

RUDOLF WACHTER

## ABBREVIATED WRITING

### 1. Definition

Odd letters are often missing in Greek inscriptions, particularly in the archaic period.<sup>1</sup> Editors normally add the letters in round brackets in their transcriptions (e. g. ἀνέθ(ε)κε), but hardly ever stop to consider why these letters were not written in the first place.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bibliographical abbreviations:

Amyx = D. A. Amyx, *Corinthian vase-painting of the archaic period*, Berkeley 1988[89], vol. II p. 556 ff. (No.).

ABV = J. D. Beazley, *Attic black-figure vase-painters*, 1956 (p. and No.).

ARV = J. D. Beazley, *Attic red-figure vase-painters*, 1963 (p. and No.).

Bechtel = F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, 1917.

Buck = C. D. Buck, *The Greek dialects*, 1955 (No.).

Chantraine = P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 1968–80.

Hansen = *Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.*, ed. P. A. Hansen, 1983; id. *saeculi IV a. Chr. n.*, 1989 (No. 466–903).

Immerwahr = H. Immerwahr, *Attic Script*, 1990.

Jeffery = L. A. Jeffery, *The local scripts of archaic Greece*, 1961 (p. and No.).

Kretschmer = P. Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht*, 1894.

Lejeune 1 = M. Lejeune, *Sur l'extension de H pour noter e long*, *REA* 51 (1949) p. 1–15.

Lejeune 2 = M. Lejeune, *La dédicace de Νικάνδρη et l'écriture archaïque de Naxos*, *RPh* 45 (1971) p. 209–15.

Lezzi-Hafter = A. Lezzi-Hafter, *Der Eretria-Maler*, 1988.

LIMC = *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zürich und München.

Lorber = F. Lorber, *Inschriften auf korinthischen Vasen*, 1979 (No.).

Para. = J. D. Beazley, *Paralipomena*, 1971.

Rumpf = A. Rumpf, *Chalkidische Vasen*, 1927 (No.).

Schwyzler = *Dialectorum graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*, ed. E. Schwyzler, 1923 (No.).

Threatte = L. Threatte, *The grammar of Attic inscriptions I (Phonology)*, 1980.

Further: 'A. W.' = abbreviated writing, c. = century, dr. = drawing, h. = half, P. = painter, ph. = photo, q. = quarter.

It is not always clear whether such omissions are merely inadvertent lapses or whether they reflect phonological changes of some kind. If the omitted letter is an intervocalic consonant (such cases are rare), we would normally explain the lapse as a mistake. If it is a consonant in a cluster, we will usually argue for weak pronunciation or assimilation. If a vowel is missing in the post-consonantal position,<sup>2</sup> we tend to think of a syncope. Syncope is, however, a change whose existence, outside certain areas (such as Thessaly), is not easy to document in archaic and classical Greece.<sup>3</sup> We should in any case avoid postulating syncope if the missing vowel is long and if the resulting cluster is otherwise unattested in Greek and contradicts the established phonotactic rules. Moreover, omission is a more likely explanation than a phonological change if, at the place and time in question, perhaps even in the same inscription, the full form is also attested.

When may we speak of a mistake? Today we are used to a clearly established orthography based on rules that can depend on anything from modern sophisticated phonemic principles (Dutch) to traditional spelling (English). In ancient Greece, especially in archaic times, no such conventions existed: there was neither a long tradition of orthography, nor any form of authority that could set up and enforce spelling rules. We must therefore be prepared to believe that unusual spellings, which we find unacceptable, had some degree of acceptability, in the light of their frequent occurrence and immediate comprehensibility. In this case we may speak of 'semi-mistakes' rather than of real mistakes.

For some time now I have been collecting cases of omitted vowel signs, and feel that I should both publish my list and attempt an explanation of a subset at least of the 'semi-mistakes'. In all instances the omitted vowel follows a consonant, as with  $\theta\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$  for  $\theta(\epsilon)\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$  or  $\text{Ακ}\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  for  $\text{ἸΑκ}(\alpha)\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . Remarkably enough, in the majority of our examples the vowel which is omitted in writing is the (first) vowel in the name of the preceding consonant letter (theta and kappa in the examples mentioned). It almost looks as if we are dealing with a device meant to simplify spelling, a phenomenon which we may refer to as

<sup>2</sup> I disregard cases that are due to contraction, elision, or *krasis*.

<sup>3</sup> See e. g. Threagte p. 395 f. for Attic. In the most comprehensive study on Greek syncope, O. Szemerényi (*Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent*, 1964, especially p. 258 ff.) accepts for Greek 14 cases of loss of *i* or *u*, 24 of *e* or *o*, none of *a*, none of any long vowel. He was looking for well-established examples, even if these often existed alongside the non-syncopated form. What we are interested in here are occasional phenomena, for which syncope is particularly difficult to establish.

'Abbreviated Writing' ('A. W.', or, in German, 'Kurzschreibung'). In section 3 I list all the examples of omitted vowels that I have come across so far, arranged according to the consonant which precedes the missing vowel, and I distinguish between those examples that conform to the rule just indicated (i. e. examples of 'A. W.'), and those other examples here termed 'wrong', that do not conform (as in ἐνθ(ά)δε with alpha missing after theta).

## 2. The names of the letters

In order to decide between 'right' and 'wrong' in the list, we have first to consider what the letter-names were at the time and place of the inscriptions in question. Most of the Greek letter-names as we know them show strong resemblance to the ones we can reconstruct for Phoenician at the time of the take-over of the alphabet. In view of the conservative manner of learning and transmitting the alphabet, we may assume that the same form of a letter-name (at least as far as the acrophonic sound and the following vowel are concerned) was used all over the Greek world, except in those cases where we know that differences existed. These latter cases must be discussed briefly:

For γ the Ionic letter-name is said to have been γέμμα (Democr. 19). This is likely to be the older form of this name<sup>4</sup> and therefore may be expected over a wider area (the form that survives today is the Attic one<sup>5</sup>). Unfortunately I have not yet come across cases of γ(ε) in Ionia,<sup>6</sup> or elsewhere.

In the case of μ and ν the Phoenician names will have been \**mem* and \**nun*. The names which we use are the Attic ones (the oldest direct evidence there is from the 4th c., cf. above, n. 5), while the Ionic names were μῶ and νῶ. The former is attested by Democr. (ibid.), and was still used in the 3rd c. on Delos (IG XI.2 205.A.b.25). The latter is not directly attested, but as it is likely that \**mem* and \**nun* followed parallel

<sup>4</sup> See Wachter, *Altlateinische Inschriften*, 1987, p. 17 f.

<sup>5</sup> K. Meisterhans—E. Schwyzler, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 3rd ed., 1900, p. 5 f. n. 19, with epigraphical evidence from the 4th c.

<sup>6</sup> A hidden case may be Old-Phrygian *lavagtaei* (C. Brixhe—M. Lejeune, *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*, 1984, p. 6 ff. No. M-01a). This was already suspected by M. Lejeune, *Kadmos* 9 (1970) p. 65: "Et si *lavagtaei* (1) était un emprunt à myc. ra-wa-ke-ta, gr. λᾱF-ᾱγέτᾱς, devrait-on supposer que Γ s'appelât *ge*?" We know nothing about the Phrygian letter-names, but a 'full' name such as *gema* or *gemma* is the easier assumption (cf. below, 5.).

lines of development (cf.  $\mu\tilde{u}$  and  $v\tilde{u}$ ), we may safely postulate Ionic  $*v\tilde{\omega}$ . If we accept the existence of 'A.W.', our confidence will be confirmed by the two East Ionian examples below where -o- was first forgotten after  $v$  and then squeezed in. On the other hand, where we have no direct reason to believe that  $v$  was *no-*, we may think in terms of *nu-*. There is also a possibility that the original form  $*nun$  was still in use in the seventh century. The well-known Nikandre-inscription from Naxos (Hansen 403) ends abruptly with ... Φηράησδ' ἄλοχος  $\nu$  (*vacat*). Modern editors read  $\nu(\tilde{u}\nu)$  in order to complete metre and line, and it would be possible to assume that  $\nu$  is simply an example of abbreviated writing for *nun* prompted exactly by the old form of the letter-name.<sup>7</sup>

The letter-names of  $\xi$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\chi$ , and  $\psi$  are spelt with - $\tilde{e}\tilde{i}$  in the oldest surviving occurrences (4th c.).<sup>8</sup> The last three are additional letters created by the Greeks and the first acquired a new name in Greece; pi is Phoenician in all respects, and presumably its original name was  $*p\tilde{e}$ . If so, all the five names may have included a long closed  $\tilde{e}$ .<sup>9</sup> There is sufficient evidence for an interchange between  $\tilde{e}$  and  $\tilde{i}$  both in Athens<sup>10</sup> and Corinth<sup>11</sup> to justify the suggestion that pi, for example, could be taken as equivalent to either  $p\tilde{e}$  or  $p\tilde{i}$ .

Two further and more difficult cases must also be mentioned:

First, the name of  $\rho$  is likely to have been  $r\tilde{e}$  originally (Phoenician  $*r\tilde{e}\tilde{s}$ ). From the examples in our list it is quite clear that the Attic letter-name was  $\rho\tilde{\omega}$ , which is also the form that survives. On the other hand, it may be more than mere coincidence that the only three 'wrong' forms from places other than Attica are cases of  $\rho(\epsilon)$ .

The second problem is the name of M, the letter used for  $s$  in many non-Ionic regions. It is natural to think of this letter in connexion with the literary statements about  $\sigma\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ , the Doric name of  $\sigma$ . But as this M in the (few) surviving abecedaria occupies the place between  $\rho$  and  $\tau$ , where we should in principle expect the letter-name  $\sigma\tilde{\gamma}\mu\alpha$  (or similar),

<sup>7</sup> It is not clear why the final  $n$  of  $*nun$  was lost in Attic and elsewhere. One possible reason could be simplification in the recitation of the series of letter-names ("Merkspruch"), e. g. Phoenician  $*lamed-mem-nun...$  > Greek  $*lambda-mum-nun-o$  >  $*lambda-mun-nun-o$  >  $*lambda-mu(n)-nun-o$  >  $*\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\delta\alpha-\mu\tilde{u}-v\tilde{u}-\delta$ .

<sup>8</sup> See the epigraphical evidence from Attica in Meisterhans—Schwyzer (above, n. 5), and the inscription from Delos cited in the last paragraph (3rd c.).

<sup>9</sup> This was argued by E. Hermann, Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. Göttingen 1929 p. 224 f.

<sup>10</sup> See Threagles p. 190 ff.

<sup>11</sup> See e. g. Lorber 26 (Schwyzer 123.8)  $\rho A(\mu)\phi\iota\tau\rho\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu$  (instead of - $\tilde{i}$ -), but Amyx 49 (Lorber 80)  $\Phi\iota\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$  (instead of - $\epsilon\tilde{i}$ -).

it would be most valuable to have examples of 'A. W.' in connexion with this letter.<sup>12</sup> I have not yet found such a case.

In conclusion we may expect missing vowels due to 'A. W.' as follows:

- (υ) after μ (where N was vŭ), and ν (everywhere except [parts of] early Ionia);
- (ε) after γ (early Ionic [and elsewhere?]), δ, ζ, h, θ, (ρ?);
- (α) after γ (Attic [and elsewhere?]), κ, λ, τ, (M type σ?);
- (ο) after μ (early Ionic), ν (where μ was μῶ), ϕ, ρ;
- (ι) after σ;
- (ι) or (ει) (i. e.  $\bar{\epsilon}$  or  $\bar{\iota}$ ) after ξ, π, φ, χ, ψ.

### 3. The List

For each example I give the reference, as well as the origin, the approximate date, and the type of inscription (vase inscriptions are painted unless they are marked as graffiti or ostraka). I have tried to check each case either with a photograph or drawing or with a reliable edition. Many of the examples appear in Threatte p. 395–407, who gives a useful discussion in some cases, though his heading "Vowel syncope" is slightly misleading, since many cases do not concern phonology at all. Examples after 300 B. C. are relegated to the notes; for although many of them still obey my principle, they were by then certainly no longer tolerable, and must be considered mistakes like any other.<sup>13</sup>

The list provided is no doubt far from complete:<sup>14</sup> further studies may help to fill the gaps and to define further the geographical and chronological limits of the principle of abbreviated writing. In its turn,

<sup>12</sup> For a discussion of these problems see Wachter, *Kadmos* 28 (1989) p. 49 ff.

<sup>13</sup> I do not include examples from defixiones. Although quite a few agree with our principle, nonetheless there are too many strange mistakes in these documents (see e. g. A. Audollent, *Defixionum tabellae*, 1904, index p. 521–23, 538 etc.), the documents are not available in good photographs, and the majority of them are later than 300 B. C. anyway (ibid. p. 556). Examples mentioned by Threatte: ἀκρ(ω)τήρια IG III.3 89.b.3 (Attica, ca. 400–350?; Threatte p. 398); στρ(α)τεύεται IG III.3 55.a.9 (Attica, 325/24?; Threatte p. 396, 478; more mistakes); Ἀρίσται[χ]μ(ο)ν *Hesperia* 20 p. 223 (Attica, 4th c.; Threatte p. 396); γλ(ώ)τταγ κ- Audollent No. 49.2 (Attica, ca. 300; Threatte p. 400); Πάνφ(ι)λος and Πανφ(ι)λου (but correct ibid. 4) IG III.3 63.1,2 (4th/3rd c.?; Threatte p. 400, more mistakes); Χαίρ(ε)στράτην IG III.3 64.10 (Attica, 4th/3rd c.?; Threatte p. 398). Quite old is the following example from outside Attica: ἀτ(ε)λείαι Schwyzler 167a.A (Selinous, 1st h. 5th c.; with more mistakes).

<sup>14</sup> I have not normally included examples of which the interpretation is uncertain, such as the ones discussed by G. Neumann, *AA* 1977 p. 38 f.

this principle may be of considerable help to those engaged in the edition and restoration of archaic Greek inscriptions.

# Γ

ἄγ(α)λμα (?)<sup>15</sup> on stone, Hansen 341 (Thessalia, 3rd q. 5th c.).<sup>16</sup>  
 ‘Wrong’: no example.

# Δ

Δ(ε)μότιμος (?) on stone, Hesperia 25 p. 375—77 l. 40 (Attica, ca. 465; Threatte p. 397).<sup>17</sup>  
 Η(ε)σσεπίδ(ε)ς (cf. below for Η(ε)-) on a Paestan vase<sup>18</sup> (2nd h. 4th c., also Μ(ύ)ρμησ(σ)α).<sup>19</sup>

‘Wrong’:

δ(ι)σῶν on stone, Hansen 570.2 (Attica, after 350; Threatte p. 397; more mistakes).<sup>20</sup>

# Ζ

Ζ(ε)ῦξις (?) on a Chalcidian vase, Rumpf 4, Schwyzler 797.4 (2nd h. 6th c.).<sup>21</sup>

‘Wrong’: no example.

<sup>15</sup> Confusion by the stonemason of the letter forms of alpha and lambda (ΑΓΛΑΜΑ, see the dr. IG IX.2 1098) may be responsible for this mistake too. In Hansen 281 (Attica, 1st h. 6th c.) all previous editions have ΑΑΛΜΑ, i. e. ἄ(γ)αλμα rather than ἄγ(α)λμα; the reason will be confusion of the similar letters alpha and gamma in the process of engraving the inscr. onto the vessel.

<sup>16</sup> Later: ἄγ(α)θόν IG III.3 90.a.6 (Attica, 3rd c.?: Threatte p. 640; also κ(ά)τοχον, below, n. 55). Here the letter-forms cannot have played a role. There are other mistakes in this inscription: 1 Θεοδ(ό)την (below, n. 20), 2 ἐ(ρ)γάζηται (phonological?, see Threatte p. 481, not mentioned there) and some ε/η/ει confusion.

<sup>17</sup> The inscr. is lost; there are many copying mistakes in it, most of them probably modern.

<sup>18</sup> A. D. Trendall, *The red-figured vases of Paestum*, 1987, p. 86 No. 2.135, p. 99 ff. (pl. 57). Kretschmer p. 221 thinks of Ἑσσεπιδάς, but the delta is indisputable.

<sup>19</sup> I do not include Threatte’s example (p. 397) [Μν]ησιθείδ(ης) IG II<sup>2</sup> 2364.5 (Attica, late 5th c.), since according to IG the squeeze showed -θειδης.

<sup>20</sup> Later: Θεοδ(ό)την IG III.3 90.a.1 (Attica, 3rd c.?: Threatte p. 400; cf. above, n. 16); Ἀφροδ(ι)τη IG II<sup>2</sup> 10936a (Attica, 2nd/1st c.; Threatte p. 399); Θεωδ(ώ)ρα IG II<sup>2</sup> 10220 (Attica, 1st c. A. D.; Threatte p. 399); Εισιδ(ώ)ρα IG II<sup>2</sup> 9706/9707 (Attica, aet. Rom.; Threatte p. 400).

<sup>21</sup> Ζεῦξις was the interpretation in CIG 7381 of what looks like TV+Ις (although already earlier the initial letter was read as a tau). Kretschmer p. 64 (bottom) assumes that +

## H

- h(ε)κηβόλοι on stone, Hansen 403 (Naxos, 2nd h. 7th c.; also ν(ϋν)).  
 h(ε)κηβώ[λωι] on stone, Hansen 425 (probably Parian<sup>22</sup>, from Delos, ca. 550—530?).<sup>23</sup>  
 Λh(ε)οντίς on a Corinthian vase Lorber 122, Amyx 66 (early 6th c.; also \*Ακ(α)στος).<sup>24</sup>  
 Η(ε)ρμᾶιος on a Corinthian vase Lorber 120, Amyx 92 (1st h. 6th c.).  
 Η(ε)ρμιοκρέ[ων] on stone, IG XII.3 780 (the correct spelling *ibid.* 548; Thera, 6th c.?).  
 Η(ε)ρμῶ (gen., next to Hermes' figure) on an Attic pelike by the Lykaon P., ARV p. 1045.2 (ca. mid 5th c.; not mentioned by Threatte p. 46; cf. also Η(ἐ)ὸς).  
 Η(ε)ρμῆς and Η(ε)κᾶτῃ (and Δεμῆτερ) on an Attic bell-krater by the Persephone P., ARV p. 1012.1 (ca. mid 5th c.; Threatte p. 46; cf. below, Appendix).  
 Η(ε)ρμῆς<sup>25</sup> on an Attic bell-krater by the Villa Giulia P., ARV p. 619.16 (ca. mid 5th c.; Threatte p. 46; cf. below, Appendix).  
 Η(ε)λικόν on an Attic white lekythos by the Achilles P., ARV p. 997.155, Para. p. 438 (ca. mid 5th c.; Threatte p. 46; cf. also Μh(ε)λανόπῳ and below, Appendix).  
 3 Μh(ε)λανόπῳ on three Attic white lekythoi by the Achilles P., ARV p. 995.121, 996.132, 141 (ca. mid 5th c.; Threatte p. 39, 45 f.; cf. also Η(ε)λικόν, and below, Appendix).  
 Η(ε)λένη on an Attic oinochoe by the Heimarmene P., ARV p. 1173 bottom (ca. mid 2nd h. 5th c.; Threatte p. 46; cf. below, Appendix).

---

exceptionally stands for *kh*, and reads Τύχῃς. Yet in view of Τοξ[...] of the same vase (Τοχ[...] does not make sense) and the unanimous use of + and X for *kh* on all other Chalcidian vases, Kretschmer's Τυχ- is not plausible.

<sup>22</sup> See the discussion about the origin of the script by Jeffery p. 294 f. As the second (h)eta and the omega of this form are not Delian, we should prefer 'A.W.' Initial aspiration was preserved on Paros (see e.g. Hansen 412).

<sup>23</sup> This is the example that is cited as Ηκηβο[λε] in Lejeune 1 p. 6 and Lejeune 2 p. 214 (from SGDI 5387). I disregard h(ε)κάβ[ο]λο[ν] (?) Kretschmer p. 99 (dr. H. Röhl, *Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae praeter atticis in Attica repertas*, 1882, p. 22 No. 56), which is too uncertain.

<sup>24</sup> A reading Λεοντίς is not advisable in view of the fact that (1) in Corinthian heta nowhere else has a vocalic-only value, and (2) that λέων etc. has a short *e*. For the aspiration of nasals and liquids see e.g. Threatte p. 25 f.; a Corinthian example is Amyx 123 Νήσ[σ]ος.

<sup>25</sup> I could not find and verify another example of this spelling of Hermes' name, mentioned by Kretschmer p. 99 (on a relief in the Villa Albani in Rome).

- H(έ)ός<sup>26</sup> on an Attic lekythos by the Brygos P., ARV p. 384.222 (late 1st q. 5th c.; Threatte p. 46).<sup>27</sup>
- H(έ)ός on an Attic pelike by the Lykaon P., ARV p. 1045.5, LIMC Eos No. 98 (ca. mid 5th c.; Threatte p. 46; cf. also H(ε)ρμῶ and below, Appendix).
- 2 H(έ)κτῶρ and H(ε)κάβῃ (and two more ῃ, five more ὄ, always ζ) on an Attic rf. kantharos by the Eretria P., Lezzi-Hafter p. 352 No. 285bis (early 4th q. 5th c.; cf. also H(έ)βῃ and below, Appendix).
- h(ε)ῖ on stone, Schwyzer 83.B.9 (Argos, mid 5th c.; also H(έ)ρᾱι and καλλ(ι)στεῖα).
- h(ε)λόντες (Ἀθηναίων) on a bronze greave, SEG 31.369 (Sikyonian dedication at Olympia, ca. 460).
- 3 h(έ)νδεκα, h(έ)ξ, h(έ)μιττα on stone, Buck 39.8/9, 11, 15/16 (Thespiai, early 4th c.).<sup>28</sup>
- h(ε)σπέλης on stone, Schwyzer 811.46 f., Buck 14 (Oropos, late 5th or early 4th c.; cf. Addenda).
- H(έ)σπεριδ(ε)ς (cf. above for -δ(ε)-) on a Paestan vase, above n. 18 (2nd h. 4th c.; also M(ύ)ρμησ(σ)α).
- h(ῃ)μ[ιστα]τῆρος· ἥνατον on a stone weight, Jeffery p. 323.13 (Thera, end 6th c.?).
- H(έ)σοφ(h)ος on stone, IG XII.3 786 (Thera, 7th/6th. c.).<sup>29</sup>
- H(έ)ρῃ graffito on a vase, Jeffery p. 297, 306.43c (Delos, 550–525).
- H(έ)ρᾱι on stone, Schwyzer 83.B.10 (Argos, ca. 450; also h(ε)ῖ and καλλ(ι)στεῖα).<sup>30</sup>
- H(έ)ρᾱ[ι] ([ἀνέθ]ῆκε) graffito on a vase, Perachora II, 1962, p. 399.123, pl. 151, 168 (Perachora, late 5th c.).<sup>31</sup>

<sup>26</sup> For the expected spelling *Héōs* see the Attic bf. epinetron (late 6th c.) LIMC Eos No. 308.

<sup>27</sup> Threatte attempts a reading *Ἄός*, since the two hastas of the heta are closer together at the top than at the bottom. It is true that the Brygos Painter (or better Brygos himself in view of his foreign name?) sometimes confused aspirates with non-aspirates (Δίτιλος, Νικοπίλῃ, etc., see Threatte p. 453, 471 f.), but this does not mean that he can be expected to write ‘Doric’ *ā*. Indeed he writes καλέ on the same vase (and e. g. Νικοπίλῃ, just mentioned, on others).

<sup>28</sup> For a ph. see BCH 62 pl. 28 (text p. 149 ff.). The inscription is carefully written; cf. *ibid.* 2 *ἡερά*, 15 *ἡάμα*, and also 4 *ἡεράωι*.

<sup>29</sup> See F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, II 1923, p. 521, who compares it to IG II<sup>1</sup> 3773, where *Ἡσάνδρου* is written twice (therefore we should not assume ‘A. W.’ *Ἡσ(ι)-* in either name).

<sup>30</sup> See also the inconsequent writing τᾱι *Ἡεράι* ἐν *Ἐεράδι* *ibid.* A.16, moreover Schwyzer 96, also from Argos, with τᾱς *Ἡεράς*.

<sup>31</sup> On the bronze bull JHS 1931 p. 194, the name of Hera is spelt with epsilon: *Ἡεράι*.

H(ἐ)ρᾱ (besides Προμῆθῆς<sup>32</sup>) on an Attic cup by Douris, ARV p. 438.133 (1st h. 5th c.; Threatte p. 46; also ἔγραφσ(ε)ν).

H(ἐ)ρακλῆς incised before firing in a small clay stele, Hansen 396 (Metapontion, late 6th c.; also ἀγαθ(ᾶ)ν).

H(ἐ)ρακλῆς on an Attic Tyrrhenian neck-amphora, ABV p. 96.13 (shortly before mid 6th c.; Threatte p. 46).

H(ἐ)ρακλῆς (besides Ηερμῆς, Ηελικάδων) on an Attic bf. hydria by the Antimenes P., Para. p. 119.35bis, LIMC Apollon 884 (late 6th c.).<sup>33</sup>

2 H(ἐ)ρακλῆς on two Attic cups by Aristophanes and the potter Erginos,<sup>34</sup> ARV p. 1319 top No. 2 and 3 (late 5th c.; cf. below, Appendix).<sup>35</sup>

H(ἐ)βῆ on an Attic epinetron by the Eretria P., ARV p. 1250f. No. 34, Lezzi-Hafter p. 347f. No. 257 (early 4th q. 5th c.; cf. also H(ἐ)κτῶρ and H(ε)κάβῆ, and below, Appendix).

h(ή)βην on stone, Hansen 155 (Paros, 476/75).<sup>36</sup>

h(ἐ)χσαγογῆ on stone, IG I<sup>3</sup> 236.9 (Attica, ca. 410–404; Threatte p. 45).<sup>37</sup>

---

Payne repeated his misleading transcription in *Perachora I*, 1940, p. 136; see *ibid.* the dr. and the ph. pl. 43.7. Correct SEG 11.226 (Jeffery p. 141, 143.7 does not cite the text).

<sup>32</sup> The form Προμῆθῆς is not due to omission of υ as Threatte claims, but is an example of the frequent and wide-spread alternation of nominative forms -ῆς and -εὺς in proper names; see Kretschmer p. 191 f., E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik I*, 1939, p. 575 f., and for Mycenaean E. Risch in: *Tractata Mycenaea* (Proceedings 8th intern. coll. on Myc. studies), Skopje 1987, especially p. 286–88.

<sup>33</sup> Basel BS 498. The inscriptions are: Ἀπόλλων, Ηελικάδων, ἴο[...], obviously Eurypylos' charioteer, otherwise unknown (on the photos in the Beazley Archives, Oxford, of the unrestored vase the final sigma is clear, in between three letters are missing, so e.g.: ἴο[λεο]ς, ἴο[κλε]ς, or ἴο[κλο]ς?), Νεοππτόλεμο{ο}ς, Εὐρύπυλος; Ηερμῆς, Ἀθηνάα, Η(ἐ)ρακλῆς, and Ἀρε[ς].

<sup>34</sup> See H. Immerwahr, *The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science* 46, 1964, p. 25–27. I do not know of any good ph. published, but Immerwahr 1990 No. 813 f. writes “vidi” and confirms the reading.

<sup>35</sup> Of the vases cited Cat. Campana IV n. 212 and 466 by Kretschmer p. 98, the former shows Ηερακλ-. I owe its identification to F. Lissarrague: it is Leningrad 1516 (25 St.). The latter seems to be lost.

<sup>36</sup> For the aspiration see *ibid.* h[ό]νεκεν, and above, n. 22. This case in a sense is unique, since we probably cannot expect what would be the ‘correct’ Parian spelling ΗΗΒΗΝ. In this writing system therefore ‘A. W.’ may well have been the normal spelling for Ηῆ-.

<sup>37</sup> Threatte takes this for a case of ῆ (cf. below, Appendix), but he also considers that there could be a hidden article, writing ῆ χσαγογῆ. IG writes <ἐ>χσαγογῆ in the text, but asks “anne ἡχσαγογῆ per crasim?” in the app. The latter is certainly correct, the article makes perfect sense. But in an inscription which does not show a single Ionic writing feature, our ‘A. W.’ is the better solution than writing ῆ.

‘Wrong’:

h(o)ι on stone, IG I<sup>3</sup> 80.19 (Attica, 421/20).

hυh(ύ)ς on an Attic cup by the potter Eucheiros, ABV p. 162 bottom No. 3 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.; also Εὔχεῖρ(ο)ς).<sup>38</sup>

Θ

θ(ε)ῆι on stone, Hansen 422 (Samos, ca. 560).

Θ(ε)ότιμος graffito on a vase, E. A. Gardner, Naukratis II, 1888, p. 65 with dr. pl. 21 (Naukratis, 6th c.).<sup>39</sup>

θ(ε)οῖς graffito on a vase, JHS 25 (1905) p. 116.1 (and also p. 116.19?) with dr. (Naukratis, 6th c.).<sup>40</sup>

θ(ε)οῖσι[v] graffito on a vase, ABSA 5 (1898/99) p. 56 No. 106, dr. pl. 5 (Naukratis, 6th c.).

θ(ε)οῖσιv on an East Greek vase, ABSA 47 (1952) p. 169.160, ph. pl. 34.8 (Naukratis, 6th c.).<sup>41</sup>

Ἀθένεθ(ε)v (?) on the Burgon panathenaic amphora, ABV p. 89 bottom No. 1, LIMC Athena 118 (shortly before mid 6th c.; Kretschmer p. 124, Threatte p. 398).<sup>42</sup>

Θμισθοκλῆς on an ostrakon, Hesperia 7 p. 233 No. A. O. 115 (Attica, ca. 480).<sup>43</sup>

<sup>38</sup> The full spelling hυhύς is found *ibid.* No. 2. The same form is used by Eucheiros' son (i. e. Ergotimos' grandson; p. 163 upper half, twice), whose name is lost: Εὔχεῖρō hυhύς. (This spelling seems to have been some sort of family tradition.)

<sup>39</sup> In view of the fact that the normal writing θεοῖς(ιv) etc. is far more frequent on similar Naukratian documents, in this and the next three cases we must prefer 'A. W.' to a phonological explanation (almost inaudible 'consonantic' ε, or the like). Contraction, as claimed for the present name by Gardner (Θούτιμος, i. e. Θότιμος), is unlikely for inscriptions of East Ionic dialect, where this change is unknown.

<sup>40</sup> No. 1 is to be read boustrophedon: [...?] τοῖς θ(ε)οῖς τῶν | Ἑλλήνων | με ἀνέθηκεν [...?]. No. 19 could be [...]θ(ε)οῖς[...], if read from right to left.

<sup>41</sup> This was thought to be a nonsense inscription (*ibid.* p. 161; for the reversed sigma see p. 160, 167.67, ph. pl. 35.18), before J. Boardman, ABSA 51 (1956) p. 58 n. 7, suspected a θεοῖς formula.

<sup>42</sup> Kretschmer *ibid.* interpreted this case as due to weak pronunciation, which is likely (cf. below, n. 96). See also Threatte p. 396. The same form on another panathenaic amphora indicated by Kretschmer *ibid.* is probably incorrect although the inscription is overpainted in the relevant passage, now showing normal Ἀθένεθεν; the identification of the amphora was possible through its description in the *Cataloghi Campana* (IV 23), which F. Lissarrague kindly excerpted for me: it is Louvre F 273 (CVA France 8, III H g, pl. 1.1,2).

<sup>43</sup> The two epsilons in question on this and the next ostrakon were first forgotten and then squeezed in, which seems not to have been noted so far.

Θμισθοκλῆς on an ostrakon, Hesperia 7 p. 237 No. A. O. 70 (Attica, ca. 480).

\*Αθ(η)ναίης graffito on a vase, SEG 34.770 (Olbia, 5th c.).

ἀνέθ(ε)κε painted on a Corinthian pinax, Hansen 357 (late 7th c.).

ἀνέθ(ε)κε painted on a Corinthian pinax, IG IV 238, Arch.Anz. 1970 p. 34 with fig. 3 (6th c.).

ἔθ(ε)κεν on a Boeotian bronze lebes, Jeffery p. 91, 94.3b, dr. pl. 7 (Attica, Attic dialect, 7th c.?).

ἀνέθ(ε)κε (?) graffito on a vase, Jeffery p. 188, 198.4 (Sparta, early 6th c.).<sup>44</sup>

[ἀνέ]θ(η)κε[ν] on a vase frg., Emporio p. 245 No. 625 (Chios, 1st h. 6th c.).<sup>45</sup>

ἀνέθ(ε)κε around the base of a small bronze bull, IG VII 3576 (Thebai, 6th c.?).<sup>46</sup>

[ἀνέ]θ(ε)κε on stone, Schwyzer 4 (Sparta, 6th c.).

[ἀν]έθ(η)κη graffito on a vase, BCH 86 p. 838 f. fig. 11 top right (Neapolis opp. Thasos, Thasian script, 6th c.).

[κα]τέθ(ε)κεν on a bronze vase, IG I<sup>2</sup> 406 (I<sup>3</sup> 585)<sup>47</sup> (Attica, ca. 550–530?; Threatte p. 397; also Δαμ(α)σίδαι?).

[ἀνέ]θ(ε)κεν on stone, IG I<sup>2</sup> 729 (I<sup>3</sup> 712) (Attica, ca. 500–480?; Threatte p. 397).<sup>48</sup>

‘Wrong’:

ἀγαθ(ᾶ)ν incised before firing in a small clay stele, Hansen 396 (Metapontion, late 6th c.; also Η(ε)ρακλῆς).<sup>49</sup>

<sup>44</sup> On the dr. ABSA 28 p. 71 fig. 13, there is a shadow next to the theta, but it does not seem to be the letter epsilon; the ph. *ibid.* is unclear.

<sup>45</sup> J. Boardman, *Excavations in Chios 1952–1955*, Greek Emporio, 1967; ph. pl. 98.

<sup>46</sup> For a ph. of the object and the first part of the inscr. see B. Schmaltz, *Metallfiguren aus dem Kabirenheiligtum bei Theben: die Statuetten aus Bronze und Blei (Kabirenheiligtum Bd. VI)*, 1980, pl. 19.341 (text p. 84). The theta is the last letter before the writer had to turn the object for the second time. On the next side he forgot about the vowel. There was plenty of space.

<sup>47</sup> I am grateful to Prof. D. M. Lewis for checking for me the readings in IG I<sup>3</sup> that are not yet published.

<sup>48</sup> Later: Πειθ(ε)δήμου (?) Arch.Delt. 22.1 p. 38 ff. l. 5, SEG 24.154 (Attica, 264/63 or soon after; Threatte p. 397; for Πειθίδαμος and Πειθόδημος, but also Πειθένους [Milet] and Πειθέας, see Bechtel p. 366 f.); ἑλεύθ(ε)πον Schwyzer 74.111 (Andania, Messenia, 92/91; correct spelling e.g. *ibid.* 102, 105, which makes a phonological explanation implausible).

<sup>49</sup> We may not argue for ‘A. W.’ ἀγαθ(ᾶ)ν. The mistake may be due to a certain similarity of Α and Ν.

ἐνθ(ά)δε on stone, Arch.Ephem. 1958 p. 85 (Attica, 400—390; Threatte p. 399).<sup>50</sup>

Θεμισθ(ο)κλέες on an ostrakon, Hesperia 7 p. 232f. No. A. O. 136 (Attica, ca. 480; Threatte p. 397).<sup>51</sup>

## K

\*Ακ(α)στος on a Corinthian vase Lorber 122, Amyx 66 (early 6th c.; also Λη(ε)οντίς).

Κ(α)λύκᾱ (?) on a Corinthian vase Lorber 35, Amyx 25 (early 6th c.).<sup>52</sup>

Κ(ά)λ(λ)ιπ(π)ος (?) on an Attic Tyrrhenian-like hydria, ABV p. 106 bottom No. 1 (shortly before mid 6th c.).

Κ(α)λ(λ)ι(χ)σενες on an ostrakon, Hesperia 19 p. 388.25 (Attica, 483 or 482).<sup>53</sup>

κ(α)θαροῖς A.13 (besides A.14 καθαρόν) in a lex sacra on a lead tablet<sup>54</sup> (Selinous, c. mid 5th c.).<sup>55</sup>

‘Wrong’:

ἀνέθῆκ(ε)ν<sup>56</sup> on stone, Jeffery p. 284.4, pl. 53 (Taras, ca. 500—490).<sup>57</sup>

## Λ<sup>58</sup>

ἄλ(λά) (?) on stone, Jeffery p. 220.6, pl. 42 (Elis, ca. 500?; ΑΑΛ, ι, the two letters can be similar).

<sup>50</sup> Slightly faulty hexameter. The mistake may be due to a confusion of Δ and Α.

<sup>51</sup> The mistake may be due to a confusion of (crossed) Θ and Ο.

<sup>52</sup> Probably the name of a hetaira. Κ(α)λύκᾱ was Blass's suggestion (SGDI 3125). Kretschmer (p. 41, 144f.; see also Threatte p. 437) interpreted it as Γλύκᾱ with assimilation. But this phonological change is unparalleled in Korinth and extremely rare elsewhere (of the examples quoted by Kretschmer only κλανικίων Hsch., undated and unlocated, could support this view). Moreover Κάλυκᾱ seems to be the name of a nymph on an Attic cup, ARV p. 146.2, and the notion ‘like a bud’ is very appropriate, see καλυκῶτις ‘like a budding flower in face’ (LSJ) in Hymn. Cer. 422, Hymn. Ven. 284, etc. I therefore prefer Blass's interpretation.

<sup>53</sup> The man's correct name was Καλλίχσενος, as shown by very many pieces. Comparable faulty examples are ibid. p. 387.23 Καλισθένος, p. 387.24 Καλλισθενες, p. 385.16 Καλλι-σενοι.

<sup>54</sup> To be published by M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan, and R. Kotansky, in a GRBS monograph, c. 1991. I am grateful to M. Jameson for a provisional copy of the text.

<sup>55</sup> Later: κ(ά)τοχον IG III.3 90.a.6, but κάτοχος ibid. 4 (Attica 3rd c.?; Threatte p. 640; cf. above, n. 16).

<sup>56</sup> Cases like this are frequent enough to allow a phonological explanation (weak pronunciation), cf. below, n. 96.

<sup>57</sup> Later: Κ(ι)βυράτις IG II<sup>2</sup> 9027 (Attica, 2nd c.; Threatte p. 397).

<sup>58</sup> Here confusion of the letters alpha and lambda in the process of copying is in most cases (except the Chalcidian vase) a possible explanation too. Yet on objects that seem

Γλ(α)ῦφος on a Corinthian vase Lorber 129, Amyx 74 (Antenor's son; 1st h. 6th c.; A, C, I).

Γλ(α)ῦφος on a Chalcidian vase, Rumpf 5, Schwyzer 797.1 (Hippolochos' son; 2nd h. 6th c.; A, C, I).<sup>59</sup>

Γλ(α)ύκη on an Attic cup by the Kleophrades P., ARV p. 192.106 (1st q. 5th c.; see Threatte p. 39 and below, Appendix with n. 124 and 129; A, Γ, Λ).<sup>60</sup>

Λ(α)κεδ(αί)μονι on a Sikyonian stater of the 4th c. JHS 18 p. 302–05 (Sparta; A, Λ).<sup>61</sup>

θαλ(α)μος (?) on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 12151.3 (Attica, ca. 400–350; Threatte p. 397; A, Λ).<sup>62</sup>

‘Wrong’:<sup>63</sup>

καλλ(ι)στεῖα on stone, Schwyzer 83.A.9 (Argos, mid 5th c.; also h(ε)ῖ and H(ἔ)ρᾱι).

Καλλ(ῖ)νος on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 13058 (Attica, before 350; Threatte p. 399).

Κα[λ]λ(ι)στιον on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 7643.1 (Attica, after 317/16; Threatte p. 399).

ξυλ(ι)νων on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1620.20 (Attica, 348/47; Threatte p. 399; one more mistake).<sup>64</sup>

## M

Σῖμ(ο)ς (?) on a Chalcidian vase, Rumpf 13, Kretschmer p. 63 (2nd h. 6th c.).<sup>65</sup>

---

to be rather spontaneously inscribed, we will not readily argue for such a copying mistake, which is possible with more formal texts on stone.

<sup>59</sup> The correct spelling Γλαῦ[φος] occurs on a Corinthian vase Lorber 121, Amyx 82, where the hero takes part in the fight over Sarpedon's body.

<sup>60</sup> The Nereid known from Homer and Hesiod; on the same vase Κυμοθέα, [Γ]αλένη, [Πασι?]θέα, Κυμώ, and ΘΗΤΙς (cf. below, Appendix). The letters are Ionic, i. e. ΓΛΥΚΗ (cf. below, n. 129). It does not seem safe to assume a copying mistake; so ‘A. W.’ is the better explanation.

<sup>61</sup> The whole inscr.: Τᾶς Ἀρτάμιτος : τᾶς ἐ(λ) Λ(α)κεδ(αί)μονι. For an assimilation similar to the one in ἐ(λ) see Hansen 367 (= Schwyzer 7; Laconian, from Olympia) τοῖ(λ) Λ-. The last omission (αί) is puzzling.

<sup>62</sup> Later: θαλ(ά)σση IG II<sup>2</sup> 3299.4 (Attica, 132 A. D.; Threatte p. 400 argues that the writer mistook his lambda for an alpha, which is possible).

<sup>63</sup> On the ostrakon Hesperia 19 p. 381.1 (Attica, ca. 480; Threatte p. 400) we probably have to read Καλίχσ(ενος) instead of Καλλ(ι)χσ(ενος), as ibid. No. 2.

<sup>64</sup> Later: Σόλ(ω)νος IG II<sup>2</sup> 11830 (Attica, 1st c.; Threatte p. 397).

<sup>65</sup> Perhaps to be read from right to left, i. e. Σ(ῖ)μις, like Σ(ῖ)μος on the same vase; the names belong to satyrs.

Μ(ύ)ρμησ(σ)α on a Paestan vase, above, n. 18 (2nd h. 4th c.; also H(ε)σσπερίδ(ε)ς).<sup>66</sup>

‘Wrong’:

[Δ?]αμ(α)σίδαι on a bronze vase, IG I<sup>2</sup> 406 (I<sup>3</sup> 585) (Attica, ca. 550–530?; Threatte p. 397; also [άνα?]τέθ(ε)κεν).

ἐγραμμ(ά)τευεν on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 502.3 (Attica, 302/01; Threatte p. 399).<sup>67</sup>

ἀποφθιμ(έ)νη on stone, Hansen 621 (Attica, 4th c.?; Threatte p. 396, 400; probably also πᾶσ(ι)ν).

Ἄρτάμ(ι)τι on a bronze vase, Jeffery p. 214.3, pl. 40 (Arkadia, ca. 525?; also τ(ᾶ)ι).

Θεμ(ι)σθοκλεο on an ostrakon, Hesperia 7 p. 238 f. No. A. O. 146 (Attica, ca. 480; Threatte p. 397).<sup>68</sup>

2 Μ(ι)λιτιάδω on two ostraka Kerameikos 3 p. 60.54, 61.61 (Attica, 461; Threatte p. 396, 478).<sup>69</sup>

Ἐχετίμ(ῶ) (?) on stone, Jeffery p. 323.12.i, pl. 61.12(i) (Thera, ca. 550–500?).<sup>70</sup>

## N

ν(ῦν) on stone, Hansen 403 (Naxos, 2nd h. 7th c.; also h(ε)κηβόλοι).<sup>71</sup>  
Διον(ύ)σιος on an Attic oinochoe by the Taleides P., ABV p. 176.2 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.).<sup>72</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Trendall’s explanation (p. 100) is not plausible: “just below the bust of Hermes, and one may reasonably conclude that the artist, intending to name the nymph who is gathering the apples, allowed his eye to wander to the bust above and confused the two names” (see already CIG 8480). Ἀστέας is an experienced writer, and the name, which is clearly the nymph’s, is easily explainable as the feminine in \*-yā from Μύρμηκ-, an appropriate denomination for a nymph. Μύρμηξ is itself well attested as a name (e. g. Bechtel p. 584, Diog. Laert. 2.113; similar, heroic: Serv. Verg. Aen. 4.402 *Myrmix*). For the painter’s spelling of intervocalic geminates see e. g. Σκύλ(λ)α Trendall *ibid.* p. 85 No. 2.129.

<sup>67</sup> Later: Εὐημ(έ)ρου IG II<sup>2</sup> 1945.112 (Attica, 45/46; Threatte p. 399).

<sup>68</sup> This is just a mistake, as also is the wrong case form. The second attempt on this ostrakon was more successful: Θεμισθοκλῆς Νεοκλῆος, but still the middle omikron was at first miswritten. The writer was probably illiterate and was copying from somewhere.

<sup>69</sup> The ph. of the example p. 61.60 shows traces of an iota. For No. 61 no ph. is given. It is easy to imagine that illiterate people, who wanted to vote, occasionally copied mistakes from each other.

<sup>70</sup> Jeffery p. 413 completes -μ(ος), but a gen. is probably the easier solution.

<sup>71</sup> The stone shows only one letter (my or ny), and a monosyllabic word is required for metrical reasons. Of all suggestions, νῦν is the only acceptable one and indeed makes perfect sense. If the stone has a my (which is disputed), we would have to blame the stone-cutter. Cf. above, 2.

Οἰνότιμος on a bronze object, Alt Smyrna I, 1983, p. 129 f. (Smyrna, ca. 600 [ibid. p. 144]).<sup>73</sup>

Δολίωνος<sup>74</sup> graffito on a vase, ABSA 59 p. 42.20, pl. 6E; Akurgal, ibid. p. 111 (Smyrna, late 7th c.).<sup>75</sup>

‘Wrong’:

Ξν(α)ι on a bronze tablet, Schwyzer 673 (Bassai, before 420?, also χρ(έ)ματα, τ(ι)ς).

Ἰπποσθέν(ε)ος on stone, Schwyzer 690 (Chios, early 5th c.; there is another mistake).

ἀν(ε)θέκεν on stone, IG I<sup>2</sup> 443 (I<sup>3</sup> 527) (Attica, ca. 500?; Threatte p. 400).

ν(ε)ώι on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1425.283 (Attica, 368/67; Threatte p. 397; also 269 κεχρυσ(ω)μένος, 366 θυμιατήρ(ι)ον).<sup>76</sup>

Σοφρον(ι)σκῶ on stone, IG I<sup>2</sup> 647.2 (I<sup>3</sup> 805) (Attica, ca. 500–480?; Threatte p. 399).

Qλῶπετίδων(ος) graffito on a vase, Jeffery p. 77.10a (Attica; late 7th to mid 6th c.).

Τεισόμεν(ό)ς on stone, Hesperia 35 p. 205 ff. l. 69 (= IG II<sup>2</sup> 2413.14) (Attica, 304/03; Threatte p. 399).<sup>77</sup>

### Ξ

Εὐξ(ι)θέῳ on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1951.131, SEG 22.53 (Attica, 406; Threatte p. 397; correct in the following line, few more mistakes).<sup>78</sup>

‘Wrong’: no example.

<sup>72</sup> Naked wreathed man seated with a krater in his hands, and a diaulos-player. Beazley reads Dionysios (the second iota is certain), which would mean ‘the dionysiac one’; the inscription hardly belongs to the flute-player as Beazley thinks, but to the seated man.

<sup>73</sup> The second omikron and the final sigma are secondarily inserted, see pl. 124.a,b and colour pl. N.1,2 after p. 80.

<sup>74</sup> The second omikron is secondarily inserted.

<sup>75</sup> Later: Διον(ῡ)σίον IG II<sup>2</sup> 9510 (Attica, 2nd/1st c.; Threatte p. 397; another mistake); Διον(ῡ)σίον IG II<sup>2</sup> 9567 (Attica, 1st/2nd c. A. D.; Threatte p. 397).

<sup>76</sup> There are many more mistakes which show that the stone-cutter was illiterate, e. g. 152, 205, 215, 224 f., 264, 279, 284, 295, 408.

<sup>77</sup> Later: Εὐκτῆμον(ος) IG II<sup>2</sup> 1822.14 (Attica, early 3rd c. A. D.; Threatte p. 397); Μεν(ε)κράτου Hesperia 17 p. 51 No. 55 (Attica, 3rd/2nd c.; Threatte p. 397); Μνασιγύν(ι)ος and Εὐμεν(ι)δος Schwyzer 536.3.8 and 4.6 resp. (Boeotia, ca. 200; the first case could be due to assimilation or palatalisation -γένιος as occurs in contemporary Attic [Threatte p. 394], the second reminds one of the names in -ώνδας); Στρατον(ι)κη IG II<sup>2</sup> 12662 (Attica, 1st c.; Threatte p. 399).

<sup>78</sup> Later: Μαξι(ι)μιον[ός] IG II<sup>2</sup> 5202 (Attica, 285–305; Threatte p. 398).

## Π

π(ί)ει besides πί(ει) on an Attic cup by the P. Elbows Out, ABV p. 250.29 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.).

2 π(ί)ει twice on an Attic cup by the Phrynos P., ABV p. 169 top No. 4 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.; Kretschmer p. 90).

π(ί)ει εὔ (besides πίει εὔ on the other side) on an Attic bf. lip-cup NSc 1893 p. 127 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.; Kretschmer p. 238).

π(ί)θι on an Attic bf. vase from Athens ("Perserschutt" Kretschmer p. 238; I could not trace and verify this case).

Ἐπ(ι)κράτης on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1928.4 (Attica, early 4th c.; Threatte p. 397).

ἐπ(ι)σκευή[ς] on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1612.215 (Attica, 356/55; Threatte p. 397).<sup>79</sup>

'Wrong':<sup>80</sup>

ἄπ(α)ρχέν on stone, Hansen 206 (Attica, ca. 500; Threatte p. 396).

Π(ά)τροκλος on an Attic amphora by the Priam P., ABV p. 330.2 (late 6th c.).

Π(ο)λ(λ)ῖο (besides Πολ(λ)ῖο) on an Attic psykter by Euthymides, ARV p. 28.11 (late 6th c.).<sup>81</sup>

## Q

Qυνίσφ(ο)ς graffito on a vase, Jeffery p. 234.14, pl. 46 (Korkyra, last q. 6th c.).

'Wrong': no example.

## P

Ἀνφίχαρ(ο)ς (?) on stone, Hansen 14, Jeffery pl. 3.20 (Attica, ca. 560—50?).<sup>82</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Later: Ἐπ(ι)κτητος IG II<sup>2</sup> 2128.196 (Attica, 190—200; Threatte p. 400).

<sup>80</sup> I do not include Ἀππλόδορος ARV p. 1565 upper half (CVA Ital. 28 pl. 23.1, p. 29; Kretschmer p. 124, Threatte p. 398, 533), since an extra pi stands where we expect the vowel. The example is as far as I can see phonologically unparallelled (see the examples in Threatte p. 533), so it may be a copying mistake (open 'omikron'). A similar case we have on ARV p. 75.64 (ca. 500; Threatte p. 400); here instead of ΗΙΠΛΟ+Ο'Ππ(ό)λοχο[ς], in view of ΗΙΠΛΡ+ΟΣΚΑΙΟΣ with Attic lambda on the same vase, it would be better to read Ηίππρχο[ς] and assume a copying mistake (incomplete 'alpha' and round 'rho').

<sup>81</sup> Later: π(ε)ντ[ή]κοντα Schwyzler 485.4 (Thespiai, late 3rd c.). The example Εὔπ(ο)ρος (?) IG II<sup>2</sup> 8657 (Attica, 1st c.; Threatte p. 397) is to be rejected since Εὔπρος is a normal short form of Εὐπρέτης vel sim. (Bechtel p. 174), and is attested elsewhere (see Pape-Benseler, Wörterb. d. gr. Eigennamen, s. v., an official at Halicarnassus).

Εὔχερ(ο)ς on an Attic cup by the potter E., ABV p. 162 bottom No. 3 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.; also *hwh(ύ)ς, ἐποί{o}ῃσεν*;<sup>82</sup> cf. also Εὔχ(ε)ρος, the same man).

Καλ(λ)ιρ(ρό)ῃ κρένῃ on an Attic hydria by the Lysippides P., ABV p. 261.41, 667 (late 6th c.; Kretschmer p. 83; also Ἀνφιτρ(ῖ)τῇ).

Φερ(ρό)φα[ττα] (sic!) on an Attic stamnos (?) by the P. of the Carlsruhe Paris, ARV p. 1315 bottom No. 2 (late 5th c.).<sup>84</sup>

Ἠγήσα(ν)δρ(ο)ς on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 11564 (Attica, early 4th c.; Threatte p. 396, 478).

σκορ(ό)δων (?) on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1184.15, SEG 21.518 (Attica, shortly after 334/33; Threatte p. 395<sup>85</sup> and 405 f.<sup>86</sup>).

Χαρ(ο)πίδου on stone, Agora 15 p. 59 No. 49.41 (Attica, 328/27; Threatte p. 397; more mistakes).<sup>87</sup>

‘Wrong’:

χσυγγρ(ά)φσει on stone, IG I<sup>3</sup> 79.16 (Attica, 421/20; Threatte p. 399).

Ἡρ(α)κλεῖ on stone, Hesperia 17 p. 137 ff. (Attica, ca. 400–350; Threatte p. 397; other strange features).

δρ(α)χμάς on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 448.86 (Attica, 318/17; Threatte p. 396; more mistakes).

<sup>82</sup> The name has always been restored as -χάρῃς, but it could also be -χαρος (short form of Bechtel p. 465 Ἀμφιχάρης as *ibid.* Ἀγλώχαρος of Ἀγλωχάρης, Πάγχαρος of Παγγχάρης). That the prosody is not as good as with -χάρῃς is not a strong objection, since proper names are often manipulated in order to fit in the metre, see precisely line 1 Χαιρεδέμω, or e.g. Hansen 380.5.

<sup>83</sup> A good ph.: J. Kirchner, *Imagines inscriptionum atticarum*, 1935, pl. 4.9. The correct spelling of the inscr. is found on the cup ABV *ibid.* No. 2: Εὔχερος ἐποίῃσεν *hōrgotímō hwhýs* (Beazley says that the vases cannot be shown to be by the same painter). For ἐποί{o}ῃσεν cf. below, n. 115.

<sup>84</sup> For the forms of Persephone's name in Attic see Threatte p. 450 f.

<sup>85</sup> Instead of “the loss of two identical unaccented short vowels separated by a liquid: σκόρδον” it should probably read “the loss of ⟨one of⟩ two identical short vowels ...”

<sup>86</sup> Threatte takes this as a case of syncope. But the other testimonies without -ο- are later inscriptions (1st c. A.D.) and literary codices (prose). The form with -ο- is attested earlier: Schwyzer 725 (Miletos, 6th c.) and in Aristophanes. The etymology is unclear; see Chantraine s.v. (many plants and spices have pre-Greek names). At any rate our epigraphical testimony σκορ(ό)δων which is much older than the other forms without -ο- and the forms like Βερνικίδης etc. (Threatte *ibid.*) is perhaps better not taken as a case of syncope (also Szemerényi, above, n. 3, p. 262 n. 1 suspects a mistake in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1184 rather than syncope).

<sup>87</sup> Later: Νικάνορ(ο)ς Schwyzer 612.B.20 (Phalanna, 3rd c.; more mistakes); Φιλόδρ(ο)μος Hesperia 38 p. 425 No. 2.39 (Attica, 220/19; Threatte p. 396; for the name see Bechtel p. 142; a few more mistakes); Πρεμυγένεια παρ(ο)ψίς CIL XV 6057, MDAl(A) 38 p. 196 (Arretine vase).

- ἀρ(ε)τάν incised before firing on a clay tablet, Hansen 334 (Ptoion, ca. 550—525?).
- ἱερ(έ)ως on stone, Schwyzer 726.45 (Miletos, 450; with a few more mistakes).
- χρ(έ)ματα on a bronze tablet, Schwyzer 673 (Bassai, before 420?, also ἐν(α)ι, τ(ι)ς).
- χρ(η)στή on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 12242.2 (Attica, after 350; Threatte p. 396).
- Ἀνφιτρ(ί)τῇ on an Attic hydria by the Lysippides P., ABV p. 260.30 (late 6th c.; Threatte p. 396; also Καλ(λ)ιρ(ρό)ῃ).
- Ἀρ(ι)στονύμῳ on an ostrakon, Hesperia 19 p. 383.8 (Attica, 483 or 482; Threatte p. 397).
- Τρ(ι)τώ (besides Τριτώ) on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 12824 (Attica, ca. 400; Threatte p. 396).
- Χαρ(ι)κλῆς on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1622.659 (Attica, ca. 342/41; Threatte p. 397; one more mistake *ibid.* 214).
- Ἀρρ(ι)λεως on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 5465 (Attica, after 350; Threatte p. 399).
- ἀργυρ(ι)ου (besides normal spelling) on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1672.21 (Attica, 329/28; Threatte p. 399).
- κυρ(ι)α on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 356.8 (Attica, 327/26; Threatte p. 399).
- θυμιατήρ(ι)ον on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1425.366 (Attica, 368/67; Threatte p. 397, 394; cf. ν(ε)ώι).
- Γρ(υ)γχεῖς (sic!) on stone, Meritt et al., Athenian Tribute Lists, 1939—53, vol. 2 No. 39.23 (Attica, 416/15; Threatte p. 396).
- Χρ(ύ)σιλλα on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1524.213 (Attica, after 334/33; Threatte p. 399, 478; two more mistakes).<sup>88</sup>

## Σ

- Πραχσ(ι)νῆ graffito on a vase, Agora 21 p. 18 No. D.10 (Attica, 1st q. 6th c.; Threatte p. 400).
- εἴκοσ(ι) μν[έ|α]ι on a silver tablet, Schwyzer 707.A.2, Jeffery pl. 66.53.2 (Ephesos, ca. 550).
- Σ(ῖ)μος on a Chalcidian vase, Rumpf 13 (2nd h. 6th c.; also Σῖμ(ο)ς [or Σ(ῖ)μις?]).
- στεφανοῦσ(ι)ν on stone, Hansen 92 (Attica, ca. 420—00?; Threatte p. 142, 396).<sup>89</sup>

<sup>88</sup> Later: Κλιαρ(ι)στιδαο Schwyzer 543.11 (Akraiphia, ca. 210; two more mistakes); [προγε]γρ(α)μμένων Hesperia 40 p. 101 No. 3.16 (Attica 84/83; Threatte p. 396, 478); Ἀρ(ι)στῶ Hesperia 23 p. 276 No. 136 (Attica, act. Rom.; Threatte p. 397).

<sup>89</sup> I doubt whether Threatte's interpretation that the iota was added after the ny, replacing the epsilon of ἐταῖροι, is correct (-νουνιταιροι lap., lost). At any rate the

Ποσ(ει)δάν on a Lucanian vase from Policoro (Herakleia)<sup>90</sup> (end 5th c.).  
 ἔχουσ(ι)ν on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1623.311/12 (Attica, 333/32; Threatte p. 396;  
 a few more mistakes).

πᾶσ(ι)ν (lectio difficilior) on stone, Hansen 621 (Attica, 4th c.?  
 Threatte p. 396, 400; also ἀποφθιμ(έ)νη).

Ὁ(ι)νασ(ι)φ(ι)λος (cf. below for -φ(ι)-) on stone, IG I<sup>2</sup> 949.2 (I<sup>3</sup>  
 1184.2) (Attica, 425–23).<sup>91</sup>

[Ἡ]γησ(ι)κλέ[η]ς on stone, MDAI(A) 67 p. 21 No. 24.16 (Attica, ca.  
 350–300?; Threatte p. 397).<sup>92</sup>

Κτησ(ι)κλής (?)<sup>93</sup> on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1570.90 (Attica, ca. 330–20; Threatte  
 p. 397).<sup>94</sup>

‘Wrong’:

Ἀλέχσ(α)νδρος (besides Ἀλέχσανδρος, Τιμά(ν)δρα) on an Attic cup  
 by Hieron and Makron (P.), ARV p. 459.4 (ca. 480).<sup>95</sup>

3 ποίῃσ(ε)ν three times on two Attic cups by the potter A(.)kles,  
 ABV p. 188 top No. 1 (once) and No. 2 (twice) (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.;  
 Kretschmer p. 124, Threatte p. 398).<sup>96</sup>

ἐποίῃσ(ε)ν on an Attic cup by the Thalia P., ARV p. 112 bottom No. 1  
 (late 6th c.; Threatte p. 398).

---

iota is metrically required, and its omission seems to have happened by normal ‘A. W.’  
 in the first place, whether it was subsequently corrected or not.

<sup>90</sup> A. D. Trendall, *The red-figured vases of Lucania Campania and Sicily*, 1967, p. 55  
 No. 1.282, pl. 25.3,4; id., *Early South Italian vase-painting*, 1974, p. 38 No. 352. We  
 may safely assume that the pronunciation of ει was close enough to ī at that time  
 (cf. above, 2. with n. 10 f.) to admit this interpretation of the mistake.

<sup>91</sup> Although the first iota is strange, Fourmont’s reading of the form seems fairly  
 reliable.

<sup>92</sup> The stone is badly worn, so *ibid.* 5 Γλ(α)υκ[ο]γ N- is too uncertain to be used here.

<sup>93</sup> The explanation as a copying mistake in Threatte p. 397 is somewhat complicated,  
 but possible.

<sup>94</sup> Later: Χρύσ(ι)ππος IG II<sup>2</sup> 8317 (Attica, 1st c. A. D.; Threatte p. 397); [Σ]ωσ(ι)βιος  
 IG II<sup>2</sup> 1964.8 (Attica, late 1st c.; Threatte p. 399); Ζωσ(ι)μη IG II<sup>2</sup> 2337.16 (Attica,  
 early 1st c. A. D.; Threatte p. 400).

<sup>95</sup> The ny is certain on the ph. which I have examined in the Beazley Archives, Oxford.  
 On the other hand the delta could be taken as the missing alpha: Ἀλέχσναρος (instead  
 of -ανρος). As for the possible lack of the *d* in -ανδρ- see Kretschmer p. 183 f.; and  
 although the mistake of two letters being interchanged is comparatively rare, we  
 have to note that on another cup Makron writes Δεμέτρῃ (ARV p. 459.3). Anyway,  
 this painter shows many odd or faulty spellings (see Immerwahr p. 90).

<sup>96</sup> Kretschmer p. 124 interpreted these and the next few cases (cf. also above, n. 42 and  
 56; there will be even more) as due to weak pronunciation, which in view of their  
 frequency seems plausible.

ἐποίῃσ(ε)ν on an Attic cup by the potter Panphaios, ABV p. 236.7 (late 6th c.; Kretschmer p. 124).

ἐποίῃσ(ε)ν on an Attic cup by Aristophanes and the potter Erginos, ARV p. 1318 f. No. 1 (late 5th c.; Kretschmer p. 124, Threatte p. 398).

ἔγραφσ(ε)ν (sic!) on an Attic cup by Douris, ARV p. 432.52 (1st h. 5th c.; Threatte p. 398; also H(ἔ)ρᾱ).

κεχρυσ(ω)μένος on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1425.269 (Attica, 368/67; Threatte p. 397; cf. ν(ε)ώι).<sup>97</sup>

## T

τ(ᾱ)ς on a silver tablet, Jeffery p. 252, 260.4 (Paestum, Schwyzer 435.1).

τ(ᾱ)ι on a bronze vase, Jeffery p. 214.3, pl. 40 (Arkadia, ca. 525?; also Ἄρτάμ(ι)τι).<sup>98</sup>

‘Wrong’:<sup>99</sup>

τ(ι)ς on a bronze tablet, Schwyzer 673 (Bassai, before 420?, also ἔν(α)ι, χρ(ἔ)ματᾱ).

αὐτ(ό)ν on stone, Schwyzer 619.17 (Mytilene, 1st h. 4th c.).<sup>100</sup>

## Φ

Φίφ(ι)τος on a Corinthian vase Lorber 147, Amyx 107 (1st h. 6th c.).<sup>101</sup>

῾Ο{ι}νασ(ι)φ(ι)λος (cf. above for -σ(ι)-) on stone, IG I<sup>2</sup> 949.2 (I<sup>3</sup> 1184.2) (Attica, 425–23).

῾Αφ(ι)δναῖος on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1675.33 (Attica, ca. 337/36; Threatte p. 397).

Π(hί)λιννα (?) on stone, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1553.18 (Attica, ca. 330–320; Threatte p. 399).<sup>102</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Later: ἰσ(ά)μεν Schwyzer 668.12 (Arkadia, 3rd c.; there are other mistakes); Διο-  
νυσ(ο)δώρα IG II<sup>2</sup> 11189 (Attica, 2nd c. A. D.; Threatte p. 397; more mistakes; for  
the name see *ibid.* 11190–92).

<sup>98</sup> Later: Ἄριστ(α)ρχος Schwyzer 235.18 (Kyrene, 3rd c.); ἔκτ(α)ι Schwyzer 404.4  
(Epeiros, ca. 170).

<sup>99</sup> I do not include IG II<sup>2</sup> 5450.4 ἀρετ(ῆ)ς (Attica, 390–365; Threatte p. 399), since  
the drawings (see Hansen 510 for references) show that the eta is probably there.

<sup>100</sup> Later: ἔστ(ί)ας IG II<sup>2</sup> 3677.1,2 (Attica, 2nd/3rd c. A. D.; Threatte p. 400; more  
mistakes).

<sup>101</sup> The iota was very probably never there, although a break now makes certainty  
difficult.

<sup>102</sup> The example Τσχοφλε on an Attic dinos, ABV p. 104.123 (mid 6th c., Threatte  
p. 21) is uncertain (see Kretschmer p. 180); it could stand e. g. for -φιλε (case form?)  
or -ὄφ(ἔ)λῃς as below Οἰκ-.

‘Wrong’:

Οἰκόφ(ἐ)λῆς (besides Οἰκόφελῆς) on an Attic stand dish by O., ABV p. 349 bottom (late 6th c.?; another mistake, see ABV *ibid.*).<sup>103</sup>

## X

Ἀρχ(ι)κλῆς (besides Ἀρχικλῆς) on an Attic cup by the potter A., ABV p. 160 bottom No. 1 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.; Threatte p. 398).<sup>104</sup>

Ἀρχ(ῖ)νος on an Attic cup by the P. of London E 777, ARV p. 939 bottom No. 1 (ca. 3rd q. 5th c.; Threatte p. 400).

Ἰππαρχ(ι)δης on stone, Hesperia 30 p. 30 ff. l. 271 (Attica, 336/35; Threatte p. 399; probably another mistake).

Εὔχ(ἐ)ρος on an Attic cup by the potter E., ABV p. 162 bottom No. 1 (ca. 3rd q. 6th c.; Threatte p. 398; cf. Εὔχῆρ(ο)ς).<sup>105</sup>

‘Wrong’: no example.

## 4. Statistical analysis

The table that follows provides a classification of the examples of vowel omission listed above. When two figures are given, as in “3–5”, the first refers to the examples that are certain, the second to the total number of examples. Of the texts considered some were not written on stone (but e.g. on pottery or bronze); the relevant numbers are indicated in *italics* and in round brackets. Thus, there are, for example, three certain instances of alpha omitted after kappa and five possible instances; none of these is written on stone. Numbers in square brackets refer to examples which may be due to phonological change. Bold figures are reserved for clear-cut examples of ‘A. W.’ (as in ἀνέθ(ἐ)κεν); normal unemphasized characters for ‘wrong’ examples of vowel omission (as in ἐνθ(ά)δε).

Some observations may be made:

(1) It is quite obvious that h(ε) is a special case (cf. below).

(2) If we subtract the examples of h(ε) from the total number of omissions of ε, and also subtract some of the disproportionately numerous cases of θ(ε), which will be partly due to the frequency of the verb

<sup>103</sup> Later: σφ(ό)γγους IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283.18 (Attica, 263/62; Threatte p. 399; one more mistake).

<sup>104</sup> The name of the same man could also be written Ἀρχαλῆς, see ABV p. 160 bottom No. 3.

<sup>105</sup> Later: Ἀρχ(ι)ππου IG II<sup>2</sup> 6472 (Attica, ca. 0 B.C./A.D.; Threatte p. 399).

	a	e	i (ei)	o	u
γ	<b>0-1 (-)</b>	—	—	—	—
δ	—	<b>1-2 (1)</b>	1 (-)	—	—
ζ	—	<b>0-1 (0-1)</b>	—	—	—
h	—	<b>39 (26)</b>	—	1 (-)	1 (1)
θ	2 (-)	<b>17-19 (16)</b>	—	1 (1)	—
κ	<b>3-5 (3-5)</b>	[1] [-]	—	—	—
λ	<b>4-6 (4)</b>	—	4 (-)	—	—
μ	2 (1)	1 (-)	4 (4)	<b>0-1 (1) + 0-1 (-)</b>	<b>1 (1)</b>
ν	1 (1)	3 (-)	1 (-)	<b>2 (2) + 2 (1)</b>	<b>2 (1)</b>
ξ	—	—	<b>1 (-)</b>	—	—
π	2 (1)	—	<b>7 (5)</b>	1 (1)	—
ρ	—	—	—	<b>1 (1)</b>	—
σ	3 (-)	4 (2)	8 (2)	<b>5-7 (3)</b>	2 (-)
τ	1 (1)	[7] [7]	<b>10 (4)</b>	1 (-)	—
υ	<b>2 (2)</b>	—	1 (1)	1 (-)	—
φ	—	1 (1)	<b>4 (1)</b>	—	—
χ	—	—	<b>4 (3)</b>	—	—
	20-25	66-78	45	13-16	6

ἀνέθηκε in inscriptions, we obtain similar totals for *a* and *e* of around 20-30 omissions, with omissions of *o* just below 20. Omissions of *u* however are very rare. On the other hand, the omission of *i* is significantly more frequent. A count of vowels in three relatively large samples of Attic inscriptions in pre-Ionic script has shown that *a*, *e*, and *o* each account for about 23-28% of the total, *i* for ca. 20% or somewhat less. The *u* vowel is far less frequent (ca. 6%) and mostly appears in diphthongs which are not suitable for 'A. W.' Similarly the relatively small incidence of *i* is further devalued for our purposes by the fact that a large percentage of the occurrences is in diphthongs. In view of this the high number of iotas missing is surprising. The only explanation seems to be that this 'simple' letter is often omitted precisely because of its graphic simplicity. We may expect this to have happened more frequently if the preceding or following letter has a vertical hasta, and this may account for the unexpectedly high rate of ('wrong') λ(ι), μ(ι), and ρ(ι) cases, which marginally exceed or equal in number the cases of the vowels marked as 'right'.

(3) The total number of examples is 150–170, the number of ‘right’ examples 103–115 (= 68–69%). In view of the frequent copying mistakes on stone inscriptions by stone-cutters who often must have been illiterate, we should also look separately at the non-stone examples, which may have been more spontaneously inscribed. Here the relation of ‘A. W.’ to the total is even more favourable: the total is 92–95, the number of ‘right’ cases 74–77 (= 80–81%). The results are only slightly less impressive if we disregard the  $h(\epsilon)$  cases: all materials total 111–131, ‘right’ 64–76 (= 58%); non-stone total 66–69, ‘right’ 48–51 (= 72–74%). But of course it is not absolutely necessary to exclude these  $h(\epsilon)$  cases. Further, it must be noted that the ‘right’ cases, which could only occur with one particular vowel at the time and place in question, largely outnumber all the ‘wrong’ cases with the other four vowels taken together! There is no doubt, therefore, that ‘A. W.’ is largely responsible for the omission of the vowels considered.

### 5. Explanation

How to explain the phenomenon is a different question. We may start with a short account of previous scholars’ reactions.

The only case that has been specifically noticed is  $h(\epsilon)$ , which is understandable in view of its frequency. As far as I can see, the first scholar to discuss this phenomenon was M. Bréal in 1889,<sup>106</sup> who supposed that it reflected the transition from a syllabic to an alphabetical script. The number of examples was significantly increased by Kretschmer (p. 20 and 97–99). They are best discussed, on the basis of six important archaic examples, by Lejeune 1, who rightly denies the possibilities of (1) “lapsus fortuits”, and (2) the influence of East Ionic writing. Lejeune also rightly argues against the view that the phenomenon should count as a remnant of the Semitic syllabic writing tradition (as assumed by E. Schwyzer, above, n. 32, p. 145 f.): He holds that (1) there seems to be a considerable gap between the take-over of the alphabet and the occurrences of this use of the letter H; (2) at the sample places and in the same period the use of heta for  $h$  in front of any vowel (including  $\epsilon$ ) is by far predominant. One could add that there is no ‘Semitic’ reason which would suggest such a use precisely and exclusively where followed by an  $\epsilon$ .

<sup>106</sup> Sur la valeur primitive de la lettre grecque H, MSL 6 p. 209–11 (dealing with the respective cases in Hansen 403 und 396,  $H(\epsilon)\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and  $H(\epsilon)\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  in ARV p. 1012.1, and the dubious case Röh1 p. 22 No. 56 mentioned above, n. 23).

Lejeune also mentions the possibility that the letter-name could be responsible for the omission of  $\epsilon$ , but sees a difficulty in this assumption since the Greek letter-name is  $\text{h}\epsilon\tau\alpha$  rather than  $*\text{h}\epsilon$  (the short type as in Latin), adding (p. 7 n. 5): “Si l’on admet que le nom  $\text{h}\epsilon\tau\alpha$  de  $h$  a pu donner lieu à des graphies où  $H$  vaut  $h\epsilon$ , pourquoi les noms  $\beta\eta\tau\alpha$ ,  $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$ , n’auraient-ils pas provoqué de graphies avec  $B$  pour  $b\epsilon$ ,  $\Theta$  pour  $tb\epsilon$ , etc.? (Att.  $\text{’}\text{A}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$  n’entre pas en ligne de compte, puisqu’on trouve aussi bien  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\epsilon\sigma\nu$ : P. Kretschmer, *Gr. Vas.* [1894], p. 124; E. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.*, I [1939], p. 280)” (similarly Lejeune 2 p. 214).

It seems to have been the special status of heta / eta which has prevented scholars from investigating and recognizing ‘A. W.’ as a whole.  $H$  was used in Ionic for a vowel, elsewhere for an aspiration; any oddity in the usage, especially at the time of transition from a local alphabet to the Ionic standard, could be accounted for on the basis of a confusion between the two writing systems. Given this, scholars felt no impulse to generalize from spellings such as  $H(\epsilon)\rho\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ . The only cautious attempt to argue that the phenomenon of vowel omission was not limited to the position after  $h$  was made by F. Solmsen, *IF* 30 (1912) p. 20 n. 1: “die Unterdrückung des  $\iota$  in der Schrift hier” (sc. in  $\Sigma(\iota)\beta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\tau\alpha\varsigma$ )<sup>107</sup> “wie bei den schon von W. Schulze verglichenen  $\Sigma(\tau\iota)\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\Sigma(\tau\iota)\mu\iota\varsigma$  dürfte ein Ansatz zur ‘Silbenschreibung’:  $\sigma = \sigma\tilde{\iota}(\gamma\mu\alpha)$  sein”.

Our list now contains, I think, enough evidence (certainly for  $th\epsilon$ ) to let us conclude that it is indeed the letter-names that are responsible for some vowels being dropped significantly more often than others. The clearest examples besides  $h(\epsilon)$  as in  $\text{h}\epsilon\tau\alpha$  and  $\theta(\epsilon)$  as in  $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$  are:  $\kappa(\alpha)$  as in  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha$ ,  $\lambda(\alpha)$  as in  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\delta\alpha$ ,  $\pi(\iota)$  as in  $\pi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ ,  $\rho(\omicron)$  as in  $\rho\acute{\omega}$ ,  $\sigma(\iota)$  as in  $\sigma\tilde{\iota}\gamma\mu\alpha$ ,  $\phi(\iota)$  as in  $\phi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ , and  $\chi(\iota)$  as in  $\chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ . (I have no examples yet for  $\beta$ ,  $F$ ,  $\psi$ .) In view of this more general approach we may also quite safely accept ‘A. W.’ as the main explanation of  $h(\epsilon)$ , usually called “syllabic use of  $H$ .” (Because Threatte tries to deny as many of these cases as possible, it becomes necessary to discuss them in greater detail; cf. Appendix below.)

It is not too difficult to understand how this type of mistake came about. Clearly the series of letter-names was the most basic and most important constituent of the teaching programme in elementary writing. But it is well known that another important early step in learning to

<sup>107</sup> This is a form rather hesitatingly suggested by W. Schulze, *GGA* 1896 p. 254, instead of  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\rho\upsilon\beta\varsigma$  on an Attic cup by the Ambrosios P., *ARV* p. 173 f. No. 10. Both forms are dubious, but Schulze’s form is worse because the letters point the other way round.  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\rho\upsilon\beta\varsigma$  will be miswritten for  $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$ , which fits the figure in question.

write was the repetition of minimal syllables (consonant + vowel). This was in fact so important as to lead to the creation of a special 'syllabic' punctuation system in Etruscan and Venetian for letters that did not belong to such minimal syllables.<sup>108</sup> We also have exercises on papyri.<sup>109</sup> The most striking evidence for the use of minimal syllables, however, is the so-called γραμματική τραγωιδία by one Kallias from Athens (PCG IV p. 39 f.; if he is the same as the comic author, he belongs to the 5th c.). In this play the prologue contains the full (Ionic!) alphabet, and then the women's chorus indulges in the basic exercise: βῆτα ἄλφα βα, βῆτα εἰ βε, βῆτα ἦτα βη, βῆτα ἰῶτα βι etc. — Two examples of syllabic division in actual writing are provided by the Attic potter and painter Nearchos<sup>110</sup> (see Immerwahr p. 26 f.; late 1st h. 6th c.). On one fragment he writes Νεαρχοσμε|γραφσεν (two lines), i. e. Νέαρχος μ' ἔ|γραφσεν:<sup>111</sup> had he been thinking 'grammatically' he would have written με|ἐγραφσεν, or μ'ἐ|γραφσεν. On another vase he writes Περσε|εύς (continued on the other side of Perseus' leg): here the painter was thinking 'grammatically', but only after the jump with his brush, when he started the suffix again, forgetting that he had already completed the last minimal syllable.<sup>112</sup> Another instructive example is the superfluous and misplaced punctuation<sup>113</sup> in Jeffery 304.3 (Schwyzer 757, Naxian, 7th c.) μ|α:νέθεκε.

So it is very likely that an inexperienced writer of archaic times, who had to write ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ, would proceed as follows (speaking aloud to himself: "Let us write ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ: *di* that is δέλτα ἰῶτα (he writes ΔΙ); *o* that is just as in ὀ (writing Ο); *ny* that is νῦ ὤ (writing ΝΥ); *so* that is σῖγμα ὀ (writing ΣΟ); *s* that is just σῖγμα (writing Σ)."<sup>114</sup> It is no surprise that sometimes one got slightly confused and wrote: "... *o* that is just as in ὀ (writing Ο); *ny* that is just as in νῦ (writing Ν); *so* that is ..." — and there we are left with ΔΙΟΝΕΟΣ, i. e. Διόν(υ)σος. Only slightly different would be a case with a longer letter-name such as θέτα. The normal way of writing ἀνέθεκε would have been: "α as in

<sup>108</sup> See Wachter, MH 43 (1986) p. 111—126; G. Fogolari and A. L. Prosdocimi, *I Veneti antichi*, 1988, p. 334 ff.

<sup>109</sup> See e. g. E. Ziebarth, *Aus der antiken Schule*, 2nd ed., 1913, p. 3 f. (No. 3).

<sup>110</sup> The vases in question are ABV p. 82 bottom No. 1 and p. 83.4.

<sup>111</sup> We would not argue for an unaugmented form in this kind of prosaic inscription.

<sup>112</sup> Obviously one regarded a diphthong as two sounds in writing. This was also the case in the Etruscan and Venetian punctuation system, where this name would have been written ΠΕ.Ρ.ΣΕ.Υ. Σ.

<sup>113</sup> See A. Morpurgo Davies in *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald*, 1987, p. 270 with n. 19.

<sup>114</sup> In Etruscan or Venetian with syllabic punctuation this would read: ΔΙ.Ο.ΝΥΣΟ.Σ.

ἄλφα (writing A); *ne* that is νῦ ξ (writing NE); *thē* that is θῆτα ξ (writing ΘΕ); *ke* that is κάππα ξ (writing KE).” Instead of this it could happen that one wrote: “*a* as in ἄλφα (writing A); *ne* that is νῦ ξ (writing NE); *thē* as in θῆτα (writing Θ); *ke* that is ...” — which would leave us with ANEΘKE, i. e. ἀνέθ(ε)κε.<sup>115</sup>

A very nice example is the base of the bronze bull IG VII 3576 (above), where after ἀνέθ the writer had to turn the object, and on the new side forgot about the vowel of the minimal syllable *thē* which was still ringing in his ears, and proceeded directly to κε.<sup>116</sup>

Finally I should like to stress again that I see no reason whatsoever to link this phenomenon to Semitic writing. Not only do we have no evidence for similar procedures in Phoenician etc., where the vowels were omitted in writing irrespective of the letter-names, but also we are dealing simply with mistakes which, however frequent, were never regularized to form an integral part of any ancient writing technique. Yet these mistakes did not cause any difficulties to the ancient reader, who was as aware of the letter-names as the writer. Given this, and given the relatively high frequency of occurrence, it seems reasonable to speak of ‘semi-mistakes’ and to dignify the phenomenon with its own special name of ‘Abbreviated Writing.’

## Appendix

Special discussion is needed for the examples of h(ε) on Attic vases. There are a few certain instances of ‘A. W.’ in the sixth century which cannot be called in doubt: H(ε)ρακλῆς and H(ε)ρακλῆες on the two black-figure vases can hardly be interpreted in any other manner. On the other hand, when we reach the fifth century the problem arises whether we should interpret H as the local Attic letter used for *h* and occasionally for h(ε), or as the Ionic letter eta, which in the Attic transition period could be used for an *e*-vowel, short or long (as in Φιλοξήνη of the late fifth century<sup>117</sup>).

<sup>115</sup> There are cases where the opposite mistake seems to have occurred, e. g. on the vase by Εὐχῆρ(ο)ς (cf. above with n. 83), where in the form ἐποί(ο)ῃσεν an extra omikron (from ἰδοτα?) has crept in. Similar cases may be: Τέρ(ο)πὼν (Attic cup by the Magnoncourt P., ARV p. 456, Louvre G 34, Kretschmer p. 125), Ἡέφ(ι)αιστο(ς) (Tyrrenian amphora ABV 96.14, with more strange features), τεχ(ι)νίταις (Schwyzer 331.12, only in one of the two copies).

<sup>116</sup> Similarly, but with ‘wrong’ vowel, IG II<sup>2</sup> 10936a, above, n. 20.

<sup>117</sup> Kretschmer p. 108 n. 1: Attic grave monuments of the late 5th c. (for the date see Immerwahr p. 181 f. with bibl.): Φιλοξήνη MDAI(A) 10 p. 363.7, and [Κλε?]ομήνης

Threatte (p. 45 ff.) adopts an almost entirely negative attitude and assumes that, starting with the fifth century, the Ionic eta causes havoc in the normal Attic system, with the result that a form like HBE is inconsistently written with eta for the first long *e* and epsilon for the second, and with omission of the initial aspirate. He dismisses the possible reading H(ἒ)βῆ on the grounds that there is sufficient evidence for the erratic behaviour of eta and epsilon because of (1) some unequivocal examples (e. g. [Δ]ιομέδης ARV p. 992.64; Threatte p. 39), and (2) the parallelism with the similar behaviour of omega and omikron, which at some stage were indifferently used for *ō*, *ē*, and *ō̄*.<sup>118</sup> In other words, in a period in which the Ionic alphabet was slowly making its way into Attic inscriptions, as shown by the alternation of letter-forms such as Attic λ (γ), Ionic Ϛ; Attic ϛ (λ), Ionic Λ, it is not unreasonable to find such an inconsistent use of Ionic eta. Is this correct?

(1) There is a common-sense argument. Admittedly it looks as if the introduction of the Ionic omega and eta into Attic was part of the same phenomenon. And yet there are differences. First, omega appears earlier (an early example is Εκτρωρ and Πατροκλῶ on a vase of ca. 520)<sup>119</sup> and, to judge from a sixth-century abecedarium, becomes part of the local alphabet<sup>120</sup>. Second and more important, the introduction of eta led to a clash with the pre-existing letter H, which had in Attic exactly the same shape (and indeed origin) as the Ionic eta, but a very different function (*h*). The problem did not arise for omega, which was an Ionic creation. Considering that Attic had an *h* phoneme, one might expect that there was some reluctance to abandon the basic function of the local H letter.

(2) If we look at Threatte's fifth-century examples in local script of words which include eta we find some impressive regularities. In the vast majority of examples the H occurs initially in words which ought

---

ibid. p. 364.9 (the latter in H. Diepolder, *Die attischen Grabreliefs*, 1931, p. 10, 13, pl. 2.1). These documents no longer show any trace of Attic local script (similarly IG II<sup>2</sup> 5962, ca. 350?, with Ἐργαμήνης, Threatte p. 162).

<sup>118</sup> Sometimes this happens on the same vase (below, Villa Giulia and Eretria Painters). For ω = closed *ē* Threatte p. 47 ff. gives ca. 30 examples, and ω̄ is quite frequent too (ibid. p. 39, 47).

<sup>119</sup> See Threatte p. 33 f., p. 35 f. No. 25, p. 38.

<sup>120</sup> See Wachter (above, n. 12) p. 30 f. and p. 40 n. 54 (the abecedarium in question shows Attic gamma, digamma, the Attic-Euboean-Boeotian order of chi and phi, but no psi). It is irrelevant what this letter Ω was used for (see the hypothesis of Immerwahr p. 81).

to have started with an aspiration followed by a long or short *e* (Ἡρμῆς for Ἡἔρμῆς, Ἡράκλῆς for Ἡἔρακλῆς, etc.). This observation is particularly significant because otherwise there is practically no certain example of eta written for a short *e*. Other less frequent examples all concern H written after an aspirated consonant. In the forms Ἀξιοπαίθης, Θήτις, Θησεύς, Ἀντίθῆ[ος], Ἀθήνηθῆν (for the references cf. below), H is constantly written after theta. Can this be due to chance, especially if we consider, as H. Immerwahr has pointed out (cf. below), that in Ἀθήνηθῆν, for example, an epsilon appears for a long *e* in the one syllable in which it is not preceded by an aspirate? It is much easier to explain this peculiar distribution if we assume that H is to be read as h(ε), rather than if we assume that it is the Ionic letter for an unaspirated *e*-vowel. The one counter-example to this rule which calls for H after an aspirated consonant seems to be ΜΗλανόπῳ. Threatte does not hesitate to assume that H here stands for a simple short *e*, but we may remember the frequent Attic spellings of the type Μηεγακλῆς, μῆετριον, etc. (Threatte, p. 25 f.). Here too then we may read Mh(ε)λαν-.

To sum up: if we accept Threatte's view that in the local alphabet H and E alternate haphazardly to indicate long and short *e*, we fail to notice and explain the regularities in the distribution of H, viz. the fact that it always occurs initially where we expect an aspiration followed by long or short *e*, and internally after an aspirated consonant. These two facts are best accounted for if here too we think of abbreviated writing and take H = h(ε).

We conclude with a short discussion of the relevant examples in their context:

H(ε)ρμῆς and H(ε)κάτῃ (and Δῆμέτῃρ) (Persephone P.). Threatte p. 46: "here H would certainly seem to represent [he]. But this painter is close to the Achilles painter, who often uses H for [ē]; note also the non-Attic ΠΣ, and Ω for [ō]." (1) I do not see why we should expect the Persephone Painter to have adopted the Achilles Painter's spelling habits. (2) "often" seems exaggerated to me, in that it is only in the names ΜΗλανόπῳ and Ἀξιοπαίθης that the heta in question occurs. (3) The -ρσ- in Περωσώφαττα has nothing to contribute to our question,<sup>121</sup> and the use of omega is perfectly 'Attic' at the time, as explained

<sup>121</sup> It is true that -ρσ- is not Attic, but it is the non-specific, literary dialect form. On the other hand -ττ- is specifically Attic (as opposed to Φερέφασ(σ)α, cf. Threatte p. 451) and therefore has more weight if we have to decide whether we want to call the form Attic or not.

above. We therefore have to interpret this painter's writing system on local Attic grounds alone.

H(ε)ρμῆς (Villa Giulia P. Again the fact that Διώνυσῶς occurs (as also Λετώ and Ἀπόλλων on a different vase, Threatte p. 39) is no argument in favour of an interpretation Ἡρμῆς as claimed by Threatte p. 46 (see also p. 39), since omega is part of the local Attic alphabet at the time.

H(ε)λικόν (Achilles P.). The use of omikron (as also in Ἀλκιμάχῳ) is clearly local Attic (for Ἀσιοπεῖθης, cf. the next paragraph), and this local place-name has an initial *b*-, so we should prefer 'A. W.' to assuming with Threatte p. 46 a case of ἥ (the proper Ionic spelling would be Ελι-).

Mh(ε)λανόπῳ (3 times, also by the Achilles P.). Cf. above. Threatte p. 46 interprets this form as Μηλανόπῳ. But the normal value of H with the Achilles P. is *b* (Ηυγιαίνων ARV p. 997.147–54), and the prevailing spelling of the name in question is Μελ- (8 times).

All other cases of ἥ occur either after (aspirated) theta, or in documents which show no longer any trace of local Attic script. The use of H after theta was first pointed out by H. Immerwahr (cit. above, n. 34) on the grounds of the two Boston Aristophanes-Erginos cups where heta is only used for an *e* if there is an aspiration before it: Ηρακλῆς (on both; cf. above in the list) and ΘΗσεύς (on both); ἈντίθH[ος] (on the first); in all other cases epsilon is used: Ἀσμετός (on both), Ἀντιβά-τῆς and Μαινεύ{ε}ς (on the first), Κρεθεύς, Τέλῆς, and Νῆσεύς (on the second), also perhaps Δεῖάνειρα (Δεῖ-?; on both). He plausibly concludes that this writer chose heta for its aspirate character, using it in the 'syllabic' way, even if the aspiration was already expressed.<sup>122</sup> We therefore ought to read H(ε)ρακλῆς, Θ{h}(ε)σεύς, and Ἀντίθ{h}(ε)[ος]. The same principle is found by Immerwahr on two Panathenaic amphorae by the same artist (ABV p. 412.1,2) with ΤΩΝΑΘΗΝΕΘΗΝ-ΑΘΛΩΝ, which we should therefore transcribe Τῶν Ἀθ{h}(ε)νῆθ{h}(ε)ν ἄθλων.<sup>123</sup> To these examples of 'A. W.' with superfluous heta we may

<sup>122</sup> Immerwahr explains the fact that in Κρεθεύς epsilon is used after the theta: "because the diphthong *eu* was too familiar to him" (sc. the writer). Of course we are dealing with exceptional spelling habits, and the normal spelling is always acceptable.

<sup>123</sup> Immerwahr at the end sees a problem in connecting these late 5th c. examples with "a feature seemingly so archaic as the syllabic use of *beta*", i.e. "an old 'inherited' syllabic *beta*", and tries to base them on "a confusion between the Attic and Ionic alphabets". But this seems no problem to me, since on the one hand 'A. W.' has a consistent tradition, and on the other hand I do not at all argue for anything 'inherited' (from, I assume, Phoenician).

add ΘΗΤΙΣ by the Kleophrades P. (who also writes 'half-Attic' [Γ]αλένη, cf. n. 60)<sup>124</sup> and Ἀξιοπεῖθης by, for example, the Achilles P., reading them as Θ{h}(ē)τις and Ἀξιοπεῖθ{h}(ē)ς respectively.<sup>125</sup>

H(ē)λένη (Heimarmene P.). Threatte p. 46 does not dispute this case (i. e. interpret it as Ἥλένη), although this scribe writes in Ionic script; see also Ἀφροδίτη (less clear Μενέλεως and Πειθώ). But as Helene's name contains an initial aspirate in the Attic dialect and has a short first vowel, we still ought to judge this as a reminiscence of Attic writing tradition rather than a case of ῆ.

H(ē)δς (Lykaon P.; Threatte p. 46). Since on another vase by this painter we read Καλλιόπῃ, and would expect an omega (ῥώς) for the proper Ionic form, we have to prefer 'A. W.' For the heta in the name Ἀξιοπεῖθης, also occurring on vases by this painter, cf. above.

H(ē)κτῶρ and H(ē)κάβῃ (Eretria P.; not mentioned by Threatte). On the vases by the Eretria Painter, which thanks to Lezzi-Hafter (here: L.) can be easily checked in their entirety, both omikron and omega are used for *ō* without any difference (which is in accordance with 5th c. Attic writing, cf. above), often on the same piece.<sup>126</sup> On the other hand the spelling of *ē* is never mixed. On the majority of vases *ε* is used,<sup>127</sup> constantly in association with *ς*-shaped sigma. Our vase is one of them, with *ē* always (i. e. 9 times) written *ε*, *ō* twice *ο*, three times *ω*, and

<sup>124</sup> On the vase in question (ARV p. 192.106) there is also Ἄρῃος (not discussed by Threatte), which is however not a good example of ῆ, since it could be the epic form of the genitive. For although there is also Ἡρακλέος, in neither case can we be sure that the *ο* is long (from which we could conclude that the *ε* is short), especially on a vase which shows such early influence of Ionic writing (Διομήδης, Ἀφροδίτης, Κύμω etc.).

<sup>125</sup> The few other examples of ῆ cited by Threatte p. 45 are in full Ionic script (except ΗΧΣΑΛΟΛΕ for which cf. above, n. 37) and rather doubtful: Κλημ[πίδ]ης on an ostrakon is doubtful because of the special situation of a diphthong, which is a long sound; Μυρρίνε ἡκλήθη is due to inversion of two letters (-ε η- instead of -η ε-). Others he overlooked, particularly two 5th c. Attic grave monuments (above, n. 117), also in full Ionic script. Some are doubtful or in plain 4th c. Ionic script: Μηλιττη (?; Kretschmer p. 107, ARV p. 1314.18, AJA 54 p. 319 f.; Μελιττα was read in Bull. Arch. Nap. A. S. 5 p. 25, see pl. 1 with something like an R as the second letter and an unclear last one); CIA II 2731 (Kretschmer p. 108 n. 1) is probably a false reading (see Threatte p. 163); later instances such as Λήσβιος (see Threatte p. 162 with more such examples) can be ignored here.

<sup>126</sup> Apart from this vase also ARV p. 1252.52 = L. p. 316.37, 1247.1 = 342.234, 1249.21 = 351.283. On 1250.32 = 346.253 only the use of *ω* for *ō* is certain, since Δοσώ could have *dō*.

<sup>127</sup> η only occurs on three vases on which no traces of Attic local script are preserved: ARV p. 1248.2 = L. p. 343.238, 1248.9 = 343.239, 1253.58 = 321.76.

sigma always ζ. Here it is interesting to notice that, even on these vases, the letter H is no longer used for *h* in front of vowels other than *e*.<sup>128</sup> This writer therefore used this letter mainly for initial Hε-, whether short or long (H(ε)βε, H(ε)κτῶρ, H(ε)κάβε), although he obviously could also write 'old Attic' Hερακλῆς (L. p. 352.284, besides Ἀπόλλων, always ζ). His writing system may therefore be described as follows: conservative Attic vowel spelling (ῶ partly with omega), modern Ionic letter-forms of gamma and lambda, but not of sigma, no Attic aspiration writing except when followed by *e*, for which he mostly used 'A. W.' h(ε)-.

A case like this shows that we should not speak too readily of "confusion" of the alphabets and "insufficient mastery of the Ionic script" (Threatte p. 39). Many a writer had developed his 'private' writing system by combining the several current possibilities, in order to be as clear, consistent,<sup>129</sup> and — if this meant something to him — as fashionable as possible.

### Addenda

In the few months since I handed in the manuscript, I have found the following cases of missing vowels (I do not adjust the statistics, above 4., though they would now look even slightly more in favour of 'A. W.')

'Right' (i.e. 'A. W.')

h(ε)[δ̄]ς on stone, Schwyzer 811.45 f., Buck 14 (Oropos, late 5th or early 4th c.; also h(ε)σπέ|ρης<sup>130</sup>).

H(ε)ρμῆς (besides Λετώ, Ποσειδῶν, etc.) on an Attic volute-krater by Polion, ARV p. 1171.2 (late 5th c.)<sup>131</sup>.

Ἀλκ(ᾶ)θλᾶ on a Corinthian vase Lorber 59, Amyx 39 (early 6th c.; new interpretation<sup>132</sup>).

<sup>128</sup> See on our vase Ἀρμονία (?), Ἰμερος, Ἰππολύτῃ, the latter also ARV p. 1252.50 = L. p. 317.41.

<sup>129</sup> The writing on the vase Brit. Mus. E 73 (ARV p. 192.106, 1st q. 5th c.) by the Kleophrades Painter looks more confusing in Threatte p. 39 than in reality: instead of wrong ΛΙΝΚΗ read ΓΙΝΚΗ; the alphabet is almost consistently Ionic (except [Γ]αλένη).

<sup>130</sup> The (non-Attic) form δραχμέων in l. 10 shows that the shortening of an antevocalic long *e* had taken place in that dialect. The *e* is therefore short, which makes 'A. W.' likely. This is also true in view of h(ε)σπέ|ρης in l. 46 f. (above, in the list) and the parallel and formulaic use of both words. A new edition of the text is published by A. Petropoulou in GRBS 22 (1981) p. 39–63, inscr. B.

<sup>131</sup> Therefore we may also have 'A. W.' in ibid. Ηρακλῆς and Ηρα.

<sup>132</sup> The reading is clear. For names with Ἀλκ- and -ᾶθλ- see Bechtel p. 35 f. and p. 23.

κ(α)λός (with λ) on an Attic bell krater by Polygnotos I, ARV p. 1029.20 (ca. mid 5th c.)<sup>133</sup>.

κ(α)λός (besides καλός, with λ) on an Attic hydra by the Priam. P., ABV p. 332.17 (late 6th c.).

‘Wrong’:

Ἀντίλ(ο)χος on a Corinthian vase HASB 11 (1986) p. 5 ff. (early 6th c.).

Addendum to n. 115 (the opposite mistake):

Φοῖνιχσ{ι} on ABV p. 97.27 (besides 9 nominative forms, e. g. Πολυσχένει with reversed grapheme for λς), and Ηέκτορ{ο} on ABV p. 368.106 (besides 2 nominative forms).

---

<sup>133</sup> Beazley notes: “the alpha of the καλός was never written — was thought of as covered by the stick”. This would be rather unusual, however, since very many inscriptions were continued beyond painted objects that got in their way. Yet, the stick in question may have induced ‘A. W.’, as the edge of the writing surface on the base of the Boeotian bronze bull, or — causing the opposite mistake — Perseus’ leg on the vase by Nearchos (for both, see above, 5.).