The inscriptions on the François Vase

By Rudolf Wachter, Oxford and Winterthur

1. Introduction

On the famous Attic black-figure volute-krater by the painter Klitias and the potter Ergotimos (ABV 76.1), dated to c. 565 B.C., no less than 130 inscriptions are fully or partly preserved. They are mostly labels, neatly painted in the local Attic alphabet, to figures and objects represented, and have received much attention since the vase was first discovered in 1844, though not quite as much as the style and iconography of the paintings. Some years ago a very useful and entertaining monograph was published on the circumstances of the find, the restoration, the subsequent smashing of the vase in 1900, its recomposition, and its most recent thorough restoration of 1973[1]. On p. 177f. M. Cristofani (here: Cr., used for the whole volume) presents the whole corpus of inscriptions (without accents and breathings, but mostly indicating long *e* and *o*), followed by very useful detail photographs (179–195)[2]. Unfortunately his text contains many errors, most of which have been put right by G. Pugliese Carratelli (here: P.C.), who also discussed a few problems concerning the readings[3]. H. Immerwahr in his recent book (here: Im.)[4], discusses aspects of letter-forms, direction of script, and the aesthetics of the inscriptions, but does not give the full text. We are therefore still without a reliable edition, and I think it is worthwhile publishing the whole, based on the new photographic document-ation, and checked against the main earlier editions. Some observations on epigraphical, philological, and literary aspects are added. For philological matters I shall cite Kretschmer (here: Kr.), Threatte (Thr.), and Chantraine (Ch.)[5]. Of earlier works on the inscriptions two will be cited several times, namely H. Brunn's (here: Br.)[6] corrections to the editio princeps, and the magnificent drawings of both the paintings and inscriptions in Furtwängler-Reichhold (F.-

1 M. Cristofani, M. G. Marzi, A. Perissinotto, et al., *Materiali per servire alla storia del Vaso François*, Bollettino d'Arte, serie speciale, vol. 1 (Rome 1980[81]).

2 Some inscriptions show better in the photographs in the preceding sections of the volume.

3 G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Le epigrafi del Vaso François*, Par. d. Pass. 39 (1984) 373–375 (see SEG 34, 1984, no. 50, with misunderstandings). He also gives a list of missing bars over ε and ο, which I do not repeat (add 20, 28, 65, 90, and remove 49; for 62 see below, section 3, ad loc.).

4 H. Immerwahr, *Attic script* (Oxford 1990) 24f. (no. 83).

5 P. Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht* (Gütersloh 1894). L. Threatte, *The grammar of Attic inscriptions* I: *Phonology* (Berlin/New York 1980). P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968–1980).

6 H. Brunn, *Revisione del vaso François*, Boll. dell'Inst. 35 (1863) 188–192.

R.)[7]. A very readable general discussion of the mythological scenes with further bibliography is given by E. Simon (here: Si.)[8]. Other authors of works cited in abbreviation are J. D. Beazley (ABV, ARV, and Para.)[9] and F. Bechtel (here: Be.)[10]. I should add that while speaking of "Klitias" or "the painter" as the writer of the inscriptions, I am fully aware that this identification is not certain. On the other hand he is the most likely writer since he is the one who had the brush in hand.

2. The inscriptions

I adhere to Cr.'s numbering of the inscriptions. Occasionally I have changed their order, however, watching the figures rather than the inscriptions while proceeding from left to right through the scenes. I have also added one he overlooked (56a). Letters which were clearly legible in the last century but are lost now, are printed in small letters without brackets.

a. The Kalydonian boar-hunt (lip, A)

Hunters to r.:
1. Ἀρπυλέā(ς) (bearded),
2. Ἀρίστανδρος,
3. Λάβρος (dog),
4. Θόραχς,
5. Ἄντανδρος,
6. Εὐθύμαχος (archer with "Phrygian" cap),
8. Ἀταλά(ν)τē,
7. Μελανίōν,
9. Μεθέπōν (dog),
10. Πελεύς,
11. Μελέαγρος,
12. Ὄρμενος (dead dog);
hunters to l.:
13. Μάρφ[σο]ς (dog),
17. Ἀνταῖος (for Ἀνκαῖος; dead under the boar),
16. Ϙόραχς (dog),
15. Κάστōρ,
14. Πολυδεύκēς,

7 A. Furtwängler/K. Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, vol. I (München 1904) pl. 1–3 (and p. 1–14).

8 E. Simon, *Die griechischen Vasen* (München 1976) 69–77.

9 J. D. Beazley, *Attic black-figure vase-painters* (Oxford 1956); *Attic red-figure vase-painters*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1963); *Paralipomena* (Oxford 1971).

10 F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle 1917).

18. Ἐγέρτες (dog),
19. Ἄκαστος,
20. Ἄσμετος,
21. Κιμ(μ)έριος (archer with "Phrygian" cap),
22. Ἀντίμαχος,
23. Σίμōν,
24. Ἔ(ν)βολος (dog)[11],
27. Τόχσαμις (archer with "Phrygian" cap),
25. Παυσιλέōν,
26. Κυνόρτες.

b. *Theseus' dance with the Athenian children (lip, B)*

28. [...]ọίε̄σεν/[...]σεν;
dancers to r.:
29. Φαίδιμος,
30. Ηιπ(π)οδάμεια[12],
31. Δαιδο̄χος[13],
32. Μενεσθό,
33. [Εὐ]ρ̣υσθένε̄ς,
34. Ḳορο̄νίς[14],
35. {B}Εὐχσίσρατο[ς],
36. Δαμασισράτε̄[15],
37. Ἀντίοχος,
38. Ἀστερίᾱ,
39. Ηέρμιπ(π)ο(ς)[16],
40. Λῡσιδίκε̄,
41. [Π]ρόκριτος,
42. [..?]επιhοια (for -βοια)[17],
43. Θε̄σεύς (the leader);
ladies to l., welcoming them:
44. ϑροφός,
45. Ἀρ̣ιά.[ν]ε̄[18].

11 P.C.; Ἔ(ὔ)βολος edd.
12 Ηυπο- Cr., corr. P.C.
13 Δαιδοκος Cr. (text), corr. P.C.; Λαιδοκος Cr. (ad fig. 162).
14 Part of the ν shows in the photo of the bare fragment Cr. 104 fig. 28. For the first letter see below, ad loc.
15 Δαμασιστρατε̄ Cr., corr. P.C.
16 Ηερμιπο[ς] Cr., but from his photo I get the strong impression that the final sigma was never written. The fourth letter is a mu (of the last stroke a dot is visible), not a nu as claimed again by Im.
17 Ε̣πιβοια Cr. The lower half of the epsilon is shown in F.-R. See below, ad loc.
18 [Αρ]ιαδ[ν]ε̄ Cr.; sim. edd.

c. The chariot-race at the funeral games for Patroklos (neck, A)

Five chariots to r.:
46. Ηιπ(π)ọ[..]ōν[19],
47. Δαμάσιπ(π)ος,
48. Διομέδες,
49. Αὐτομέδōν,
50. Ὀλυτ(τ)εύς;
51. Ἀ[χ]ιλ(λ)εύς (referee).

d. The fight between Lapiths and Centaurs (neck, B)

The names of the first three Centaurs (here: C.) are not preserved.
52. [Θ]ēσεύς,
53. Ἀντίμαχος,
54. Ηūλαῖος (C.),
57. Καινεύς (half knocked into the ground),
55. Ἄκ̣ριος (C.)[20],
56. {Η}Ἄσβολος (C.),
56a. [λίϑ]ọς (on the stone in 56's hands)[21],
58. Πετραῖος (C.),
60. Ηόπλōν,
59. Πύρ(ρ)ος (C., dead on the ground),
61. Μελαν[χα]ίτ̣ες (C.)[22],
62. Θέρανγρος (for -ανδρος?) (C.)[23],
63. Δρύ[ας],
64. Ὀρόσβιος (C.)[24].

e. The wedding of Peleus and Thetis (shoulder, B and A)

Procession to r. starting under the handle:
(65–89, see after 99)
90. Ηέφαιστος (on a mule; he is the last in the procession)[25],
91. [Ὀ]χεανός (a sea-monster next to a chariot with deities whose names are lost)[26],
92. Ηερμᾱς (on chariot with 93),
93. Μαῖα,

19 -[ὑό]ōν edd.; Ηυπọ-΄ Cr. ad fig. 176, corr. P.C. (the photo in question is upside-down too).
20 For the second letter see below, ad loc.
21 Not in Cr. and P.C. The final sigma and a trace of what must have been a clear omikron still at F.-R.'s time, is visible in the photo Cr. 161 fig. 126.
22 See below, ad loc.
23 See below, ad loc.
24 Br. corrected: "non *Orobios*, ma *Orosbios*", and the top of the sigma is visible in the photo.
25 All letters, though mostly faint, are visible in the photo.
26 [Ō]κεανος Cr. I do not think the first letter preserved can possibly be a kappa. Indeed already Br. and F.-R. read a chi.

94. Μο[ῖ]ρα[ι] (four ladies on foot),
95. Αὐξ̣[ν]α̣ία (on chariot with another lady whose name is lost)[27],
96. Δōρίς (on foot, greeting),
97. Νēρ[ε]ύς̣ (on foot, greeting and showing the way),
98. Ἄρēς (on chariot with 99, covered by handle),
99. Ἀφροδῑ́τē;
65. Στēσιχόρē (on foot),
66. Ἐρα̣τ[ṓ] (on foot),
67. Πολυμνίς (on foot),
68. Ἀνφιτρῑ́τē,
69. [Πο]σειπōν (for -δōν; on chariot with 68, covered by handle)[28],
70. Μελπομένē (on foot)[29],
71. Κλε{ι}ṓ (on foot)[30],
72. Εὐτέρπē (on foot),
73. Θάλεια (on foot),
74. Hḗρā,
75. Ζεύς (on chariot with 74),
76. Ōρανίā (on foot),
77. Καλ(λ)ιόπē (on foot);
78. Ἐργότῑμος μ' ἐποίεσεν;
79. Hōραι (three ladies, on foot),
80. Διόνῡσος (on foot, dancing);
81. Hεστίā (one of three ladies, 81–83, on foot),
82. Χαρικλṓ,
83. Δēμ[έτēρ],
85. Ἶρις (with kerykeion),
84. Χῑ́ρōν (Centaur);
86. Κλιτίας μ' ἔγραφσεν;
87. βōμ[ός] (incised on the altar),
88. Πēλεύς (shaking hands with 84 over 87),
89. Θέτις (in the house).

f. The death of Troilos (body, A)

100. Ἀπόλ(λ)ōν,
101. Τρόōν (a boy going to 102 with a hydria),
102. κρḗνē,
103. Ῥοδίā (a girl, upset),
104. Θέτις,

27 Αὐξ̣[να]ια Cr.
28 See below, ad loc.
29 F.-R. show three dots at the end, which had to separate the name from 71. Traces seem visible on Cr.'s photo.
30 Br. corrected the reading Κλεο of the editio princeps to Κλειο. See below, ad loc.

105. Ηερμε̃[ς],
106. Ἀθεναί[α],
107. Τρōΐλος (on horseback; behind him Achilleus whose name is lost),
108. ηυδρίᾱ (lying under the horse),
109. [Πολυχ]σένε̄ (running to r.),
110. Ἀντε̃νōρ,
111. Πρίαμος (to l., sitting on 112),
112. θᾶκος (incised on the seat),
113. Ηέκτōρ (under the city gate, with 114),
114. Πολῖτες.

g. The return of Hephaistos (body, B)

115. [Ποσειδō?]ν (behind him a god, probably Hermes, whose name is lost)[31],
116. Ἄρτεμις,
117. Ἄρε̄ς,
118. Ἀθ[ε̄να]ίᾱ,
119. Ηε̄ρᾱ (sitting on throne),
120. Ζεύς (sitting on throne),
121. {Η}Ἀφρογῖτε̄ (for -δίτε̄)[32],
122. Διόνῡσος,
123. Ηέφα{ι}στος (on a mule)[33],
124. Σῑλε̄νοί,
125. Νύ(ν)φαι.

h. Achilleus carrying dead Aias (twice, on the handles)

126. Ἀχιλ(λ)εύς,
127. Αἴας;
128. Ἀχιλ(λ)εύς,
129. Αἴας.

3. Commentary

a. The Kalydonian boar-hunt

We have several lists of participants in this famous adventure[34] (no lists of dogs are attested). It is obvious that the painter grouped those names that he could remember next to the boar. Most of these are very well attested in the other lists (8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20). Only two are slightly dubious: 19 Ἄκαστος occurs only in Ovid, and 7 Μελανίōν in none of the lists. Both of course fit well with this enterprise, and indeed Akastos also takes part in the hunt on a fragmentary Attic dinos, which is slightly older, dating from the beginning of

31 [Ποσειδō]ν Si. because of the stick of what could have been a trident. [Ἀπόλō]ν edd.
32 See below, ad loc.
33 See below, ad loc.
34 Particularly Ov. *Met.* 8, 298–317; Apollod. 1, 8, 2; Hyg. *Fab.* 173.

the 6th century[35]. Melanion makes particularly good sense next to Atalante[36]. On the other hand to the far left and to the far right the painter added names for which we know of no connexion with the Kalydonian boar-hunt, while other illustrious hunters are not named (Dryas, Eurytion, Iason, Idas, Iolaos, Lynkeus, Telamon, Theseus, and the sons of Thestios). Why he chose these other names, we do not know[37]. Two names (1, a man, and 3, the dog next to him) remind us of the names of two of Aktaion's dogs in Ov. Met. 3 (see also Hyg. Fab. 181): 222 *Harpalos* (compare also the dog 215 *Harpyia*), and 224 *Labros* (for similar parallels with Centaurs' names see below, 13 and d).

1. The name Ἀρπυλέᾱ(ς) is not easy to understand. It clearly reminds one of ἁρπαλέος 'desirable, greedy, etc.', attested already in the Odyssey. As far as the etymology of this adjective is concerned, one assumes first that the *r* is due to dissimilation of an original *l*. Secondly it seems not to have had initial aspiration (see Ch. s.v. ἄλπνιστος), which is best explained by popular etymology. For it is quite obvious that the Greeks connected this adjective semantically with the stem of ἁρπάζω (i.e. ἁρπαγ-). Now the same connexion was made in the case of the Harpies (see Ch. s.v. Ἅρπυια), the rapacious wind-goddesses, whose name also seems to have nothing to do etymologically with ἁρπάζω. Their name is attested on one of the most archaic Attic vases as Ἀρεπυια, also without initial aspiration (ABV 5.4, Im. no. 57). In view of its -υ-, our name Ἀρπυλέᾱ(ς) is best understood as a (spontaneous?)[38] mixture of ἁρπαλέος and Ἀρ(ε)πυια. Its not being aspirated fits both its own etymology and the old Attic testimony for the Harpies. As for the final sigma, which was never written (as in 39), this is a frequent phenomenon and may be due to occasional weak pronunciation of -ς[39].

3. For the beta see 35. See also above on Aktaion's dog so named.

12. Ὅρμενος does not designate the action of the dog in question, who is lying dead on the ground.

13. This is the bravest dog who has jumped onto the back of the boar, biting deep in its neck. The rho was seen in the last century and the phi was clearer than it is now. P.C. is quite right in promoting the connexion with μάρπτω 'seize' again, i.e. to understand it as a speaking name. A maximum of two letters are missing, probably two rather narrow ones (the fragments are very accurately joined here). The root does not contain an aspirate (see perf.

---

35 *ABV* 23 (Im. no. 76 with some inaccuracies; SEG 36, 1986, no. 91), showing ⌈Ἄ⌉καστος (only one letter is missing), [Θ]έρōν (dog?), Πέγαῖος (dead), Με[...] (Im. writes Μα[--] which is wrong: part of the lower oblique bar of the epsilon shows in the photo, fig. 4 of the ed. pr.; see also next note), Ἀταλ[άντē], and another name starting with a delta, mu, nu, or pi.

36 This presupposes the story with their race and the golden apples (see Theogn. 1293f.). On the dinos just mentioned, the name of the hunter next to Atalante is normally restored as Με[λέαγρος]. One could just as well think of Με[λανίōν].

37 Of the three barbarians helping the Greek heroes, two (21 and 27; see below, ad 27) are Kimmerians, whereas one (6) bears a Greek name.

38 See also above on Aktaion's dogs.

39 Many examples in Thr. 639f.

μέμαρπε); therefore the first missing letter must be a sigma as has long been seen. After that a vowel is needed. The usual restoration is Μάρφ[σα]ς (also P.C.), which is plausible. As an aorist participle[40] it would describe what the dog is actually doing, but in view of the name 12 we should interpret it as a proper name. Now on a recently found Chalcidian vase fragment[41], there is a Centaur Μάρφσος. In view of this new name and the fact that quite a few names of mythical dogs recur as names of Centaurs (see above, and below, d), I prefer the restoration Μάρφ[σο]ς.

16. A speaking name ('raven'), appropriate for a black dog (but 9 and 12 are also black). For other speaking names apart from the dogs see below, c.

17. In Hom., A.R., Paus., Apollod., Ov., etc. and on other vases[42] this boar-hunter who found his death from the boar, is unanimously called Ἀγκαῖος (see below, section 4).

20. For -σμ- see Kr. 148f. and Thr. 567–569.

24. Ἔ(μ)βολος is P.C.'s interpretation and is very plausible. I write Ἔ(ν)β- (as well as 125 Νύ(ν)φ-) because of 68. The previously restored form Ε(ὔ)βολος (Im. writes Ε⟨ὐ⟩βόλος) does not make particularly good sense for a dog ('having good insight' or 'shooting well'). P.C. compares the non-writing of the nasal in 8 and 125 (for this frequent phenomenon see Kr. 161–166, Thr. 485–488; nasals are however more often written before a stop than left out on our vase, namely in 2, 5, 17, 22, 37, 53, 61, 62, 68, 110). I had reached the same conclusion when working through Thr.'s list of alleged cases of what he calls (346 bottom) "just careless omissions" of -υ- in diphthongs -ευ-. Six out of nine examples in this list (346f.) are due to a morphological process (ending -ες instead of -εύς; Thr. apparently denies this possibility), one is likely to be due to dissimilation (Ἔ(υ)ρυ-), and two can be regarded as not containing an *u* at all, our Ἔβολος and one Ἔκρατες, i.e. ἐγκρατής used as a name (an athlete on ARV 24.11, otherwise unattested)[43]. In support of P.C.'s interpretation we may add that the adjective ἔμβολος, designating any pointed object, is very appropriate for a dog with pointed nose and no doubt sharp teeth, and the relation with ἐμβάλλω -ομαι also evokes the notion of 'attacking'; particularly appropriate in our context is Ar. Pax 1312 ἐμβάλλεσθε τῶν λαγώιων. Im. did not take any notice of this interpretation.

27. The first part of the name is Greek (or hellenized), the second is barbarian (see Kr. 75 n. 8). Who is this character? In view of 21 Κιμ(μ)έριος (also an archer with "Phrygian" cap) and the fact that a famous Kimmerian king, named Λύγδαμις in Greek (first attested Callim. H. 3, 252), had a name of this formation, we can at least be sure that Τόχσαμις was meant to be

---

40 Similar examples are Βιάσας, Ὀνομάσας, Ἀρκέσας.
41 See A. W. Johnston, *Supplement 1961–1987* (Oxford 1990) to L. A. Jeffery, *The local scripts of archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) 455, D, photo pl. 76.
42 See e.g. the fragment of an Attic dinos at Ostermundigen, *Para.* 42, Im. no. 184.
43 Kr. 137f. discussing these last two examples, admits that the explanation of the missing *u* is difficult.

specifically Kimmerian too. But we can go a step further with the identification. The fact that a barbarian Kimmerian is given the honour of participating in this Panhellenic enterprise otherwise reserved to an illustrious circle of Greek heroes may be explained in two ways. On an individual basis this could have to do with a personal predilection of the painter (see below, section 4). On a political basis one may remember the fact that the Kimmerians by their attacks in the mid-7th century (i.e. some two generations before our vase)[44] restrained the power of the Lydians under Gyges and his successors who were the more immediate and lasting threat to the Greek colonies in Asia Minor[45]. There may therefore have been quite some friendly feelings of Greeks towards this people. But should a Kimmerian taking part in the Kalydonian hunt not at least be a king? Here the Assyrian tradition comes in, where in 640 B.C. a foreign king *Tug-dam-me-i*, i.e. */Tugdammē/* occurs who is plausibly identified with Lygdamis. Jeremy Black (Oxford)[46] assures me that the first sign is to be read *tug, tuk,* or *túq,* not *dug* etc.; the spelling with *dúk* occurs only once, in Neoassyrian. This variant with *D-* has been given too much weight in order to reconcile the Assyrian form with the Greek one which was thought to have arisen from a paleographical confusion of Λ and Δ. The *t* is no doubt the correct initial sound of the Assyrian form. Now in view of the fact that our vase shows a high-ranking Kimmerian named Τόχσαμις represented as a τοξότης (for which those barbarian peoples were famous), only a touch of popular etymology is needed and we reach the form *Tugdammē*[47]. What we have here is therefore likely to be the earliest attestation of this king's name in Greek. It is a different question, how the Greek form Λύγδαμις arose. Maybe it is an adaptation by popular etymology (λύγδην or λύγδινος?), but the initial *l* also reminds one of the widespread uncertainty between *d* and *l* in Asia Minor[48]. The question remains, however, why the sound which could be rendered as *t* by the Assyrians and our archaic Greek painter should have become a *d.* Here some intermediate stage in a language, which we cannot determine, would probably be the easiest solution. This assumption seems particularly advisable since the name could be Indo-European in view of the name of Tugdammē's son *Sandakšatru,* which looks Indo-Iranian[49], and there seems to be no particular reason why an Indo-Iranian *t-* should be taken over as a Greek *d-.* At any

---

44 See Hdt. 1, 15f., etc.

45 See C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, RE 11 (1921) 420, 11–20.

46 I am grateful to him for advice on the Assyrian side of the problem. He also pointed out to me A. Kurth's article *Lygdamis* in the Reallexikon der Assyriologie 7, 3/4 (1988).

47 The geminate in the Assyrian form is unequivocal (J. Black). But our Greek form could of course be */Toxammis/.*

48 See A. Heubeck, *Lydiaka* (Erlangen 1959) 20. This may be what S. Karwiese apud Kurth (above, n. 46) 187 meant by "difficulty in rendering the specific sound of an Anatolian language". Surely the old paleographical explanation with Λ and Δ is not satisfying.

49 Kurth (above, n. 46) 188 § 3, 3; A. Kammenhuber, Der Kleine Pauly 3 (1969) s.v. *Kimmerier* 211, 28ff. with bibliography.

rate our Τόχσαμις seems at least as appropriate a hellenization of the Kimmerian name as the later Λύγδαμις.

b. Theseus' dance with the Athenian children

The names of the young Athenians brought back from Crete by Theseus have been much discussed, see H. Herter, RE Suppl. 13 (1973) 1101f. Without going into details here, I only mention the second Attic vase on which this myth is shown and the figures are labelled, an amphora in Leiden[50], which is roughly contemporary.

29. On the Leiden vase (see above) there is a Φαίνιπ(π)ος, clearly legible in the photo. Φαίδιμος is attested elsewhere (Be. 436).

34. The first letter is not very clear. The unanimous reading has been Κορ-, which is what we expect, and with some goodwill a kappa may be seen in the photo. If it were a chi, however, we could compare it with 91 and the testimony χορωνός 'crown' (see Ch. s.v.), taken from Simonides (174 Bergk) by Apion, as reported by Ath. 15, 680 d. Our vase is not far from Simonides' time. Moreover a name Χορōνίς, evoking the notions both of 'crown' and 'chorus', would seem quite appropriate for a dancer, even if the chi were due to popular etymology. This may at the same time be the explanation of χορωνός.

35. For -σρ-, which is quite a frequent spelling, see 36. Here and in 42 (see below, ad loc.) Cr. observes (177) a tendency to confuse beta and heta, which could be interpreted as due to the painter's being illiterate (see below, section 4). But on the whole the betas are decently written. Let us go through them all. The ones in 3 and 24 (slightly damaged) and 87 (incised) are perfect, and the one in 64 is only slightly oddly shaped (also damaged). The one in 56, it is true, is incorrect in that it is unfinished (only the upper loop is written, as observed by P.C.), but unfinished letters on vases do not say anything about the literacy of the painter (see below, section 4). Only in 42 our painter clearly wrote a heta which must be a miswriting for beta. Now in our name 35 the initial beta is thought to stand for a heta. Not only is this letter very likely to be a secondary addition[51], however, but also we must not too readily say that it is erroneous for a heta, since from an etymological point of view an aspiration is not expected (see Kr. 156)[52]. The fact that in 121 there is a clear case of an aspiration which was added in a second step, is not really relevant either, for there the sign in question is a correct heta. For a possible explanation see below, section 4.

50 *ABV* 104.126, CVA Netherlands 3 (1972) 4f., photo pl. 4.
51 This is suggested not so much by its size (with its difficult shape of two superimposed loops beta can easily come out somewhat taller than most other letters) than by its stronger inking and its position far below both the ground and the top line of the other letters. It is not impossible that it replaces a different letter.
52 We must surely not take this case as evidence for an aspirated pronunciation of the stop in the -*ks*- cluster (as Thr. 460 suggests). For there is no aspiration sign, but a beta, whatever the reason for it is.

36. For -σρ- see 35, as well as Kr. 184 and Thr. 571f.

39. Although here we could think of a genitive form, in view of 1 where this explanation is impossible, this is less likely.

41. Πρόκριτος recurs on the Leiden vase (see above) and is therefore a certain restoration.

42. A heroine called 'Ερίβοια, Περίβοια, Μελίβοια, Φερέβοια (see Herter, cited above) plays a major part in this myth. This fits the fact that she leads the dance, following immediately on Theseus. Obviously the first part of her name was fluctuating, which makes it quite acceptable that we have yet another form on our vase. In view of the space between the upper margin of the frieze and where the epsilon must have been[53], the latter is rather unlikely to have been the first letter (compare the other labels to the left and right). About two more letters seem to be missing. The second part of the name on the other hand is stable, and can hardly be anything else than -βοια. The fourth letter from the end is a heta, and this is a clear mistake[54] (see below, section 4).

44. For the assimilation[55] see Kr. 150 and Thr. 460 (who wrongly thinks that it is a name, writing Θρόφος).

45. As the fragments are now recomposed, there is indeed a letter missing before the epsilon. The third letter preserved, however, could not only be a delta ('Αριάδνε), but also a nu ('Αριάννε[56]), or a gamma ('Αριάγνε). On these forms see Kr. 171f., Thr. 565f. In the last century Αρ- was apparently still preserved, but the crucial passage was obviously not in a better state than it is now (the almost unanimous reading with a delta must be considered a lectio facilior). This case remains unsolved.

c. The chariot-race at the funeral games for Patroklos

This is the only scene (apart from the Muses' list, below, section 5 b) for which we have a full epic account. The agreement is poor: whereas the painter "correctly" attributes to Achilleus the role as referee (this is of course the reason why we identify the scene as the games for Patroklos), and shows Diomedes taking part in the race, in the Iliad Odysseus does take part, but not in the chariot-race, Automedon is only briefly mentioned as Achilleus' famulus (23, 563–565) and does not take part in any contest, and Hippo[..]on and Damasippos are names non-existing in the Iliad. In labelling the two losers of

53 I do not know what to make of the dark dot in front of the pi. It can hardly be the remains of the epsilon.

54 It is true that heta practically never occurs within the word in the intervocalic position (examples of -*h*- written at the beginning of a second part of a compound are comparatively rare and seem to be a feature of formal texts; Thr. 498f.), and that a Greek would therefore not have had any difficulty reading the name correctly. It is also true that heta was easier to draw than beta, which with its two loops was the most difficult letter to produce with paint and brush without blotting. But these are no excuses.

55 I need not discuss here, how exactly this phenomenon is related to Grassmann's law.

56 This is the form on the Leiden vase (see above), which shows 'Αριάνγε. But on our krater no other geminate is expressed in writing.

the race the painter obviously ran out of imagination, and gave them any "horsey names"[57] (i.e. a kind of speaking names). It is true that the writer may have put the label Diomedes because he knew of that hero's victory. But the Homeric account both in the race and in the disputes afterwards contains such unforgettably amusing scenes which mainly concern the other competitors (Eumelos, Menelaos, Antilochos, Meriones), that there is hardly any excuse: this writer did not know Homer's book 23.

46. Ηιπ(π)ο[ϑό]ον is no more likely a restoration than e.g. -[τί]ον or -[κό]ον.

d. The fight between Lapiths and Centaurs

See below, section 5 a. Lists of the Lapiths are given in the Iliad and the Hesiodic Shield as well as in later texts. The Centaurs on the other hand are not listed in the Iliad, but in the Shield and in later sources. It has to be noted that three Centaur names recur as names of Aktaion's dogs in Ov. Met. 3 (see also Hyg. Fab. 181): 213 *Hylaeus* (our 54), 218 *Asbolos* (our 56), 232 *Melanchaetes* (our 61)[58].

53. A Centaur of this name, killed by the Lapith Kaineus (our 57), is attested in Ov. Met. 12, 460. Although here the character in question is a Lapith not a Centaur, and the name is used again in 22 in a rather colourless way, a pure coincidence seems unlikely (see below, section 5 a).

54. A Centaur of this name, written Ὑλαῖος, together with Ἄσβολος (our 56) and Πετραῖος (our 58) is fighting against Ηερακλῆς on a kantharos of c. 550 B.C.[59]. In Callim. H. 3, 221 and Apollod. 3, 9, 2, he is killed by Atalante after assaulting her. Serv. Aen. 8, 294 says that he was killed by Theseus, which is closest to our vase, but we cannot guess the source of Servius' information. For Aktaion's dog see above.

55. Br. corrected the earlier reading Αγριος into Ακριος, which is confirmed by Cr. Although the upper oblique stroke does not show in the photo, the almost vertical first stroke makes a kappa more likely than a gamma. We therefore have to be careful not to overestimate the testimony Ἄγριος (a Centaur killed by Herakles; Apollod. 2, 5, 4). See below, section 5 a.

56. Attested Hes. Scut. 185 and later. For the beta see 35 and below, section 4. In view of the darker ink of the initial heta and the space to the next letter which is smaller than the spaces between the other letters, it seems quite likely that the initial heta is a secondary addition (as in 121). We cannot say whether the aspiration is justified or not, since the etymology of this word is

---

57 An appropriate expression used by D. A. Amyx, *Corinthian vase-painting of the archaic period* (Berkeley 1988[89]) passim, particularly suitable for scenes where horses are involved as is the case here.

58 There are also similar names, e.g. 233 *Thērodamas* and 210 *Orībasus,* see our 62 and 64, respectively.

59 Berlin F 1737 (*Para.* 27 Sokles Painter no. 1; LIMC IV s.v. *Hasbolos 2,* with photo).

unclear (see Ch. s.v.)[60]. The Berlin kantharos (above, ad 54) is of no help, since there the writing of the aspirations in Ηερακλες and Ὑλαῖος is strangely inconsistent. For Aktaion's dog see above.

58. Attested Hes. Scut. 185 and later, as well as on the Berlin kantharos (above, ad 54), where he is throwing a stone whereas the others are fighting with trees.

59. Πύρος seems not to be attested. But πυρρός of course contains the stem of πῦρ; therefore a connexion with the Centaur *Pyracmus* Ov. Met. 12, 460, killed by Kaineus who is also present on our vase (57), seems quite possible.

61. P.C. duly criticizes Cr.'s pessimistic reading Μελαν[---]. Some traces towards the end of what was read Μελαν[χα]ίτες in the last century are still visible, especially the top bar of a tau (P.C.), quite in the right position for the traditional restoration. This compound occurs, although probably as an epithet, in Hes. Scut. 186. For Aktaion's dog see above.

62. Θέρανγρος, a Centaur. L. A. Milani in 1902 (apud Cr. 100, document no. 125) interpreted this name as (1) Θήρανδρος 'l'uomo ferino', or (2) Θήραγρος 'cacciatore'. Both suggestions are possible. For the latter A. Morpurgo Davies draws my attention to the Thessalian variant ἀγγρέω for ἀγρέω (IG ix 2, 517, 41). Although this additional nasal is unexplained[61], this interpretation can indeed not be excluded. For the myth of the war between Centaurs and Lapiths is precisely a Thessalian tradition. The first suggestion, on the other hand, presupposes a slight mistake, but as the painter in 121 forgot to complete the delta (Δ) whereby leaving a gamma (Λ), the same may easily have happened here too (this is also Cr.'s interpretation, 177). In that case the second part of the compound would be -ανδρος. Here we have several possibilities: (1a) Proper names like Θήριππος, Βούθηρος, Πάνθηρος (Be. 209) suggest that the element -θηρ- in connexion with an animal could be understood as a verbal element. This would yield a meaning 'man-hunter', not altogether impossible for a Centaur, though not attested elsewhere. (1b) More plausible is however the interpretation proposed by Milani. The name could in this case be grouped with a special kind of determinative compounds, called "Mischungskomposita" by E. Risch[62], of which the earliest example is already found in the Iliad (21, 394 and 421 κυνάμυια 'a fly as shameless as a dog'). Thus our name could mean 'a man looking like a beast', which would of course be very appropriate for a Centaur. (1c) There would be yet another, completely different interpreta-

---

60 If the heta was not added in a second step, it is more likely that the aspiration was original. For it cannot like other cases (Kr. 156, Thr. 460) be explained by assimilation, and such wrong aspiration, for which it would be a very early example too, is comparatively rare in Attic (Thr. 494–497).

61 Whereas nasals are often omitted in writing where we expect them (see above, ad 24), the opposite phenomenon is extremely rare; see Thr. 488f. (read: "... an obtrusive nasal appears ...").

62 IF 59 (1944) 56–61 = Kleine Schriften (Berlin/New York 1981) 56–61.

tion, namely as Θέρ(ρ)ανδρος with Attic -ρρ- for -ρσ- in other dialects[63]. In view of the fact that all other Centaurs' names on our vase reflect aspects of their rural life or their appearance, I do not favour this interpretation[64].

64. For the beta see 35. The name clearly means 'living in the mountains'. Etymologically we expect Ὀρέσβιος, which is attested (e.g. Il. 5, 707–709, a man, not otherwise recorded, from rural Ὕλη in Boiotia). This must be a case of vowel assimilation as e.g. Τριπτόλομος (see Kr. 117f. and Thr. 389, not mentioning this example). A Centaur Ὄ(ὔ)ρειος is attested from Hes. Scut. 186. In Paus. 3, 18, 16 and Diod. Sic. 4, 12, 7 (above, n. 64), he is slain by Herakles.

e. The wedding of Peleus and Thetis

68. The use of nu instead of mu before nasal stops is widespread (Kr. 165, Thr. 595ff.). It is parallel to the use of nu before velar stops (as in 61).

69. [Πο]σειπõν is certainly a mistake. I do not think, however, we can easily argue for a copying error, since the two letters in question are not sufficiently similar, and a proper example of a pi was available for comparison. On the other hand it is very likely that the writer drew the strokes of the two letters in the same order: for the pi the order "long vertical – horizontal – short vertical tail" is the only probable one, and for the delta we know from 121 (see also 62) that he drew the bottom bar last, while it is likely that the oblique stroke next to the preceding letter was done before the other one. The general movement in drawing the two letters was therefore very similar. In view of this a careless lapse, induced by what could be characterized as a "graphical assimilation": ΠΟ- ΔΟ- > ΠΟ- ΠΟ-, seems a very likely thing to happen. A copying error would only be plausible if the error was already present in the original, but then we should have to ask why it had not long been corrected there.

71. The iota was inserted in a second step. This is clear not only from the narrow spaces but also from the different consistency of the paint, and has considerable implications (see below, section 5 c).

91. As a more or less regular change from a voiceless stop to an aspirate seems only to have occurred in contexts that allowed assimilation (as in 44 ὑροφός; see Kr. 149–152), the -χ- instead of -κ- in our case will be due to some other process, possibly contamination of different stems[65]. On the other hand

---

63 Θέρσανδρος is well attested (see W. Pape/G. E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen,* Braunschweig 1862, s.v.); see also Θάρρανδρος (Be. 50, 198) and Θερσάνωρ (ibid. 53, 207).

64 The fact that Diod. Sic. 4, 12, 7 names two Centaurs Μελαγχαίτης and Ὄρειος, and moreover one Θηρεύς, may suggest that a name with Θηρ(ο)- was part of the tradition. On the other hand this stem lent itself to the creation of Centaurs' names at any time, and the Hesiodic *Shield* where the other two are likely to be taken from (l. 186, both), does not contain a Θηρ(ο)- name.

65 In view of the sea-monster body of our figure, a suitable candidate would be the root of ὄφις, ἔχις, etc., which could also have existed in crossed forms with ὀχ- (see Ch., s.v., who cites modern Greek οχιά).

this is a non-Greek name, and there are other forms which differ precisely in the quality of this velar sound, e.g. Ὠγηνός (see Ch., s.v. Ὠκεανός)[66].

95. Athena's companion is Leto (or Artemis) (Si.).

98/99. Fig. 78 in Cr. is wrongly labelled as Ares and Aphrodite's chariot, which is in fact hidden under the handle just as the two deities themselves. What is shown in the photo is a chariot with two figures and beyond three ladies whose names are all lost. They are regarded as Apollon and Artemis (or Leto) and the Nymphs (Si.).

f. The death of Troilos

101. For many more hypocoristic names in -ων derived from cities see Be. 558f. The fact that the boy is called after the city he is from, is probably best explained as a polite reminder for the reader of the geographical context in which the scene is taking place (see below, ad 103). Other such hints – not quite indispensable – are 56a, 87, 102, 108. It is not certain whether the first *o* must be imagined long or short. For the hypocoristic names in -ων can be derived from the very shortest available stem or even pseudo-stem of a name (e.g. Ἥρ-ων, Be. 193, Θράσ-ων, ibid. 213), i.e. from Τρο- as in Τρο-ίη or Τρω- as in Τρῶ-ες. We do not need an intermediate *i* (which would be written if it were there).

103. The name of this girl will have to be explained in a similar way: Ῥοδίος is one of the rivers flowing through the Troad (Il. 12, 20). Her name may be meant to evoke the notion "extra muros".

g. The return of Hephaistos

121. The initial heta is a secondary addition (as perhaps in 56), as we know from the consistency of the paint and the fact that the letter is partly written in the upper margin (its writer did not commit the same "correction" in 99). It is unlikely that we have to read h(ε)Ἀφρο-[67], since this would be the only article on the whole vase. The addition of the heta could have phonological reasons (assimilation because of the following aspirate -φ-, see Kr. 156), though it is hard to see why the same addition was not made in 99 (nor in 6, 22, 37, 51, 53, 95, 68, 106, 118, 126, 128). The similarly looking "second thoughts" in 35 should not be too readily compared (see above, ad loc.). The delta is incomplete as in 62 (see below, section 4); this was observed by Cr. (177), who however wrongly writes Ηαφρολιτε̄ (criticized by P.C.). The delta in 99 is complete.

123. The iota was first forgotten and then squeezed in (in 90 it was written in the first instance). The form without an iota is attested twice more on Attic vases, but it is hard to explain (see Kr. 126f., Thr. 269). See below, section 4.

124. As has long been stressed, this is (apart from H. Ven. 262f. whose date

---

66 Sophilos on the dinos *Para.* 19.16bis writes Ὀ̄κεανός.
67 For this kind of omission of vowels see Wachter, Kadmos 30 (1991), in print.

is controversial) the first attestation of these mythological figures[68]. As in H. Ven., the plural is used. The well-known story of Silenos (in the singular) in captivity, however, is attested almost as early, on a cup by the same potter Ergotimos (ABV 79f.). It is interesting to note in this connexion that it was Midas, the Phrygian king, who had him captured[69], another element on this vase which points to barbarian peoples in the East (see above, ad 27, and below, section 4).

125. See above, ad 24.

4. Copying errors?

The question whether some of the mistakes on this vase can be shown to be copying errors is relevant to two different problems: (1) If we can show that they are, we should know something about the degree of literacy of a writer who is likely to have been one of the finest and best-informed archaic Attic vase-painters. (2) If we can show that they are, we should have an argument for the assumption that the pictures were also copied from some original (a wall-painting[70], or whatever).

P.C. thinks that the errors on this vase are "errori nati da disattenzione piuttosto che da imperizia". Im. however takes the unusual forms 24, 35, 42, 62, 69, 121 (the gamma) for "copyist's mistakes". On the other hand a few lines up he describes the inscriptions as "written with fluency by a highly literate painter". This is contradictory, since for a highly literate man there was no need to copy the lettering from any source, and if he did, we should expect him to write correctly even if the source was faulty, rather than make any mistakes which could be identified as being due to the copying process.

What can we say about our writer's literacy? In a few of the cases in question a copying error is a priori unlikely. (1) For 24 we have seen above (ad loc.) that there is an explanation which is easier than assuming any error, and even makes better sense. (2) As for the unfinished delta (i.e. gamma) in 121 (and perhaps also in 62), one may remember that our Western cursive writing often omits the horizontal stroke through the small *t*, which can then look like an *l*. Moreover we must not forget that before the firing, the black glaze was only slightly darker than the clay surface of the vase, particularly if the brush was running out of paint and needed dipping in (as was clearly the case towards the end of 121), or if the paint was not thick enough[71]. Whenever a

---

68 See e.g. Th. H. Carpenter, *Dionysian imagery in archaic Greek art* (Oxford 1986) 76ff.

69 Hdt. 8, 138, reporting a Macedonian tradition; Xen. *Anab.* 1, 2, 13; etc.

70 This is e.g. assumed by Si. for the frieze with the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (above, e) in view of Sophilos' vase (see above, n. 66). The order of the deities however differs a great deal, and the fact that many of them are represented on both vases can be explained in other ways. As with dialects, common features in pictorial art need not go back to a common historical source, but can develop by contact, mutual influence, indeed by fashion and trends.

71 See e.g. J. V. Noble, *The techniques of painted Attic pottery*, revised ed. (London 1988) 79 (general remarks), 85 (preparation of black glaze), 114f. (mistakes), 127 (dilute glaze), 146 (inscriptions).

painter stopped for a moment while writing a letter, he ran the risk of forget-
ting its completion and never noticing it until it was too late and the lapse
showed with relentless clarity. In my view it is quite remarkable that such
mistakes are not more frequent on our vase. There is another irregularity
which can be explained through this principle, namely the half-finished beta in
56 (above, ad 35). (3) I cannot see either how the mistake in 69 [Πο]σειπōν can
be a copying error, unless the mistake was already present on the alleged
original (see above, ad loc.). What remains are (4) a case of unexpected aspira-
tion in 121 (56 is uncertain), (5) the unexpected initial beta in 35, and (6) the
heta instead of beta in 42 [..?]επιhοια. In cases (4) and (5) the letters concerned
are one certain and one likely secondary addition (the latter possibly replacing
an earlier letter). Unless we can offer some plausible explanation for both, we
have to assume that they were added by a writer different from the one who
produced the inscriptions in general. For the main writer not only was very
correct and consistent with respect to initial aspiration[72], but also can hardly
be expected to commit a gross mistake when trying to correct something.

I may attempt a step towards quite a different explanation. On the one
hand 121 Ηαφροδῖτē (miswritten -γιτε) seems to offer the possibility of a
popular etymology, namely with ἀβρός 'graceful, pretty' (mainly used of beau-
tiful women), quite appropriate for the goddess in general and for her represen-
tation in the center of the frieze. But -φ- for -β-? On the other hand 35 Βευξί-
σρατος, the name of one of the Athenian youths led back from Crete by
Theseus, reminds of a possible compound φευξίστρατος, which makes more
sense at first sight, I think, than Εὐξίστρατος[73]. Although there are no other
compound nouns or names with φευξι-[74], the type is quite common[75]. Here we
should then have B- for Φ-. The notion of φευξίστρατος immediately evokes
the story of Achilleus who was wearing girl's clothes while hiding among the
daughters of Lykomedes at Skyros in order to avoid going to the Trojan war[76].
Now it is interesting in this connexion that in the Oschophoria which were
connected with Theseus' and the children's return from Crete (Plut. Thes. 23),
two boys in women's clothes were leading the procession (see Herter, above b,
1102 with references). This was probably part of an initiation ceremony of
young men[77], and indeed Theseus himself, when he first arrived in Athens, was
mocked at because of his girl's clothes (Paus. 1, 19, 1). It is difficult to say,
however, although not inconceivable, what the function of a character called

72 There is correct aspiration in 30, 39, 46, 54, 60, 90, 92, 74, 79, 81, 105, 108, 113, 119, 123; there
    is correct non-aspiration in 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 17, 18–20, 22, 24, 37, 38, 45, 49–51, 53, 55, 64, 95, 98,
    99(!), 66, 68, 72, 76, 78, 85, 86, 100, 106, 110, 116–118, 126–129.
73 The two oldest examples of Εὐξι- names in Be. 179 are Εὐξίθεος (there is also an Attic potter
    of this name around 500) and Εὐξίθεμις (5th/4th century). Freer combinations occur later.
74 For the rare stem φευξι-, known mainly from tragedy, see LSJ s.v. φευξείω, φεύξιμος, φεῦξις.
75 A contemporary example is λείψανδρος (Helen and her sisters) in Stesich. fr. 223 PMG.
76 Ilias parva fr. 4 Davies = fr. 24 Bernabé; etc.
77 See W. Burkert, Greek Religion (Oxford 1985) 261.

Φευξίστρατος might have been in such a ritual. If this connexion is correct, the beta instead of a phi in our name could be compared with the *b* instead of a *ph* in the possible popular etymology of Ηαφροδῖτε. Confusion of aspirates and voiced stops are well-known from the (half-)barbarian peoples in the north of Greece, e.g. the one whose western part, near Macedonia, is called Βρῦγες or Βρῦγοι, and the Eastern part Φρῦγες. The Lydian painter in Athens (c. 550, signing his vases with: ho Λῦδος ἔγραφσεν)[78] and the potter Βρῦγος (a century later) come to mind[79]. And we remember the hard-to-explain predilection on our vase for Kimmerians with "Phrygian" caps on the frieze with the boar-hunt (6, 21, 27), as well as the Phrygian myth around Silenos (see above, ad 124). Of course Κλιτίας has a name which sounds Greek. But could he not have been the son of a barbarian, like the important potter Κλεοφράδες (c. 500), whose father Ἄμασις was also a foreigner?[80] I dare not go further since this would lead into speculation. But it seems that this is a way towards an understanding of these two spelling oddities.

Case (6), namely 42 [..?]επιhοια, showing a wrong letter similar to the one expected, is therefore the only mistake which could be safely argued as a copying error, and due to illiteracy of the writer.

On the other hand, there are positive indications that the writer was not copying, but writing spontaneously. (1) There are forms containing features which are much more likely to be due to popular or even idiosyncratic pronunciation and spontaneous writing than to have been included in, and copied from, an existing original, particularly in their entirety (which does not mean, of course, that a particular writer did not consider at least some of them as correct and would always spell them like this): 1 Ἀρπυλέᾱ(ς) (two features!), 8 Ἀταλά(ν)τε, 20 Ἄσμετος, 24 Ἔ(ν)βολος, 35 -σρατο[ς] and 36 -σράτε, 39 Ηέρμ-ιπ(π)ο(ς), 44 ὑροφός, 64 Ὀρόσβιος, 91 [Ὁ]χεανός, 125 Νύ(ν)φαι. (2) There are two similar cases, where he first wrote down the name and then changed it. In both cases the correction consisted in inserting an iota: 71 Κλειό (first Κλεό; see below, section 5 c) and 123 Ηέφαιστος (first Ηέφαστος; see above, ad loc.). Both names are however attested, the first one even expected, in Attic without iota. If these forms without the iota were copying mistakes, and if they were worth "correcting", we may wonder why they were not "correct" or "corrected" on the original before the copying took place. The corrections make much better sense if they are second thoughts on what had been spontaneous writing of the sort of the twelve examples above. (3) The rather unusual labelling of a stone (56a), an altar (87), a well (102), and a pot (108) also seem to be due to spontaneity. (Why did he not label the boar, the ship, the prizes of the

78 *ABV* 107ff.

79 On some of Brygos' vases voiceless stops are written instead of aspirates, see Im. 88, Kr. 81, Thr. 453 and 471f.

80 *ARV* 191.103; D. von Bothmer, *The Amasis Painter and his world* (Malibu/New York/London 1985) 230f.; J. Boardman, *Amasis: the implications of his name*, in: *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his world* (Malibu 1987) 141–152.

chariot-race, Hephaistos' mule, Peleus' house, Troy's wall and gate, etc.?) (4)
The strongest argument against illiteracy however is the case where we can
only assume that the writer's memory failed him slightly, namely the dead
boar-hunter 17 Ἀνταῖος who should be Ἀνκαῖος. It is not plausible that this is
either a copying error of an illiterate person (the "wrong" name is a correct
name too, belonging to an equally well-known mythical figure), or an error
which was already included on an alleged original (where it should have been
long noticed and corrected).

In view of all this, I doubt that the one mistake in 42 is sufficient proof of
the writer's illiteracy. After all, we all make mistakes from time to time, and a
wrong but similar letter is one of the mistakes that are likely to happen. I
therefore support P.C.'s view and Im.'s (first) statement of a "highly literate
painter".

5. Literary implications of the names of the Lapiths, Centaurs, and Muses

a. Lapiths and Centaurs

The oldest catalogue of names of Lapiths and Centaurs that has come
down to us, is Hes. Scut. 179–187. A shorter list of Lapiths only is given in Il. 1,
263–265. It will be convenient for what follows to cite these two lists:

Scut. 179ff. (Lap.):   Καινέα τ' ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα Δρύαντά τε Πειρίθοόν τε
                       Ὁπλέα τ' Ἐξάδιόν τε Φάληρόν τε Πρόλοχόν τε
                       Μόψον τ' Ἀμπυκίδην, Τιταρήσιον, ὄζον Ἄρηος,
                       Θησέα τ' Αἰγεΐδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισιν· ...

185ff. (Cent.):   ἀμφὶ μέγαν Πετραῖον ἰδ' Ἄσβολον οἰωνιστὴν
                       Ἄρκτον τ' Οὔρειόν τε μελαγχαίτην τε Μίμαντα
                       καὶ δύο Πευκεΐδας, Περιμήδεά τε Δρύαλόν τε, ...

Il. 1, 263ff. (Lap.): οἷον Πειρίθοόν τε Δρύαντά τε, ποιμένα λαῶν,
                       Καινέα τ' Ἐξάδιόν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον,
                       Θησέα τ' Αἰγεΐδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισιν·

As for the Lapiths the vase cannot be said to be very close to, or even
depending on, either of the two lists. It is particularly important to note that
the special fate of Kaineus is not told in either poem. He was invulnerable and
the only way the Centaurs could overcome him was by knocking him into the
ground and heaping trees and stones on him (earliest literary mention: Pind.
Thren. 6 = 128f, 7–9 Sn.). Three names however recur in both poetic lists of
Lapiths, namely Καινεύς, Θησεύς and – a likely restoration on the vase –
Δρύας (at least two names are lost on the vase, amongst which will have been
Peirithoos). Ηόπλον agrees to a certain extent, being Ὁπλεύς in Hes., but the
remaining Lapiths' names on the vase are not found in the two literary lists.

As for the Centaurs the connexion between the vase and the only list we

have is closer. 3 of the 8 names in Hes. (counting μελαγχαίτης as a name[81]) are perfect matches (58 Πετραῖος, 56 {H}Ἄσβολος, and 61 Μελαν[χα]ίτες), and 2 are similar (55 Ἄκριος and 64 Ὀρόσβιος; Ἄρκτος and Οὔρειος in Hes.); the other 3 are not now found on the vase, but this could (partly) be due to the fact that 3 Centaurs' names are lost. The agreement is however even closer. The central Centaur on the painting is 58 Πετραῖος (fighting against the Lapith 60 Hόπλōν), and the next two Centaurs immediately behind Petraios' back are 56 {H}Ἄσβολος and 55 Ἄκριος. This corresponds to the order in which they are named in the Shield, where Petraios is the first one, called 'the huge', and Asbolos as the second has the special role of the augur. Of course Ἄκριος is not identical with Ἄρκτος, the third in the Shield, but very similar, particularly with respect to paleography (Ἄρκτος could therefore be corrupt). It is also clear that the name on the vase is more appropriate a name than Ἄρκτος. Ἄκριος 'the one from the top of the mountain (ἄκρον)' goes very well together with the following Οὔρειος, whereas 'Bear' is unparalleled and rather odd for a creature half-man-half-horse. The agreement in order of these three names on the vase and in the poem cannot be due to mere coincidence. We may even go a step further. It is true that the next Centaur to the left of Ἄκριος on the vase is Hῦλαῖος not Οὔρειος. But the two are metrically equivalent. May we therefore assume that it was exactly the name Ἄκριος that induced the following Οὔ-ρειος, whereas the original version, ringing in the order of the names on our vase, was: ἀμφὶ μέγαν Πετραῖον ἰδ᾽Ἄσβολον, οἰωνιστὴν, Ἄκριον Ὑλαῖον τε ... etc.?[82] This gets some support from the Berlin kantharos with the fight between Herakles and three Centaurs (see above, ad 54), where besides Petraios and Asbolos there is (H)ylaios (Akrios is missing, though, and the three are not "in order": Y.-P.-He.-A.). If this reconstruction is correct, Ἄρκτον (with addition of τ᾽ for metrical reasons) would indeed be not the mistake of the poet of the Shield, but a secondary lapse which happened in the course of transmission of the poem[83]. This, as mentioned, would be paleographically plausible. As for the continuation we cannot draw any conclusions because the next Centaur to the left of Hylaios is lost, and on the right side of the frieze the gaps are even bigger.

As we have seen above, the vase painting cannot be said to depend on the passage in the Shield, since Kaineus' fate is not included in the poem. But we have now established on the basis of the Centaurs that the painting is very likely to reflect a similar hexametrical tradition.

Let us now pass on to the Lapiths. First it has to be stressed that the one

---

81 A similar uncertainty occurs with the Nereid's name Θόη, see Wachter (below, n. 87, Quad. tic.) 38, n. 16.

82 As for the lack of a conjunction see e.g. Hes. *Th.* 245 and 339; *Il.* 15, 302; 18, 40 and 47. This is comparatively rare in these lists and may have been an additional (or even the main) motivation for the change to Ἄρκτος.

83 Unless we are prepared to believe that also Οὔρειος, a perfect name for a Centaur, is due to a later corruption rather than to the poet, which is quite unlikely in any respect.

and only Lapith's name that occurs on our vase but not in the Shield, and is attested later in this context (for a Centaur), namely 53 Ἀντίμαχος, is a further trace of such a lost tradition. It is quite obvious that the vase where he is a Lapith preserves the original version, rather than Ovid (and his source) where he is a Centaur. For his dull battlefield name is in clear contrast to the other Centaurs' names.

Similarities and differences between the two early literary lists of Lapiths have often been discussed. Eduard Meyer's two main conclusions[84] are still more or less generally agreed upon, namely (1) that the line Il. 1, 265, naming Theseus, is an interpolation of Attic propaganda[85], and (2) that the list of Lapiths in the Shield cannot be said to depend on the one in the Iliad (since Polyphemos is lacking). We should however not only look at which names are shared and which are not, if we are considering possible relations between these lists. More important, there are "hidden" similarities, viz. identical positions of the names in the lines and small blocks of lines. (1) Kaineus in both lists is at the beginning of a line, but whereas in Homer he is followed by Exadios, in Hesiod he comes one line earlier, and Hopleus, metrically equivalent, takes his place before Exadios. (2) Exadios' position in the line is fixed, and together with the preceding name + τ(ε) and the following τε we get a block of half a line up to κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον. (3) Although Peirithoos in Homer is in the first half of the line and in Hesiod in the second, he is still named in the analogous line in both lists. (4) He goes together with Dryas, whose position in the line is the same in both lists[86]. Here we should also mention the fact that both lists of Lapiths are in the accusative case. Such features, a combination of differences as well as perfect matches, are not explicable if we assume that one author copied his list from the other at a time when the latter's work had been written down, but they show that there is some common ancestry behind the two lists. The only context where such a combination of differences and matches can easily emerge, is the context of oral poetry, and it seems reasonable to conclude that Homer, too, drew from current tradition. (For this argument the lists of Nereids in the Iliad and the Theogony are particularly revealing[87].)

Let us sum up. From the names of Centaurs we have concluded that there was a hexametrical Centaur list or – more likely – a tradition of Centaur lists which is reflected both in the Shield and on the François Vase. From the lists of Lapiths it follows that they reflect a tradition which we can already observe in Homer. Both lists of course belong closely together since they contain the two

84 Hermes 27 (1892) 375.
85 It is a good line, though, and conveniently usable also in the nominative and dative case.
86 Is it mere chance that there is some assonance before and after this name: -τα Δρύαντά τε Πει-
    in the one list, -τε Δρύαντά τε ποι- in the other?
87 See my articles Ποντομέδοισα und die antiken Nereidenkataloge, Num. e ant. class., Quad. tic.
    19 (1990) 34–46; Nereiden und Neoanalyse: ein Blick hinter die Ilias, Würzb. Jahrb. N.F. 16
    (1990), in print.

parties to the same conflict. The fact that the Centaurs are not listed in the Iliad will have to do with the general tendency of this epic to disregard monstrous creatures. The – trivial – conclusion from all this is that both Lapiths and Centaurs were glorified in lists even earlier than the writing down of the Iliad passage. The following list openings will not be far off the "standard" version an oral poet had to know[88]:

Lapiths: Καινέα τ' ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα Δρύαντά τε Πειρίθοόν τε
'Οπλέα τ' 'Εξάδιόν τε ...
Centaurs: ἀμφὶ μέγαν Πετραῖον ἰδ' 'Ασβολον οἰωνιστήν,
'Άκριον 'Υλαῖόν τε ...

b. The Muses

The importance of the observations on the Muses on our vase made over a century ago by A. Trendelenburg[89] and stressed again by Hubert Schmidt[90] is not sufficiently acknowledged by modern scholars[91] and therefore is worth stressing. Trendelenburg noticed that the names of our Muses not only are almost identical with those given by Hes. Th. 77–79 Κλειώ τ' Εὐτέρπη τε Θάλειά τε Μελπομένη τε Τερψιχόρη τ' 'Ερατώ τε Πολύμνιά τ' Οὐρανίη τε Καλλιόπη ϑ', but that they also occur almost consistently in the same order as in the Theogony. If we read the names of the Muses on the vase according to their rank, i.e. from right to left, there are first two single ones, namely 77 Καλ(λ)ιόπε as the foremost, the only one shown in front view, and playing an instrument (the syrinx), and behind her 76 'Ōρανίᾱ. The former is of course the recognized leader of the Muses already in Hes., but the latter too seems to have played a more important role than most in that she is specially honoured as being the mother of Linos (Hes. fr. 305 M.-W.). What comes then, however, is highly significant: first a group of four, namely those of l. 77 (Κλειό̄, Εὐτέρπε̄, Θάλεια, and – slightly behind and partly covered by the handle – Μελπομένε̄), and finally a group of three corresponding to the remaining ones in l. 78 (Στε̄σιχόρε̄, 'Ερατό̄, Πολυμνίς). Schmidt's discussion goes even further than these observations of Trendelenburg: "Haec cum casu quodam accidisse vix credibile sit, accurate Hesiodea nomina vel potius versus ipsos memoria pictorem tenuisse iudico. Quoniam autem pro Terpsichora et Polymnia, quae nomina codices exhibent, Stesichoram et Polymnida in pictura ponit, quaestio

88 I prefer the non-Homeric version for the Lapiths, since it is syntactically independent, names the great Kaineus first, and can do without the stereotyped ποιμένα λαῶν. The epithet of Asbolos on the other hand is likely to be an old feature, at least we do not know what is behind it (see also the old debate whether in Ov. *Met.* 12, 307f., where a Centaur *Astylus* is given the epithet *augur*, one should conjecture *Asbolus*; the mistake may of course have happened long before Ovid).

89 *Der Musenchor*, 36. Berl. Winckelm. Progr. (1876) 11.

90 *Observationes archaeologicae in carmina Hesiodea* (Diss. Halle 1891) 8f.

91 Schmidt's work is mentioned by M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 181 ad 78 Τερψιχόρη.

non supervacanea nobis oboritur, num memoriae lapsu Clitias a poeta abscesserit, an in libro vetustissimo hae nominum formae exstiterint; neque enim proprio Marte eum nomina commutasse credi potest. Atqui certa ratione quaestionem diiudicare difficile est. Id tantum dici potest versum Στησιχόρη τ' Ἐρατώ τε Πολύμνις τ' Οὐρανίη τε tradita lectione deteriorem non esse. At etiamsi Clitias versum in suo Hesiodi exemplo ita legisset, tamen ne tum quidem constaret, genuinas has esse nominum formas, quia iam antiquitus varias lectiones in Hesiodi exempla irrepsisse cogitari potest."

There is hardly anything to add. Indeed the observation that the variants which occur on our vase also fit the metre, practically rules out the possibility that they are just careless mistakes on the part of the vase-painter[92]. A second argument against this view is the Ionic form Στεσιχόρε (instead of Attic -χόρᾱ) which clearly shows that this list is a faithful citation from a literary text, as was pointed out by W. Schulze in 1896 (see Kleine Schriften, 1933, 702). There is only one aspect we might see differently today. We ought to stress that Klitias is depicting neither the birth of the Muses, nor their concert for the gods in Olympus, nor their favouring great kings on earth as Hesiod relates, but he shows them in the precise context of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. This story was contained in the Cypria (said to be by Homer or Stasinos), and there is a fair chance that in the catalogue of guests invited to the wedding the Muses were (individually) named. Moreover it seems more likely that such small differences between the two hexametrical lists of Muses we are dealing with, one in Hesiod and one reflected in our vase-painting, came about in a context of oral poetry rather than of copying a fixed text within the first century of its existence. If this is correct, it might even tell us something about the much discussed question of whether Hesiod invented the names of the nine Muses or not. Personally I do not think he did, but in view of the lack of contemporary hexametrical lists (as there are for the Nereids; see above, n. 87) or of lists that are slightly later but independent (as in the case of the Lapiths, explained above, a), we have no means of proving that this list reflected a tradition that was alive already before Hesiod (nor can we disprove it, of course).

c. Excursus: the spelling of the name Κλειδ̄

The fact that epic poetry is reflected in the series of Muses on our vase, gets confirmation from the name 71 Κλειδ̄. This name is a hypocoristic derivative with the suffix -ōi- from the stem of κλέ(Ϝ)ος, one of the most frequent elements in proper names. This feminine suffix is always added to a stem directly, without a derivation in -io- in between[93]. So there are, for example, another Muse Ἐρατ-ώ, the Nereids (Hes. Th. 243ff.) Σα-ώ, Σπει-ώ, Δωτ-ώ,

---

92 This is the view which West (see previous n.) seems to favour.
93 There is of course sometimes an *i* in front of the suffix, but in the early examples of such names it always belongs to the root, as far as I can see, e.g. in Φαιώ 'the grey shining one' (one

Πρωτ-ώ, Κυμ-ώ, Νησ-ώ, Θεμιστ-ώ, the Oceanids (Hes. Th. 349ff.) Πειθ-ώ, Πρυμν-ώ, Ἱππ-ώ, Ζευξ-ώ, Πλουτ-ώ, Μενεσθ-ώ, Τελεστ-ώ, Καλυψ-ώ, Ἀμφιρ-ώ. Often the part of the name preceding our suffix is the first part of a compound name, of which the last vowel is dropped if it was in use at all, e.g. (taking some of the examples just cited, all from Be.): Ἐρατ(ο-σθένης), Σα(υ-γένες), Πρωτ(ό-λαος), Πειθ(-αγόρης), Ζεύξ(-ιππος). Our name is therefore a hypocoristic from a name whose first part is, or is based on, the stem of Κλέος. By far the most frequent type of names beginning with this element has Κλεο- (from ΚλεϜο-; Be. 239–241; 56 examples, the earliest ones are Il. 9, 556 Κλεο-πάτρη and 16, 330 Κλεόβουλος), less frequent are names with Κλει- and Κλη- (from ΚλεϜι- and ΚλεϜε-, often indistinguishable as to their origin[94]; Be. 238f.; 27 examples, none in Hom. and Hes.), and Κλεα- (from ΚλεϜα-; Be. 241; 2 examples, late)[95]. All such names would lend themselves to the derivation of a hypocoristic name with our suffix, whereby they would drop their second vowel[96]. (The best suited ones were no doubt those with Κλεο- where the vowel which had to be replaced agreed best with the new one of the suffix.) It is important to notice that this would also automatically happen to the *i* in Κλει-. The result would therefore in any case be Κλέώ, not Κλειώ. The same procedure can be observed for the masculine counterpart of this short hypocoristic name, Κλέων, which has always a short *e*.

Nevertheless our Muse is called Κλειώ, not only in Hesiod, but also later, leading to Latin *Clīō*. There are two possibilities: (1) The name is very archaic, going back to an unknown time when the full stem of κλέϜος, i.e. κλεϜεσ-, could be used as the first part of a compound or compound name. The hypo-coristic name would in that case have had the following development: *Klewesōi > *Klewehōi > *Kleeōi > Kleō = Κλειώ. But there is no certain example of a compound or name with *klē- +* vowel, or *klēs- +* consonant which might suggest such an origin. Moreover its initial position in the line makes the scansion Κλεεώ impossible. (2) The long vowel is due to metrical lengthen-

of the Hyads, Hes. fr. 291, 3 M.-W.; from φαι- in φαιός, φαικός, φαι-δ-, see Ch. s.vv.). For Σπειώ see below.

94 Cases which make the existence of ΚλεϜι- likely, are: (1) the potter Kleimachos who wrote Κλείμαχος μ' ἐποίεσε, κἐμὶ κἐνō (*ABV* 85 top, read: "JHS 52 ..."; towards 550 B.C.); in view of the "correct" writing -ē- in the same inscription, Κλει- is more likely to represent *ΚλεϜι- than ΚλεϜε-; (2) Κλειδίκō (cited by Be. 239; Milet I, iii no. 122, I, 21), a 6th-century name in a list of stephanephoroi which, although written in the 4th century, preserves the old spelling very well down to Alexander (334/33), except 91 Πρόξεινος (5th century).

95 In Mycenaean there is only *ke-re-wa* (KN Od 666?, Xd 282), which may be the hypocoristic name ΚλέϜ-ᾱς.

96 For the names with Κλε- + a second part starting with a vowel (Be. 238; 18 examples, e.g. Κλέ-ανδρος), we cannot know of which type the first part is (nor would a Greek have been able to tell).

ing[97], which is probably the easier explanation[98]. Be this as it may, in either case the long vowel, written -ει-, is a spurious diphthong, not a real one.

As for the occurrences as a woman's name, the normal form was Κλεώ with short $\breve{e}$, which is quite frequent in inscriptions. On the other hand whenever a woman's name Κλειώ occurs (which is rather rare), it is likely to reflect the Muse's name[99], well-known from prominent early poetic occurrences (such as in Hesiod's Theogony).

Now it is interesting to notice that even the Muse herself is once attested as Κλεώ with a short $\breve{e}$, namely in Pind. Nem. 3, 83 (gen. Κλέους)[100]. A second example of her being scanned like this is our vase. For what the painter first produced is Κλεό, and he only later changed his mind and inserted an iota. Two questions arise: (1) Why did he have second thoughts about what he wrote in the first instance? (2) Why did he precisely insert an iota? The first question is relatively easy to answer. He (or whoever gave him the advice) must have felt the desire to make it clear that the first syllable is meant to be long. In view of the fact that our series of Muses' names reflect the actual lines of epic poetry with their catalogue, this desire is most understandable. This means that, although in local Attic script of the time Κλεο could also stand for *Klēō* with a spurious diphthong, he must have felt that this was not clear enough. (This is the reason why we can take our form as a second attestation of the everyday pronunciation *Klēō* of the Muse's name, as in Pindar.)

The second question is more difficult. For we should not too readily answer: "Because this was what he could read in his copy of the Cypria (or whatever)". It is true, the form looks so familiar that nobody seems to have wondered about it so far. But as a matter of fact, the first examples of this spelling of a spurious diphthong in Athens start around 500[101], and there is

---

97 This need not mean that this name is young, e.g. an invention of Hesiod, since not only metrical lengthening but also names with Κλεο- are attested in the *Iliad* too and may go even much further back. The same metrical lengthening took place in Κλεοίτας in an Olympian inscription (apud Paus. 6, 20, 14), and Κλειοπάτρην A.R. 2, 239, etc.

98 Although comparable on first sight, the case of the similar sounding Nereid's name Σπειώ (*Il.* 18, 40; Hes. *Th.* 245) is slightly different. This name occurs in a metrical context where it can be scanned double short (see above), i.e. Νησαίη Σπεέω τε ... Moreover it is contained in a part of the Nereid's lists which is likely to be pre-Homeric (see Wachter, above, n. 87), and there are no compound nouns or names with this neutre noun, neither *Σπεο- *Σπει- *Σπεε- which could induce *Σπεώ, nor any with σπεε(σ)-. Therefore we may here prefer an origin *Σπε᾽εσ-ώ (for the etymology see Ch. s.v. σπέος). The only nominative with metrical lengthening, *Od.* 5, 194 σπεῖος (besides over 20 instances of σπέος in Homer and Hesiod) is more likely to be based on Σπειώ than vice versa.

99 See Be. 565 with examples for most of the Muses' names.

100 Another metrical example for this name (not the Muse, though) is from the 4th century B.C., namely Phalaec. apud Ath. 10, 440 d Κλεώ.

101 Threatte 172. The beginning (174) of his list of the earliest occurrences contains dubious and wrong cases: His first example, the name Κλείμαχος, contains a real diphthong (see above, n. 94); his second example, imperf. ἐποίει (in a metrical text, P. A. Hansen, *Carmina epigraphica graeca*, vol. I, Berlin/New York 1983, no. 42; c. 525?) besides ἐποίε (in prose) could be a

nothing to suggest that its phonological confusion with the real diphthong started much earlier in Athens. We could try to escape this problem, asking: "Was it because the copy of his text, which was presumably an East-Ionic epic, was not written in the Attic alphabet?" For it is well-known that the new spelling of this spurious diphthong (the same is true for oυ) was adopted in official Athenian inscriptions around 400 B.C., roughly at the same time as the East-Ionic alphabet (i.e. the new letters Ξ, Ψ, Ω, and the new use of H)[102]. We could therefore be tempted to see these two things together. Yet whereas the Ionic alphabet in official documents was shunned before 403/02 B.C. but consistently used after this date, the new spellings of the spurious diphthongs start well in the 5th century[103], and the old spellings go on well down into the 360s[104]. And whereas it is obvious from the epigraphical evidence that the three new letters and the use of H for $ę$ came from East-Ionia, in East-Ionic inscriptions the spelling ει (and οu) for the spurious diphthong does not start earlier than in Attica, i.e. not before the early 5th century, and is not regularly used even in the late 5th century. This new spelling was therefore not connected with East-Ionia at all[105]. Given this, it is important to ask the question, for what reason one adopted the new spelling which was after all illogical (two letters for one sound) and more laborious too. (The *possibility* to change, because the pronunciation of the spurious diphthongs was similar or identical to that of the real ones, does of course not imply the *need* to change, as can be seen in English or Modern Greek spelling.)

Now there is one context where the possibility of the new orthography with H and Ω for the long open sounds was very welcome, because it made possible a distinction in quantity: this is poetry, in particular epic poetry. For the Homeric language must have been quite difficult to understand e.g. for a non-specialist Athenian already in the 6th century because of a considerable number of strange archaic features. In such a context, I think, and only here, does also the decision to use EI and OY for the long closed sounds to distin-

mistake in analogy to the present 3rd person sing. ποιεῖ (particularly since the augment may have to be elided); and his third example is a wrong reading (see Hansen, ibid., ad no. 70). With his fourth example we are well down in the 5th century. – The writing OY for the analogous spurious diphthong starts little earlier: Thr. 240 gives two examples (no. 1 and 2b) that are dated to the end of the 6th century, all others are later.

102 In informal writing this started already earlier in the 5th century, see Thr. 33ff.; on H and Ω also Wachter (above, n. 67) Appendix.

103 See Thr.'s lists cited above, n. 101.

104 See the first over 100 inscriptions in IG II², e.g. no. 106.

105 This can be easily seen in official documents written in Athens before 403, but concerning East-Ionians, namely the proxeny decrees for Herakleides of Klazomenai, IG I³ 227 (424/23), and for Oiniades of Skiathos, IG I³ 110 (408/07), and the Honours to the Samians, IG I³ 127 (405). In both cases the Athenians, probably for reasons of flattery, wrote in the Ionic alphabet, but never use EI or OY for the spurious diphthongs, see e.g. ἔδοξεν τῆι βōλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι.

guish them from the short ones, make perfect sense[106]. (We may remember how hard it can be to read Latin verse where no such distinctions are made!) It is not even necessary to assume a totally identical pronunciation of the real and the spurious diphthongs since under this assumption there would have been an active impulse to change with a reason not of quality but of quantity of the sounds in question. Finally it should also be mentioned that the advantage of better distinction between long and short closed sounds outweighed the disadvantage of a new non-distinction of real and spurious diphthongs, since the real diphthongs are quite rare, and therefore the number of occasions for uncertainties diminished through this innovation. Where this development first took place, it is impossible to say.

Returning to our Κλειỗ, we may ask: Does this mean we have to assume that in Athens this spelling rule – perhaps hidden in poetic circles as a reciting aid – existed as early as 565 B.C.? Peisistratos and the redaction of the Homeric poems which is connected with his name come to mind, although this seems to have happened somewhat later. (As we have seen above, section 3 c, Homer's Iliad is not directly reflected on the François Vase.) And does it mean that Klitias (or Ergotimos if it was he who pointed out the "mistakes" in this name and in 123) had his own copy of the text in question, perhaps the Cypria[107], on the shelf, as well as a copy of an epic with a list of Centaurs? "Highly literate" indeed would he have to be called.

6. Summary of the results

After a general introduction on the François Vase (section 1), a full edition was given of the texts preserved on this splendid example of archaic Attic vase painting (section 2).

In a commentary (section 3) epigraphical, philological, and historical aspects of many names were discussed (see particularly nos. 1, 13, 24, 27, 34, 55, 62, 64, 69, 71, 91, 101, 103, 123). Links between some names, particularly of Centaurs, and dogs in mythology were stressed (sections 3 a and d; nos. 1, 3, 54, 56, 61; see also 13). Moreover we saw that the painter did not know Homer's Iliad, at least not book 23, when he painted the vase (section 3 c).

In section 4 the question was discussed whether we have to accept that the writer of these inscriptions was illiterate, as is often assumed. This could be denied. Most mistakes are in fact hard to understand as copying errors, and there are easier ways of explaining them. Many more details suggest on the contrary that the writer was highly literate. A possible explanation of the

---

106 Is it by sheer chance that the first unequivocal example of this spelling is in a poem (see above, n. 101), whereas the normal Attic spelling is applied in the prose line just underneath?

107 From Schulze's observation concerning Στἐσιχόρε (above, b) we know that the poem in question was in the Ionic dialect. In which alphabet it was written is not certain, but we may note that our vase does not show East-Ionic spellings.

difficult cases 35 and 121 would link them to other features on this vase which seem to point to barbarian peoples in the East (see also ad 27, the earliest attestation of the name of the Kimmerian king Lygdamis, and 124).

In section 5 the order of the names of some Centaurs (a) and all the Muses (b) on the François Vase was compared with the respective order in literary lists of these mythological figures. This showed clearly that the writer of the inscriptions on the François Vase drew from poetic sources. From this comparison we could also conclude that there must have been different hexametrical traditions of these lists in archaic Greece, whose variants can only be explained in a satisfactory way with the technique of oral poetry. The tradition of Lapiths and Centaurs can be traced back before Homer (with the Muses, first attested in Hesiod, no certain conclusion is possible).

In a final section (excursus, 5 c) on the form of the name Κλειό (71), designating a Muse and therefore drawn from a poetic source, attention was drawn to the spelling of the spurious diphthong. It seems likely that the spelling ει (and ου, respectively) of these sounds originated in a context of written poetry, and that Κλειό of the François Vase is a very early example of this spelling in Ionic-Attic writing.