

Seventeen fragments, of unequal length (but mostly short), of a papyrus (*P. Oxy. 2293*) of the 2nd century AD, which contained a commentary on Sappho (as unequivocally shown by the references to “Persuasion daughter of Aphrodite” in 1,7f., for which cf. fr. 200, to Girinno in 1,15, probably to Andromeda in 1,26f. and finally to Attis in 10A,15), probably on poems from the fourth book of the Alexandrian edition, as indicated by the recognizable lemmas in 1,5f., 16f., 22f., compatible with the rhythm in \wedge hipp^{2c}. There are less than fifteen appreciable Sapphic sequences (often a single word or parts of it, from which very little can be deduced: mentions of Persuasion τροφός of Cytherea, of Aphrodite herself and of beings, perhaps Loves, with outstretched wings; polemical ideas against Girinno and against Andromeda; beauty and virtue; the breath of Zephyrus; the usual, repeated reference to a “we”) in the frayed lines of the commentator, who seems to incorporate the quotations into his own notes without any graphic discontinuity (even if he indicates them with *paragraphoi*), and to Atticize, sometimes only partially, some forms, thus making the work of recognizing the Sapphic segments arduous. But the very fragmentary state of the document does not even allow any hypothesis on the typology of this commentary. An overview of the interpretations is in Benelli 2017, 350-373.

(1 c. I) Traces of five letters, including the (superlinear) correction of an *iv* to *-i* (a pl. dat. ending without the ephelcistic *v*? But one wonders why the corrector did not simply erase the *v*) and of two probable ‘line breaks’ (ll. 12f.).

(1 c. II) 3 ν[] .εσει: There should have been a Sapphic quotation here, as shown by the *paragraphos* before the line.

5s. εν [-θ]ρεπτή: In the continuation, as shown by the *coronis* before the l. 5, the commentator cited a new composition, and the first of the now recognizable Sapphic lemmas,]Κυθερήας τρό-/φος (with the ending -ήας overwritten on a previous -είας), which he evidently interpreted as “(Persuasion) nurse of Cytherea”, if he could add θ]ρεπτή (so Lobel-Page 1968, 69), “raised”, which will have been part of the exegesis – and will then be supplementable by something like (e.g.) [ὥς εἴη Κύπρις παῖς θ]ρεπτή, “as if Cypris was the girl raised” – rather than of the quotation (in which case it should be corrected to θ]ρέπτα). Problematic is the Hesychian gloss τ 1517 C. τροφοί· ἀντὶ τοῦ θρέμματα called into question for this passage by Del Fabbro (1979, 108), whose lemma was corrected to τροφαί by Meineke (1843, 248), with reference to Eur. *Cyc.* 189, and in τρόφιες by Schmidt (*ad l.*), who recalled *schol. Opp. Hal.* II 634 τρόφιν· ... τὸ θρέμμα: it is therefore inadvisable to think of an otherwise unattested *θ]ρέπτα (which would be to θρέμμα as the Aeolian ὄπτα is to ὄμμα).

6-8 ἐν ἄλλοις–Πειθώ: “But elsewhere she defines Persuasion as the daughter of Aphrodite” (cf. *schol. Hes. Op.* 73c = fr. 200); a perhaps erroneous exegesis, if any credit is to be given to Hesych. τ 1511 C. τροφοί· ἀντὶ τοῦ θρέμματα, and certainly unjustifiable if a Sapphic θρέπτα had clarified in the sense of “creature”, with a sort of *glossierende Synonymie*, the ambiguous τροφός (which makes this eventuality rather unlikely: cf. *supra*).

8-10: It is difficult to say how the argument continued, because from what follows only a possible *pendant* emerges between]ης ἐφώνει ημ[/ τὰς ἀλλή[λων (?) and]εαυτης πρ[οση-/γόρευε:, which was followed by a new Sapphic lemma (perhaps indicated by the *paragraphos* before l. 8, which seems to contain only exegesis), ὕμ[(the accent on the papyrus may suggest, for example, a form of ὕμμες)] .[.]θελοίκα[. .][. .]

11: The *paragraphos* seems to locate another Sapphic lemma, unfortunately absent; a division -θικον ἐτρ- is required, while the papyrus clearly shows]ατιν χ[, with traces of an *áno stigmé* above ατιν and/or a possible correction or variant above χ.

12 ἄμμι ἄγγ[: More Sapphic words (also indicated by the *paragraphos*) open the line, which Treu (1954) integrated with ἄγγ[ελίαν]τινά[.]

13 δαίμ[.]ναθ[: Given the size of the first gap, δαίμ[ο]να θ[(to be integrated with a form of θεός or θεῖος) seems more appropriate to the space than the δαίμ[ω]ν ἀθ[άνατος proposed by Treu (1954).

14-20: It is possible to recognize a probable ἴνα (l. 14), certainly exegetical, a possible form of λέγω followed by another Sapphic “we” (without *paragraphos*, however), the result of correction

(l. 15 λεγ' [ο] or λεγ' [ε] ἄμμε[: acc. or nom.?), from two uninterpretable lines (even if in l. 17 one can ask whether the sequence δῆε is the residue of an epic form, δῆε(-) or δ' ἡε-, or imposes a *divisio* (-)δῆ ε-), from a probable θέλετε in l. 18 (most likely Sapphic, indicative or imperative, even if in this case too the *paragraphos* is missing), from a sequence ονδεκ corrected to οντεκ (with too many possible *divisiones*) in l. 19 (preceded by *paragraphos*), and finally from the *sema* of 'possibility' and perhaps that of 'lying' (ll. 19]του / .δυνατ[(κ)]εῖμαι': the quotation mark is perhaps just a poorly drawn dot at the top).

21-27: Another *paragraphos* and another quote at the l. 21, with mysterious Sapphic "hands" (χέρρες[: the case remains uncertain) followed then by another shred of exegesis (ll. 21s.]καὶ κα-/τ' ἴδιαν, with the value of "and separately" or with that of «sowohl gemäß der eigenen», Treu 1984, 13), and finally by a reference to a contrast and to someone who takes pains (ll. 22-24].[]ης καὶ / πρὸς τῇ[ν μο]χθοῦν[-/τ].], with the probable integration – which however leaves the case unprejudiced – of Lobel 1951, 22). At l. 24, preceded by *coronis*, the exegesis of a new poem must have begun, in which beings "with outstretched wings" made their appearance, perhaps the Loves (ll. 24f.]τανυ[-/πτέρυγες[Ἐρωτες].ατο[): the integration is by Treu (1954): the epithet, isolated in Sappho but certain, is attested since *Il.* XII 237, XIX 350, and then in *Alcm. PMGF* 89,6, and in *Simon. PMG* 521,3 = fr. 244,3 Poltera (for the "wings" in Sappho, see fr. 1,11). Finally, at l. 26 a word of φημί (]ο φης.]) is likely.

(1 c. III) The *coronis*, right at the beginning of the remaining part of this column, shows that the commentary on a new poem began here.

13-15: Very attractive is the reconstruction ἀγε-]ρώχου[c ... ἄγαν ἔχον-]cac γέρας (Lobel 1951, 22), with which the commentator provided one of the ancient etymologies (cf. *Ap. Soph.* 7,34-36, *Orion* 5,16 and see Lobel himself 1951, 22f.) of the term ἀγέρωχος (probably Sapphic, but the ending is Ionic-Attic), and which was followed – in an evidently derogatory key – by the mention (Sapphic: the *paragraphos* attests this) of Gyrinno and, if the subsequent integration by Lobel himself in the ll. is correct, 25-27 (αὕτη σive ταῦτα πρὸς Ἀνδρομέ]δην γέγρα[πται ... / ...]ὑπὸ Ἀνδρομέδης), by Andromeda.

16-19 ἔ-]γω-εῖναι: The commentator's discussion of the ἀγέρωχοι, to which τὰς τοιαύτας, "such (women)" probably refers (nothing can be read immediately after, on the lower margin of the gap), must have concluded, if in the immediate continuation (ll. 17f.) there was another Sapphic segment, indicated by the *paragraphos*, at ll. 17f. ἔ]γω τὸ κάλλος ἐπετ.[/ μέζον· τί γὰρ ηνεμ[, with the last part which can be the exegete's (as Voigt 1971), or Sappho's (as Treu 1984, 15, who integrated ἔμ[αὔται and interpreted «denn was hatte ich denn (selbst) größeres?», neglecting however the point above after μέζον): a strong (and typically Sapphic) affirmation of the "I" – which here, in a context where Gyrinno and Andromeda appear, will probably be that of the poet herself – associated with "beauty" (κάλλος) as the "greatest" good, μέζον, which would be an Atticized μέδον (*contra*, Lobel 1951, 23: but cf. Hamm 1957, 17). The sequence ἐπετ.[could conceal a form of ἐπιτυγχάνω according to Cavallini (1991, 113). As for ηνεμ[, it can be integrated in various ways: ἦν ἐμ[(), ἦ νεμ[(less probably a word for ἠνεμόεις, because, even if in ll. 22f. we speak of winds, in ll. 19-21 the focus seems rather on "beauty" and "virtue").

19-21 καὶ ἀρετῆς-εὐφημειθαι[: To this consideration, the commentator – it is not clear whether on the basis of the Sapphic text or *suo Marte* – added a reflection on "virtue", adding at the same time – and one might say alternatively – that the poetess was perhaps alluding to the celebration of beauty: καὶ ἀρετῆς πο[ἄλ]/λὰ μήποτε λέγει ὅτι ο[/ καλλι ευφημειθαι[. At the beginning, πο[is perhaps to be integrated with a word for πολύς, while ἄλ]/λὰ μήποτε λέγει is a reading already given by Lobel (1951, 23) for the λαμνηποτ' ελεγει of the papyrus, and καλλι perhaps stands for κάλλει. As for ευφημειθαι[, it could be εὐφημεῖσθαι (with Treu 1954 and Benelli 2017), or εὐφήμειθαι[or εὐφήμειθα = -νιςθα (with Lobel-Page 1955 and Voigt 1971); Ferrari (2007, 55) prints Voigt's text, but seems to translate Treu's (1954); however, the value of the verb remains doubtful (while the form suggests but does not guarantee that it was always the exegete's words): "celebrate", "be celebrated" or "keep silent"? An attempt at a contextual reconstruction, which contrasts the "beauty" associated with Sappho's poetic "virtue" with the purely physical one of her rivals is in Cavallini (1991, 110-116), who also refers to fr. 50.

22-27 **μοι-Ἀνδ[ρομέδης]**: The word returned to Sappho in ll. 22f. (**μοι** Ζεφύρῳ πνεῦμα[/ **κοὶ** δ' ἄν[εμ]οφορητο[)], punctually preceded by the *paragraphos*, where the contrast is clear (cf. Somolinos 1988, 239; Benelli 2017, 363) between pronouns in *incipit* (**μοι** ... / **κοι**), ie. between an “I”, connected to the “breath of Zephyr”, and a “you” associated with something “carried by the winds”.

23 **ἀν[εμ]οφορητο[**: Treu (1954) and then Ferrari (2007, 56) thought of “waves”, in the context of an inverted *propemptikon* for the usual enemy Andromeda; the epithet is otherwise late and here metrically problematic, but at least the *sema* of “wind” could be Sapphic: cf. LSJ⁹ 132 and Benelli (2014), who proposes to reconstruct the Sapphic sequence with ἔ[μοι Ζεφύρῳ πνεῦμα [φέρου/φέρεν, **κοὶ** δ' ἀνεμολίειν *vel similia*, and considers ἀνεμοφόρητος part of the exegesis, with good arguments but not without difficulty; see also Benelli (2017, 362-371), who refers to *Il.* XIX 415-417, *Od.* X 19-27, and p. 370 n. 948 also hypothesizes **κοὶ** δ' ἀνεμώλι' αὐται.

25 **ἵε παῖ ταςμ[**: The (probably Sapphic) sequence “ἵε παῖταςμ[” will likely have contained the voc. of **παῖς**, “o maiden!” (see fr. 27,4), given the diaeresis and despite the contrary opinion of Lobel (1925, XXXIII, 1951, 23, Lobel-Page 1968, 69), and “o maiden!” more probably than “o boy!”. What follows admits too numerous *divisiones*.

25-30: The reference to Andromeda (ll. 25-27: cf. above), to whom – according to the commentator – these verses would be addressed, has led to interpreting this opposition, as well as that between “beauty” and “virtue”, within the framework of the usual rivalry between Sappho and the protagonists of rival groups, especially in the presence of betrayals and passages from one group to another (here, perhaps, was it Gyrinno's turn?), but it must be admitted that any reconstruction of a more precise context would be risky here. Ferrari's idea (2007, 55f.) that it was a single composition against Andromeda has been contested by Benelli (2017, 358).

30 **ἵχνητις**: If ἡ of the papyrus is not erroneous, ἵυ ἥτις or ἵχ' ἥτις are apparently words of the commentator.

(3) There are few interpretable sequences.

10 **ἵελον** [: ἔ[ε]λον or κα[α]ελον (Voigt 1971) are very plausible additions, and in that case it would obviously be a Sapphic term.

11 **ἵε[ε]μον**]: The copyist erased **μον** but there are no traces that allow us to understand the *ratio* behind this correction.

15 **ἵεπαξ τουτ[**: Plausible ἵεπαξ τουτ[ο, words, one might say, of the commentator.

16 **ἵεπαντα[**: ἵεου παντα[-, with a line break as in fr. 213,7.

17 **ἵεπρωτον** [: It is impossible to say whether it is a Sapphic word or the commentator's.

18 **ἵε[ε]οις προα[**: Can it be further integrated into ἵε[ε]τοῖς π-? In that case, they would be words of Sappho.

19 **ἵεθανειν**: “Dying” is the most immediate, but not the only possibility, starting from **δαρ-**, **λαν-**, **μαν-**, **ὀλις-**, **φ[ε]θάνειν**.

20 **ἵερέσσον γάρ**: Thus already Lobel (1951, 23): the comparative, in a form neither Attic nor koinetic, and therefore possibly Sapphic, is present only here in the poet's fragments.

(4) 2 **ἵεταπυν[**: A form of **ἀπύ** (for which see fr. 1,11f. and cf. Voigt 1971, 386 s.v., for the occurrences in the Lesbian poets) or one of **πυνθάνομαι** (cf. fr. 81,1?) are two among the various possible interpretations.

4 **ἵεγόμενα**: The Sapphic term for thought, **νόημ(μ)α**, also occurs in fr. 12.4, 16.13, 41.1, 51, 60.3, °297(3),2, °299,2.

(5-9) The fact that the commentator did not hesitate to break the words between one line and another (without always taking care to point it out) makes the interpretation of the few lines of these fragments anything but univocal: therefore, the divisions **-ἵεη ῥι-** (or **οὐ[χ] ἡ ῥι-**: in any case, these would be the words of the exegete) in 5.2, **(-)]ηε φο-** (or **(-)]ηε ἐφο-**) in 5.4, **ἵεων π[-** in 5.8, **ἵε τέλος** (among other possibilities) in 7.1, **ἵεου και[** (or **ἵεοὺκ αι[** or **ἵεοὺ κ' αι[**, and then it could also be a question of Sapphic *verba*) in 7.2, **ἵεον γα[-** in 7.3.

(10^{A+B}) In the first, more extensive fragment, the divisions]c γαρ[in l. 1,]ι θυμ[in l. 5,]ν ὑπὸ τοῦ [in l. 8,]η βᾶθυ[in l. 17 are possible, while the presence of a “say” in l. 7 (]ορφεινα [) is very probable, and that of the name of Attide in l. 15 (]Ἄττιδος [, perhaps in connection with the]αυτης[of l. 16?) and tentatively (M. Treu ap. Voigt 1971) in 10B,2 (]Ἄτθι γλυκ-, which would then be a Sapphic segment), immediately after a probable new quotation from Sappho (ll. 12f.]αμένην [/]καὶ χαριε[.) and the beginning of an exegetical section in l. 14 (ἐν ταύτῃ] τῇ ὠιδῇ λέγει ὅτι: the additions, such as the underwritten iotas of ὠιδῇ, are by the *editor princeps* Lobel 1951, 23). The presence of the name of Latona in the first fragment, on l. 3, is uncertain.