

VERBAL REPETITION IN SAPPHO: TWO WEDDING SONG
FRAGMENTS (114, 104A V.).

With notes on ἀναφορά and the text and translation of Demetr. *Eloc.* 141 and 268.

Demetrius “On Style”, preserving much of what is left of Sappho’s wedding poetry¹, observes for a couple of instances that its style is different compared with that quality he associates with the poetess more than any other, *grace* (χάρις). PAGE translates (p. 121) the ancient critic’s opinion on 110 (“The doorman’s feet”) and 111 (“Lift the roof higher”) V.: “‘Very cheap’, Demetrius calls it, ‘and in words more suitable to prose than poetry²’”. PAGE agrees that “the humour is heavy and flat”, adding the following critical assessments: “nothing of much interest” (p. 122, on 112 V.), “comparatively insignificant” (p. 125, on the entire book of Epithalamians), and “trivial in subject and style” (p. 126, on the same).

PAGE appreciated the rich splendour of the higher genres of Greek lyrical poetry, and the wedding songs may seem to belong to a lesser category of the art. His dismissal might perhaps also be explained in part as a reaction to a certain tendency on the continent. Evaluations of a more literary historical character had been offered in Germany. In contrast to PAGE, HERMANN USENER, for one, claimed (p. 288) that the loss of Sappho’s wedding poems is more painful to us than the loss of *any other* part of her work, seeing in them “die sinnige Verwerthung der alten volkstümlichen Bestandtheile des Hochzeitsbrauchs”.

However we may regard USENER’s aesthetical judgement, we should agree that *volkstümlich*, “folk-like”, denotes an important characteristic of many of the wedding song fragments. Several scholars have made this observation, recently for instance PERNIGIOTTI, who points to concrete examples of this kind of style, speaking of “folk-like tones and forms of address such as, for instance, apostrophe, dialogue, or straightforward mockery³”. Whether some of the nuptial poetry should in fact belong to the “Carmina popularia” collection, having been incorrectly ascribed to Sappho due to her reputation as a wedding poet, is a question that should not be dismissed out of hand. It may be considered a remarkable coincidence that of the 36 preserved fragments in the current collection of Greek popular song (*PMG*, pp. 449–70), only one (35/881) pertains to a wedding – and that one which would be impossible for any ancient critic to attribute to Sappho. The question of authentic authorship will not further be addressed in this article, though, neither of the fragments discussed exhibiting features of language, style or content which render it particularly suspicious.

¹ On which see, in general, PAGE pp. 9–26, CONTIADES-TSITSONI pp. 68–109, FERRARI pp. 117–28.

² εὐτελέστατα καὶ ἐν πεζοῖς ὀνόμασι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν ποιητικοῖς (Demetr. *Eloc.* 167).

³ Translation in FERRARI p. 118; original by PERNIGIOTTI p. 15: “... dei frammenti che usualmente si raccolgono sotto la sezione Epitalami (104–117) è che la loro destinazione alla cerimonia sembra sempre evidente, concreta, e ottenuta spesso attraverso il ricorso a toni immediati, popolar-eggianti, e a forme dirette come, per esempio, l’apostrofe, il dialogo o il vero e proprio motteggio”. Cf. LESKY p. 170: “volkstümliche Brauchtdichtung in all ihrer blumhaft natürlichen Frische”, CONTIADES-TSITSONI pp. 68–69.

Apart from those mentioned by PERNIGIOTTI, another common figure of folk song, used sparingly in the higher genres of Greek lyrical poetry, is verbal repetition. Verbal repetition occurs in some form in about half of the preserved wedding song fragments⁴, but is very rare, if at all extant, as an intentional stylistic feature in the remaining corpus of Sappho's poetry. Neither Sappho nor archaic folk poetry is likely to have had a notion of σχήματα, rhetorical figures, but this is the frame in which Demetrius was bound to understand the verbal repetitions that he encountered in poetry. He cites two of the wedding song fragments as examples of ἀναδίπλωσις and ἀναφορά, two rhetorical devices of verbal repetition. In these cases, grace is present in full measure, according to the critic ("On Style" 140–41):

αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν σχημάτων χάριτες δῆλαί εἰσιν καὶ πλείσται παρὰ Σαπφοῖ, οἷον ἐκ τῆς ἀναδιπλώσεως που νύμφη πρὸς τὴν παρθενίαν φησί: [114.1] παρθενία, παρθενία, ποῖ με λιπούσα οἴχῃ; ἢ δὲ ἀποκρίνεται πρὸς αὐτὴν τῷ αὐτῷ σχήματι: [114.2] οὐκέτι ἤξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἤξω· πλείων γὰρ χάρις ἐμφαίνεται, ἢ εἴτερ ἅπαξ ἐλέχθη καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ σχήματος. καίτοι ἢ ἀναδίπλωσις πρὸς δεινότητος μάλλον δοκεῖ εὐρησθαι, ἢ δὲ καὶ τοῖς δεινοτάτοις καταχρητῆται ἐπιχαρίτως. χαριεντίζεται δὲ ποτε καὶ ἐξ ἀναφορᾶς, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑσπέρου, [104a] Ἑσπερε, πάντα φέρεις, φησί, φέρεις οἶνον, φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις ματέρι παῖδα. καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἢ χάρις ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως τῆς φέρεις ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀναφερομένης.

In one important detail of the present passage (see below), I take the English translation of RHYS ROBERTS to be more accurate than the more recent ones of GRUBE and INNES:

The graces that spring from the employment of figures are manifest, and abound most of all in Sappho. An instance in point is the figure "reduplication," as when the bride addressing her Maidenhood says: "Maidenhood, Maidenhood, whither away, Forsaking me?" And her Maidenhood makes reply to her in the same figure: – "Not again unto thee shall I come for aye, Not again unto thee!" The thought, thus presented, has more grace than if it had been expressed once only and without the figure. "Reduplication," it is true, seems to have been devised more particularly with a view to giving energy to style. But in Sappho's hands even the most passionate energy is transfigured with grace.

Sometimes also Sappho makes graceful use of the figure "anaphora," as in the lines on the Evening Star: – ["Vesper, thou bringest everything," he says, "thou bringest the wine, thou bringest the goat, thou bringest the child to its mother." ⁵] Here the charm lies in the repetition of the verb "thou bringest," which has the same reference throughout.

We shall consider the textual constitution and sense of the two wedding song fragments preserved in this passage, including in the discussion an attempt to ascertain Demetrius' definition of the rhetorical figures which he takes them to exemplify. The fragments will be treated in the order cited by Demetrius.

⁴ 104 (*v.infra*), 105 ἄκρωι – ἄκρον – ἀκροτάτοι, 108 ὦ, 111 ὑμήναον, 112 ἄραο, 114 (*v.infra*), 115 εἰκάσδω, 116 χάρει (cf. 117). Cf. *Carm.pop.* 3/849, 6/852, 23/869, 24/870, 25/871 *PMG*, Passow 2.3–4, 3.2–3, 9.1–4, etc.

⁵ A literal translation has been substituted for RHYS ROBERTS's rhymed verses (retaining the archaic forms of verb and pronoun so as to accord with the following text).

This is cited as an example of ἀναδίπλωσις. Demetrius does not use this term in the technical sense it later attains, “repetition of the end of a clause at the beginning of the following clause”⁶, but apparently in a general sense, single repetition (i. e., a doublet) of one or several words regardless of position in clause. So LSJ: “2. *repetition, duplication* ... esp. in Rhet.” with reference to “On Style” 66 and Alex. *Fig.* 2.2 (= III 29 S.: see below). RHYS ROBERTS suggested (p. 266) that the definition of ἀναδίπλωσις should be narrowed to “immediate repetition of the word”, which may be acceptable if a repetition with one or two words intervening is taken to be within the boundaries of “immediate”: so οὐκέτι ἤξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἤξω in the present passage as well as the examples of ἀναδίπλωσις in Demetrius 66 and 267, in both of which cases the figure is illustrated by repetition of a single word with one word intervening.

In the first verse, BLOMFIELD (p. 16) restores the Aeolic form of the participle and emends the hiatus:

Παρθενία, Παρθενία, ποῖ με λίποις' ἀ<π>οίχη;

Maidenhood, Maidenhood, where have you gone and left me?

This text is adopted by VOIGT, CAMPBELL, PAGE (p. 122), TREU (1979, p. 92), ALONI (p. 200), FERRARI (p. 122), and others. Radical emendation will be needed, however, to restore the answer of the Maidenhood to the bride, if the second verse had indeed the same metre⁷ as the first (which ought probably to have been the case: cf. Sapph. 140 V.):

†οὐκέτι ἤξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἤξω†

The same is true of the second verse of 104a (see below). Paleographic reasoning may be of limited use, if RHYS ROBERTS is correct in supposing that the corruptions are due to careless citation rather than mechanical scribal error (p. 237; cf. CHIRON p. cxxxviii). One might hypothesize that such carelessness could have been abetted by a wish for pedagogical clarity helpful to the intended reader, the student of rhetoric: see SCHENKEVELD (2000) for the theory that “On Style” is a handbook for students of declamation. On such a speculative assumption, more subtle Sapphic verse could simply have been altered into plain examples of verbal repetition, whether the culprit cited freely from memory, as Demetrius might have, or edited the text of an exemplar, as a hypothetical teacher or student of rhetoric making use of the text might have. KAPPELMACHER (p. 2) suggested the possibility that the text originated as notes taken by a student at a lecture, a theory which is not ruled out by DENNISTON (p. 9) and SCHENKEVELD (2000, p. 36, n. 20). Still, the mechanics of corruption cannot be ascertained in the present case.

For 114.2, I suggest the following:

οὐκέτι <π>ρὸς σέ <π>οτ' ἤξω <π>οθέν, οὐκέτ' ἤξω⁸.

⁶ “Wiederholung des Ausgangs eines Satzes oder Verses am Anfang des folgenden” (MATUSCHEK). So first Alex. *Fig.* III 20 S.

⁷ 3 cho + ba, as in 128 V., Alc. 455 V., and possibly inc.auct. 35 V. and some of the lines in Sapph. 103 V.

⁸ πρὸς σε and οὐκέτ' ἤξω BOWRA (1936, p. 451) in the version οὐκέτ' ἤξω πρὸς σε πάλιν, νῦν πάλιν οὐκέτ' ἤξω (he defends the metrical license). οὐκέτ' ἤξω already SEIDLER (p. [198]), in the version οὐκέτι, <Σαλφοῖ.> ποτί σ' ἤξω, ποτί σ' οὐκέτ' ἤξω. ποτ(ά) SHTZLER (col. 1002) in the versions οὐκέτι τ' ἤξω οὐκέτι τ' ἤξω <ποτ' ἀπαλλάγεισα> and ... <ποτά· χαίρε νύμφα>.

Not again <by any means> to you <at any time> shall I return <from anywhere>;
not again shall I return.

Apart from emending the three illicit hiatuses and restoring the metre, the three indefinite correlative adverbs put further emphasis on the impossibility of restoring virginity, and at the same time, being alliterated words of identical word class, constitute a literary device that is akin to verbal repetition as such (cf. Xenophon cited by Alexander Rhetor below). They answer to the bride's ποῖ, "where?", ποθέν being in fact an acknowledgement of this question, something which we lack in the transmitted text and in the previous emendations I have seen (see n. 8). As for literary parallels, cf. *Orac. ap. Stob.* 1.49.46 (about the body after the soul has departed): οὐκέτι πως βιώτοιο παλίνδρομον οἶδε κέλευθον, E. *Or.* 215 πόθεν ποτ' ἦλθον δεῦρο; πῶς δ' ἀφικόμην;

This ἀναδίπλωσις, somewhat indistinct as such, may possibly, as we hypothesized, have been clarified through simplification by Demetrius' own editing, although one might for a broader and more inclusive definition of the term note Alex. *Fig.* III 29 S., where the figure is exemplified by a passage in which a phrase is not repeated verbatim, but merely echoed by words with similar grammatical and phonetic attributes, referring to the same subject: ὠγκωμένωι ἐπὶ γένει, πεφουσημένωι δ' ἐπὶ πλούτωι, διατεθουμμένωι δὲ ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων (X. *Mem.* 1.2.25).

104a

Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρηις ὅσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ' Αὔωις,
†φέρεις οἶνον, φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις† μάτερι παῖδα

Vesper, you bring all that shining dawn has scattered,
†you bring the wine, you bring the goat, you bring† the child to its mother.

This is an example of ἀναφορά, according to Demetrius. Here, too, modern rhetorical terminology may be misleading: the term now means "repetition of the same word or phrase at the beginning of several successive clauses or verses"⁹. But for this sense Demetrius (61, 268) and later Greek rhetorical treatises and literary commentaries normally use ἐπαναφορά¹⁰. RHYS ROBERTS observes (p. 266) that ἀναφορά "is commonly used (as the examples in π.ἐρμ. show) of the repetition of a word, or words, in successive clauses", but there is nothing in the text of Demetrius that suggests that he includes in its sense a reference to the position of the word in the clause.

A few later Greek rhetoricians¹¹ seem to take ἀναφορά and ἐπαναφορά to be synonyms (explicitly so in Phoeb. *Fig.* 1.3), defining the figure as stated above. The Latin grammarians¹²

⁹ "Wiederholung desselben Wortes bzw. einer Wortgruppe am Anfang mehrerer aufeinanderfolgender Sätze, Satzteile, Strophen oder Verse" (BLASBERG).

¹⁰ Dem. *Eloc.* 61, 268, Longin. 20.2, 20.3, Alex. *Fig.* III 20, 29 S., Hermog. *Id.* 1.10, 1.12, 2.1, Tib. *Fig.* 23, 29, Syr. in Hermog. I 51, 54, 55, 65 R., Zon. *Fig.* III 161, 164, 166 S., Phoeb. *Fig.* 1.1.75, 1.3.10, 2.4.50, Anon. *Fig.* III 131, 140, 152, 174, 181, 182, 183 S., Ps.-Plu. *Vit.Hom.* 2, ΣΣ II. 2.382b, 4.406a, Σ E. *Hec.* 146, Σ S. *Aj.* 7d, ΣΣ (Ulpian.?) D. 8.27, 8.30, 8.79, 9.65, 18.96a, 18.96b, 18.286, 18.290, 19.40a, 19.530, 21.116, 21.224b, etc.

¹¹ Alex. *Fig.* III 30 S. (2nd century), Tib. *Fig.* 30 (3rd to 4th century), Phoeb. *Fig.* 1.3, 2.4 (5th to 6th century?); cf. Anon. in Hermog. VII 1040 W.

¹² Char.gramm. I 281 K., Don.gramm. IV 398 K., Pomp.gramm. V 302 K., Sacerd.gramm. VI 458 K. Donatus elsewhere (*ad Ter. Eun.* 193) uses *epanaphora*, as do earlier Latin authors: Fronto

follow this line (although see on Diomedes below), after which the sense of the term is more or less unambiguous in Western rhetorical tradition. However, I believe that there may be something to say for RUSSELL's claim (on Longin. 20.1) that "strictly, anaphora is the generic term and epanaphora should be confined to the repetition of a word at the beginnings of cola", at least in Demetrius, whose "On style" is likely to be the earliest¹³ preserved rhetorical text that uses these terms. Just as in the case of ἀναδίπλωσις, which assumes a narrower sense in later rhetorical literature, it seems likely that the technical sense of ἀναφορά that pertains to the position of the repeated words in their clauses is also of a later date, being a case of sense assimilation to the much more common term ἐπαναφορά. A stage in the process might be observed in the Latin grammarian Diomedes (fourth century), who, while defining *anaphora* as *relatio eiusdem verbi aut similis per principia versuum plurimorum*, gives as one of his examples "Aeneid" 12.57–59¹⁴:

*spes tu nunc una, senectae
tu requies miserae, decus imperiumque Latini
te penes, in te omnis domus inclinata recumbit.*

Whereas the words *tu* and *te* here occur four times, only two instances stand at the beginning of verses, which accordingly by no stretch of the term may be called *plurimi*. In the light of this discrepancy, it seems possible that the source of Diomedes (on which see KEIL vol. 1 pp. 1–liv) wrote something like *per versus plurimos* rather than *per principia versuum plurimorum*. Two Latin glossaries may also be cited for a different, and more general, although eccentric definition of *anaphora*: "repetition of word in the same verse"¹⁵. For the possible relevance of this, see n. 12.

In Greek rhetorical treatises and scholia, while ἐπαναφορά occurs hundreds of times (see n. 10 for a selection), ἀναφορά is hardly used at all in either of the senses discussed here, but only occurs, as far as I can tell, twice in Demetrius (141, 268¹⁶), once in Longinus (20.1), and five times in the examples cited here in n. 11. This ratio seems highly abnormal for words that are supposed to be synonyms, especially when the less common term is also the simpler one. It makes one suspect that the narrower definition of ἀναφορά may either stem from a misunderstanding of information similar to that found in Demetrius, or,

ad Ant. 3.1.1 (p. 97 H.–H.), *Aquila* 20 (p. 29 HALM). Later, though, *epanaphora* is understood in the Latin tradition as "repetition of words in the same verse", Isidorus (1.36.9) exemplifying with Verg. *Aen.* 7.759 *te nemus Anguitiae, vitrea te Focinus unda, I te liquidi flevere lacus*. But this is the sense of *anaphora* according to other Latin glossaries (see text for n. 15), which could indicate that the senses of the two terms have been interchanged in Latin usage, and that *anaphora* originally covered instances like "Aeneid" 12.57–59 (see text for n. 14).

¹³ The date of Demetrius has been much debated. Some features of his language could suggest influence from Atticism, although of a rather non-systematic and irregular kind. His aesthetical and rhetorical doctrine and the authors he endorse, on the other hand, have made some scholars support as early a date as the third century B.C. (GRUBE pp. 39–56), even if the medieval attribution to Demetrius of Phaleron is rejected. In later years, a cautious consensus of guesses has formed around a date in the early to mid-first century B.C.: so RUSSELL 1972 (p. 172), CHIRON (pp. xv–xl, suggesting, after HAMMER, an identity with Demetrius of Syria, *RE* IV 2 2844–45 no. 98), KENNEDY pp. 88–89, DÜHRSEN (suggesting Demetrius of Magnesia, *RE* IV 2 2814–17 no. 80), DIHLE. (For other possible candidates with this name, cf. *RE* IV 2 2841–44 nos. 87, 96, 97.)

¹⁴ *Diom.gramm.* 1 445 K.

¹⁵ *Gloss.Bern.* III 488 L.–G. *repetitio verbi in eodem versu*; *Gloss.Vat.* III 508 L.–G. *relatio vel repetitio verbi eiusdem versi*.

¹⁶ Also, in a different sense ("ascent"), in 72.

in the earliest instances, even be cases of corruption. The single examples of ἀναφορά in Alexander and Tiberius, who use ἐπαναφορά seven and five times¹⁷ respectively, both appear in the vicinity of one or several words beginning with ἀν-.

ἀναφορά is normally used in an entirely different sense in Greek rhetorical theory, “reference”¹⁸. In (pseudo-?)Hermogenes, “On the method of force”¹⁹, this use is elevated to the status of figure, “reference to authority”, recommended beside βεβαίωσις, “corroboration”, as a means to strengthen a proposition. If Longinus 20.1–3 understands ἀναφορά and ἐπαναφορά to be exact synonyms or the former in a more general sense cannot be ascertained from the context, where the terms are semantically neutralized²⁰. For Demetrius, the sense has to be decided from the text itself rather than interpolated from *De figuris*-treatises likely to be several centuries younger.

The last sentence of 141 is relevant for the understanding of Demetrius’ use of the term, and it is here I believe that the later translations are mistaken. INNES in the current Loeb edition of Demetrius modifies RHYS ROBERTS’s translation to: “Here the charm lies in the repetition *in the same position* of the phrase ‘you bring’” (italics added). She accordingly, unlike RHYS ROBERTS, takes ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ to refer to the position of the repeated phrase within the clauses²¹. This appears to be mistaken in the light of Demetrius 61, where we find a similar expression (with reference to *Il.* 2.671–73): ἐπαναφορὰ τῆς λέξεως ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα τὸν Νιρῆα. In this passage, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ does not refer to the position of Νιρῆός in the clause but to the name itself, being identical (τὸ αὐτὸ) in all three verses. Accordingly the noun ἐπαναφορὰ attains together with the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ the required sense “repetition”. Similarly in our passage in 141, the cognate verb ἀναφέρομαι does not by itself mean “be repeated”²², but attains this sense in conjunction with ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ: on analogy with ἐπαναφορὰ τῆς λέξεως ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα meaning “the utterance’s repetition with regard to the name”, the proper expression for “be repeated” in the Greek of Demetrius is (λέξιν) ἀναφέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (sc. ῥῆμα, ὄνομα): lit. “(the utterance) be referred back to the same (sc. word)”. In neither case can ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ refer to an identity of the position of the word in the clause, as it refers in both to the identity of the repeated word itself²³. For a reference to the position of the phrase, Demetrius in 268 instead uses τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν ἐπαναφέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχήν, lit. “the same utterance be referred back to the same beginning”, where he explicitly mentions the word position (τὴν ... ἀρχήν), and separately expresses the

¹⁷ ἀναφορά: Alex. *Fig.* III 30 S., Tib. *Fig.* 30; ἐπαναφορὰ: Alex. *Fig.* III S. p. 20 x2, p. 29 x5, Tib. *Fig.* 23, 29 x4.

¹⁸ Theon *Prog.* II 121 S., Longin. *Excerpta* 22, Minuc. p. 348 H., Ulp. p. 6 D., Nicol. *Prog.* pp. 19, 25 F., ΣΣ (Syrian., Sopat.Rh., Marcellin.) Hermog. *Stat.* IV 125, 486, 713 W., Anon. *in Rh.* p. 167 R., Anon. *in Hermog.* VII 405, 752, 763 W., Anon. (Marcellin.?) *in Hermog.* p. 290 R., Anon. *Prol.* pp. 73, 79, 166 R., Anon. *Fig.* III 120 S., Anon. III 728, 729 S., VIII 691 W.

¹⁹ Hermog. *Meth.* 28.

²⁰ On semantic neutralization of near-synonyms, see APRESJAN pp. 38–42.

²¹ So also GRUBE, “the repetition ... in the same place in succeeding clauses”, INNES 1972: “... at the beginning of successive clauses”, CHIRON: “... à la même place”, whereas ORTH translates (more correctly) “das sich auf dieselbe Person zurückbezieht”.

²² LSJ s. v. ἀναφέρω II 11 give one single alleged instance, Pl. *Ti.* 26a, of the active form of the verb meaning “repeat”; this should not have a paragraph of its own but be sorted under II 2 (cf. also II 6 c), “report”.

²³ While the text of Demetrius is indeed severely corrupt in places, there is no need to assume, with SOLMSEN p. 259, n. 2, corruption in these particular expressions (pace SCHENKEVELD 1964, p. 161).

identity both of this and of the repeated word (if the passage is sound; the second αὐτὴν has been suspected by DENNISTON p. 10).

268 has been understood by some as if Demetrius considers ἀναφορά and ἐπαναφορά to be synonymous²⁴. I believe this too is a mistaken interpretation, which can only be read into the text if we adopt VICTORIUS' emendation ἐστίν, ὡς for the ms. reading ἴσως in the following:

καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀναφορᾶς καλουμένης [sc. ἐστὶ δεινότερον ποιεῖν τὸν λόγον], ὡς τὸ ἐπὶ σαυτὸν καλεῖς, <ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους καλεῖς,> ἐπὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καλεῖς²⁵. τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τὸ εἰρημένον τοῦτο τριπλοῦν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπαναφορὰ ἴσως εἴρηται ἄντὶ τὸ τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν ἐπαναφέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἀσύνδετον (δίχα γὰρ συνδέσμων λέλεκται), καὶ ὁμοιοτέλευτον.

Also through the so-called ἀναφορά [sc. it is possible to make the speech more intense], as in “against yourself you summon; <against the laws you summon;> against democracy you summon”. This figure which has been uttered is threefold: for it is also ἐπαναφορὰ ἣ has perhaps been said ἣ due to the same phrase being repeated at the same beginning; ἀσύνδετον (for it has been uttered without connective particles); and ὁμοιοτέλευτον.

The passage is corrupt, but I believe that SCHNEIDER's (p. 180) analysis and emendation, adopted by RADERMACHER and in the translation of ORTH, is more likely to be correct than that of VICTORIUS. SCHNEIDER took ἴσως εἴρηται to be an interpolation from a note in the margin, which gains probability from the common use of this exact phrase by grammarians suggesting etymologies²⁶. A commentator may have intended to mark Demetrius' mention of the verb ἐπαναφέρεσθαι precisely as such, an etymology for the noun ἐπαναφορά. Less likely is that Demetrius himself intended to explain the word etymologically, in which case he might have written <ὁ> ἴσως εἴρηται, “which has perhaps been named”, but then we would expect ἀπὸ τοῦ or παρὰ τὸ, not διὰ τὸ (cf. refs. n. 26). As for VICTORIUS' emendation, the copula (ἐστίν) is left out in the previous sentence and unnecessary here, and “it is ἐπαναφορὰ, as has been said” is a careless phrase to use when Demetrius has not said this, but ἀναφορᾶς, just two lines before. If it is adopted we should also emend ἀναφορᾶς to ἐπαναφορᾶς. But as ERNESTI suggests (p. 21), Demetrius seems rather to intend the subsequently mentioned figures to be a precision of the general ἀναφορὰ, taking at least ἐπαναφορὰ and ὁμοιοτέλευτον to be different variants of the former.

To return to Sappho, the first verse of 104a²⁷, a line of hexameter, only half of which is cited by Demetrius, but which is preserved more or less intact in other sources²⁸, is given above as it reads in VOIGT. She retains the finite verb given by Demetrius, perhaps with good reason²⁹, even if all other sources read φέρων. The second verse, with which we are concerned here, is found only in Demetrius and in *Et.Gen.* s. v. ἔσπερος (p. 129 MILLER, p. 27 CALAME), in both cases severely corrupt, if we take it to have been origi-

²⁴ SCHENKEVELD (1964) p. 123.

²⁵ Aeschin. *Ctes.* 202.

²⁶ E. g., Σ II. 2.108, Σ E. *Or.* 168, Σ Luc. *JTr.* 21.15, Phot. δ 786, *Et.Gud.* s. v. μανλῖς, *EM* 605, *Eust. Od.* II 159.23 ST.

²⁷ We shall not be concerned here with 104b, a prose paraphrase in *Him. Or.* 46.8: ἀστὴρ οἶμα σύ τις ἐσπέριος, ἀστέρων πάντων ὁ κάλλιτος· Σαπφούς τοῦτο δὴ τὸ ἐς Ἐσπερον ἄισμα.

²⁸ Σ E. *Or.* 1260 and several places in the Greek *Etymologika*: see VOIGT's apparatus.

²⁹ As suggested by one of the journal's Readers, φέρων may have been introduced from the same word occurring a short while before the citation in *Et.Gen.* and *EM*. This does not occur in the other witnesses, but they all seem to depend on the same source, where the corruption would have originated: that is a work by Seleucus, explicitly cited in *Et.Gen.*, *EM*, and *Et.Gud.*

nally a hexameter, which seems likely (PAGE p. 121, FERRARI p. 121, n. 14). The latter source reads in CALAME:

ἔσπερος· (...) εἴτε ὁ καιρὸς εἴτε ὁ ἀστήρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσω περᾶν τὰ ζῶια ποιεῖν καὶ παυσόμενα ἢ ὁ πέρασ τῆς ἐώας φέρων. Σαπφῶ δὲ ἐτυμολογεῖ οἶον **Ἔσπερε πάντα φέρων ὅσα φαινόλις ἐσκέδασ' Ἀῶως, †φέρεις οἶον† φέρεις †οἶνον, φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις †ἄποιον μητέρι παῖδα.** τὸ γὰρ ἐναντίον ἕως καλεῖται, παρὰ τὸ ἐάν πάντα καὶ ἀπολύειν.

This partly difficult and textually uncertain passage might translate into something like:

ἔσπερος. Whether the time or the star, it comes from its making the animals ἔσω περᾶν [“move inwards”] and rest, or from its holding a πέρασ τῆς ἐώας [“opposite³⁰ of the East”?]. Sappho etymologizes it as “Vesper, bringing all that shining Dawn has scattered”, †φέρεις as† “you bring †wine, you bring goat, you bring the mother the child †without characteristics†”. For ἕως [“dawn”] is named according to the opposite, from ἐάν [“letting go”] everything and releasing it.

οἶνον, “wine”, occurring in both sources, is generally emended to οἶν or οἶν, “sheep”: see below for a palaeographic argument and a note on the word form. For the impossible ἄποιον, “without characteristics”, BERGK suggested (p. 122) ἄπτu, which has been adopted by WILAMOWITZ (p. 72, printing ἀπὸ), DIEHL (p. 378, fr. 120), VOIGT, and most other editors and critics³¹ after BERGK. Their understanding of this reading differs, however, as we shall see below.

Following BERGK, and with the Aeolic word forms restored, the latter half of the verse will read:

φέρεις ἄπτu μάτερι παῖδα.

As to the sense, scholars who accept this reading are not in agreement. Many refer to verses by Catullus (62.20–23), which have often been taken to be an imitation of, or at any rate inspired by, Sappho:

*Hesperie, qui caelo fertur crudelior ignis?
Qui natam possis complexu avellere matris,
complexu matris retinentem avellere natam,
et iuveni ardenti castam donare puellam.*

Vesper, what flame more cruel is carried in the sky?
You, who can tear the offspring away from her mother's embrace,
tear the offspring holding on away from her mother's embrace,
and give the chaste girl to the passionate youth.

In the light of this parallel, some take the phrase under discussion to mean “you steal the child away from its mother”. So POSITANO (1945, p. 136), TREU (1979, p. 89), ALONI (p. 185), FERRARI (p. 120), and perhaps WILAMOWITZ, who does not translate the Greek but claims (p. 72) that it is “the original” of Catullus' version. This was also what BERGK intended, to judge from *eripis*, the partial translation he supplied, meaning “you snatch

³⁰ The etymologist (Seleucus? Cf. prev. n.) seems to take πέρασ ≈ πέρατα, “opposite (coast)”, a sense not recorded in LSJ.

³¹ In what must be put down as a misprint (at least I cannot understand the rationale behind it), LOBEL (p. 46) and LOBEL–PAGE (p. 86) print BERGK's ἄπτu in the text but obelized, i. e., marked as possibly corrupt; so also BOWRA (1935, p. 240; 1936, p. 449; 1961, p. 219). PAGE (p. 121) prints the reading of *Et. Gen.*, partly obelized, making no mention of BERGK's conjecture.

away". The translations of BOWRA (1936, p. 224; 1961, p. 219), COLONNA (p. 150), REINACH–PUECH (p. 285), and CAMPBELL (p. 131), however, are all versions of "you bring back the child to its mother" (so also PAGE p. 121, but he does not adopt BERGK's ἄπτu).

Verbs meaning "take away from" occasionally take the dative, labelled *incommodi* by SMYTH, and "proper" ("eigentliche", "sog. echte") by KÜHNER–GERTH and SCHWYZER–DEBRUNNER³²: e. g., Od. 1.9 αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ, E. *Andr.* 841 τί μοι ξίφος ἐκ χειρὸς ἠγροεύσω; The problem, however, is that the verb ἀποφέρω also means "bring back" (LSJ s. v. II), and that this sense seems likely to take precedence when the verb is construed with the dative (as in, e. g., E. *Ph.* 1161–62 οὐδ' ἀποίεται βίον ... μητρὶ).

While most editions and translations appearing after BERGK have accepted his emendation, understanding it in opposite senses, few have commented on the syntactical difficulty. Those who accept BERGK's understanding of the verb argue that the meaning is attractive, and that Catullus' version favours it, but most fail to explain (away) the sense "bring back" of the verb³³. But POTISANO has made an attempt (1945, p. 189). As her book is long out of print and appears to be relatively rare even in major research libraries (at least in the present online catalogues), I translate her central argument here, even if I do not consider it to be decisive, and the syntactical justification vague at best.

Decisively in favour of [the sense "bring away"] would be the word ἄπτu, used in combination with the elevated force of the anastrophe, had this reading been secure. In fact, if ἀποφέρεις had meant *return* and not *take away*, it is impossible to understand why S. would have used this compound, and not instead repeated again the simple φέρεις. In my opinion, it is instead precisely the tmesis that renders the first interpretation impossible: S. intentionally repeats φέρεις but adds suddenly afterwards ἄπτu: just as the animals, so Vesper returns also the girl, but to a faraway place, to another house and no longer that of the mother. [Catull. 62.20–23 is cited.]

Anastrophe in this context is not the rhetorical figure of verbal repetition³⁴ but means that the verb in tmesis precedes its prepositional affix, which is accentuated on the first syllable³⁵. It may be significant, and even speak in favour of BERGK's emendation, that in Homer this repeatedly occurs with ἄπτο in a formula³⁶ exhibiting what is probably³⁷ an Aeolic word, βρότος, "gore" or "spilled blood":

(νίξειν, λούειν) ἄπτο βρότον αἱματόεντα.

(Wash) away the bloody gore.

POSITANO further suggests that μάτερι is *dativus incommodi*, adding some misgivings about the certainty of this interpretation and of BERGK's emendation. In a later edition of her commentary (1967, pp. 161–62), she removes her misgivings and adduces Sapph. fr. 71.7 GALLAVOTTI = 81.7 V. as a parallel for the dative: ἀστεφανώτοισι δ' ἀπυστρέφονται.

One more syntactical defence has been forthcoming, from PISANI (p. 80), who basically follows POSITANO with some modification³⁸: ἄπτu is said to be an adverb, and the

³² KÜHNER–GERTH I 406, cf. 329; SCHWYZER–DEBRUNNER p. 146, SMYTH § 1481.

³³ Cf. TREU (1979) p. 225, TREU (1964) p. 294, ALONI pp. 184–85, FERRARI p. 120.

³⁴ The rhetorical figure ἀναστροφὴ is the same as ἀναδίπλωσις in its later technical sense; for which see n. 6.

³⁵ SCHWYZER–DEBRUNNER pp. 425–26, HEWSON.

³⁶ *Il.* 7.425, 14.7, 18.345, 23.41.

³⁷ FRISK I 271; CHANTRAINE I 198.

³⁸ I file a protest here to the otherwise useful bibliographic review of GERBER. Whereas PISANI may have other interesting things to say about the poem, regarding the syntactical difficulty he

dative is “sympatheticus”, for which he refers to SCHWYZER–DEBRUNNER pp. 147–48. But SCHWYZER–DEBRUNNER’s examples on p. 146 of the “so-called proper” dative with verbs meaning “take away” (see above, text for n. 32) seem more relevant. As for an adverbial force of ἄπυ, this need not speak for the sense advocated by POSITANO *et al.*: ἄπυ may well be an adverb even if the verb means “give back”. The sense “(away) from” in that case relates to the verb’s subject instead of indirect object. So in one of the Homeric examples adduced above (*Il.* 23.41): εἰ πεπιθοῖεν | Πηλεΐδην λούσασθαι ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα, “if we may persuade Peleus’ son to wash away *from himself* the bloody gore”; cf. *Il.* 1.98 πρὶν γ’ ἄπο πατρὶ φίλω δόμενα ἐλικώπιδα κούρηγ, “before giving away³⁹ to the father the bright-eyed girl”.

Despite the attempts at a defence, then, the main problem remains, viz. that the sense “return” should take precedence with the dative, despite the tmesis and anastrophe, which do not favour a particular sense. A parallel would be preferable to abstract grammar paragraphs, but no certain parallel for the dative with ἀποφέρω in the sense “take away” may be found. There is an uncertain one, though. WILSON adopts in the OCT of Aristophanes, “Acharnians” 582 the variant μοι offered by secondary hands in two fourteenth-century mss., where the major tradition and most editors read ἀπένεγκέ μου τὴν μορμόνα. “The dative of the person affected, though not well attested, is idiomatic”, is WILSON’s single comment (*Aristophanea*, p. 28); *sat sapienti*, I suppose. We may assume that *difficilior lectio* is the reason for the editorial choice, and find proper references for the dative here above, text for n. 32. If the reading of E², Γ², and WILSON is correct, then, this would constitute a parallel.

Even so, the sense of the second half of the verse with BERGK’s emendation is ambiguous at best. I would like to add that the transition from the bringing home of the cattle to the bringing away of the girl is not as literary attractive as its defenders claim: it is too abrupt, too little contextualized, really to effect much more than confusion (unlike the version of Catullus). POSITANO argued that the lack of an adversative particle is one of the things that speak against her preferred understanding. STITZLER (col. 1002) suggested that <δ’> should be added before ἄπυ, introducing a note of contrast, but this is not much improvement, at least in the absence of a context that will spell out this contrast in a satisfying manner.

We should remember, though, that we are dealing with a fragment and not a complete poem. Catullus uses two verses to describe the removal of the girl from her mother, in which he employs ἀναφορά in the broadest sense – at least I know of no other rhetorical term that would cover a verbal repetition such as *qui natam possis complexu avellere matris, / complexu*

does little more than repeat, without a word of credit, the argument and even Italian translation of POSITANO 1945 (p. 189): “A favore di essa sarebbe decisiva la parola ἄπυ, messa in forte rilievo dall’anastrofe, se fosse sicura. Infatti, se ἀποφέρεις significasse *qui riconduci* e non *porti via*, non si intenderebbe perchè S. avrebbe usato questo composto, per di più con la tmesis, e non avrebbe ripetuto ancora il semplice φέρεις. [...] Si è pensato a un *dativus incommodi*, ma la spiegazione è stiracchiata, non convince”. PISANI (p. 80): “Eher wird man sich dagegen sträuben, in φέρεις ἄπυ eine „Anastrophe“ zu sehen. Warum sollte dieses Kompositum nur für das Mädchen gebraucht sein, während sich die Dichterin bei πάντα, ὄν und ἀγα mit dem Simplex begnügte, obgleich doch die Bedeutung immer dieselbe war? [...] Dann ist μάρτυρ ein Dativus „sympatheticus“, vgl. SCHWYZER II, 147 f. und die Wendungen *bringst der Mutter das Kind weg* oder *it. porti via la figlia alla madre*.” Yet according to GERBER (p. 134), PISANI may well be right regarding the dative and ἄπυ, whereas POSITANO’s book is “almost entirely useless” (p. 51). (Neither GERBER nor the current online version of *l’Année philologique* has taken note of POSITANO 1967, which contains a translation of the testimonies in GALLAVOTTI in addition to a revised edition of the 1945 fragment translations and commentary.)

³⁹ ἄπο in these verbs answer to English *off* in “wash off”, “pay off”, stressing the removal of something from the verb’s subject (dirt, debt). The sense “back” is secondary.

matris retinentem avellere natam. There is then the possibility, perhaps even likelihood (cf. PAGE p. 121, n. 1, more pessimistic), that a subsequent, lost line of our poem would have featured a repeated mention of the mother, including a clarification of the situation, e. g.:

τῆλέ γε παῖδα φέρῃς ἀπὸ μάτερος, ὄλιος ἄστηρ.

Far away you bring the child from her mother, baneful star.

A verse with the gist of this would resolve the ambiguity. This is speculative verse composition of course, but for the repetitive “figure”, which consists in using ἀπό twice with the same verb, first as an adverb or verb affix in tmesis in combination with a dative, then as preposition with the genitive, cf. Il. 10.186–87:

ἀπό τέ σφισιν ὕπνος ὄλωλεν·
ὡς τῶν νήδυμος ὕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάρουιν ὄλώλει.

Sleep is undone for them:
thus sweet sleep was undone from their eyelids.

For τῆλε ... φέρῃς ἀπὸ μάτερος, cf. Poseidon’s abduction of Mestra in Hes. fr. 43a.56 M.–W. (fr. 69.80 Most): τῆλ’ ἀπὸ πατρὸς εἰοῖο φέρων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον. For ὄλιος (hypothetical Aeolic form) ἄστηρ⁴⁰, cf. Catullus’ *crudelior ignis* and Il. 11.62 οὐλιος ἄστηρ, perhaps of the Dog Star, although Aristonicus for the latter passage records the variant αὐλιος, which he understands to refer to the Evening Star: ἐσπέριος, πρὸς ὃν ἀνύλιζεται τὰ ζῶια (cf. *Et.Gen.* s. v. ἔσπερος cited above; A.R. 4.1630, Call. fr. 177.6 Pf., HENTZE pp. 78–79).

We shall take a brief look also at the first half of 104a.2. VOIGT’s critical apparatus cites one attempt to restore the full hexameter, by BOWRA (1935, p. 240), who may also have been the first to restore the proper Aeolic verb forms:

αἶγα φέρῃς <καὶ> οἶν <τύ>, φέρῃς <τ’> ἄπυ μάτερι παῖδα.

VOIGT remarks that this destroys the anaphora, but this may be incorrect, if Demetrius as we argued by this term understands repetition of words in general or possibly in subsequent clauses, but regardless of their position in their respective clause. (Catullus’ version could also indicate that the verbal repetition found in Sappho’s poem was of an asymmetric nature.) There are some reasons, however, why KOECHLY’s restoration (p. 198) of the first half of the verse may be more attractive than BOWRA’s:

{φέρεις} οἶν σὺ φέρῃς <τε καὶ> αἶγα.

The choice of the Aeolic rather than Doric form of the pronoun (corrected also in BOWRA 1936, p. 224) may carry a palaeographic rationale as a cursive or minuscule οἶνου could be misread as οἶνον. The loss of τε καὶ could have led to the addition of φέρεις at the beginning of the line. Hence KOECHLY’s version, while necessarily stipulating a number of corruptions, contains only one major lacuna and no changes of word order. τε καὶ and the transmitted order of sheep and goat are also found in an extant epic formula:

Od. 9.167 καπνόν τ’ αὐτῶν τε φθογγὴν οἶων τε καὶ αἰγῶν
Od. 9.184 μῆλ’, οἶες τε καὶ αἶγες, ἰαύεσχον
Od. 14.519 ἐν δ’ οἶων τε καὶ αἰγῶν δέρματ’ ἔβαλλεν
Hes. fr. 17a.8 M.–W. = 13.8 Most] ἐκόμισσε πατήρ, οἶων τε καὶ αἰγῶν
Or.Sib. 3.239 οὐδ’ ἀγέλας ἐλάουσι βοῶν οἶων τε καὶ αἰγῶν

⁴⁰ Nom. for voc. with predicative nuance: COOPER–KRÜGER III 1942.

However, it should be mentioned that Bowra's version has a single Homeric precedent as well: *Il.* 11.245 αἶγας ὀμοῦ καὶ οἴς, τὰ οἱ ἄσπετα ποιμαίνοντο. As for οἴν, neither the contracted nor the uncontracted form is attested in Aeolic, although cf. Alc. 306A i.5 V. = SLG S 279.5 = POxy. 2506 fr. 115.5 ΓΑΡΟΙΣΠΙΟΗ. Theocritus 5.99, in Doric dialect, has οἴν.

Cited works

- ALONI, A. (ed.), *Saffo: Frammenti*. Florence 1997.
- APRESIAN, J., *Systematic Lexicography*. Oxford 2000.
- BERGK, T. (ed.), *Poetae lyrici Graeci*, III/III, *Poetas melicos continens*. Ed. 4, Leipzig 1872.
- BLASBERG, C., "Anapher". In: G. Uding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch des Rhetorik*, I/X, *A-Bib*, Tübingen 1992, col. 542–45.
- BLOMFIELD, C. J. (ed.), "Sapphonis fragmenta". *Museum Criticum; or, Cambridge Classical Researches* 1 (1814, rep. 1826), pp. 1–31.
- BOWRA, C. M., "Zu Alkaios und Sappho". *Hermes* 70 (1935), pp. 238–41.
– *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*. Oxford 1936.
– *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*. Ed. 2, Oxford 1961.
- CALAME, C. (ed.), *Etymologicum Genuinum: Les citations de poètes lyriques*. Rome 1970.
- CAMPBELL, D. A. (ed., transl.), *Greek Lyric*, I/V, *Sappho, Alcaeus*. Ed. corr., Cambridge MA 1990 (Loeb Classical Library).
- CHANTRAINE, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. [I–II,] Paris 1968–80.
- CHIRON, P. (ed.), *Démétrios: Du Style*. Paris 1993.
- COLONNA, A. (ed.), *L'antica lirica greca*. Turin 1955. [Not seen.]
- CONTIADES-TSITSONI, Eleni, *Hymenaios und Epithalamion: Das Hochzeitslied in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*. Stuttgart 1990.
- COOPER, G. L. & K. W. KRÜGER, *Greek Syntax: Early Greek Poetic and Herodotean Syntax*. III–IV/IV, Ann Arbor 2004 (vols. I–II with the title *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*).
- D.] M. R. Dilts (ed.), *Scholia Demosthenica*. I/II, Leipzig 1983.
- DENNISTON, J. D., "Notes on Demetrius, *De Elocutione*". *CQ* 23 (1929), pp. 7–10.
- DIEHL, E. (ed.), *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, I/II, *Poetae elegiaci, Theognis, Carmen aureum, Phocylidea, iamborum scriptores, poetae melici: monodia*. Leipzig 1925.
- DIHLE, A., "Zur Datierung der Schrift des Demetrios „Über den Stil“". *RhM* 150 (2007), pp. 298–313.
- DÜHRSEN, N. C., "Wer war der Verfasser des rhetorischen Lehrbuchs „Über den Stil“ (Περὶ ἐπιμνησίας)?" *RhM* 148 (2005), pp. 242–71.
- ERNESTI, I.[J.] C. T.[G.], *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae*. Leipzig 1795.
- F.] J. Felten (ed.), *Nicolai progymnasmata*. Leipzig 1913 (Rhetores Graeci, 11).
- FERRARI, F., *Sappho's Gift: the Poet and her Community*. Ann Arbor 2010 (transl. of *Una mitra per Kleis: Saffo e il suo pubblico*, Pisa 2007).
- FRISK, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I–III, Heidelberg 1960–72.
- GALLAVOTTI, C. (ed.), *Saffo e Alceo: Testimonianze e frammenti*. I/II, ed. 3, Naples 1962 (Collana di studi greci, 10).
- GERBER, D. E., "Greek lyric poetry since 1920. Part I: General, Lesbian poets". *Lustrum* 35 (1993), pp. 7–179.
- GRUBE, G. M. A., *A Greek Critic: Demetrius, On Style*. Toronto 1961 (Phoenix: Supplementary volume 4).

- H.] C. Hammer (ed., post L. Spengel), *Rhetores Graeci*. 1, fasc. 2, Leipzig 1894.
- HALM, C. (ed.), *Rhetores Latini minores*. Leipzig 1863.
- HAMMER C., *Demetrius Peri Hermēneias: ein literarisch-historischer Versuch*. Landshut 1883 (Programm der Kgl. Bayer. Studien-Anstalt Landshut, [1882]/83). [Not seen.]
- HENTZE, C., *Anhang zu Homers Ilias: Schulausgabe von K. Ameis*. IV/VIII, *Erläuterungen zu Gesang X–XII*. Leipzig 1878.
- HEWSON, J., “Tmesis and anastrophe: the beginnings of configuration in Indo-European languages”. In: J. Elmegård Rasmussen & T. Olander (eds.), *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European: Section Papers from the XVI International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, 11th–15th August, 2003*, Copenhagen 2009 (Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European, 3), pp. 85–92.
- H.–H.] E. Hauler & M. P. J. van den Hout (eds.), *M. Cornelii Frontonis epistulae*. Ed. 2, Leipzig 1988.
- INNES, Doreen C. (transl.), “Demetrius *On Style*”. In: D. A. Russell & M. Winterbottom (eds.), *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations*, Oxford 1972, pp. 173–215.
- INNES, Doreen C. and W. Rhys Roberts (ed., transl.), “Demetrius: *On Style*”. In: *Aristotle, Poetics: Edited and Translated by Stephen Halliwell: Longinus, On the Sublime: Translation by W.H. Fyfe revised by Donald Russell: Demetrius, On Style: Edited and Translated by Doreen C. Innes based on W. Rhys Roberts*, Cambridge MA 1995 (Loeb Classical Library), pp. 344–525.
- K. = KEIL.
- KAPPELMACHER, A., *Bemerkungen und Übersetzungsprobe zu Pseudo-Demetrius περὶ ἐρμηνείας*. Nikolsburg 1903 (Jahresbericht des K.K. Staatsgymnasiums in Nikolsburg, 30).
- KEIL, H. (ed.), *Grammatici Latini*. I–VII, Leipzig 1857–80.
- KENNEDY, G. A., *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton 1994.
- KOECHLY, H., “Ueber Sappho, mit Rücksicht auf die gesellschaftliche Stellung der Frauen bei den Griechen”. In: *Akademische Vorträge und Reden*, Zürich 1859, pp. 153–217.
- KÜHNER, R. & B. GERTH, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, T. 2, *Satzlehre*. I–II, Hannover 1898–1904.
- LESKY, A., *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Ed. 3, Bern 1971.
- L.–G.] G. Loewe & G. Goetz (eds.), *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*. I–VII, Leipzig 1888–1903.
- LOBEL, E. (ed.), *Σάπφους μέλη: The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Sappho*. Oxford 1925.
- LOBEL, E. & D. L. PAGE (eds.), *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*. Oxford 1955.
- LSJ] H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart-Jones, a.o., *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., with a revised supplement, Oxford 1996.
- MATUSCHEK, M., “Anadiplose”. In: G. Uding (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch des Rhetorik*, 1/x, *A–Bib*, Tübingen 1992, col. 471–72.
- MILLER, E.-C.-B. (ed.), “Etymologicum Magnum de Florence”. In: *Mélanges de littérature grecque: contenant un grand nombre de textes inédits*, Paris 1868, pp. 11–318.
- MOST, G. W. (ed., transl.), *Hesiod: The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Cambridge MA 2007 (Loeb Classical Library).
- M.–W.] R. Merkelbach & M. L. West (eds.), *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford 1967.
- ORTH, E. (transl.), *Demetrios: Vom Stil*. Saarbrücken 1923.
- PAGE, D. L., *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford 1955.

- PASSOW, A. (ed.), Τραγούδια Ῥωμαϊκά = *Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris*. Leipzig 1860.
- PERNIGIOTTI, C., “Tempi del canto e pluralità di prospettive in Saffo, fr. 44 V.”. *ZPE* 135 (2001), pp. 11–20.
- PF.] R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus*. I–II, Oxford 1949–53.
- PMG] D. L. Page (ed.), *Poetae melici Graeci*. Oxford 1962.
- POSITANO, Lidia M. (transl., comm), *Saffo*. Naples 1945 (Collana di studi greci, 2).
– (transl., comm), *Saffo: traduzione e commento di Lidia Massa Positano*. Naples 1967.
- R.] H. Rabe (ed.), *Prolegomenon sylloge*. Leipzig 1931 (Rhetores Graeci, 14). *Syriani in Hermogenem commentaria*. I–II, Leipzig 1892–93 (Rhetores Graeci, 16). *Anonymi et Stephani in artem rhetoricam commentaria*. Berlin 1896 (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 21:2).
- RE] G. Wissowa a.o. (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung, I–XXIV, I²–XV², Suppl. I–XV, Stuttgart 1894–1978.
- REINACH, T., & A. PUECH (eds., transl.), *Alcée. Sappho*. Paris 1937.
- RHYS ROBERTS, W. (ed., transl.), *Demetrius On Style: the Greek Text of Demetrius De elocutione: Edited after the Paris Manuscript with Introduction, Translation, Facsimiles, etc.* Cambridge 1902.
- RUSSELL, D. A., “Demetrius On Style: Introduction”. In: D. A. Russell & M. Winterbottom (eds.), *Ancient Literary Criticism: the Principal Texts in New Translations*, Oxford 1972, pp. 171–73.
– (ed.), *‘Longinus’: On the Sublime*. Oxford 1964.
- S.] L. Spengel (ed.), *Rhetores Graeci*. I–III, Leipzig 1853–56.
- SCHENKEVELD, D. M., *Studies in Demetrius On Style*. Amsterdam 1964.
–, “The intended public of Demetrius’s *On Style*: the place of the treatise in the Hellenistic educational system”. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 18 (2000), pp. 29–48.
- SCHNEIDER, J. G. (ed.), Δημητρίου Περί ἐρμηνείας βιβλίου: *Demetrii De elocutione liber*. Altenburg 1779.
- SCHWYZER, A. & A. DEBRUNNER, *Griechische Grammatik*, II/II, *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich 1950 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, II 1.2).
- SEIDLER, [J. F. A.,] “Ueber einige Fragmente der Sappho und des Alcäus”. *RhM* 3 (1829), pp. 153–228, 292.
- SITZLER, J. (review), “Σαπφούς μέλη. ... Edited by E. Lobel”. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 47 (1927), col. 993–1004.
- SLG] D. L. Page (ed.), *Supplementum lyricis Graecis*. Oxford 1974.
- SMYTH, H. W., *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge MA 1956.
- ST.] G. Stallbaum (ed.), *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*. I–II, Leipzig 1825–26.
- TREU, M., “die Struktur von Sappho fr. 48,3 und 120 D”. *RhM* 107 (1964), pp. 289–94.
– (ed., transl.), *Sappho: griechisch und deutsch*. Ed. 6, Munich 1979.
- USENER, H., “Beiläufige Bemerkungen”. *RhM* 55 (1900), pp. 286–98 (rep. in *Kleine Schriften*, IV/IV, Berlin 1913, pp. 307–15).
- V. = VOIGT.
- [VICTORIUS, P. (ed.), Δημητρίου Φαληρέως Περί ἐρμηνείας: *Demetrii Phalerei De elocutione*. Florence 1552.
- VOIGT, Eva-Maria (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus: fragmenta*. Amsterdam 1971.
- W.] C. Walz (ed.), *Rhetores Graeci*. I–X, Stuttgart 1832–1836.

- WILAMOWITZ-Moellendorff, U. von, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*. Berlin 1900 (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. 4:3).
- WILSON, N. G. (ed.), *Aristophanis fabulae*. I–II, Oxford 2007 (OCT).
 –, *Aristophanea: Studies on the Text of Aristophanes*. Oxford 2007.

University of Bergen

PÅR SANDIN

