν ὀλίγοις χαρίσασθαι' καὶ Σαπφῶν 'σμικρὰ μοι παῖς ἔμμεναι ἴφρησι λίεσθ' χάρις', ἢ μήπω δυναμένη χαρίζεσθαι* [see above for the variant readings]. The second gloss in Hsch. (see above) stems from here or the same source, and confirms the ending of Plutarch's text: *ἢ χαρίζεσθαι μὴ δυναμένη, ἢ οὐκ εὐχαρις*. These two therefore do not count as independent witnesses to this supposed use of *ἄχαρις*. Note that Hesychius has the correct explanation as well: *ἢ οὐκ εὐχαρις*; as do scholiasts C and D to the line of Pindar: 78c. *ἀνευ οἱ Χαρίτων· οἶον τὸν ἄχαριν γόνον. ἄχαρις γὰρ ἦν τις καὶ ἄγριος ὁ Νεφέλης καὶ Ἰξίονος Κένταυρος*. 78d. *ἐκείνην [Νεφέλην] μὲν γὰρ φησι τεκεῖν τὸν τοιοῦτον γόνον, ὃς οὔτε ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὔτε ἐν θεοῖς τιμὴν εἶχεν*.

⁷⁸ Brown (n. 67).

⁷⁹ At 44A.7 *χάρις* means 'as a favour to me', 'for my sake'; other attestations are too fragmentary to be clear: 68a.10, *χαρίεις* apparently in relation to the Dioscuri; also 90d.13.

trustworthy and he is a tad uncertain about his sources. More importantly, even a cursory inspection of his oration shows how superficial his comparisons are. It is impossible to determine from his use the context of any of his Sappho quotations; one can scarcely recognize Socrates. Since this section is our only source for several of his quotations and since it has so often taken as gospel, it is best to give it in full (Max. Tyr. 18.9, 230.11–232.15 Hobein, 160.234–162.268 Trapp, 232.203–234.235 Koniaris):

ὁ δὲ τῆς Λεσβίας [ἔρω] — εἴ τοι χρὴ πρεσβύτερα τοῖς νέοις εἰκάσαι — τί ἂν εἴη ἄλλο ἢ αὐτό, ἢ Σωκράτους τέχνη ἐρωτική; δοκοῦσι γάρ μοι τὴν καθ' αὐτὸν ἐκάτερος φιλιαν, ἢ μὲν γυναικῶν, ὁ δὲ ἀρρένων, ἐπιτηδεύσαι. καὶ γὰρ πολλῶν ἑρῶν ἔλεγον καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων ἀλίσκεσθαι τῶν καλῶν. ὅ τι γὰρ ἐκείνῳ Ἀλκιβιάδης καὶ Χαρμίδης καὶ Φαῖδρος, τοῦτο τῇ Λεσβίᾳ Γυρίνα καὶ Ἀθίσι καὶ Ἀνακτορία· καὶ ὅ τι περ Σωκράτει οἱ ἀντίτεχνοι Πρόδικος καὶ Γοργίας καὶ Θρασύμαχος καὶ Πρωταγόρας, τοῦτο τῇ Σαπφῷ Γοργὸν καὶ Ἀνδρομέδα· νῦν μὲν ἐπιτιμᾷ ταύταις, νῦν δὲ ἐλέγχει καὶ εἰρωνεύεται αὐτὰ ἐκείνα τὰ Σωκράτους· “τὸν Ἴωνα χαίρειν”, φησὶν ὁ Σωκράτης. “πόλλα μοι τὰν Πωλυανάνκιδα παῖδα χαίρην”, Σαπφὼν λέγει. οὐδ' προσίεναι φησὶν ὁ Σωκράτης Ἀλκιβιάδῃ, ἐκ πολλοῦ ἑρῶν, πρὶν ἡγήσατο ἱκανὸν εἶναι πρὸς λόγους. “σικκρά μοι παῖς ἔτι φαίνεο καὶ χαρίεσσα”, Σαπφὼ λέγει. κωμῶδῃ στήμᾳ πον καὶ κατὰ κλισίαν σοφιστοῦ. καὶ αὕτη· “τίς δὲ ἀγροῶτιν ἐπεμμένα στόλαν”. τὸν ἔρωτ' αὖ φησιν ἡ Διοτίμα τῷ Σωκράτει οὐ παῖδα, ἀλλὰ ἀκόλουθον τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ θεραπείοντα εἶναι. λέγει πον καὶ Σαπφῷ ἢ Ἀφροδίτῃ ἐν ἄσματι, “σύ τε καλὸς θεράπων Ἴερος”.⁸⁰ ἡ Διοτίμα λέγει ὅτι θάλλει μὲν ἔρως εὐπορῶν, ἀποθνήσκει δὲ ἀπορῶν. τοῦτο ἐκείνη ξυλλαβοῦσα εἶπεν “γλυκύπικρον” καὶ “ἀλγεσίδωρον”. τὸν ἔρωτα Σωκράτης σοφιστὴν λέγει, Σαπφὼ “μυθοπλόκον”. ἐκβακχεύεται ἐπὶ Φαίδρῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος, τῇ δὲ ἔρως ἐτίναξεν τὰς φρένας, “ὥς ἄμενος καρ' ὅρος δρῶσιν ἐμπέσω”. ἀχθεταὶ τῇ Ξανθίππῃ ὀδυρομένη ὅτι ἀπέθνησκειν, ἢ δὲ τῇ θυγατρὶ· “οὐ γὰρ θέμις ἐν μουσσοπόλῳ οἰκίᾳ θρήνον εἶναι οὐκ ἄμμι πρέποι τάδε”.

What else was the love of the Lesbian woman – if one may compare older things with newer – except Socrates' art of love? For they seem to me to have practised love each in their own way, she that of women, he that of men. For they both said that they loved many and were captivated by all things beautiful. What Alcibiades and Charmides and Phaedrus were to him, Gyrinna and Atthis and Anactoria were to the Lesbian. And what the rival craftsmen Prodicus and Gorgias and Thrasymachus and Protagoras were to Socrates, Gorgo and Andromeda were to Sappho. Sometimes she upbraids them, sometimes she refutes them and uses irony, just like the words of Socrates. ‘Hello to Ion’, says Socrates [*Ion* 530A]. ‘Fare-you-well to the daughter of Polyanactes’, says Sappho [155]. Socrates says that he did not approach Alcibiades, though he loves him very much, before he was ready for his words. ‘*You still seemed to me to be a small and graceful child*’, says Sappho. He makes fun somewhere of the clothes and way of reclining of a sophist.⁸¹ She: ‘And what woman wearing a rustic dress ...’ [57]. Eros, says Diotima to Socrates is not a child but the follower of Aphrodite and her servant [*Symp.* 203Cc]. And Sappho says somewhere in an ode to Aphrodite, ‘And you, lovely servant Eros’ [159]. Diotima says that Eros prospers when he has resources but dies when he is without resource [*Symp.* 203e]. She, comprehending this, called [him] ‘bittersweet’ [130] and ‘paining’ [172]. Socrates calls Eros a sophist [*Symp.* 203D]; Sappho, ‘tale-weaver’ [188]. He goes into a bacchic frenzy over Phaedrus under the influence of Eros [*Phdr.* 234D]. Eros shook her heart, ‘like the wind attacking the oaks on a mountain’ [47]. He is bothered by Xanthippe wailing that he was dying [*Phd.* 60A], and she at her daughter: ‘For it is not right for there to be a lament in the house of the followers of the Muses. These things are not suitable for us.’

Now there is nothing ‘ironic’ about the opening of the *Ion*. The point of comparison is nothing more than the fact that both authors use the word *χαίρω*. Indeed, it looks very much as if Maximus has got Sappho completely turned around,

⁸⁰ A. Fick, ‘Die Sprachform der lesbischen Lyrik’, *BB* 17 (1891): 201, first emended Maximus’ *καλὸς* to *κάμος* [accenting it, however, *κάμος*].

⁸¹ Trapp in his edn. refers to *Prot.* 314E, Koniaris to *Hp. mai.* 291A, and *Prt.* 315D (of Prodicus), but none of these seem to match.

for everywhere else that we find χαῖρε πολλά it is used to say 'goodbye', not 'hello'.⁸² He misrepresents the *Symposium*,⁸³ misremembers the *Phaedrus*,⁸⁴ and misunderstands ἀλγεσίδωρον.⁸⁵ Socrates somewhere criticizes someone's dress; so does Sappho. There is something about mourning in Socrates; there is something about mourning in Sappho.⁸⁶ The only legitimate thing here is that both use the word θεράπων of Eros.

So for our line of Sappho: we can tell nothing about the real context of her words from Maximus' use of them.⁸⁷ Sappho said something about a child (not a word about her being ready); Socrates said something about waiting until Alcibiades was ready (not a word about his being a child).⁸⁸ Trapp wondered if Maximus' words might refer to the lost *Alcibiades* of Aeschines of Sphettus.⁸⁹ However, his statement seems more like a vague memory of the opening of the Platonic *Alcibiades I*, where Socrates tells Alcibiades that though he was the first of his lovers, he has not addressed him for many years because of the opposition of his daimon.⁹⁰ Maximus has given us very little reason to trust him. We cannot be sure that he is giving us an accurate account of the context of even Socrates' words, much less that Sappho's words had anything to do with them whatsoever. Sappho tells us that someone female seems a small and ill-favoured child. We know nothing more than that.

V

There are good reasons, even if we accept the standard readings of each, for separating these lines. First, as has been noted, the context of Plutarch's quotation of 49a (addressed to 'someone who did not yet have the right age for marriage') rules

⁸² Page (n. 16), 135, n. 11. J. McIntosh Snyder, *Lesbian Desire in the Lyrics of Sappho* (New York, 1997), 114, and Tsomis (n. 1), 210 point out the alliteration of *p*-. The meter is uncertain (see Voigt for possibilities) and the text may have been adapted to indirect discourse. For the ethical dat. μοι, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 1378 χαῖρε, πάτερ, μοι.

⁸³ Diotima's speech about the intermediate nature of Eros (see K. J. Dover, *Plato: Symposium* [Cambridge, 1980], 136–43) has nothing to do with Sappho's oxymoron.

⁸⁴ Trapp refers to *Phdr.* 253A, where Socrates uses the phrase ὥσπερ αἱ βάκχαι of the Followers of Zeus when siezed by Eros, but it is rather a reminiscence of *Phdr.* 234D, where Socrates says he joined Phaedrus in a frenzy (συνεβάκχευσα) under the influence, not of Eros, but of Lysias.

⁸⁵ Maximus is apparently taking ἀλγεσίδωρον as an oxymoron also, meaning 'painful gift', but such determinative compounds are routinely dependent (the first part in nominal, the second verbal). Sappho meant 'pain-giver', Maximus wants it to mean 'painful gift'.

⁸⁶ The situations are presumably not similar; one is not meant to imagine that Sappho is dying, though A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (New York, 1966), 146, invents an occasion 'when her daughter is mortally ill'.

⁸⁷ Note also that Maximus' linkage has nothing to do with 'grace'. The connection here rests entirely on the notion 'child'.

⁸⁸ The image of 'Sappho schoolmistress' influences current interpretation of even this text. If Maximus could be trusted even a bit for context, the only thing his words could mean is that Sappho said she had fallen in love with someone when that someone was a little girl and that she, like Socrates, *had waited until the beloved was grown-up*.

⁸⁹ Trapp (n. 19), 161. The only relevant passage of the extant fragments seems to be the opposite of what Maximus describes: Socrates says he thought he could make Alcibiades better by his love for him (11c Dittmar). H. Dittmar, *Aischines von Sphettos*, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 21 (Berlin, 1912), did not recognize any allusion to Aeschines' *Alcibiades* in this passage; for what Maximus did know of Aeschines, see Dittmar, 115–16.

⁹⁰ *Alc. I* 103A–B; Maximus' words also sound like a general reference to the story of Socrates' resistance in the face of Alcibiades' attempted seduction in the *Symposium* (216C–19E; cf. 222B), the source of Maximus' next several comparisons.

out a link. Second, the fact that no one who quotes 49b mentions Atthis should at least give us pause.

We may be so lulled by our familiarity with this 'couplet' that we fail to notice that it really does not make any sense. 'I used to love you, once, long ago.' What is the only natural follow-up to this statement? Clearly, 'But not any more'.⁹¹ Sappho is made to say: 'I used to love you, once long ago. [I don't love you any more. However, back when I did,] I thought you were a small and clumsy child.' This will not work.

Only a few scholars have noticed that the partners suffer from mutual incompatibility.⁹² Many, however, after having gone to great trouble to claim that *ἄχαρις* means 'too young for love', apparently have no difficulty in making Sappho turn around and say that she fell in love with someone who was too young for love. Snyder notes the difficulties with joining the two lines, but does so anyway, and draws what would be the correct conclusion: 'We may hypothesize that the narrator is declaring her love to Atthis at a time when Atthis herself was not yet old enough to respond' and labels Atthis a 'prepubescent'.⁹³

MacLachlan and Stehle seem to be alone in noticing that what Sappho is made to say here is at variance with all the texts the scholars are citing. So MacLachlan: 'If the two verses were consecutive, Sappho loved Atthis before the young girl reached her *hōra*. What is significant about the passage is that, as a diptych, it provides a *terminus post quem* (in normal circumstances) for erotic *charis*, just as Archilochus' dried-up Neobule provides a *terminus ante quem*'.⁹⁴ Stehle remarks: 'If we take Terentianus and the two Greek lines together, we construct the statement that Sappho, when ready for marriage, loved Atthis, who was not yet nubile'.⁹⁵

There are really only two possibilities if we accept the fusion of these two lines. In the first, Sappho must say the exact opposite of what all the other poets say. Other poets, quoted by scholars wishing to turn *ἄχαρις* into a sign of virginity or youth, say they like girls at their prime. Sappho apparently, alone of Greek poets, did not care about beauty, and says she sexually desired (*ῥάμαν*, our usual translation, 'love', paints a romantic picture) a girl before she came to the sexually desirable age.

The second interpretation brings up a point that I am at loss how to express delicately. But basically, why should Sappho care whether a girl is ready to be deflowered or not? Scholars become a trifle vague and squeamish on this point.⁹⁶ They can accommodate a mention of age only within a strange set of parameters, by assuming (as is nearly universally done) that girls came to Sappho's school as children

⁹¹ So Bowra (n. 36), 194 calls them 'lines which Sappho wrote after she had ceased to love her [Atthis]'.

⁹² So Bowra (n. 36) and Campbell (n. 37).

⁹³ Snyder (n. 82), 86.

⁹⁴ MacLachlan (n. 35), 64.

⁹⁵ Stehle (n. 1), 268–9.

⁹⁶ See Bergk's paraphrase above: 'non tamen usa sum flore virginitatis'. So Vervliet, (n. 44), 18, translates *ἄχαρις* as 'inexpérimentée'. It sometimes seems that they think that Sappho's lesbian sexual technique might imperil the girls' hymen. I am bewildered by R. Merkelbach's note, 'Sappho und ihre Kreis', *Philologus* 101 (1957), 3, n. 2: 'Est is aber weder in Sparta noch in Lesbos an eine *αισχρά φίλια* zu denken (Suidas s. v. Sappho); die Mädchen der Sappho traten als Jungfrauen in die Ehe, s. fr. 105 und 114 sowie Catull 62, 40 *nullo convulsus aratro*'. What can the man be thinking? Is he rescuing Sappho (and Spartan women) from charges of actual physical contact in their 'lesbian' love (cf. p. 7, n. 1, invoking Plato—a bad choice, and doesn't he mean Socrates)? Is he using *Jungfrau* to mean 'without sexual experience of any sort'? Did he misunderstand the *Suda* and think of the girls having intercourse with men? And what does Catullus prove?

and left to get married pretty much on menarche. The odd thing about this is that Sappho misses the boat. Girls come to her as mere children, too young for sex (pre-*χάρις*), so it is claimed, and then are whisked away the second that they hit their *ῥα*. This has led to some very curious calculations. Lasserre, for example, has used Plutarch to prove that Atthis arrived at Sappho's school at the age of eleven (plus or minus) and left to be married at around fourteen, leaving Sappho with a scant three years of prepubescent bliss.⁹⁷ Sappho is made not only a pederast, but a very peculiar type of pederast, one who falls in love only with girls before they become beautiful. In contrast to all the male lovers, whose preferences are usually blithely transferred onto Sappho, she must either disdain the very prime of youth which everyone else thinks best, or else live in a state of permanent rut, watching the girls she has so carefully hand-raised snatched from her just as she's ready to pounce.⁹⁸

VI

In conclusion:

1. In 49a, the standard emendation is both unnecessary and unlikely. The line should be printed:

ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, ἃ τε πάλαι ποτά

I used to love you, you who once long ago . . .

with Tyrwhitt and Bentley's emendation *Ἀτθί* in the apparatus.

2. In 49b, there is no need for wholesale rewriting. Plutarch, our only reliable witness, records a clear glyconic and the beginning of another. Maximus' text is merely a metrical reworking. We should read:

*σμίκρα μοι πάϊς ἔμμεναι
φαίνῃ κᾶχαρις*

You seem to me to be a small and graceless child . . .

The lines can be assigned to Book 5.

3. Terentianus Maurus' lines provide no justification for joining 49a and 49b, howsoever they be emended. His mention of Sappho's subject matter is no more than a reference to the fact that Sappho said she loved Atthis. His lines should be added to the list of testimonia, however, as a possible witness that Sappho spoke about her virginity at some point.

4. The word *ἄχαρις* is not an indication of virginity or prepubescence. The only text that seemingly supports this is a sophistical argument by a character in Plutarch. Maximus of Tyre is superficial and utterly unreliable on context. The word means simply 'lacking in grace'.

The two fragments are in different metres. They have different subject matters. They have nothing to do with each other. Joining them is an *ἄχαρις χάρις*. It is time for a divorce.

University of Cincinnati

HOLT R. PARKER
holt.parker@uc.edu

⁹⁷ Lasserre (n. 39), 119.

⁹⁸ Brown (n. 67) has merely the latest version of a Sappho 'frustrated not only by distance, but the inexorable progress of female physiology'.