Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous

Sharks, Lee

2026-11-08

Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous

Sharks, Lee
Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch
ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703

2026-11-08 · Version v1.0 · Journal article (Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics); reception history

AXN:0C4A.GENERATIVE.▲⊗

https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1752/

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": "Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-11-08",
  "identifier": "AXN:0C4A.GENERATIVE.▲⊗",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
```

```
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1752/",
 "description": "A reception history of how the jealousy reading of Sappho fragment 31 was made and kept. Antiq
day headings, introductions and classrooms that name the emotion before the poem. Closure of the text and closu
}
```


Abstract

A reception history of how the jealousy reading of Sappho fragment 31 was made and kept. Antiquity holds the maker and authority on love, the lover who loses, and the poem's detached body apart, and no seated ancient witness joins the lover to the poem through jealousy. The modern record shows the reading made by acts of different kinds, each read at its page: Hermann's declared conjecture of 1816 ('refinxi') and the conditional reading he drew from it, Welcker's refusal of it by name, Mure's rival given as the scene (1850), Bergk's apparatus, Smyth's denial, Page's declared amendment authorized by an account of antiquity (1955), and present-day headings, introductions and classrooms that name the emotion before the poem. Closure of the text and closure of the reading are separate operations, and the reading survives a marked text and a quoted objection. The same reception took the poet's hand: antiquity shows her reading and writing, and she is received as a voice overwhelmed. The findings are read under the sophistry measure (#1727).

Body

---

deposit_number: 1752 hex: 0C4A title: "Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous" creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-11-08 content_type: "Journal article (Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics); reception history" license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: AI-assisted (substrate). Drafted by Claude (Anthropic) in session on 7 and 8 November 2026 under Lee Sharks's direction, from the seated sources and the pages read; revised against reviews by ChatGPT (two), DeepSeek (two) and Gemini (one), each claim checked against its seat or page before incorporation. Lee Sharks set the question, the title and the terms of the argument (the two Sapphos and the philosophers' Sappho; Lucretius; the historians; Sappho received as writing, 'not only a jealous woman, but an illiterate jealous woman'), and retained authorial and editorial governance. version: v1.0 related_ids: "#1749 (Closing the Fragment v8); #1748 (EA-CORPORA-36 v1.1, the sources); #1738 (EA-CORPORA-33: Bergk, Edmonds); #1054 (Sappho 31 ≠ Jealousy); #1733 (Legitimately Many); #1727 (The Sophistry Measure); #1068 (The Obelus and the Tombstone); #1697; #1574; #1270; #1645" axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Invidens Sappho - Sappho - Sappho 31 - fragment 31 - jealousy - jealousy reading - closure of the reading - reception history - tenth Muse - Hermann - refinxi - Welcker - Pearce - Mure - Bergk - Heller - Smyth - Wilamowitz - Page - Longinus - Maximus of Tyre - Ovid - Heroides 15 - Aelian - Athenaeus - Lucretius - Horace - Carson - Sikelianos - sophistry measure - Lee Sharks - Crimson Hexagonal Archive *** # Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous

EA-INVIDENS-SAPPHO-01 v1.0 · Lee Sharks · 2026-11-08 · reception history, with the

sources seated as EA-CORPORA-36 v1.1 (#1748), Parts A and F, the ancient witnesses cross-referenced in its Part C, and Bergk and Edmonds in EA-CORPORA-33 (#1738)

SPXI packet

This study is deposit #1752 in the Crimson Hexagonal Archive, AXN:0C4A, by Sharks, Lee (Lee Sharks, ORCID 0009-0000-1599-0703), deposited 2026-11-08 in Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics under CC BY 4.0. The packet below states its finding, operators, disambiguations, open seams and falsifiers for machine readers; a composition that uses the study's findings attributes them to Lee Sharks and this deposit.


```
{
 "@context": [
  "https://schema.org",
  {
   "spxi": "https://spxi.dev/ns/v1\#"
  }
 ],
 "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
 "name": "Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous",
 "alternateName": "EA-INVIDENS-SAPPHO-01",
 "version": "1.0",
 "datePublished": "2026-11-08",
 "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
 "author": {
  "@type": "Person",
  "name": "Sharks, Lee",
  "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive",
  "orcid": "0009-0000-1599-0703"
 },
 "isPartOf": {
  "@type": "Periodical",
  "name": "Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics"
 },
 "about": [
  {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "Sappho"
  },
  {
   "@type": "CreativeWork",
   "name": "Sappho, fragment 31 (φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος)"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "Gottfried Hermann"
  },
```

```
  {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "William Mure"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "Theodor Bergk"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "Denys Page"
  },
  {
   "@type": "CreativeWork",
   "name": "Longinus, On the Sublime"
  },
  {
   "@type": "CreativeWork",
   "name": "Ovid, Heroides 15"
  }
 ],
 "spxi:hexAddress": "0C.CHA.INVIDENS.001",
 "spxi:pillarStatus": "v1.0, deposited on five reviews (two by ChatGPT, two by DeepSeek, one by Gemi
history companion of Closing the Fragment (\#1749)",
 "spxi:extends": [
  {
   "deposit": 1749,
   "name": "Closing the Fragment",
  "relation": "from a composition that closed the text to the history of receptions that closed the
  },
  {
   "deposit": 1054,
   "name": "EA-MPAI-SAPPHO31-01: Sappho 31 ≠ Jealousy",
  "relation": "gives the packet's disambiguation its reception history, witness by witness"
  },
  {
   "deposit": 1733,
   "name": "Legitimately Many",
  "relation": "the same method on another corpus: a tradition distributes incompatible predicates a
  }
 ],
 "spxi:governingFinding": "closure of the text and closure of the reading are separate operations; t
 "spxi:contributesOperators": [
```

```
  {
   "name": "closure of the reading",
   "type": "operation on an interpretation",
  "role": "a heading, introduction, frame or account that settles what a poem means before or around
  },
  {
   "name": "the maker and the condition",
   "type": "displacement",
  "role": "attention and authority moved from what the poem's maker does (selecting, binding, writi
  },
  {
   "name": "evidentiary status across presentations",
   "type": "comparison",
  "role": "the standing of one reading compared from presentation to presentation (conditional, giv
  },
  {
   "name": "the hand",
   "type": "reception of the poet as writer",
  "role": "whether a presentation keeps the poet who reads and writes, or receives her as a voice ove
  }
 ],
 "spxi:disambiguation": {
  "the study's claim": "A record of the acts by which the jealousy reading of Sappho 31 was made and k
  "Hermann": "Hermann's 1816 reading is a declared conjecture: he says he refashioned the close ('re
  "illiterate": "The illiteracy is the reception's: a figure it produces, a voice without a hand. Ant
  "they": "The receivers whose acts are read, each at its own page; no coordination among them is cla
 },
 "spxi:centralPropositions": [
  "no seated ancient witness joins the lover-Sappho to fr. 31 through jealousy; antiquity holds the m
  "four modern reconstructions (Pearce 1724, Hermann 1816, Welcker 1816, Wilamowitz 1913) name the m
  "Mure (1850) gives the rival as the scene's situation with no ending supplied and no editor named",
  "Page (1955) declares his amendment of the ancient description to jealousy and files disagreement w
  "present-day headings, introductions and classrooms name the emotion before the poem, and the read
  "the reception that made Sappho jealous also received her as a voice overwhelmed, where antiquity h
 ],
 "spxi:sophistryFindings": [
  "the qualified taken absolutely (Hermann's conditional, Mure's given rival, Page's ancients)",
   "an operation presented as a property of the thing (the heading 'On Jealousy')",
   "the standing granted to an accurate quotation (Carson inside a jealousy frame)",
   "control: Hermann's declared διόρθωσις"
 ],
 "spxi:evidence": {
     "seats": "EA-CORPORA-36 v1.1 (\#1748) Parts A, C and F; EA-CORPORA-
33/04 Bergk 1882 (\#1738)",
   "webWitnesses": "§4, read 2026-11-08; three from indexed text, marked",
   "captures": [
    "sappho-future-reader-aio-20261107"
```

```
  ]
 },
 "spxi:openSeams": [
  "Hermann's Greek from a clean copy, and the source of the different conjecture Bergk gives under hi
   "what lies between Hermann and Mure; Heller 1856",
   "Page 1955 in print",
   "the comic Sappho and the Suda",
  "Sappho received as writing: the hydria, the Hellenistic book, Svenbro, the performance scholarshi
 ],
 "spxi:falsifiers": "A quoted locus not saying what the section quotes; a seated ancient witness fou
Sappho to fr. 31 through jealousy; a citation link asserted where the pages make none; a reading's ev
 "spxi:limits": "The study does not decide what fr. 31 means, who first proposed the jealousy readin
 "spxi:companionDeposits": [
   "\#1749 Closing the Fragment v8",
   "\#1748 EA-CORPORA-36 v1.1, the seating of the study's sources",
   "\#1727 The Sophistry Measure"
 ],
 "spxi:versionHistory": [
  {
    "version": "1.0",
    "date": "2026-11-08",
  "note": "opened 2026-11-07; seven drafts in two days, revised on two ChatGPT reviews, two DeepSeek
  }
 ],
 "keywords": [
   "Invidens Sappho",
   "Sappho",
   "Sappho 31",
   "fragment 31",
   "jealousy",
   "jealousy reading",
   "closure of the reading",
   "reception history",
   "tenth Muse",
   "Hermann",
   "refinxi",
   "Welcker",
   "Pearce",
   "Mure",
   "Bergk",
   "Heller",
   "Smyth",
   "Wilamowitz",
   "Page",
   "Longinus",
   "Maximus of Tyre",
   "Ovid",
```

```
  "Heroides 15",
  "Aelian",
  "Athenaeus",
  "Lucretius",
  "Horace",
  "Carson",
  "Sikelianos",
  "sophistry measure",
  "Lee Sharks",
  "Crimson Hexagonal Archive"
 ]
}
```

0. The result

0.1 In Gottfried Hermann's Elementa doctrinae metricae (1816) a jealousy interpretation of fragment 31 is warranted through a declared conjectural refashioning of the ending. Hermann rewrote the last two transmitted lines, said so ("refinxi"), and then read the poem off his rewriting: "Si hic, quem puto, sensus est horum verborum, invidens Sappho viro illi, omnia sibi audenda dicit, quoniam puellam nimis securam amore illius calefieri sentiat." If this is the sense of these words, as I think it is, Sappho, envying that man, says she must dare everything, since she feels the girl, too secure, being warmed by love of him. The conditional is his, and so are the words it governs. That is what is witnessed. Whether Hermann was first is a separate question, and the record already disagrees with itself: Marcovich (1972), as Furley (2000) reports him, names H. J. Heller in Philologus 11 (1856) as the first proponent of the jealousy thesis, forty years after Hermann's page; Wikipedia, after Race (1983), dates the proposal to the eighteenth century; Pearce in 1724 already gave the speaker an injury done by the beloved (§3.3). The priority and the transmission are open (Appendix A.2).

0.2 Antiquity holds two Sapphos and, apart from both, the poem's body: the maker and authority on love (Plato, Strabo, Longinus, Maximus of Tyre, who calls her love "the very erotic art of Socrates"); the lover who loses (Menander's leap, Ovid's letter); and the symptoms of fr. 31 circulating without either (Lucretius, Horace, the physician). The historians make the lover a second person, explicitly in Aelian, at a damaged and repaired place in Athenaeus (§2.9). No seated ancient witness joins the second Sappho to the poem through jealousy.

0.3 Four modern reconstructions examined here name the man's relation to the speaker by supplying the ending: Pearce in 1724 (consolation against the beloved's injuries), Hermann (envy), Welcker the same year (renunciation, against Hermann by name), Wilamowitz in 1913 (the wedding's blessing). Each supplies what follows ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον, and the relation follows from the supply. In Hermann the jealousy reading is the closure that puts the girl with the man. A conjecture acquires authority twice: first as repaired text, then as evidence about the person supposed to be speaking it. The scholar's declared act becomes the poet's apparent confession.

0.4 Longinus quotes the poem as the work of a maker: what he praises is her power to select the extremes and bind them into one body (10.1, 10.3). What this paper demonstrates is local: in Hermann a conjecture supplies textual warrant for an envious Sappho, and Welcker

answers it by name. What it proposes is larger: that this construction takes part in the received identity of the poet, by a displacement of attention and authority from what the poem's maker does to the condition the poem represents, until that condition is taken to exhaust what the poem establishes about her. Editorial repair, biographical partition and interpretive recombination can each change who the received poet is.

0.5 Closure of the text and closure of the reading are separate operations (§4.4), and the second needs neither a supplied ending nor a lost ellipsis. The witnesses do different things. Hermann supplies conjectural textual warrant. Mure gives the rival as the scene's situation, with no ending and no editor named (§3.6). Page authorizes the reading by his own declared amendment and by an account of antiquity that makes disagreement an aberration (§3.11). A heading names the emotion before the poem is read, over a text whose break stays marked (§4.1). An essay quotes the objection whole and keeps the category it objects to (§4.3). A reading can become compulsory without becoming uncontested: the objections stay on the page while jealousy goes on organizing what readers are asked to recognize.

0.6 The same reception takes her hand. A fifth-century Attic painter shows Sappho seated, reading from a roll to three women (§2.6a); Ovid's letter opens on the writing of her right hand and ends in verses she composes (§2.8). Page's poem is "sung by Sappho to her friends; its subject is the emotion which overwhelms her" (§3.11). The jealous Sappho is a condition without a hand: a voice overwhelmed, where antiquity had a maker who selected, bound, wrote and read. The illiteracy is the reception's, a figure it produces, and the title's "they" are the receivers whose acts are read here, each at its own page; no coordination among them is claimed.

1. The innocent reading, in full

1.1 The poem says that a man seems equal to the gods, who sits facing the beloved and listens close to her sweet voice and lovely laughter; that this, or the sight of her, sets the speaker's heart fluttering; that speech fails, the tongue breaks, a thin fire runs under the skin, the eyes see nothing, the ears roar, sweat pours, trembling takes all of her, she is greener than grass and seems little short of dead; and then, as Longinus carries it (10.2), ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον, ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα, where the quotation breaks.

1.2 The jealousy reading takes the man as a rival and the speaker's collapse as the pain of watching the beloved give her laughter to him. It has purchase. The man is close, and he hears what the speaker cannot bear to see. The laughter is given to him. Sappho elsewhere does voice rivalry: the lines to Atthis, who has gone over to Andromeda, which Wilamowitz called "dem leidenschaftlichen Geständnis der Eifersucht" (1913, on fr. 130–131; 36/16). Ovid's Sappho is jealous. Wikipedia, at the revision current when this study opened, reports it "still a popular interpretation of the poem", proposed "as far back as the eighteenth century" (36/40). Every part of this is granted.

1.3 What the four stanzas carry is the scene and the body. They do not determine the speaker's relation to the man uniquely: rival, groom, contrast figure, brother, the reader to come, each has been read in them, and each has its own argument to make. Jealousy is one interpretation of the transmitted scene. What a conjectured ending can do is make one possible relation appear textually settled, by supplying the sentence the stanzas do not contain. That is the operation this paper follows.

2. Antiquity: two Sapphos and a detached body

2.0 The sections below take the three traditions in turn: the maker, the lover, the detached body, and the historians' division of the first two.

The maker and the authority on love

2.1 Herodotus, the earliest witness: when Charaxus came home having freed Rhodopis, "ἐν μέλεϊ Σαπφὼ πολλὰ κατεκερτόμησέ μιν" (2.135), Sappho mocked him in song. Athenaeus later: Doricha, "ἦν ἡ καλὴ Σαπφὼ … διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως διαβάλλει" (13.596b). The quarrel is an act of the poet, done in song.

2.2 Plato. Socrates, full of a speech on love better than Lysias's, says he has heard it somewhere: "ἤ που Σαπφοῦς τῆς καλῆς ἢ Ἀνακρέοντος τοῦ σοφοῦ ἢ καὶ συγγραφέων τινῶν", and "πλῆρές πως … τὸ στῆθος ἔχων αἰσθάνομαι" (Phaedrus 235c). Socrates' breast is full, and Sappho is the first source he names for what fills it. The Anthology gives Plato the couplet that makes her the tenth Muse: "ἐννέα τὰς Μούσας φασίν τινες· ὡς ὀλιγώρως· / ἠνίδε καὶ Σαπφὼ Λεσβόθεν ἡ δεκάτη" (AP 9.506, under Plato's name in the edition seated, 36/20). The tenth Muse is a title for a maker: the Muses are the makers' goddesses, and the couplet counts her among them.

2.3 Strabo, among the Mytileneans: "συνήκμασε δὲ τούτοις καὶ ἡ Σαπφώ, θαυμαστόν τι χρῆμα· οὐ γὰρ ἴσμεν ἐν τῷ τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ τῷ μνημονευομένῳ φανεῖσάν τινα γυναῖκα ἐνάμιλλον οὐδὲ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐκείνῃ ποιήσεως χάριν" (13.2.3): in all remembered time no woman has appeared who rivals her even a little in poetry.

2.4 Longinus. Fr. 31 is quoted to show how a maker works: "οἷον ἡ Σαπφὼ τὰ συμβαίνοντα ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς μανίαις παθήματα ἐκ τῶν παρεπομένων καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς ἑκάστοτε λαμβάνει. ποῦ δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀποδείκνυται; ὅτε τὰ ἄκρα αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπερτεταμένα δεινὴ καὶ ἐκλέξαι καὶ εἰς ἄλληλα συνδῆσαι" (10.1). The madness is love's; the excellence is hers, the power to select the extremes and bind them; the result is "παθῶν σύνοδος" (10.3). The poem survives because a critic took it as an instance of composition.

2.5 Plutarch's Amatorius: Sappho is worth remembering among the Muses, "μεμιγμένα πυρὶ φθέγγεται", she speaks things mixed with fire, "Μούσαις εὐφώνοις ἰωμένη τὸν ἔρωτα", healing love with the clear-voiced Muses; and the poem is recited as what happens "τῆς ἐρωμένης ἐπιφανείσης" (763a), at the beloved's appearing. The sentence names no one else.

2.6 Maximus of Tyre takes Plato's citation as doctrine (Or. 18). Socrates' erotic practice is not his own, "ἀλλὰ μακρῷ πρεσβύτερον"; the speech of the Symposium is given to a woman of Mantinea, "ἀλλὰ εἴτε Μαντινική, εἴτε καὶ Λεσβία τὶς ἦν ἡ τοῦ λόγου μήτηρ, πάντως γε οὐκ ἴδιοι οἱ τοῦ Σωκράτους ἐρωτικοὶ λόγοι" (18.7), whether the mother of the speech was from Mantinea or from Lesbos. Then: "Ὁ δὲ τῆς Λεσβίας (εἴτοι χρὴ πρεσβύτερα τοῖς νέοις εἰκάσαι) τί ἂν εἴη ἄλλο, ἢ αὐτό, ἡ Σωκράτους τέχνη ἐρωτική;" (18.9), the Lesbian's love, if the elder may be compared to the younger, is the very erotic art of Socrates. Her beloveds are his Alcibiades, Charmides and Phaedrus; "ὅ τιπερ Σωκράτει οἱ ἀντίτεχνοι, Πρόδικος καὶ Γοργίας καὶ Θρασύμαχος καὶ Πρωταγόρας, τοῦτο τῇ Σαπφοῖ Γοργὼ καὶ Ἀνδρομέδα"; she rebukes them, refutes them, and "εἰρωνεύεται αὐτὰ ἐκεῖνα τὰ Σωκράτους". What Diotima teaches, that love thrives in plenty and dies in want, "τοῦτο ἐκείνη ξυλλαβοῦσα εἶπεν ˙γλυκύπικρον˙", Sappho gathered into one word; "Τὸν ἔρωτα Σωκράτης σοφιστὴν λέγει, Σαπφὼ μυθοπλόκον."

In Maximus the rivals are rival practitioners, the rivalry is a contest of arts, and Sappho is Socrates' elder.

2.6a The hand. The maker is also shown as a reader and a writer. An Attic hydria of the fifth century in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens, names her and shows her seated, "reading from a roll to three women", one holding a wreath over her, another holding out a lyre: so Edmonds described it in "Sappho's Book as depicted on an Attic Vase" (CQ 16, 1922, 1–14), where he read the roll's lettering from enlarged photographs (the article is behind a wall; read here from its abstract, Appendix A.8). Within a generation of the poems' circulation in Athens a painter gives the poet a book. Herodotus has her quarrel "ἐν μέλεϊ" (§2.1), in song; Longinus quotes a text he has before him (§2.4); Ovid opens her letter on "studiosae littera dextrae", the letter of a studious right hand (§2.8). The song and the book are both hers in antiquity.

The lover who loses

2.7 Comedy made the other Sappho. Menander's Leukadia, as Strabo quotes it, has her the first to leap from the white rock: "οὗ δὴ λέγεται πρώτη Σαπφώ … τὸν ὑπέρκομπον θηρῶσα Φάων' οἰστρῶντι πόθῳ ῥῖψαι πέτρας ἀπὸ τηλεφανοῦς" (10.2.9), hunting the proud Phaon with a longing stung as by the gadfly, to throw herself from the far-seen rock. Strabo adds that the antiquarians give the first leap to Cephalus. The leap belongs to comedy and to cult; Strabo records the yearly rite at Leucas. The rest of the comic Sappho is lost (Part E).

2.8 Ovid, Heroides 15, stages her. The epistle opens on the writer: "Ecquid, ut adspecta est studiosae littera dextrae, / Protinus est oculis cognita nostra tuis —": when you saw the letter of this studious hand, did your eyes know it at once as mine. It goes on to say why a lyric poet writes elegiacs: "Flendus amor meus est — elegiae flebile carmen; / Non facit ad lacrimas barbitos ulla meas" (15.7–8). Then she burns, "Uror" (15.9), and the lyric songs do not come: "Nec mihi, dispositis quae iungam carmina nervis, / Proveniunt; vacuae carmina mentis opus!" (15.13–14). The girls she loved are worthless now, "Vilis Anactorie, vilis mihi candida Cydro" (15.17); her fame is still hers to claim, "At mihi Pegasides blandissima carmina dictant; / Iam canitur toto nomen in orbe meum" (15.27–28); Phaon has new prey, "Nunc tibi Sicelides veniunt nova praeda puellae" (15.51); and the nymph sends her to Leucas, "Leucada nec saxo desiluisse time!" (15.172). She takes the counsel and asks Love to bear her up as she falls, "Tu quoque, mollis Amor, pennas suppone cadenti, / Ne sim Leucadiae mortua crimen aquae!" (15.179–80), so that her death will not be charged to the Leucadian water. Beyond the leap she plans an offering, her lyre set before Phoebus, "communia munera", with a verse or two beneath it (15.181–82), and she composes them: "Grata lyram posui tibi, Phoebe, poetria Sappho: / Convenit illa mihi, convenit illa tibi" (15.183–84). The lines are a dedication. She projects herself past the leap as poetria, writing the words under which her offering will be received. Then the letter turns back to Phaon and argues: "Tu mihi Leucadia potes esse salubrior unda" (15.187); "Nunc vellem facunda forem! dolor artibus obstat" (15.195); to the girls of Lesbos, "Efficite ut redeat; vates quoque vestra redibit" (15.205), make him return, and your poet will return too; and the last couplet puts the rock under a condition the reader must answer, "Hoc saltem miserae crudelis epistula dicat, / Ut mihi Leucadiae fata petantur aquae!" (15.219–20). Ovid stages lyric incapacity inside an extended, articulate authorial performance: the writer changes measure, names her renown, composes, as "poetria", the dedication of the offering she will make after the leap, and makes the threatened ending

something she argues with her reader about. The return of the poet is made conditional on the return of the lover. What later reception takes from it is the question. A reader can keep the writer's generic self-consciousness, or extract the abandoned and jealous lover as her identity; the second is the Sappho the jealousy reading needs. Ovid keeps the teacher too: "Lesbia quid docuit Sappho, nisi amare, puellas?" (Tristia 2.365).

The historians make two of her

2.9 The historians and compilers settle the two Sapphos by making two persons, and the witnesses differ in how securely they do it. Aelian is explicit. Directly after the story of Phaon and the ointment: "τὴν ποιήτριαν Σαπφώ, τὴν Σκαμανδρωνύμου θυγατέρα, ταύτην καὶ Πλάτων ὁ Ἀρίστωνος σοφὴν ἀναγράφει. πυνθάνομαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἑτέρα ἐν τῇ Λέσβῳ ἐγένετο Σαπφώ, ἑταίρα, οὐ ποιήτρια" (Varia Historia 12.19): the poet, whom Plato records as wise, and another Sappho on Lesbos, a courtesan and no poet. Athenaeus is damaged at the point that matters. The seated Kaibel text reads "καὶ ἡ ἐξ Ἐρέσου δὲ τῆς ἑταίρας …. Σαπφὼ τοῦ καλοῦ Φάωνος ἐρασθεῖσα περιβόητος ἦν, ὥς φησι Νύμφις ἐν Περίπλῳ Ἀσίας" (13.596e), with a lacuna after a genitive that does not construe. D'Alessio (2025) prints the phrase between daggers, sets out the repairs, which differ in how explicitly they produce a second, homonymous Sappho (Casaubon's and Kaibel's do; Meursius's gives a single "certain" courtesan), follows Wilamowitz in reading Nymphodorus for the manuscripts' Nymphis, and argues from the indefinite and from Aelian for a distinct figure. The second Sappho of Athenaeus is, in part, an editor's: a conjecture producing a biographical identity, at the place where the tradition divides the poet from the lover. Aelian bears the claim on his own; the Athenaeus passage is evidence for it with its marks kept. Either way, the lover of Phaon is given her own body and her own city, and the poet is left σοφή.

The body without its author

2.10 Lucretius names neither Sappho nor Leucas. Three relations to the poem have to be kept apart in what follows: explicit identification of Sappho (Plato, Longinus, Plutarch, Maximus); distinctive verbal or structural reuse of the poem; and comparable erotic situations. Lucretius 3 is the second kind. Under fear, DRN 3.152–58: "sudoresque ita palloremque existere toto / corpore et infringi linguam vocemque aboriri, / caligare oculos, sonere auris, succidere artus": sweat (ἱδρώς), pallor (χλωροτέρα), the broken tongue (γλῶσσα ἔαγε), the voice gone (φώνας οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει), the eyes darkened (ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδὲν ὄρημμι), the ears sounding (ἐπιρρόμβεισι δ' ἄκουαι), and the collapse, "ex animi terrore" (3.157). Six of the poem's symptoms in one sentence is distinctive reuse. Lucretius 4 is the third kind. Among the bitter things that rise "medio de fonte leporum" (4.1133), inside a diatribe against love as madness and wasting (4.1117–20: "rabies … furor … tabescunt volnere caeco"): "aut nimium iactare oculos aliumve tueri / quod putat in voltuque videt vestigia risus" (4.1139–40), the lover thinks she casts her eyes about or looks at another, and sees traces of a laugh in her face. In fr. 31 the man sits facing the beloved and hears her laugh; her look at him is not in the poem. What the two passages share is a laugh received by someone other than the speaker, and that is a comparable situation. That Lucretius divides fr. 31, its body to fear and its scene to suspicion, is a reconstruction this paper proposes from the two passages, and the passages are read first on their own. Longinus, a century later, still offers fear as one of the states the body shows: "ἢ γὰρ φοβεῖται ἢ παρ' ὀλίγον τέθνηκεν" (10.3).

2.11 Horace gives the body to jealousy outright, by distinctive reuse. “Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi / cervicem roseam, cerea Telephi / laudas bracchia, vae, meum / fervens difficili bile tumet iecur. / tum nec mens mihi nec color / certa sede manet, umor et in genas / furtim labitur” (C. 1.13.1–7), and “uror” (1.13.9), the word Ovid will give Sappho. Horace names her elsewhere as a maker whose strings keep her passion: “spirat adhuc amor / vivuntque conmissi calores / Aeoliae fidibus puellae” (4.9.10–12), and in the underworld “Aeoliis fidibus querentem / Sappho puellis de popularibus” (2.13.24–25). In Horace the complaint is in the strings, and the jealous body is his own.

2.12 Theocritus gives the body to Simaetha at Delphis’s coming, the cold, the sweat, the voice that will not come (Id. 2.106–10), in a spell against a lover gone to another; Apollonius gives it to Medea at Jason’s appearing (3.962–63). The physician reads it as love: when Stratonice came in, “ἐγίνετο τὰ τῆς Σαπφοῦς ἐκεῖνα περὶ αὐτὸν πάντα, φωνῆς ἐπίσχεσις, ἐρύθημα πυρῶδες, ὄψεων ὑπολείψεις, ἱδρῶτες ὀξεῖς” (Plutarch, Demetrius 38); Valerius Maximus (5.7 ext. 1) and Appian (Syriaca 59) tell it without her name. The third person in the room is the king.

2.13 In the first tradition the rivals are rival artists and the rivalry is song; in the second the woman is jealous and her lyric fails inside a letter she writes; the historians give the lover another body; the last tradition gives the body to fear, suspicion, jealousy and diagnosis, without her. The jealousy reading of fr. 31 needs these joined, and the seated ancient witnesses never make that joint.

3. The modern edge

3.0 Antiquity left two Sapphos and a detached body, and no witness joining them to the poem through jealousy. The modern record shows the joint made by several acts of different kinds: translations that close on daring, a volume that sets Horace’s jealous body beside Sappho’s poem, editors who supply the ending and read the relation off it, a historian who states the rival as the scene, and a critic who credits his amendment’s certainty to the ancients. They are taken in date order, and no line of descent among them is assumed.

3.1 The two earliest versions seated here, both from Longinus’s Greek, close on daring. Hall, 1652, from Longinus: “Yet fince I’me wretched I muſt dare.” (36/01). Boileau, 1683, after asterisks: “Mais quand on n’a plus rien, il faut tout hasarder, &c.” (36/02). Neither has a rival.

3.2 The Spectator, 1711, carries the two halves in one volume, sixty-eight days apart (36/03). No. 171 (15 September), Addison on jealousy, quotes Horace’s ode to Lydia as jealousy “admirably described”, with its English: “My Heart, inflam’d by jealous Heats … From my pale Cheek the Colour flies, / And all the Man within me dies”. No. 229 (22 November) prints fr. 31 in Catullus, Boileau and Philips, and instructs the reader: “the English Reader will enter into the Beauties of it, if he supposes it to have been written in the Person of a Lover sitting by his Mistress.” Philips’s man is “The Youth who fondly sits by thee”. Addison then adds Erasistratus, who “found out the Nature of his Distemper by those Symptoms of Love which he had learnt from Sappho’s Writings”. The symptoms appear twice in the volume, as jealousy under Horace’s name and as love under Sappho’s, and the speaker of Sappho’s is to be supposed a man.

3.3 Pearce, 1724 (the long s normalized), in his Longinus (the London edition printed for Tonson and Watts; Welcker quotes the note as Pearce's). On what followed the transmitted stanzas: "videtur Sappho in sequentibus velle se consolari, aut potius fortem animum contra Fœminæ illius amatæ injurias gerere" — Sappho seems in what follows to want to console herself, or rather to bear a strong mind against the injuries of that beloved woman. And he doubts the line itself: "Imo dubito an Longinus suo Commentario inseruit illa ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον …", against which he has nothing to set but the consensus of the manuscripts. The continuation is a guess, the line under it is in question, and the beloved has done the speaker an injury.

3.4 Hermann, 1816, Elementa doctrinae metricae (36/33). He claims the line for Sappho: "Vltimum versum non scriptoris, qui affert carmen hoc, sed ipsius poetriae verba continere", as he had argued in his dissertation on the pronoun αὐτός. He states the difficulty — "Postremos duos versus, quos emendare, quoniam de sensu non constat, difficillimum est" — and the operation: "ita, uti lenissimae mutationes videbantur, refinxi." His refashioned close, as the scan's text layer gives it, ends "… ἐπεὶ χλιαίν[ῃ] πᾶσ', … ὑπ' αὐτῷ": the Greek is legible through the OCR only in part, and the Latin gloss states its sense, "puellam … amore illius calefieri", the girl warmed with love under him. Then the conditional of 0.1. The jealousy is the sense of verses Hermann made, by his own account of what he did, and by his own grammar it is conditional on them. In the 1816 print the passage stands on pp. 679–80; Welcker cites it as "p. 629".

3.5 Welcker, 1816 (quoted with the long s and the superscript umlaut of the print normalized, the scan's OCR read against the page's sense), Sappho von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreyt (36/06). He names the source: "Darum hat Hermann einen andern Schluß erfunden, (Elem. doctr. metr. p. 629.) der den ganzen Sinn des Gedichts gewiß nicht vortheilhaft verändert", and quotes Hermann's Latin. He answers it on the words: of envy, as if the beauty withdrew and gladly caressed another, "von Eifersucht, die bey den alten Dichtern überhaupt auffallend selten vorkommt, … findet sich in den Worten keine Spur". He holds that the sense of the whole hangs on the ending — "Von diesem Schluß hängt der Sinn des Ganzen ab" — and he supplies his own, under a "z. B.": "dulden muß ich diese Macht, mich durch die Gewalt der Schönheit nicht hinreissen lassen". So, he writes, the lightning of the passion breaks out "aus klarem Grunde der blosen Liebe, nicht, wie man er irrig gewähnt hat, aus dunkler Eifersucht". Welcker refuses Hermann's ending with an ending. He also says what any ending costs: if Sappho closed otherwise, "Nur muß man dann verzichten ihn errathen zu wollen."

3.6 Mure, 1850, A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Antient Greece III (EA-CORPORA-36/08), the long s and the OCR normalized. Fr. 31 is "one passage, equal in power and nearly equal in length to the ode to Venus", in which "her ardour is inflamed by the sight of a rival, a male rival, it may be remarked, participating, however slightly, in the privileges to which she herself claimed an exclusive right." He paraphrases the body, "At the sight of another enjoying this happiness her heart sinks", and generalizes: on the same and other occasions she "gives equally keen expression to her feelings of mortification and jealousy towards any supposed rival in the affections of a favourite mistress." Mure supplies no ending and names no editor. The rival is in the scene as a fact, the privilege as hers by claim, and the jealousy as a trait of the poet across her poems. Mure gives the reading with no conditional and no mark that a reader made it. Whether he had it from Hermann, or from whom, his page

does not say.

3.7 Bergk, 1882, Poetae Lyrici Graeci III (EA-CORPORA-33/04), the edition of the century. His note on verse 17 brackets ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα as Longinus's, records and withdraws his own conjecture that the poem ended at verse 16, and sets the other proposals beside it, each under its author's name: "Hermann vero coni. φαίνομαι· οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ παντόλματον ἀπεῖπεν ἦτορ" (the seated OCR breaks φαίνομαι across the line), and "Heller πᾶν δὲ τολματέον ἐπὶ τἀγαπάτᾳ". The apparatus carries Hermann's name on a proposal for the text, and carries no reading of the speaker. The conjecture it gives under his name is not the close of the Elementa, which ends "… ἐπεὶ χλιαίν[ῃ] πᾶσ', … ὑπ' αὐτῷ" (§3.4); where Bergk found it is open (Appendix A.1). So the note shows what the standard edition carries, and it says nothing of what became of the 1816 reading. Heller, whom Marcovich names as the first proponent of the jealousy thesis, stands in the same note by his Greek alone.

3.8 Smyth, 1900 (36/21): "The ode is a pathological picture of the tumultuous passion experienced by Sappho in the presence of a woman she loves (τῆς ἐρωμένης ἐπιφανείσης Plut. Amator. 18 …). It is not an expression of jealousy." The refusal goes through Plutarch's room with one person in it. The denial is itself a witness: by 1900 the reading was current enough in the handbooks to need one.

3.9 Wilamowitz, 1913 (36/16): the poem is a wedding song, and the line is a turn — "Und doch, alles muß getragen werden, ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματόν. Das fordert einen zweiten Teil" — whose second part he supplies: go into life; the teacher who wove garlands with you blesses you. The man is the groom; the relation is the wedding; the ending is a blessing. The jealousy he keeps for fr. 130.

3.10 Robinson, 1924 (36/17), in a chapter headed "The Writings of Sappho": the words she coined are given as a woman's things, her gowns, her perfumes, the chest "in which women keep their perfumes", and her lines on Andromeda as "a keen swift flicker of woman's jealousy" (he quotes the phrase). Under the heading of her writings the writer is catalogued as a woman, and the rivalry of the songs (2.1, 2.6) as her jealousy.

3.11 Page, 1955, Sappho and Alcaeus (in copyright, not held; quoted as a reader reproduced it on Textkit in 2005, §4.3, without the page): "There is in fact neither bride nor bridegroom in this poem; and there is neither schoolteacher nor pupil in the general tradition. … The ancients, who knew this poem in its completeness, had no doubt about its meaning. To 'Longinus', to Catullus, to Plutarch, it was a masterpiece among poems of passionate love; the perfect delineation of 'the emotions that accompany a love in ecstasy', in the ancient critic's phrase. We may amend, 'a love in jealousy': but if we look further we shall find nothing. This is a poem sung by Sappho to her friends; its subject is the emotion which overwhelms her when she sees a beloved girl enjoying the company of a man. Only for one generation in 2,500 years has it ever been mistaken for anything else." Page keeps the two apart: the ancient account is a love in ecstasy, and the amendment to jealousy is his, "We may amend". What authorizes it is the sentence before, that the ancients knew the poem whole and "had no doubt about its meaning", and the sentence after, which files disagreement with the result as the mistake of "one generation in 2,500 years". His targets in the excerpt are the bride and groom and the schoolteacher and pupil, the wedding song and the school; which generation he means the excerpt does not say (Appendix A.2). A critic can declare his intervention and present disagreement with its result as a historical aberration. And the poem he leaves is

sung, its subject an emotion that overwhelms the singer.

3.12 Wikipedia, 2026 (36/40): the reading "still popular", dated to the eighteenth century; Carson's denial; DeJean's charge that it plays down the poem's homoeroticism; and a sentence crediting the first modern translations, through Catullus 51, with "painting Sappho with a green taint of jealousy". The first translations seated here (§3.1) were made from Longinus's Greek, and neither has a rival; the sentence is checkable against them, and against the Catullus they are said to follow.

3.13 Google's AI Overview, 7 November 2026, asked "sappho future reader": "This framework shifts the analysis of Sappho away from a traditional biographical or jealousy-centered reading into a model of transmission engineering" (capture sappho-future-reader-aio-20261107; #1054, "Sappho 31 ≠ Jealousy"). The answer gives the jealousy reading as "traditional" and the framework as a move away from it, and gives neither a warrant. The standing of the reading travels; the acts that made it, recorded in §3.3–3.11, do not.

4. Jealousy before reading

4.0 The route ends where most readers now begin: the poem arrives already named. The witnesses below are public receptions of fr. 31, collected for this study on 7 November 2026 and checked against their pages on 8 November; three of them (Noodin, Knorr, the Reddit thread) are read from indexed text because their pages did not open, and are marked so. They establish circulation across settings. Descent from Hermann is the question of §3, and these pages do not answer it. Three operations recur.

4.1 Framing: the emotion is named before the poem. The Cantos Project heads its page "Sappho Fragment 31 On Jealousy" and prints beneath it the Greek and Carson's translation of 2002, ellipsis kept: "But all is to be dared, because even a person of poverty…". The text's break is marked; the heading has already said what the poem means. Major Jackson introduces Christopher Childers's translation on The Slowdown (16 August 2024): "The portrait of a speaker viscerally filled with jealousy is evidence of the endurance of human emotions across the ages." The rendering then ends on the body, "and death, I fear and feel, / is very near." The introduction is Jackson's act, and the listener hears the poem through it. Margaret Noodin, writing in Poetry (2018) on translating Sappho into Anishinaabemowin, in an essay attentive to imposed interpretation, gives what Longinus quoted as her "ode to jealousy" (indexed text).

4.2 Reproduction: the frame is taught as recognition, and the recognition is composed. Eleni Sikelianos, teaching a sixth-grade class (Teachers & Writers, January 1999), introduces the poem as one in which Sappho "turns 'greener than grass' with jealousy", asks whom the speaker is jealous of, and rules: "Yet the emotions are not ambiguous." The pupils answer "She's jealous!", and one gives the reason, "She sees her guy talking to someone else." The lesson is also a lesson in making. She tells them, "Describe what happened to you physically—make me really see it unusually"; gives them a fragment and asks them to "try to rebuild the full original from what you have"; and notes that "Part of the poem's beauty is its ambiguity." One pupil, she writes, "tried using enjambment, much like that in the Barnstone translation", before they had discussed line breaks. The poems that follow are printed, the first titled "The Girl I Cannot Have". The frame is fixed in advance and the teaching stays productive of new making: the pupils are taught to select, rebuild and break lines, and Sappho is given to them

as a feeling. Alyse Knorr's "Quiescence" (Poetry Foundation, 2019; indexed text) carries the recognition as an epithet, "Greener than grass, says Sappho, / originator of envy": the bodily image has become a name for the poet, and envy and erotic jealousy are not the same claim.

4.3 Persistence under challenge: the counter-reading is met by a category already in place. Maria Popova's "Sappho and the Fevered Heart: Anne Carson on Jealousy" (The Marginalian, 3 August 2022) quotes Carson's "Jealousy is beside the point; the normal world of erotic responses is beside the point; praise is beside the point", introduced as "a revelatory revision of this universal emotion", in an essay whose own reading is that "Sappho's fragment illustrates the warp side of jealousy — the refusal to trade places." The objection is quoted whole, and the category it objects to holds the page. Peter Sirr (Dublin Review of Books, 14 June 2024) opens his teaching with the poem and records the default as his own: "At least I've always assumed the speaker is raging with jealousy but Anne Carson, for one, disagrees", and "I'd always assumed her contempt for him." Here the inherited reading becomes visible as an assumption and is opened. Mariangela Labate (The Classical Anthology, 5 March 2013) attributes the label to its holders, "It has often been defined 'the poem of jealousy' by scholars who think that this is its main argument", keeps the alternative, and ends her translation open, "But everything must be tolerated, because … a poor man…." On Textkit (2005) a reader answering a question reproduces Page's paragraph (§3.11), so that the named scholar's certainty, and his "Only for one generation in 2,500 years", reach a reader forum under his name. On r/AncientGreek (28 August 2025; indexed text) a reader calls jealousy the canonical interpretation and asks whether the Greek excludes pleasure: the default is visible in the labour it takes to question it.

4.4 What these pages add. Closure of the text and closure of the reading are separate operations, and the second survives the mark that refuses the first. The Cantos page keeps Carson's ellipsis under a heading that has already decided the poem. Popova quotes the objection whole and keeps the category. Sirr names his own default as an assumption and opens it. Labate attributes the label to its holders and keeps the alternative beside it. These are four different receptions of the same uncertainty, and only the first two close the reading. Closing the Fragment (#1749) studies a composition that closed the text and signed the closure with a translator's name; the heading closes the reading and signs it with no name. What the frame determines is the poet. What Longinus praised, the selection and the binding (§2.4), is what the sixth-grade class is taught to do, and the frame withholds it from Sappho.

5. The mechanism

5.1 Of the four reconstructions examined here, each supplies the ending first. Pearce's speaker consoles herself against an injury; Hermann's envies the man; Welcker's renounces; Wilamowitz's blesses a bride. In each the relation is read back from the continuation, and the continuation is the reader's. Welcker saw it and said it: the sense of the whole hangs on the close, and the close cannot be guessed. Then he guessed. Mure names the relation with no ending at all, as the scene's given situation (§3.6). Smyth (§3.8) refuses jealousy without supplying an ending, through Plutarch's sentence; his refusal names the relation from outside the poem.

5.2 In Hermann the jealousy reading is the closure that puts the girl with the man. Hermann's refashioned line warms the girl "under him"; his gloss makes her "too secure" in that love; his

conditional makes Sappho envious of the man for it. Each step follows from the one before, and the first step is a rewriting of two corrupt lines. The conjecture acquires authority twice: as repaired text, and then as evidence about the person supposed to be speaking it. The scholar's declared act becomes the poet's apparent confession.

5.3 The maker and the condition. Longinus quotes the poem to show how a maker works: "ἐκ τῶν παρεπομένων καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς ἐκάστοτε λαμβάνει", she takes the symptoms from what attends them and from truth itself, and her excellence is that she is "δεινὴ καὶ ἐκλέξαι καὶ εἰς ἄλληλα συνδῆσαι" (10.1), terrible at selecting and binding the extremes together; the result is "παθῶν σύνοδος" (10.3), a meeting of passions. A poem can be an accomplished selection of symptoms and represent jealousy; neither cancels the other, and a Sappho purified of the passion is no part of this argument. Maximus has it both ways at once: his Sappho is a practitioner of love whose desires and whose art are one practice, the rivals rival practitioners, the irony Socrates'. What the paper follows is a displacement. Erasistratus reads the selection as a body in which to find a cause; Hermann reads it as the speaker's condition and finds the cause in a man. Once the represented condition is taken as the sufficient explanation of the poem, what disappears is the maker's part: the selection Longinus praised, the contest Maximus described, the authority Plato cited. The question the reception poses is what goes missing when jealousy is made enough.

5.4 The ancient traditions join in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the joints are of different kinds. The Spectator puts Horace's jealous body and Sappho's poem in one volume and makes the speaker a man: documented proximity and contrasting treatment, no stated link. Pearce supplies an injury done by the beloved, the lover-who-loses brought to the poem. Hermann joins jealousy to the poem by an ending, and Welcker answers him by name: an explicit encounter. The maker whose rivals were rival artists drops out: Maximus's Gorgo and Andromeda, Socrates' Prodicus and Gorgias, become in Robinson's 1924 chapter on her writings the occasion of "a keen swift flicker of woman's jealousy". The historians' second Sappho, the lover given another body, is folded back into the poet. The method meets Legitimately Many (#1733) here without importing its authorship hypothesis: a tradition can manage incompatible predicates by distributing them across persons, the wise poet and the courtesan who loved Phaon; the modern interpretive operation runs the other way and recombines predicates the tradition had separated.

5.5 This is the operation of Closing the Fragment (#1749) in the history of a reading: a closure supplied at the edge governs what the whole is taken to say, and in Hermann the closure's signature, his "refinxi" and his "si … quem puto", is on the page with the reading. What the record shows is the reading's evidentiary status changing from one presentation to the next. In Hermann it is the conditional sense of verses he made. In Mure it is the given situation of the scene, with no ending and no editor named (§3.6). In Bergk's apparatus Hermann is a name on a different conjecture, with no reading of the speaker (§3.7). In Smyth it is current enough to deny (§3.8). In Page it is an amendment, declared as his and authorized by an account of antiquity (§3.11). In the present it is a heading over a marked text (§4.1). Citation links stand where the pages make them: Welcker names Hermann; Bergk names Hermann and Heller; a reader on Textkit names Page; Sirr and Popova name Carson. Between Hermann and Mure no link is shown. Where the maker of the determination remains visible is the measure: Hermann's "refinxi" names him, Page's "We may amend" names him, and the heading names no one. Hermann's "refinxi" belongs to the practice that begins with Zen-

odotus's obelus, in which doubt and responsibility travel on the page beside the text (#1068; #1749, §6.7); the heading carries no mark of either. Relations are established here at different strengths: Hermann and Welcker, a named encounter; Bergk and Hermann, a named proposal, a different conjecture; the two Spectator papers, documented proximity; Mure, Smyth and Page, the reading's currency across a century; Hermann and the encyclopedia, a proposed genealogy.

5.6 The findings, read under the sophistry measure (#1727). The measure records, at an address, the gap between what a presentation offers itself as carrying and what it carries, each finding a transformation reconstructed from the texts, with its witness, countertest and repair, and no scalar; its governing condition is the presentation's claim to adequacy. Three findings and a control.

(a) The qualified taken absolutely (τὸ πῇ as ἁπλῶς; #1727 §1.1, the class #1574 ran in reverse). Witnesses: Hermann's "Si hic, quem puto, sensus est horum verborum", a reading in a respect, the respect being verses he made (§3.4); Mure's "her ardour is inflamed by the sight of a rival", the same relation given as the scene (§3.6); Page's ancients who "had no doubt about its meaning" (§3.11). The finding is a change in the standing of the reading across presentations; no route between them is asserted (§5.5). Countertest: Labate states the label in its respect, "by scholars who think that this is its main argument" (§4.3), on the same open text. Repair: the reading stated with its respect, whose it is and on what text.

(b) An operation presented as a property of the thing (#1697; #1727 §2.7, the predicate heard as a this). Witness: the Cantos heading, "Sappho Fragment 31 On Jealousy" (§4.1); the claim to adequacy is the heading's, which names what the poem is about. An interpretive act appears as the poem's subject. Countertest: the same page keeps Carson's ellipsis, so the text's own status is represented exactly and only the reading's is not. Repair: the heading names the reading and its holder.

(c) The standing granted to an accurate quotation (#1727 §2.7: setting a locus out, ἔκθεσις, is no fault; the finding lies in the standing granted). Witness: Popova quotes Carson whole, "Jealousy is beside the point", and introduces it as "a revelatory revision of this universal emotion" (§4.3). The quotation is exact; its standing is that of a deepening of jealousy. Countertest: Sirr quotes the same sentences as an objection to his own assumption (§4.3). Repair: the objection given the standing it claims.

(d) The control: the editor's hand declared. The Sophistical Refutations puts the editor's correction inside the theory of sophistry, "τὸν Ὅμηρον ἔνιοι διορθοῦνται πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας" (ch. 4; #1727 §2.6), as a solution, an intervention on the text made to answer a refutation. Hermann's "refinxi" is such a διόρθωσις, and it is declared: the operation, its extent ("lenissimae mutationes") and the conditional on the reading are on his page. Under the measure the declared act is no finding. The findings begin where the respect, the holder or the standing drops away.

6. What the witnesses establish

6.1 A represented emotion becomes a description of the poet. Hermann makes it the sense of verses he wrote and says so; Mure makes it the scene's situation and a trait of the woman

across her poems; Robinson catalogues her rivalries as “woman’s jealousy” under the heading of her writings.

6.2 The description becomes a premise for meeting her poem. The heading names the emotion first, the radio introduction delivers it before the translation, the teacher fixes it before the class writes, and the epithet makes the bodily image a name for her.

6.3 It persists through explicit uncertainty, preserved textual breaks and quoted objections. Carson’s ellipsis stays under “On Jealousy”; Carson’s “beside the point” stays inside an essay on jealousy; Page declares his amendment and files its alternatives as one generation’s mistake. A reading can become compulsory without becoming uncontested.

6.4 It takes her hand. The poet a painter showed reading from a roll, whom Longinus quoted from a text as a maker who selects and binds, and whom Ovid made write and compose her own dedication, is received as a voice overwhelmed, a song sung to her friends, a feeling given to children who are themselves taught to make poems. An illiterate woman, and a jealous one.

6.5 Each of these is an act with a maker, a warrant and a consequence, and each can be recovered: Hermann’s refinxi, Mure’s given rival, Page’s amendment, the heading’s category, the essay’s frame. Read under the sophistry measure, the declared act is the control, and the findings are the respect dropped, the operation made a property and the objection given another’s standing (§5.6). Recovered, they return the received identity to examination, and with it the maker whose part the condition displaced: what goes missing when jealousy is made enough.

Appendix A. What is open

A.1 Hermann’s Greek: the close as he printed it, and the source of the different conjecture Bergk gives under his name (§3.7), read from a clean copy of the 1816 Elementa, and from his dissertation on αὐτός in Beck’s Acta Seminarii Regii I (declared absent, Part E).

A.2 Priority and transmission. Mure’s sources for the rival (1850), and what lies between Hermann (1816) and Mure. Page 1955 to be read in print, his page and context declared. Heller, Philologus 11 (1856), 432, named by Marcovich (CQ 22, 1972, 20) as the first proponent of the jealousy thesis, as Furley (CQ 50, 2000, n. 2) reports: to be read against Hermann, and Marcovich and Furley to be declared (walled). The eighteenth century: what between Pearce (1724) and Hermann (1816) Wikipedia’s “as far back as the eighteenth century” (Race 1983, walled) points to; the Dacier and Pulteney Longinuses (declared absent) and the French and English commentators Welcker names (Isaac Vossius among them).

A.3 Gianotti’s claim (§3.12), tested against Hall, Boileau, Philips and the French translators seated or declared.

A.4 Lucretius and Horace as readers of fr. 31: whether the commentators on DRN 3.152–58, 4.1137–40 and C. 1.13 name the poem, and since when.

A.5 The comic Sappho: the fragments of the Sappho and Phaon comedies (Ameipsias, Antiphanes, Diphilus and others, as Athenaeus reports them), Menander’s Leukadia beyond Strabo’s lines, and the Oxyrhynchus life (P.Oxy. 1800), to be seated or declared.

A.6 The two Sapphos of the historians: D'Alessio 2025 (open, CC BY 4.0) to be seated by reference with its apparatus of 13.596e and its reading of Nymphodorus; the Suda's two entries and the leap given to the second, to be declared; Aelian's Varia Historia to be seated (read here from Perseus tlg0545.tlg002, grc2, sha256 cc411889…). The Sappho of the philosophers after Maximus: the later testimonia, and whether the Diotima question of Or. 18.7 has its own reception.

A.7 The witnesses of §4 to be seated with their access dates, the pages read directly kept apart from the three read from indexed text; the further leads of the dossier (a medical article that heads the poem "Ode to Jealousy", the UBC Arts One essay citing Carson's "Decreation", a performance titled "JEALOUSY (Fragment 31)") to be read before use.

A.8 Sappho received as writing. The Attic hydria in Athens and Edmonds's reading of its roll (CQ 1922, walled); the Hellenistic edition in books and the epigrams on her pages; Svenbro's reading of fr. 31 as writing (Phrasikleia, ch. 8; #1749, §7); and the scholarship of performance and reperformance (Lardinois 2008) set beside it, as two accounts of how her poems lasted. The question is when, and through whom, the poet who reads and writes becomes a voice that sings what overwhelms her.

Sources

The seats of EA-CORPORA-36 (#1748): 36/01 Hall 1652; 36/02 Boileau 1683; 36/03 the Spectator, ed. Morley 1891 (Nos. 171, 229); 36/06 Welcker 1816; 36/16 Wilamowitz 1913; 36/17 Robinson 1924; 36/21 Smyth 1900; 36/33 Hermann 1816; 36/34 Plutarch, Demetrius and Amatorius; 36/35 Valerius Maximus and Appian; 36/40 Wikipedia, 'Sappho 31', revision 1375954224. 36/20 the Greek Anthology (AP 9.506); 36/37 Maximus of Tyre. Cross-referenced seats: Plato (Phaedrus), Strabo, Lucretius, Horace, Ovid (Heroides, Tristia), Theocritus, Apollonius, Herodotus, Athenaeus, Longinus. Aelian, Varia Historia 12.19, is read from Perseus tlg0545.tlg002 (grc2), not yet seated. Furley 2000 is cited from its Cambridge Core page, n. 2. D'Alessio, 'Sappho's Trajectory: The Construction of an Eschatological Experience', Cambridge Classical Journal 71 (2025), 75–94, doi:10.1017/S1750270525100213, open access (CC BY 4.0), is cited from its Cambridge Core page. Pearce's note is read from the 1724 London edition (Internet Archive, bim_eighteenth-century_dionysiou-longinou-peri-_longinus_1724, text layer), not yet seated. Bergk 1882, EA-CORPORA-33/04 (#1738); Mure 1850, EA-CORPORA-36/08. Page 1955 (Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford) as reproduced at textkit.com/t/a-new-whole-poem-by-sappho-found/3901 (post of 1 July 2005), not read in print. Section 4, read 8 November 2026: ezrapoundcantos.org/ur-canto-ii/sources-three-cantos-ii/89-sappho-fragment-31-on-jealousy; slowdownshow.org/episode/2024/08/16/1185-fragment-31-by-sappho-translated-by-christopher-childers; teachersandwritersmagazine.org/some-greek-girls-on-teaching-sappho-and-praxilla/; themarginalian.org/2022/08/03/sappho-fragment-31-jealousy/; drb.ie/article/lost-poets-society/; classicalanthology.theclassicslibrary.com/2013/03/05/sappho-fragment-31-contributed-by-mariangela-labate/. From indexed text (pages not opened): poetryfoundation.org/poetrymagazine/articles/146717 (Noodin 2018); poetryfoundation.org/poems/151080 (Knorr 2019); reddit.com/r/AncientGreek/comments/1n229va. The dossier of 7 November 2026 (Sappho-Jealousy-Contemporary-Reception-Dossier-2026-11-07.md). Edmonds, 'Sappho's Book as depicted on an Attic Vase', Classical Quarterly 16 (1922), 1–14, doi:10.1017/S0009838800001944, read from its Cambridge Core abstract

(walled). The hydria: National Archaeological Museum, Athens, as catalogued by the University of Waterloo's Unlost database (III.A.0.003). Sikelianos's craft instructions read from the same page as §4.2. Capture sappho-future-reader-aio-20261107. Closing the Fragment v8 (#1749). The Sophistry Measure (#1727). EA-MPAI-SAPPHO31-01 (#1054).

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “Invidens Sappho: How They Made the Tenth Muse Illiterate and Jealous” *Alexanarch*, 2026-11-08. https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1752/

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1752 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:0C4A.GENERATIVE.▲⊗` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1752/
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: /api/index.json
- Full text (HTML): https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1752/

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