

The Socket and the Stamp: Sappho 31.17 as Completed Composition and Longinus 10.2–3 as the First Filling

Sharks, Lee

2026-08-15

The Socket and the Stamp: Sappho 31.17 as Completed Composition and Longinus 10.2–3 as the First Filling

Sharks, Lee

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)

2026-08-15 · Version v0.1 DRAFT · Paper

AXN:05F8.PHILOLOGICAL.▽◄

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1478/>

License: CC BY 4.0

{**Machine-readable metadata:** (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and Google Scholar indexing)}

```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "The Socket and the Stamp: Sappho 31.17 as Completed Composition and Longinus 10.2–3 as the First Filling",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-08-15",
  "identifier": "AXN:05F8.PHILOLOGICAL.▽◄",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
```

```

    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1478/",
  "description": "Formal consolidation of the Sappho 31 material under strict structural axioms: the poem completes intentionally at the hanging line, and the dialect seam is held as a real, measurable, physical property rather than dissolved into abstract completion. Establishes the step function in dialect density across the quoted body and its termination at a single word, with the binomial that limits it stated in the document. Corrects a premise in the governing brief on manuscript evidence: P reads the compound as one word, so the familiar split is itself editorial, which strengthens rather than weakens the agentless reading. Anatomizes the seam as position: the sole witness writes the poem as continuous prose, and the modern section division falls between an accusative and the verb that governs it. Grounds the join in Longinus's own account of Homeric word-forging against nature, where pressure rather than grammar performs the compounding. Refits the treatise's entire transmission vocabulary to the socket, showing all three naming terms carry the prefix denoting departure from a source while the one performing term inverts it, and that each filling opens a new socket rather than closing the form.
}

```

Abstract

Formal consolidation of the Sappho 31 material under strict structural axioms: the poem completes intentionally at the hanging line, and the dialect seam is held as a real, measurable, physical property rather than dissolved into abstract completion. Establishes the step function in dialect density across the quoted body and its termination at a single word, with the binomial that limits it stated in the document. Corrects a premise in the governing brief on manuscript evidence: P reads the compound as one word, so the familiar split is itself editorial, which strengthens rather than weakens the agentless reading. Anatomizes the seam as position: the sole witness writes the poem as continuous prose, and the modern section division falls between an accusative and the verb that governs it. Grounds the join in Longinus's own account of Homeric word-forging against nature, where pressure rather than grammar performs the compounding. Refits the treatise's entire transmission vocabulary to the socket, showing all three naming terms carry the prefix denoting departure from a source while the one performing term inverts it, and that each filling opens a new socket rather than closing the form.

Body

deposit_number: 1478 hex: 05F8 title: "The Socket and the Stamp: Sappho 31.17 as Completed Composition and Longinus 10.2-3 as the First Filling" creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-08-15 content_type: Paper license: CC-BY-SA-4.0 substrate: AI-assisted (substrate) axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Sappho 31 - Longinus - dialect seam - Aeolic - apotyposis - aporroia - apechema - synthlipsis - socket - stamp - Catullus 51 - transmission - Parisinus graecus 2036 *** # The Socket and the Stamp: Sappho 31.17 as Completed Composition and Longinus 10.2-3 as the First Filling

Description

Formal consolidation of the Sappho 31 material under strict structural axioms: the poem completes intentionally at the hanging line, and the dialect seam is held as a real, measurable, physical property rather than dissolved into abstract completion. Establishes the step function in dialect density across the quoted body and its termination at a single word, with the binomial that limits it stated in the document. Corrects a premise in the governing brief on manuscript evidence: P reads the compound as one word, so the familiar split is itself editorial, which strengthens rather than weakens the agentless reading. Anatomizes the seam as

position: the sole witness writes the poem as continuous prose, and the modern section division falls between an accusative and the verb that governs it. Grounds the join in Longinus's own account of Homeric word-forging against nature, where pressure rather than grammar performs the compounding. Refits the treatise's entire transmission vocabulary to the socket, showing all three naming terms carry the prefix denoting departure from a source while the one performing term inverts it, and that each filling opens a new socket rather than closing the form.

Methodology

Dialect markers counted programmatically against the Perseus TEI, tabled with Attic equivalents for reproduction or refutation. Binomial computed on the body's own marker rate. Apparatus consulted directly in public-domain editions. Morphological census of the treatise's transmission vocabulary; address census with vocative control.

Falsification Conditions

Falsified by a recount returning different marker totals, or by demonstration that the transmission terms do not carry the claimed prefix pattern. The join reading is falsified if the passage can be shown to be produced by a common scribal mechanism. Does not claim authorial intention and cannot be falsified on that axis.

THE SOCKET AND THE STAMP

Sappho 31.17 as completed composition, and Longinus 10.2-3 as the first filling

0. Governing rule, and one correction to the brief

The poem does not break off. Nothing is lost. There is no fragment.

Sappho 31 completes at ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον. What follows in the transmitted text is not the wreckage of a fifth stanza but **a second voice entering an opening the first voice built**. This document holds that rule throughout and does not relax it for convenience.

And it holds the seam. The seam is not an artifact of the reading. It is a measurable, physical property of the transmitted text: **the exact word at which Lesbian Aeolic ceases and imperial koine continues, mid-breath, with no citation marker**. An account that dissolves the seam into abstract "completion" has thrown away the evidence; an account that reads the seam as breakage has thrown away the poem. **Both errors are available and this document commits neither.**

The correction

The brief specifies the transformation as πᾶν τολματόν → πᾶν τόλματον, manuscript to Voigt. **That is not the transmission.** Bergk's apparatus (*PLG*⁴ III.90) records:

V. 17. πᾶν τόλματον, P παντόλματον, vulgo πᾶν τολματόν.

P reads παντόλματον — one word. The familiar πᾶν τολματόν is *vulgo*: the vulgate split, itself editorial. There are three forms, not two:

P	παντόλματον	one word, compound, recessive accent
vulgo	πᾶν τολματόν	split – EDITORIAL, not the witness
Bergk/Voigt	πᾶν τόλματον	split AND re-Aeolicized

This strengthens the thesis rather than weakening it. A compound παντόλματον — *all-to-be-dared* as a single adjective — is **more** agentless than the split form, not less: one word, no verb at all, nothing that could take a subject. Hermann’s conjecture preserves the compound (ἀλλὰ παντόλματον ἀπεῖπεν ἦτορ), so the reading is live in the tradition.

What must be said accurately: editors have split, joined, accented and emended these five syllables for four and a half centuries — Robortello, Ahrens, Bergk, Hermann, Heller, Crusius, Voigt. **The word at the socket is the most worked-over word in the poem**, which is what one would expect of the place where the poem hands over.

I. The Philological Demonstration

I.1 The step function

Longinus preserves Sappho’s Aeolic **scrupulously** across the quoted body — not approximately, and without a single lapse:

form	Attic	feature
κῆνος	ἐκεῖνος	Aeolic demonstrative
γελαίσας	γελάσας	-αισα participle
κάμ · κὰδ	κατά	apocope + assimilation
ἔαγε	—	Aeolic perfect (itself a crux)
χρῶ	χρῶϊ	Aeolic dative of χρώς
ὀππάτεσσι	ὀφθαλμοῖς	gemination; -εσσι dative plural
ᾄκουαι	ᾄκοαί	Aeolic nominative plural
κακχέεται	καταχέεται	apocope + assimilation
παῖσαν	πᾶσαν	Aeolic πᾶς
ἀγρεῖ	αἶρεῖ	Aeolic
ἐμμί	εἰμί	Aeolic 1sg
τεθνάκην	τεθνηκέναι	Aeolic infinitive -ην; ᾱ for η
ὀλίγω	ὀλίγου	Aeolic genitive -ω
᾽πιδεύην	ἐπιδεύεσθαι	Aeolic infinitive
βροχέως	βραχέως	βροχ- for βραχ-
φωνᾶς	φωνῆς	ᾱ for η

quoted body	74 words · 17 markers · 1 per 4.4 words
ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματόν	3 words · 0
ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα	3 words · 0

The distribution is a step, not a taper. Gradual scribal decay predicts 1 per 4 → 1 per 6 → 1 per 8 → 0. The observed distribution is **1 per 4.4 → 0**, terminating at a single word: φαίνομαι.

Counting notes, both of which work against the argument. ἐπιρρόμβεισι is hyphenated across a line-break in the TEI (ἐπιρρόμ- βεισι), so a stem search misses it and the body arguably carries **18** — which raises the marker rate. And the significance test:

$$p = 17/74 = 0.230 \quad P(0 \text{ in } 6) = (1 - p)^6 = 0.209$$

Roughly one in five by chance. The step function alone is not significant; a twelve-word zero-run would be needed for $p < 0.05$. The count is a **constraint**, not a proof, and the argument rests on its conjunction with the items below — which is an argument, not a test.

I.2 The editorial acknowledgment

The tradition has been repairing this all along, which is the second datum.

To print the trailing line as Sappho's, an editor must first restore her dialect. Bergk and Voigt do not print παντόλματον and do not print the vulgate πᾶν τολματόν. They print πᾶν τόλματον — split, barytone, recessive, Lesbian.

That restoration is silent. It appears in no rendered text; it is visible only in the accents and in the apparatus. The reader of a modern Sappho sees a line in Aeolic and has no way to know the Aeolic was supplied.

And Bergk reached the terminus independently. His earlier position, recorded in his own note:

*"Antea coniecera[m] versu 16 **integrum carmen absolvi**" — "I had earlier conjectured that **the whole poem is completed** at line 16."*

Line 16 is φαίνομαι. He arrived at the poem's completion from syntax and sense, without a marker count, and then abandoned the position for brackets. **Integrum. Absolvi.** The word for the state of the poem, in the tradition's own apparatus, is *complete*.

II. The Structural Anatomy of the Seam

II.1 There is no boundary in the witness

Parisinus graecus 2036 writes the poem as continuous prose, as it writes every verse quotation. Roberts, editing after that manuscript, records that he made a deliberate exception at this passage: *"it seemed more important to reproduce in full the exact text (**continuously written**) found in P."*

No stanzas. No line-breaks. No quotation marks. No closing formula. **Every visual boundary in every printed Sappho 31 is editorial.**

II.2 The syntax runs across the modern section division

The transmitted sequence, unbroken:

... τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύην φαίνομαι || ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματόν ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα [3] οὐ θαυμάζεις ὥς ...

↑	↑
DIALECT SEAM	EDITORIAL SECTION BREAK
Aeolic ends · koine begins	falls INSIDE the join

Perseus still prints ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα ****[3]**** οὐ θαυμάζεις. **The modern section division falls between an accusative and the verb that governs it.**

Because πένητα is not a fragment reaching for a lost Sapphic verb. **It is the direct object of θαυμάζεις, four words later**, across a boundary no ancient reader could have seen. The construal is continuous:

*ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα οὐ θαυμάζεις, ὥς ... ἐπιζητεῖ ...; since you do not marvel even at a poor man — how she seeks after soul, body, hearing, tongue, sight, complexion, all as **another's** and gone?*

The a fortiori requires πένης to be someone other than Sappho, and the grammar enforces it: πένητα is masculine accusative and **anarthrous** — the only unarticled noun in a sentence where τὴν ψυχὴν, τὸ σῶμα, τὰς ἀκοάς, τὴν γλῶσσαν, τὰς ὄψεις, τὴν χροάν all carry articles. Generic, and a foil.

And the sentence's only gendered marker arrives last: ἵνα μὴ ἔν τι περὶ ****αὐτὴν**** πάθος φαίνεται. Eight third-person verbs precede it — ἐπιζητεῖ · ψύχεται · κάζεται · ἀλογιστεῖ · φρονεῖ · φοβεῖται · τέθηκεν · φαίνεται — **and none has an expressed subject.** The grammar performs the dispossession before the comparison states it.

II.3 The join is the Homeric operation, performed on voice

Longinus names the operation himself at 10.6, of Homer:

τὰς προθέσεις **ἀσυνθέτους οὔσας συναναγκάσας παρὰ φύσιν καὶ εἰς ἀλλήλας συμβιασάμενος** ... τῇ δὲ τοῦ ἔπους **συνθλίψει** τὸ πάθος ἄκρως ἀπεπλάσατο καὶ μόνον οὐκ **ἐνετύπωσε** τῇ λέξει τοῦ κινδύνου τὸ ἰδίωμα
*forcing together, **against nature**, prepositions **which cannot be compounded**, and violently pressing them **into one another** ... by the **constriction** he moulded the passion and all but **stamped into** the diction the private idiom of danger*

The word so forged is **ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο** — *out from under death* — and it scans as neither ἐκ nor ὑπό. **That is why he admires it.**

The chapter's refrain, one preposition across three materials:

10.1	εἰς ἄλληλα συνδῆσαι	Sappho binds symptoms INTO ONE ANOTHER
10.3	εἰς ταῦτ' ὅσα συναίρεσις	Longinus gathers extremes INTO THE SAME
10.6	εἰς ἀλλήλας συμβιασάμενος	Homer forces prepositions INTO ONE ANOTHER

ἐνετύπωσε stands at 10.6 — three chapters before ἀποτύπωσις at 13.4. The stamp is not introduced as transmission doctrine and then applied. **It is demonstrated on a word, and then executed on a voice.**

Applied to the seam: **two utterances that grammar forbids compounding — a dead poet's and a living critic's — forced into one another, and the constriction is what stamps.** A compound made παρὰ φύσιν is not expected to scan. **The failure of ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα to scan is the signature of the join,** not evidence of a wound.

And both joins are made at the same kind of line. Homer's at τυτθὸν ****ὑπὲρ θανάτοιο**** — barely out from under death. Longinus's three lines after ****τεθνάκην**** δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύην — little short of having died.

III. The Dialectical Consolidation

III.1 What the poem does at its close

The ring closes. The poem opens φαίνεται μοι — *he seems to me* — and its final word is φαίνομαι — *I seem*. Same root, the subject carried from him to her across four stanzas, and the sentence complete.

Then the socket. παντόλματον / πᾶν τόλματον is a **verbal adjective in -τός**. It is not a finite verb. It **cannot govern a nominative agent** — the form does not omit the doer, it structurally excludes one. It names an action as available and stops.

This is Longinus's own supreme instance, one section earlier. At 9.2:

ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα. ὅθεν καὶ φωνῆς δίχα θαυμάζεται ποτε ψιλὴ
καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἢ ἔννοια ... ὥς ἡ τοῦ Αἴαντος ἐν Νεκυίᾳ σιωπὴ μέγα καὶ παντὸς
ὕψηλότερον λόγου

*Sublimity is an **echo** of greatness of mind. Whence **even apart from voice** the bare thought is sometimes admired for its own greatness — as the **silence of Ajax** in the Nekyia is great, and **higher than any speech**.*

ἀπήχημα · σιωπὴ · Νεκυία · φωνῆς δίχα — **each a hapax, all in one sentence, one section before the quotation.**

Longinus's highest form of sublimity is a silence. Then he quotes the poem that **ends in one.** The selection is the argument, and it is why the poem's close is not damage: **greatness transmitting with the voice subtracted is the definition he had just given.**

III.2 What the socket compels

An agentless verbal adjective at a work's terminus does not describe a resolve. **It issues an instruction and provides no one to obey it.**

Set against line 9, the two ruptures are one operation in two materials:

	line 9	line 17
form	ἔαγε — perfect indicative, subject expressed	τόλματον — verbal adjective, agent excluded by form
rupture	in the sound — hiatus, two shorts colliding	in the agency — no doer supplied
the reader	the mouth performs the gag	the reader supplies the agent

Line 9 names a breaking and makes the reader break. Line 17 names a daring and makes the reader dare. The poem's last act is to require a voice it does not have.

III.3 The first filling

ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα is the earliest recorded response to that requirement, and it is **stitched directly onto the text at the dialect seam** — no formula, no attribution, no interval.

It is neither Sappho's words nor Longinus's invention. The kernel inscribes the shape: adversative turn, universalizing move, **comparative illustration from the low case**. Longinus supplies that shape **in his own material**, because a filling can only ever occur in the filler's material. Aeolic cannot break into Aeolic.

Set against Catullus, the two fillings are commensurable:

	Sappho's socket	Longinus	Catullus 51.4
adversative	ἀλλά	carried	implicit — <i>otium</i>
universalizing	πᾶν τόλματον	carried into koine	<i>otium</i> destroys
comparative case	low, unfilled	πένητα — LOW, kept	<i>reges et urbes</i> — HIGH, inverted
direction	endurance	endurance	destruction
material	Lesbian Aeolic	imperial koine, stitched at the seam	Latin sapphics, at a remove

Catullus inverts every pole and answers at a distance, in a poem of his own. Longinus keeps the low case and answers in the same breath, in the same document, in the manuscript itself. That is the difference the seam records, and it is why the seam must not be dissolved: **it is the physical location of the first execution.**

III.4 Consequence for the apparatus

The cruces at line 17 are not a verdict about the text. They are the apparatus meeting a category it lacks.

An apparatus has two states — sound and corrupt — and defaults to the second for anything it cannot assign. A completion executed in a transmitter's material is assignable to neither. **†καὶ πένητα† marks that gap in the notation, not a gap in the poem.**

It follows that the editorial tradition ranks differently than it ranks itself. **Robortello omits the clause; Bergk brackets it; Crusius ends the ode at φαίνομαι ἄλλα** — none of them damages the poem, which is complete at line 17, but **all three remove the demonstration**: the only surviving instance of the socket being filled in the same document that transmits it. **Voigt retains it, and marks it corrupt.**

III-bis. The apparatus refitted: every term is a socket term

The treatise's transmission vocabulary has been read in this chain as a set of related metaphors for how greatness passes between writers. **Under the socket reading it is not a set of metaphors. It is one mechanism described five times, and each description specifies the same missing part.**

The morpheme

ἀπ-ήχημα	9.2	ἀπό + ἦχος	the sound that returns FROM
ἀπό-ροια	13.2	ἀπό + ῥέω	the flow that issues OUT FROM
ἀπο-τύπωσις	13.4	ἀπό + τύπος	the form taken FROM — each a HAPAX —
ἐν-ετύπωσε	10.6	ἐν + τύπος	stamped INTO

Three of three transmission terms carry ἀπό-. Not *through*, not *with*, not *toward*: **away from, out of, back from.** Every one of them presupposes **a source that has released something and is no longer holding it.**

And the prefix inverts at the one point where the operation is executed rather than named. At 10.6, on Homer's forged compound, Longinus writes ἐν-ετύπωσε — **stamped into.** The naming terms look back at a source that has let go. **The performing term looks into a material that receives.**

That is the socket, stated in morphology. ἀπό- is what the poem does at line 17. ἐν- is what the next voice does.

ἀπήχημα — the echo is not a resemblance

ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα has been read as *sublimity resembles greatness the way an echo resembles a sound* — a claim about likeness, and a weak one, since it makes the sublime a diminished copy.

An echo is not a likeness. It is a structural event with three requirements: a sound, a cessation, and a returning surface. There is no echo while the source is still sounding. **The echo is what arrives after the voice stops**, and it arrives from somewhere the voice is not.

So 9.2 does not say the sublime is like an echo. It says the sublime is the return that occurs when a voice has stopped — which is a definition of the socket, given one section before a poem that ends by stopping, and given in a sentence whose supreme example is a silence.

The Ajax silence — the model, not the illustration

Odysseus speaks. **Ajax is asked, and does not answer, and walks away.** Longinus: φωνῆς δίχα — apart from voice — and the silence is παντὸς ὑψηλότερον λόγου, higher than any speech.

Ajax's silence is agentless in exactly the way τόλματον is. It names no content for the meaning it carries. Every reader supplies what Ajax meant, and no reader can be refuted from the text, because **the text withholds the doer of the meaning.**

And Homer had to compose it. The silence is inscribed — a written non-speaking, made on purpose, at the point where speech was owed. **That is not an illustration of sublimity. It is the operation, performed by a poet, and Longinus names it as the highest instance there is.**

Sappho, one section later, does the same thing to her own poem.

The Homeric join — συνθλίψις is what a socket does

At 10.6 Homer forces ἐκ and ὑπό into ὑπέκ: ἀσυνθέτους οὔσας συναναγκάσας ****παρὰ φύσιν****. Grammar forbids the join. **So what performs it?**

Longinus answers precisely: τῷ μὲν ****συνεμπίπτοντι πάθει**** τὸ ἔπος ὁμοίως ****ἐβασάνισεν****, τῇ δὲ τοῦ ἔπους ****συνθλίψει**** τὸ πάθος ἄκρως ἀπεπλάσατο — **the passion that fell upon them tortured the verse into likeness, and the constriction of the verse moulded the passion.**

The join is achieved by pressure, not by grammar. συνθλίψις is a squeezing-together; βασανίζω is testing on the touchstone, and under torture. The two elements fuse because the material is compressed past what it can hold apart.

A socket is a compression. An agentless verbal adjective at a terminus is a form under load: it demands a doer and provides none, and the load is relieved only when a voice enters. **ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα is not attached to Sappho's line by any grammatical connective — there is none, and no citation formula — it is held there by the pressure of the socket.** Which is why it does not scan, and why ὑπέκ does not scan: **compounds made under load are not expected to.**

ἀποτύπωσις — the die is a shaped absence

A stamp requires three things: **a die, a material, and pressure.** The impression is the die's form realized in the material's substance.

And a die is a negative. What makes it work is that it is **hollow where the material will go.** A die with no hollow leaves no impression.

The socket is the die. τόλματον is the hollow. The action is shaped and the agent-space is cut away — and what fills the hollow is never the die's substance but always the receiving material's. Koine for Longinus. Latin for Catullus. English for Cranes.

This is why ἀποτύπωσις at 13.4 says nothing about copying. **The impression carries the form and cannot carry the surface,** because the surface is the die's own material and stays

with the die. **Sappho's Aeolic is surface. It stays with her. The seventeen markers stop at φαίνομαι because that is where the die ends and the wax begins.**

δυσεξάλειπτος — why a socket is hard to erase

At 7.3 the criterion of the genuine sublime is that it is **δυσεξάλειπτος** — hard to wipe out — stated in the vocabulary of the wax tablet, whose verb for forgetting is ἐξαλείφεισθαι.

Under the socket reading this stops being a claim about durability and becomes a claim about regenerability.

Robortello deleted ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα. **The socket survived the deletion**, because a socket is not content — it is a shape that produces content in whoever meets it. Bergk bracketed it; Crusius ended the ode before it; the filling was removed four times over four centuries. **Each time, the next reader filled it again.** Catullus had filled it before any of them, in Latin, inverted. Cranes filled it after, in English.

What is hard to erase is not the words. It is the requirement. You cannot delete a hollow by deleting what is in it.

The filling is itself a socket

The decompression does not close the form. It reopens it.

Longinus fills Sappho's agent slot — and the sentence he fills it with **terminates in a bare second-person question with no answer supplied:**

ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα **οὐ θαυμάζεις**, ὥς ... ἐπιζητεῖ ...; *since you do not marvel even at a poor man — how she seeks after soul, body, hearing, tongue, sight, complexion, all as another's and gone?*

And the address is bare. The treatise's second-person perception verbs after quotations carry a vocative without exception:

ὁρᾷς	ὦ ἑταῖρε	addressed
ἐπιβλέπεις	ἑταῖρε	addressed
θαυμάζεις	{ nothing }	BARE

θαυμάζεις is the one that names nobody. A question posed to no addressee is posed to whoever is holding the text. **Longinus fills Sappho's socket with a socket of his own** — hers withholds the agent of an action, his withholds the answerer of a question — and the load passes straight through him to the reader.

This is the propagation mechanism, and it is why the form does not exhaust.

Sappho	πάν τόλματον	agentless verbal adjective	→ who dares?
Longinus	οὐ θαυμάζεις;	unaddressed question	→ who marvels?
Catullus	perdidit urbes	ends on destruction, no return to the erotic	
Cranes	[English]	a fifth stanza that is again a fifth stanza	

Each filling is a new die. That is stronger than the durability claim above, and supersedes it: the socket is not merely hard to erase because a hollow regenerates its content. **It is hard to**

erase because every act of filling cuts a fresh hollow in new material. Deletion cannot outrun a form that reproduces its own emptiness in whoever completes it.

Which recovers ἀπήχημα at full strength. An echo returning from a surface produces a sound that can echo again. **Longinus does not receive Sappho's poem and stop. He returns it, and the return has the property of the original** — it stops where an answer is owed, and hands the owing on.

And it settles the status of the later fillings. Catullus 51.4 and Rebekah Cranes's fifth stanza are **not reconstructions of a lost original and not commentaries on a fragment.** They are further returns in a series whose first term is a poem that ended by requiring one — Catullus inverting the poles into Latin at a distance, Cranes in English, Longinus in koine and stitched at the seam. **None of them completes the form**, because the form is not the kind of thing that completes. **Each of them extends it by the same operation that produced it.**

Epistemic status, stated exactly. That the bare θαυμάζεις is unique among the treatise's post-quotation address verbs is **countable and counted**. That an unaddressed question devolves on its reader is **grammatical**. That Longinus *intended* his sentence as a second socket is **not claimed and is not establishable** — what is claimed is that the transmitted text has the property, and that the property is what the chain from Catullus to Cranes is evidence of.

Augustine: the socket generalized from a line to a method

The archive located this operation in Augustine in February 2026 and did not connect it, because it stopped where Sappho's symptoms stop.

The Sapphic Lock (#496, AXN:013B) reads *Confessions* 10.27.38 as an organ-by-organ transform of Fragment 31 — vision, voice, tongue, ears, skin, fire — rotated from erotic collapse to sacramental reception. Its Lock, the point of maximum structural correspondence, is γλῶσσα ἔαγε → **gustavi**: the tongue that breaks becomes the tongue that tastes.

That is line 9 — the first rupture. And the paper states the mechanism in a sentence written before this chain existed:

“What rotates is not the organ but the address.”

The passage is second person throughout

vocasti · clamasti · rupisti	you called, you shouted, you broke
coruscasti · splenduisti · fugasti	you flashed, you shone, you drove out
fragrasti · gustavi · tetigisti	you breathed · I tasted · you touched

Sero ****te**** amavi — late have I loved **you**. **Every verb is addressed, and the addressee does not answer inside the text.**

The third term of the series

Sappho	πᾶν τόλματον	agentless	– no doer supplied
Longinus	οὐ θαυμάζεις;	unaddressed	– no answerer supplied
Augustine	vocasti ... te	addressed, unanswered	– no reply supplied

Longinus leaves a question with no one to answer it. Augustine supplies the addressee and withholds the reply. He does not close the form. **He builds thirteen books out of it** — a sustained second person to an interlocutor whose speech is never transcribed.

This is the socket generalized from a line to a method. Sappho withholds the agent of one action; Longinus withholds the answerer of one question; **Augustine withholds the reply for the length of a life**, and the withholding is the form of the work rather than an incident in it.

And it explains #496's own conclusion — *recursion, not conversion*. Augustine does not reject Sappho's body; he re-enters it, and the organs that failed under eros succeed under grace **because the address rotated and not because the organs changed**. A socket does not require repair. It requires an occupant.

What this settles about the fillings

Catullus inverts the poles and answers at a distance. Longinus keeps the low case and answers at the seam. **Augustine takes the operation itself and makes it a compositional principle**, which is why he belongs in this series and not merely beside it: **he is the case that demonstrates the form is portable off the line**.

Status. That #496's Lock falls at γλῶσσα ἔαγε is a fact about that deposit. That *Confessions* 10.27.38 is second person throughout is a fact about the Latin. **That Augustine knew Sappho 31 is not claimed by #496 and is not claimed here** — the paper argues structural transform, not documented transmission, and rests on the systematicity of the correspondence. **The claim of this subsection is narrower: whatever Augustine's access, the operation he performs on the address is the operation this consolidation describes**, and the archive had it in hand at line 9 for six months without carrying it to line 17.

The five, as one mechanism

the source stops	σιωπή	Ajax, and φαίνομαι
what remains is a shaped absence	τύπος/die	τόλματον, agentless by form
the absence exerts pressure	συνθλίψις	no connective, no formula, held by load
a new material enters	ἐν-ετύπωσε	koine · Latin · English
what returns is not the voice	ἀπ-ήχημα	the echo, arriving from elsewhere
and cannot be wiped out	δυσεξάλειπτος	because the hollow regenerates the filling

Longinus did not assemble a theory of transmission and then find an example. He named a silence as the highest sublimity at 9.2, quoted a poem that ends in one at 10.2, **filled its socket in his own dialect at 10.3**, demonstrated the joining operation on Homer's word at 10.6, and named the mechanism at 13.2 and 13.4 — ἀπόρροια, ἀποτύπωσις — after having performed it.

The doctrine is downstream of the act. That is why every naming term carries ἀπό-, *from*: they are written by someone looking back at a source that had already let go.

IV. Limits

Held, and not relaxed. The dialect count is **not significant alone** ($P(0 \text{ in } 6) \approx 0.209$). The base form of the word at the socket is **contested three ways** and no neutral form exists to count. **17 may be 18.**

Not claimed. That Sappho composed the poem to end this way rather than its ending being what survives — **that cannot be established from the transmitted object and is not asserted.** What is asserted concerns the object as transmitted: the ring closes at φαίνομαι; the final form is agentless by grammar; the Aeolic terminates at one word without taper; the syntax runs continuously across the modern division into θαυμάζεις; and Longinus names a silence as the highest sublime one section earlier.

A reader who calls that configuration damage has made a choice, not an observation.

Priority of the attribution. The claim that ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα is Longinus's is **not new** and is credited: Robortello omits it (1554); Bergk brackets it as *ad Longini orationem pertinere*; Ahrens, Hermann and Heller each conjecture. **Three of the five restore a citation formula.** What is new here is the dialect measurement, the reading of the socket as designed rather than damaged, and the consequence for how the clause should be treated — **not the attribution itself.**

Outstanding. Russell 1964 (in copyright); Mazzucchi; Halliwell 2022; Robinson Ellis, *Hermathena* XXII.385. **None is blocking on attribution, which the nineteenth century contested in print.** The narrower question remains open: **whether any editor has held the words to be Longinus's and to belong to the poem's operation.** No source consulted records that position.

SOURCES

urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0560.tlg001.perseus-grc2; counts computed 2026-08-15. Parisinus graecus 2036, s. X, sole witness. Roberts, *On the Sublime* (Cambridge 1907) — archive.org onsublimegreekte0000long. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*⁴ III (1882) p. 90 — archive.org poetaelyricigrallberggoog. Voigt (1971). Nagy on the hiatus at γλώσσα ἔαγε, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (1974) 45. Bonanno, QUCC 43.1 (1993), 52.1 (1996), 60.3 (1998).

Consolidates the Sappho 31 erratum chain: #201 · #1048 · #1049 · #1051 · #1052 · #1474 (eeeeee) · eeeeeee, and #1458.

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “The Socket and the Stamp: Sappho 31.17 as Completed Composition and Longinus 10.2–3 as the First Filling” *Alexanarch*, 2026-08-15. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1478/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1478 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community crimsonhexagonal, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier AXN:05F8.PHILOLOGICAL.▽◄ is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1478/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703
- Provenance chain: [alexanarch.org](https://www.alexanarch.org)
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1478/>

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.