

A new papyrus often raises as many questions as it resolves. This holds true for the two papyrus fragments (P. Köln 21351 and 21376), published by Gronewald and Daniel in ZPE 147 and 149 (2004) respectively, as well. While they considerably help to supplement an older fragment of Sappho, known as fr. 58 from the Oxyrhynchus papyri, they also raise new questions about the ending of the poem at line 22 (as in the Cologne papyri) or four lines later (as suggested by the Oxyrhynchus papyrus). The purpose of this paper is to present the different arguments that have been advanced over the past two years either to end the new poem at line 22 of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus or to continue it till line 26. Directly related to this problem is the question how the poem begins (with a first or a second person statement in lines 11-12). I will discuss the different supplements that have been proposed for these two lines as well.

The new Sappho poem begins at line 11 of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus (fr. 58). This was already suspected by Di Benedetto in 1985 and is now confirmed by the Cologne papyri. The standard editions of Sappho continue fragment 58 till line 26 of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus, but the Cologne papyri end the poem at line 22. This line is followed in the Cologne papyri by a different lyrical poem in a different meter (Daniel & Gronewald 2005). This raises three possibilities that different scholars have proposed over the past two years:

- 1) The Cologne papyrus only copied part of the poem. It misses the last four lines that are found in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus (Daniel and Gronewald 2004, Puelma & Angiò 2005, Edmunds 2006).
- 2) We have to assume that the poem in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus also ends at line 22 and that the next four lines belong to a new poem (Di Benedetto 2004, Janko 2005, West 2005, Bernsdorff 2005).
- 3) There survived into the Hellenistic period two versions of the poem, one ending on the myth of Tithonus, as in the Cologne papyrus, and another continuing the poem with four more lines, as in the Oxyrhynchus fragment (Boedeker, forthcoming).

I will survey the different arguments advanced in support of these three positions. At the moment I am most inclined to accept the third possibility, but have to admit that it is possible that I will change my mind before the 2007 APA meeting. Articles on the new poem continue to appear and may persuade me to think differently about the ending of the poem.