HESPERIA 79 (2010)
Pages 541–554

GREEK VERSE ON A VASE BY DOURIS

ABSTRACT

A schoolroom scene on an Attic red-figure kylix painted by Douris (Berlin, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen 2285) presents two interdependent problems of reading. One concerns the text on the scroll held up by the teacher: is it in hexameters or lyric, and is it part of a preexisting poem or an *ad hoc* composition by the painter? The second problem is iconographical: how is the viewer to interpret the action? Here it is argued that the verse is meant to be an epic hexameter and that its mistakes are to be attributed to the student, rather than to Douris.

The exterior of a well-known Athenian red-figure kylix painted ca. 490–485 B.C. by the artist Douris is decorated with four scenes set in a schoolroom (Figs. 1, 2).[1] On each side a lesson involving a text balances one involving a musical instrument.[2] Students, teachers, pedagogues, and perhaps teachers' assistants *(hypodidaskaloi)* are nicely arrayed, so that no one scene exactly mirrors another. Some figures stand, some sit; some face left, some right; one turns backward; and one seated figure faces front. A musical instrument hangs on the wall behind one of the text scenes,

1. Berlin, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen 2285: *CVA* Deutschland 21, Berlin 2, pl. 77; *ARV*² 431–432, no. 48, 1653; *Paralipomena* 374; *Beazley Addenda*² 237; *CAVI* 2330 = Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 78, no. 88, pl. 58. Earlier studies include Beazley 1948, pp. 337–338; Chamoux 1970; Booth 1985; Palumbo Stracca 1994. The date is that of Beazley (1948, p. 337), who, partly on the basis of style and partly because of the appearance (twice) of Hippodamas as a *kalos* name in the interior, places it in the third of Douris's four periods (*ARV*², 425–426). Buitron-Oliver (1995, p. 23) assigns it to the painter's "middle" period. For the several vases by Douris inscribed with the name Hippodamas, see Wegner 1968, pp. 76–87.

For help of various sorts I am grateful to Miles Beckwith, Ettore Cingano, Daniela Colomo, Raffaella Cribiore, Jaap Hemelrijk, Regina Höschele, Henry Immerwahr, Günther Koepke, Kenneth Lapatin, Andrew Lear, Joel Lidov, Carol Mattusch, Bernd Seidensticker, and Alan Shapiro. I also benefited from the useful suggestions offered by audiences in Berlin, Boston, and Washington, D.C., as well from the advice of the *Hesperia* referees and editors. Photographs were supplied by and are used with the permission of the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.

2. See further Birt 1907, pp. 138–139; Havelock 1982, pp. 201–203; Blanck 1992, pp. 24–25; Neils and Oakley 2003, pp. 245–246; Steiner 2007, p. 190. We are probably to imagine these several isolated actions taking place at the same time and place in a "unified" narrative, as Shapiro (1992, p. 38) calls it; see further Snodgrass 1982. The question has been raised whether the same teacher and the same student have been depicted more than once, but Booth (1985) argues convincingly that we are expected to understand that each of the students and teachers is represented by a stylized likeness.

Figure 1. Attic red-figure kylix, ca. 490–485, Douris. Sides A (top) and B (bottom). Berlin, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen 2285.
Courtesy Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photos U. Jung

Figure 2. Berlin, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen 2285, detail of side A. Courtesy Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo I. Geske

while an unopened roll hangs behind one of the music scenes. The painter of the vase has identified himself by writing ΔΟΡΙΣ ΕΓΡΑΦΣΕΝ (Δοῦρις ἔγραψεν) in the tondo.[3]

In one of the scenes on side A, a seated teacher holds an open scroll containing a poetic text (Fig. 2) in front of a standing student. The text raises interesting questions about Greek poetry, dialects, and letter forms, as well as how the scene as a whole should be understood. In the following discussion, I offer some brief comments on the text and the scene in which it is set, arguing that Douris has intentionally incorporated at least one (and perhaps more than one) mistake in the verse for the delight of his viewers, and that the reading of the verse is related to the reading of the scene itself.

TEXT AND COMMENTARY

Since Douris clearly wanted us to read the poem, let us follow his lead, beginning with a literal transcription of the letters on the vase:

ΜΟΙΣΑΜΟΙ
ΑΦΙΣΚΑΜΑΝΔΡΟΝ
ΕΥΡΩΝΑΡΧΟΜΑΙ
ΑΕΙΝΔΕΝ

No word is divided between lines. It appears that an initial attempt at writing stoichedon soon had to be modified, since the generous spacing of the first line could not be maintained; even so, apart from the first alpha

3. Here and throughout I regularly transliterate inscriptions into post-Euclidean forms. The most thorough discussion of the artist is that of Buitron-Oliver (1995). It should perhaps be noted that a Greek name with a nominative ending in -ις can, without further determination, belong to either a man or a woman, and it has been suggested that Douris the vase painter was in fact a woman; see Hauser 1902, col. 1581; Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 1. The somewhat damaged tondo depicts an image of a young athlete, perhaps adjusting his sandals. Blanck (1992, pp. 24–25) suggests that this figure represents *gymnastike,* which, together with the instances of *mousike* and *grammata* on the exterior, fills out the *trivium* of Greek *paideia.*

of ΑΡΧΟΜΑΙ, lines 2–4 try to conform to a roughly stoichedon alignment. With the introduction of word division and diacritical marks, and a few other adjustments discussed in detail below, the passage can be "cleaned up" to read Μοῖσά μοι ἀ<μ>φὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον ἄρχομ' ἀεί{ν}δειν, almost every word of which is of interest for some combination of literary, orthographical, phonological, dialectical, and metrical reasons. Although at first glance the line looks like a dactylic hexameter, earlier editors have classified it as lyric.[4]

Μοῖσα: Μοῖσα is the Aeolic form of Attic/Ionic Μοῦσα ("Muse"), but it is regularly used by Pindar, Stesichoros, Bacchylides, and other poets who write lyric poetry in the Doric dialect.[5] The remaining words are equally at home in Attic/Ionic and Doric. The exact dialectic and poetic status of forms in -οισα is not entirely clear, but Rudolf Wachter makes a good case for "the possibility of a Lesbian dactylic-hexametric tradition of prayers, probably combined with hymns to gods, which influenced the archaic Greek world in general."[6] For the moment, therefore, we should leave open the question of the genre of the poem.

Early Greek poets (and later ones who imitated them) typically begin their poems with an appeal to a Muse, and Douris's verse too will have been understood as the first line of a poem. The *Odyssey* famously begins ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα, but closer in form to the poem on the vase are the following Archaic and Classical comparanda, chosen from a larger group.[7] (In the discussion that follows, these passages will be referred to by letter alone.)

(a) *Hom. Hymn Pan.* 19.1: ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμείαο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα
(b) *Hom. Hymn Pos.* 22.1: ἀμφὶ Ποσειδάωνα, θεὸν μέγαν, ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν
(c) *Hom. Hymn Diosc.* 33.1: ἀμφὶ Διὸς κούρους ἑλικώπιδες ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι
(d) Terpander 1 (*PMG* 697): ἀμφί μοι αὖτις ἄναχθ' ἑκατήβολον ἀειδέτω φρήν

4. It was printed as adespota 30A by Bergk (1882) and as Stesichoros 26 by Diehl (1925), and included, along with other poetic passages found on vases, among the anonyma by Page (*PMG* 938e), all of whom take it as a lyric (melic) poem, as does Campbell (1993, pp. 358–359, no. 938e), who essentially follows Page. I shall return to the question of meter below. For writing on vases in general, see Snodgrass 2000; Steiner 2007, pp. 74–93; for a study of the earliest examples, see Webster 1960; Osborne and Pappas 2007.

5. Cf. Herodian, Περὶ κυρίων καὶ ἐπιθέτων καὶ προσηγορικῶν 3.2 (pp. 1.29–2.1 Lentz): Ἀργεῖοι δὲ λέγουσι *μόνσα*, Αἰολεῖς *μοῖσα*, ὧν ἐστι Πίνδαρος, Ἀττικοὶ δὲ καὶ Ἴωνες καὶ Συρακούσιοι *μοῦσα*, Λάκωνες *μῶσα* καὶ οἱ μεταγενέστεροι Λάκωνες ἄνευ το *σ μῶα*. ("Argives say *monsa;* Aeolians *moisa,* among whom is Pindar[!]; Athenians, Ionians, and Syracusans say *mousa;* Spartans *môsa,* while later Spartans omit the sigma and say *môa.*" This last word should perhaps be understood as *μῶά, môha;* cf. Ahrens 1843, pp. 74–79.) When the original combination of an *n*-sound and *s*-sound became generally unstable in Greek, one of the two (here the nasal) disappeared, while the preceding syllable, at first long only "by position" because of the following two consonants, was kept long by lengthening the short vowel to a long vowel or diphthong; that is, ŏ > ō (which came to be written as ω or ου). In late Lakonian the sigma itself, now intervocalic, was also dropped, perhaps leaving a trace in the form of a rough breathing. Diphthongization in αι and οι was a secondary phenomenon in Aeolic and some forms of Doric (Cyrenaean and Elean); cf. Mendez Dosuna 2007, pp. 450–451. For Pindar's use of μοῖσα, see Verdier 1972, pp. 21–33, 124–127.

6. Wachter 2001, p. 341.

7. For invocations in prayers and hymns in general (and even a brief address and request from a poet to a Muse qualifies as such a prayer), see Furley and Bremer 2001, vol. 1, pp. 50–64. For literary invocations to Muses in particular, see Faulkner 2008, pp. 71–72.

(e) Eur. *Tro.* 511–514 (beginning of a choral ode):
ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον, ὦ
Μοῦσα, καινῶν ὕμνων
ᾆσον σὺν δακρύοις ᾠδὰν ἐπικήδειον
(f) Ar. *Nub.* 594–596 (beginning of a choral ode):
ἀμφί μοι αὖτε Φοῖβ' ἄναξ
Δήλιε, Κυθίαν ἔχων
ὑψικέρατα πέτραν

μοι: To be taken as a matter of course with a following verb (here ἄρχομαι), not with Μοῖσα (see below). Enclitics tend to occur at the earliest possible position in their clauses, often intruding into alien syntactic units (Wackernagel's law); cf. texts a, d, e, and f, above, and note especially Eur. *Hipp.* 10–13, where the με in line 10 (ὁ γάρ με [sc. Ἀφροδίτην] Θησέως παῖς . . .) is not accounted for until line 13 (λέγει κακίστην).[8] Texts a, d, e, and f are enough to show that μοι should not be elided like ἄρχομαι (see below).

ἀ<μ>φί: The use of ἀμφί + accusative to designate the subject of the song in question does not occur in Homer, where the preposition has only a local sense. The later meaning appears first in the Homeric Hymns (e.g., *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 57). Douris's subject is the river Skamandros, close to Troy, and in the texts cited above the subjects are a god (b, c, d), a god's birth (a), and Troy (e). Since scribes, on whatever surface they write, often spell words the way they pronounce them, the omitted mu in this word, like the added nu in ἀεί{ν}δειν (see below), need not be regarded as arbitrary misspellings.[9] The restoration ἀ<μ>φί accords with standard editorial practice, but ἀ<ν>φί is just as likely at this date, as the evidence collected in Henry Immerwahr's corpus of vase inscriptions *(CAVI)* shows. Note, however, the spelling Ἀμφ[ιτρίτη] on another vase by Douris.[10]

Σκάμανδρον: The initial Σκ- in this word regularly fails to make a preceding short syllable long in early epic; otherwise the word could not be accommodated to a hexameter line. Cf. *Il.* 12.21 τὲ Σκάμανδρος; Hes. *Theog.* 345 τὲ Σκάμανδρον; and, in *Il.* 7.329, at line-end, the very words found on the vase, ἐύρροον ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον (where ἀμφί, as noted above, has a purely local meaning).[11] If we similarly scan ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον in the text on the vase, and read ΕΥΡΩΝ as ἐύρροον (see below), the result is a hexameter line. Outside of epic, there is no metrical necessity for the preceding syllable to remain short; see, e.g., Aesch. *Ag.* 511 παρὰ Σκάμανδρον; *Cho.* 366 παρὰ Σκαμάνδρου (spoken and lyric iambs, respectively).

Thanks to the many references in Homer, an ancient audience, including the schoolboy in Douris's painting, would have recognized the name

8. Wackernagel 1920, pp. 7–8; Collinge 1985, pp. 217–219.

9. For omitted nasals in particular, see Kretschmer 1894, pp. 161–166; Threatte 1980, p. 488; Wachter 2001, p. 234 (citing, among other examples, Ἀ<μ>φιάρεος and Ἀ<μ>φι<τ>ρίτα). Note also an Athenian graffito of the late 6th century, Τίτας ὀλυ<μ>πιόνικος καταπύγων ("Titas is a world-class butt-boy," *Agora* XXI, no. C 5), and an ostrakon with the name Φαλά<ν>θ[ο] (*Agora* XXV, no. 642). My translation of the graffito differs from Lang's, who takes the adjective with Titas rather than with καταπύγων.

10. See n. 50, below.

11. West (1966, p. 98, on Hes. *Theog.* 345) suggests that the variant Κάμανδρον may lie behind this odd scansion. Cf. Hainsworth (1993, pp. 319–320, on *Il.* 12.21), who thinks that the oddity is explained by sheer metrical necessity, as if Homer did not have the option of composing a verse using the name Xanthos, Skamandros's more metrically tractable alias, instead.

of this river around Troy. What, though, would be the story of Skamandros separate from that of the Trojan War? Apollodoros (*Bibl.* 3.12.1–3) employs a personified Skamandros as a mere placeholder in early Trojan genealogy, where he is said to be the father of three children: Teucer; Kallirhoe, who married Tros, the eponymous hero of the city; and Strymo, who married Laomedon. The only Homeric episode involving the river god is his exciting battle with Achilles in *Il.* 21.211–382, which may well have provided another poet with the material for a separate and presumably shorter tale.[12] The depiction on vases of many episodes from the Trojan War not found in our text of the *Iliad* suggests that there were more poems on this subject than survive in the literary record.[13]

ἐύρροον: Aside from the fact that this (or εὔρροον) is the only form of the word found in all of Greek poetry in any meter (in the nominative, genitive, or accusative; it never appears in the dative), metrical considerations alone require understanding ΕΥΡΩΝ as a four-syllable word, at least if the line is correctly interpreted as a dactylic hexameter. (The form ἐύρρων, even if it were acceptable in another context, is unlikely in this position of a hexameter, since it would violate Naeke's Law: no word end, except for a forward-looking monosyllable, after a spondaic fourth foot.) The writing of a single consonant for a double has many parallels in inscriptions and on vases, including other examples by Douris (see below on metrics). Although the letter omega was developed about 650 B.C. in Ionia, it seems not to have been used much in Athens until the last third of the 6th century, and it was not made an official part of the Attic alphabet until the late 400s.[14] Its occurrence here, standing for omicron + omicron, can be explained as a phonological spelling, if Douris, like many in Athens, pronounced the two short vowels as one long syllable. This closed *o* sound was originally written with a single omicron, and later with an omicron and upsilon (a so-called spurious diphthong; cf., e.g., the crasis of δηλόομεν > δηλοῦμεν), but in several early instances in inscriptions, on ostraka, and on vases, the sound is spelled with an omega.[15] Note that Douris spelled his own name on this vase as ΔΟΡΙΣ (which, if it were a woman's name, would conventionally be spelled Δωρίς).

ἄρχομ': As is often the case in inscribed verses, the scribe has here written out in full *(scriptio plena)* a form (ἄρχομαι) that for metrical reasons would have been elided in performance.[16] Middle/passive forms ending in the diphthong -αι are regularly elided in epic verse, but this particular

12. See *RE* IIIA, 1927, cols. 431–434, s.v. Skamandros (F. Münzer). Photios (*Bibl.* codex 186, p. 140b16–18 Bekker) states that Priam sent two of Hector's sons, Skamandros and Oxynios, to Lydia for safekeeping as Troy was falling. This would have allowed scope for a story about the former's exploits on reaching maturity, but of course a human member of the family would not be described as "flowing" (in epic at least; for a later, metaphoric use of the adjective, see *Suda,* s.v. ἀμφιλαφῆ [defined as διπλοῦν]: ὅτε καὶ εἶδον ἄνθρωπον εὔρρουν τε ἅμα καὶ ἀμφιλαφῆ τὴν διάνοιαν πρὸς τὰς πολιτικὰς ἐξηγήσεις; "When I saw a man both *eurrhous* and duplicitous in his political explanations").

13. There are other reasons as well for the discrepancies between textual and artistic sources; Lowenstam (1997, p. 37) notes in particular that "painters did not see themselves as illustrators of poems."

14. See Jeffery 1990, pp. 37–38, 428, 471; Heubeck 1979, pp. 93, 126; Immerwahr 1990, pp. 165–168; D'Angour 1999; Hildebrandt 2006, p. 89. The earliest-known omega occurs on a mid-6th-century graffito abecedarium found in the Samian Heraion, now in the Archaeological Museum in Vathy (Jeffery 1990, pl. 79:7).

15. Threatte 1980, pp. 47–49; Immerwahr 1990, p. 167.

16. Cf. Heubeck 1979, p. 163; Wachter 2001, pp. 246–247.

two-word phrase, ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν, is never found in Homer or Hesiod, or indeed anywhere else in Greek literature, except for the Homeric Hymns, where it occurs eight times, always at line end, and in all cases but one in the first line of the hymn.[17] Douris elides this syllable in a poetic tag on a cup in Munich as well, where οὐ δύναμ' οὐ may be a variant of the beginning of Theognis 939: οὐ δύναμαι φωνῇ λίγ' ἀειδέμεν ὥσπερ ἀηδών.[18]

ἀεί{ν}δειν: Threatte notes that this is one of only a very few Greek words not of foreign origin with a parasitic nasal.[19] Immerwahr suggests that the painter somehow kept the missing nasal of ἀ<μ>φὶ in mind, restoring it to the text in this word.[20] This seems fanciful to me, but Threatte thinks that it "has perhaps a small chance of being correct."

SETTING AND INTERPRETATION

If this were a photograph taken in an actual schoolroom, we might assume that the teacher is holding up a text from which the student has been asked to read aloud. This may, in fact, be what Douris intended, although there are similar scenes on other vases in which it is quite clear that the student cannot see the text held by the teacher. Artists, however, whose works need not be strictly documentary, often present images in such a way that information is conveyed to the viewer in an "unrealistic" manner.[21] Here it is quite possible that the ancient viewer would have interpreted the scene as one in which the student has been asked to recite from memory; although the teacher holds the text open before him for reference, it would be understood that

17. *Hom. Hymn* 2.1, 3.8, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1. I believe that the painter of a hydria in Athens with a scene showing Sappho reading from a book roll (National Museum 1260: *ARV*² 1060, no. 145; *CAVI* 764) intended to write these same words, although what he seems to have written instead, again in *scriptio plena,* is ἄρχομαι AINANTTIN. The final letters are poorly formed, but they may be meant to represent ἀείδειν (again with a nasal infix?); cf. Immerwahr 1964, p. 26. Thus, the text can be understood as the beginning and end of a dactylic hexameter: ἠερίων ἐπέων [⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑] ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν. Beazley (1928, p. 11, n. 2) more cautiously reads αρχομα·ατ··ν·τ·ν, where the interpuncts represent "misshapen and uncertain letters." Another possibility, suggested by Joel Lidov (pers. comm.), is to read αἰὲν ἀείδειν, which appears at line-end in Hes. *Theog.* 34. The line-endings ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν (Hes. *Theog.* 1) and ἄρξομ' ἀείδειν (Theoc. 22.25) are also found. Note that the artist seems to have given up at the point where Sappho's thumb and hand begin to cover the exposed writing surface of the papyrus, suggesting that for one reason or another, he did not attempt to indicate that there were letters in ἀείδειν (if that was indeed the intended word) obscured by Sappho's hand.

18. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen 2646: *ARV*² 437, no. 128; Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 83, no. 173, pl. 96. The attribution to Theognis, who begins lines 361 and 695 in the same way, was first suggested by Hartwig (1893, p. 258, n. 8), and is accepted by Young (1961) in the apparatus of his edition. In a very similar scene on a calyx krater by Euphronios, the words coming from the singing symposiast's mouth form what is probably a hipponacteum: Ὤπολλον, σέ τε καὶ μάκαι<ραν> [sc. Ἄρτεμιν] (Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen 8935 [olim 2419]: *ARV*² 16–17, 1619, no. 17; *Paralipomena* 322; *CAVI* 5363; cf. Shapiro 1995, pp. 212–214.)

19. Threatte 1980, pp. 488–489.

20. Immerwahr 1964, p. 19, n. 1.

21. An excellent example of this appears on a bell krater of ca. 470 B.C. by the Pan Painter (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 10.185: *ARV*² 550, no. 1), on which dogs are shown attacking a man while the goddess Artemis looks on. As the presence of the goddess proves, the viewer is expected to interpret the scene as the death of Aktaion, who at the time of the attack had already been transformed into a stag. Were Aktaion shown entirely in animal form, the viewer would not know that this is not an ordinary hunting scene. For further examples of the ways in which vase paintings may be interpreted, see, among many others, Connelly 1993; Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999; Steiner 2007. For the particular problems facing artists wishing to portray metamorphosis, see Buxton 2009, pp. 76–109 (ch. 3, "Visual Arts"); Frontisi-Ducroux 2003, pp. 99–105, 116–118 (for Aktaion in particular).

the student is unable to see it.[22] Later in the 5th century, another student, Pheidippides the son of Strepsiades in Aristophanes' *The Clouds,* complained that he had been made to learn to sing (ᾆσαι) the lyrics of Simonides, probably in a classroom setting much like that depicted by Douris.[23]

Similarly unrealistic is the way in which the painter, in order to present the text to the viewer as clearly as possible, has changed its orientation. In all known literary texts on papyrus rolls, the text is laid out in columns with the lines parallel to the edges of the roll. By rotating the text shown here by 90 degrees, Douris allows the teacher to hold the roll more naturally in the plane of the image, without having one arm obscure the letters.[24] Actual examples of texts written in this fashion *(chartae transversae)* date only from the Christian era, and none is a literary work.[25]

We can now consider the line as a whole. When adjusted to correct for the simple and common phonetic errors that led to the omitted and intrusive nasals, the *scriptio plena,* and the misspelled ΕΥΡΩΝ, the line readily forms a dactylic hexameter (with the metrical feet set off by vertical lines):

Μοῖσά μοι | ἀμφὶ Σκά|μανδρον ἐ|ύρροον | ἄρχομ' ἀ|είδειν.

Metrically, it is unimpeachable. All caesurae are in the preferred positions (after μοι, Σκάμανδρον, and ἐύρροον), and the line violates none of the so-called laws—norms would be a better term—that observe where word divisions regularly occur or are avoided.[26] Dactylic hexameters such as this one, consisting entirely of dactyls (except of course for the final spondee), make up fewer than 20% of the verses in early epic, but that is no basis for objection here.[27]

Denys Page prints the text exactly as I have (*PMG* 938e), but he evidently interpreted the meter differently, since he explicitly states that, in gathering a few verses from vases, he has excluded dactylic verse.[28] He may have scanned the final iota in ἀμφὶ as long before the two following consonants, which produces a line that can be read as *cho pher*^{2d}, that is, a choriamb followed by a pherecratean with a two-dactyl insertion (enclosed below in angle brackets):

– ⏑ ⏑ – | – ⏑ <– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑> – ⏑ ⏑ – –
Μοῖσά μοι ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν.[29]

22. So, e.g., Immerwahr 1964, p. 19 ("The boy seems to be reciting, the teacher checking"); Lissarague 1990, p. 138. See also Havelock 1982, pp. 201–203. For other scenes in which one person holds a scroll while he, she, or another recites, see Immerwahr 1973. In one, a red-figure kylix of about 460 B.C. by the Sabouroff Painter, a boy recites while a woman who may be his mother clearly holds the text so that he cannot see it (Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 8210: *ARV*^{2} 838, no. 27). There are, however, enough variations on the theme that no one example can be used to determine the interpretation of the scene painted by Douris.

23. Ar. *Nub.* 1355–1356. Similarly unhappy are the boy who "learns to sing badly" in Aristophanes' *Banqueters* (*Daitales* fr. 225 K-A) and the one who "strains" to sing a song to Apollo in Herodas's *Schoolmaster* (3.33–34).

24. So Birt 1907, p. 139; Palumbo Stracca 1994, p. 123, n. 10. Contrast the representation of Sappho on the hydria in Athens (n. 17, above). For a survey of the positions in which rolls are held on vases, see Immerwahr 1964, p. 38. Birt also points out (pp. 138–139) that where the scroll is still rolled up, at the top and the bottom as the teacher holds it, all four scroll-ends extend impossibly outward on both sides to the left and right.

25. See Turner 1978, pp. 26–53.

26. On these laws (Meyer's, Naeke's, Hilberg's, etc.), see West 1982, pp. 35–39; Sicking 1993, pp. 69–82.

27. For the statistics of verse types, see Raalte 1986, p. 36.

28. *PMG,* p. 505.

29. Note the similar metrical scheme in Pindar *Ol.* 1.2 = 13, ⏑⏑*cr pher*^{2d}. Palumbo Stracca (1994, p. 127) strangely scans the line on the vase as *hemiepes* + *reizianum*. Bergk (1882, p. 696),

The treatment of the line as melic can be justified by the form Μοῖσα, which (as noted above) is common in Aeolic and Doric lyric poetry. It was also used by at least one writer of dactylic verse, the early epic poet Eumelos of Corinth (8th–7th century B.C.): τῷ γὰρ Ἰθωμάτᾳ καταθύμιος ἔπλετο Μοῖσα ("the Muse was well disposed to Zeus of Ithome," *PMG* 696.1). Since, however, this fragment is said to come from a *prosodion* (a song sung by a chorus on approach to a god, here Apollo), it must be regarded as a not uncommon example of lyric dactyls.[30] If the same is true of Douris's verse, it would indeed belong in editions of lyric poetry. On the whole, however, given its subject matter, it seems likely that the verse on the cup was meant to be read as a dactylic hexameter, rather than a lyric.[31]

While the verse is metrically competent, syntactically it is such a disaster that it could never have been composed by a Greek poet. Two constructions overlap in the middle of the line like paths in an Escher print, and only the central prepositional phrase, ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον, can go with both. The combination of μοι and ἄρχομαι is an especially bad fit.[32] The opening words, Μοῖσά μοι ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον ("Muse, to me of the well [= "rapidly"] flowing Skamandros"), lead one to expect an imperative, as in the opening lines of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and in passages a, c, d, and e above. The second half of the line, however, ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν ("I begin to sing of the rapidly flowing Skamandros"), substitutes an entirely different construction; compare the first words of passages b, d, and e, as well as the many examples of ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν in the

reading the unlikely form ἐύρρων (see above) and interpreting the verse as melic, does not indicate how he would scan it, but it would seem to be *cho pher ad.*

30. For *prosodia,* cf. Ar. *Av.* 852–854: συμπαραινέσας ἔχω | προσόδια μεγάλα σεμνὰ προσιέναι θεοῖσιν; *Suda,* s.v. προσόδια: οὕτω δὲ ἔλεγον τὰς προσαγομένας τοῖς θεοῖς πομπάς. καὶ προσόδια τὰ εἰς πανηγύρεις θεῶν ποιήματα παρὰ τῶν λυρικῶν λεγόμενα. On lyric dactyls, see West 1982, pp. 98, 128–132. On Eumelos, see Bowra 1963.

31. It may also be significant that dactylic verses occur several times on vases: cf., e.g., a lekythos from the Seyrig collection, Paris (*ARV*² 452, in the manner of Douris; *CAVI* 6767) with Ἑρμῆ<ν> ἀείδω (*Hom. Hymn Herm.* 18.1), on which see Beazley 1948; 1950, pp. 318–319; and n. 33, below. These are literary quotations; for *ad hoc* compositions, cf. the following: (1) a 6th-century Corinthian aryballos with a hexameter that describes a scene of a young boy dancing (Corinth C-54-1: *CEG* 452; Wachter 2001, pp. 44–47, no. COR 17): Πυρϝίας προχορευόμενος· αὐτοῦ δέ ϝοι ὅλπα ("Pyrwias dancing; [this is] his very own olpe"). The sigma of προχορευόμενος must be doubled in pronunciation to make the preceding syllable metrically long, as often in Homer and other epic. (For a different view of this inscription, see Boegehold 1965.) (2) An Attic oinochoe of the late 8th century (the "Dipylon jug") (*IG* I² 919; *CEG* 432): ὃς νῦν ὀρχηστῶν πάντων ἁταλώτατα παίζῃ | τοῦ τόδε . . . . (3) A kotyle of the late 8th century from Pithekoussai ("Nestor's cup") (*SEG* XIV 604; *CEG* 454): ὃς δ' ἂν τοῦδε πίησι ποτηρίου, αὐτίκα κεῖνον | ἵμερος αἱρήσει καλλιστεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης. (4) A 5th-century Attic kylix in Odessa (*CEG* 464): ἡδύποτος κύλιξ εἰμὶ φίλη πίνοντι τὸν οἶνον. On the Dipylon jug and Nestor's cup, see in particular Heubeck 1979, pp. 109–118. A selection of lyric tags on vases is printed by Page (*PMG* 938); see further Csapo and Miller 1991, pp. 381–382. Lowenstam (1997, p. 47) points out that, not surprisingly, lyric passages on vases tend to appear in sympotic scenes, but he and Csapo and Miller may be wrong to exclude from these examples a scene on an amphora in London by the Kleophrades Painter (British Museum E 270: *ARV*² 183, no. 15; *CAVI* 4545), where the words coming out of the bard's mouth, ὧδέ ποτ' ἐν Τίρυνθι, could well be lyric dactylo-epitrite; cf. Pind. *Ol.* 10.30–32: δάμασε καὶ κείνους Ἡρακλέης ἐφ' ὁδῷ, | ὅτι πρόσθε *ποτὲ Τιρύνθιον* | ἔπερσαν αὐτῷ στρατόν.

32. Gallavotti (1979, pp. 127–128) is right for several reasons to reject a reading of μοι as dative of possession: (1) although μοι can function like this with words such as γυνή or τέκνον, nobody has a personal Muse in the same way; (2) a bard would not summon a Muse only to be a passive witness while he sings; and (3) there are too many parallel passages (as noted above) in which μοι is obviously to be taken with an imperative addressed to the Muse. Campbell (1993, p. 359) translates "Muse, I begin to sing for myself of fine-flowing Scamander," but the notion of singing for oneself is largely alien to Greek thought. For other attempts to save the syntax, see Lowenstam 1997, p. 45, n. 75.

Homeric Hymns (noted above) and the opening of the *Little Iliad:* Ἴλιον ἀείδω καὶ Δαρδανίην ἐύπωλον.[33]

How can we explain this? Not by treating the vase as a medieval manuscript and emending the text, as François Chamoux did when he suggested that for ΕΥΡΩΝ Douris meant to write ΕΦΕΥΡΩΝ = ἔφευρ' ὧν.[34] It is true that scribes frequently make mistakes, and that some artists, who are either illiterate or simply do not care to take the trouble to spell words properly, write gibberish. The failure of syntax seen here, however, is an example of neither of these faults. Indeed, Douris shows himself to be literate on so many other vases that Immerwahr has even attempted a handwriting analysis.[35]

Of the various proposals to save the syntax without conjecture, most involve dubious interpretations of the pronoun μοι.[36] A different solution is adopted in the editions of Theodor Bergk and Ernst Diehl (followed recently by Jenifer Neils and John Oakley), who posit a pause after μοι, on the assumption that the poet has interrupted himself with the parenthetical phrase ἀμφὶ . . . ἀείδειν (for which no parallel is adduced and for which no reason can be given), and that the expected imperative would have appeared in the following line.[37]

Another reading of the scene is more likely than any of these: namely, that the composer of this awkward line is none other than the student shown on the vase.[38] Douris, that is, has intentionally written the faulty verse as an example of poor homework. Actual examples of student work preserved on papyrus, wax tablets, and wooden boards show that, like their modern counterparts, ancient students could and did make mistakes of all sorts when copying out or composing Greek verses.[39] Moreover, some student writing examples, not necessarily mistakes, consist of half-verses of Homer, which suggests that students had half-verses in mind.[40] If so, then this particular student has put two of them together badly, combining and overlapping two lines such as those in passages a and b above.[41] It cannot be the case, as argued by Kretschmer, that the student has joined the beginnings of two lines, since a line beginning ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν

33. Fr. 28 Bernabé (1987). Part of this line was scratched on both sides of a potsherd (the vertical line indicates the division between the two sides)—Ἴλιον ἀείδω καὶ Διαρδανίην—at a date roughly contemporary with that of Douris's vase. See Dubois 1996, pp. 83–85, no. 42; Vinogradov 1997, pp. 385–390, pl. 15:2, 3.

34. Chamoux 1970. Since ὧν is a forward looking monosyllable, the emendation does not violate Naeke's law, and Chamoux, followed by Lissarague (1990, p. 137), translates, "Muse, trouve pour moi sur la bord du Scamandre la matière initiale du mon chant." Nevertheless, this reading is not defensible. Since the verb ἐφευρίσκω ("invent, discover") is transitive, it cannot easily be construed with ἀμφί, which Chamoux is forced to take in a local sense (as in Homer), ignoring the six parallel passages (quoted above) in which it stands in the first line and identifies the subject of the poem. Nor is there a proper explanation for the genitive ὧν, which Chamoux oddly construes with ἄρχομαι, leaving ἀείδειν unaccounted for. Furthermore, as Palumbo Stracca (1994, p. 124) notes, the idea that the Muse, or the bard, is on the bank of the Skamandros at the moment when the line is recited is not a happy one ("bizzarro emendamento" is her overall assessment). See also Calame 1989, p. 51, n. 24, for further criticism of the conjecture.

35. Immerwahr 1990, p. 86. Buitron-Oliver (1995, pp. 41–45) discusses the inscriptions on Douris's vases; see especially pp. 44–45 for "spoken or sung inscriptions."

36. See n. 32, above.

37. Bergk (1882, p. 696) even suggests that the next line was something like καὶ Θέτιος φίλον υἷα, παρίστασο. See Neils and Oakley 2003, p. 246.

38. This suggestion has already been made by Calame (1989, pp. 51–52) and, without argument, by Gallavotti (1979, pp. 127–128).

39. Cf. Cribiore 1994; 1996, pp. 139–142. Examples of student writing exercises are gathered in Ziebarth 1910.

40. See Cribiore 1996, p. 243, no. 291 (*P.Ryl.* III 545), which contains half-lines of Homer for students to memorize, a practice that would facilitate faulty combinations.

41. Cf. Calame 1989, p. 52, for a slightly different way of describing what the student has done.

contains not only a minor and forgivable violation of Meyer's first law (a word beginning within the first foot ending between the two short syllables of the second), but also, far worse, a caesura at midline (after ἐύρροον), between the third and fourth feet, which is completely unacceptable and hence could not have been offered to the student as a model.[42]

If this interpretation is correct, then the teacher is holding the text up to the student to point out his many mistakes.[43] Perhaps he is doing so gently and with a sense of sadness, knowing that as long as there are students he will have to correct mistakes like this. Douris, however, is surely having fun at the student's expense, showing off the flaws in the composition for the amusement of his viewers.[44] There are other intentionally humorous scenes on Greek vases: Douris himself, in the tondo of another drinking cup, has painted a drunken symposiast vomiting into a bucket—the humor of which becomes clear when one remembers that the image would have been invisible when the kylix was filled with red wine, and would have been seen only as the drinker tilted and drained his cup, a reminder of the dangers of drinking to excess.[45] The joke is all the more pointed in that the exterior of the cup shows men drinking from kylikes just like the one on which the scene is painted, having clearly forgotten what may result from such fun. Douris's painting of a satyr balancing a sizable vase on the tip of his vertically erect penis was likewise surely intended for laughs.[46] Carlo Gallavotti also finds humor in Douris's inscription on a scene of *a tergo* lovemaking: ἡ παῖς καλή· ἔχε ἥσυχος ("the girl is beautiful; stay calm"), which, with the elision of ἔχ', he reads as an iambic dimeter.[47] The humor

42. For the suggestion, see Kretschmer 1894, p. 106.

43. Students probably did their homework mostly on wax tablets, although the exterior of a kylix by the Painter of Munich 2660 in New York (Metropolitan Museum of Art 17.230.10: *ARV*² 784, no. 25; ca. 460 B.C.) shows two students, one on each side, holding papyrus rolls, along with a third holding a writing tablet. Interpretation is hindered by the fact that, in addition to the three students, two "teachers" shown on the vase are also children of the same age as the students. Nonetheless, one of the students is passing the roll over to the "teacher" in a way consistent with the idea that he is handing in his homework. In the tondo of another kylix in New York, by the Painter of Bologna 417 (Metropolitan Museum of Art 06.1021.167: *ARV*² 908, no. 13; ca. 460–450 B.C.), two girls or young women are out walking hand in hand (to or from school?), one of them holding a papyrus roll. Perhaps students (maybe only rich ones) did in fact use expensive papyrus for their homework. If this is true, then the objection raised by Palumbo Stracca (1994, p. 125), that the student on Douris's vase would not have done his homework on papyrus, is not determinative. Furthermore, just as Douris had his own artistic reason for depicting a *charta transversa*, so too, unable to write a legible text on a wax tablet, he would have felt free to depict it on a papyrus roll instead.

44. For humor on vases in general, see Agard 1923; Hemelrijk 1984, pp. 151–152, 187–188; 2009, pp. 151–152; Mitchell 2009; Walsh 2009, pp. 32–34. Shapiro (1995, passim) notes many examples of the humorous use of inscriptions by vase painters, often at one another's expense. The work of Agard apart, the recognition of humor in Greek painting is very much a recent development; hence it is no impediment to my argument that earlier scholars such as Bergk, Diehl, and Page have failed to notice it on the vase discussed here.

45. Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco 16561: *ARV*² 427, no. 2; Buitron-Oliver 1995, pp. 72–73, no. 8, pl. 5. For sympotic vomiting scenes, see Mitchell 2009, p. 90. For other vases on which the painting takes account of the wine within, see Lissarague 1990, pp. 112–115.

46. London, British Museum E 768: *ARV*² 446, no. 262; Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 78, no. 84, pls. 54, 55. Cf. Johns 1982, p. 91 (on this scene in particular) and pp. 90–96 (for sexual humor in general). A similar balancing act also appears on a cup by the Ambrosios Painter (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 01.8024: *ARV*² 173, no. 9; ca. 500 B.C.).

47. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 1970.233: *ARV*² 444, no. 241; *Beazley Addenda*² 240; Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 85, no. 233, pl. 111; *CAVI* 2822. See Gallavotti 1979, p. 128. Gallavotti is, I believe, alone in connecting the two phrases to create a line of verse; others consider the first to be merely a label and the second to be spoken by the man. Nor should he be followed in reading ΗΣΥΧΟΣ as ἡσύχως, since the phrase ἔχε (or μένε) ἥσυχος appears several times in Aristophanes (e.g., *Av.* 1199, *Thesm.* 925, *Nub.* 1244).

(from the point of view of a male viewer of the vase) lies in the idea that the girl, enjoying the act as much as the man, is moving too fast for him.

If this interpretation of the schoolroom scene on the kylix in Berlin is correct, the homework assignment being judged here was primarily one of composition and writing; thus, speculation about the performance of the line (and of any that may be assumed to follow) and distinctions between rhapsody and citharody are irrelevant.[48] The view that the scene is primarily a comic one also renders irrelevant the question of whether the line is drawn from a real, but no longer extant, minor epic poem. It is a student's poor attempt at epic composition, and as such is to be added to the list of *ad hoc* compositions on vases discussed above.[49] Furthermore, since with only one exception Douris nowhere else inserts or omits sonants,[50] we are now free to assume that the joke is not restricted to the flawed syntax, but extends to all of the student's mistakes, including the errant nasals as well as the forms Μοῖσα (as alien to epic) and εὕρων (points off for violating Naeke's law).

48. Pavese (1991, p. 162, n. 12) argues for a citharodic *prooimion,* but see the remarks of Palumbo Stracca (1994, p. 121, n. 9).

49. See n. 31.

50. He writes Χαιρέστ<ρ>ατος on two early vases, but includes the rho on 29 other vases with this name; see Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 42. On the omission of mu, see the discussion of ἀμφί, above, and contrast the spelling of Ἀμφ[ιτρίτη] on another fragment (ex-Malibu, Getty Museum 81.AE.213, now returned to Italy: Buitron-Oliver 1995, p. 74, no. 29, pls. 19, 20; Godart and De Caro 2007, pp. 110–111). Buitron-Oliver (1995, p. 42) judges Douris's literacy to be significantly higher than that of most of his contemporaries. Note that a kylix in Paris (Louvre G 138: *ARV*² 365, no. 61; *CAVI* 6480) with the name Ἀ{ν}ριστοτέλης, although ascribed to Douris by Hartwig (1893, pp. 590, 595), is now attributed to the Triptolemos Painter by Beazley.

REFERENCES

Agard, W. R. 1923. "Greek Humor in Vase Paintings," *CJ* 19, pp. 97–105.

Agora = *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens,* Princeton

XXI = M. L. Lang, *Graffiti and Dipinti,* 1976.

XXV = M. L. Lang, *Ostraka,* 1990.

Ahrens, H. L. 1843. *De dialecto dorica,* Göttingen.

Beazley, J. D. 1928. *Greek Vases in Poland,* Oxford.

———. 1948. "Hymn to Hermes," *AJA* 52, pp. 336–340.

———. 1950. "Some Inscriptions on Vases: V," *AJA* 54, pp. 310–322.

Bergk, T., ed. 1882. *Poetae lyrici graeci* 3: *Poetae melici,* 4th ed., Leipzig.

Bernabé, A., ed. 1987. *Poetae epici graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta* 1, Leipzig.

Birt, T. 1907. *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst: Archäologisch-antiquarische Untersuchungen zum antiken Buchwesen,* Leipzig.

Blanck, H. 1992. *Das Buch in der Antike,* Munich.

Boegehold, A. L. 1965. "An Archaic Corinthian Inscription," *AJA* 69, pp. 259–262.

Booth, A. D. 1985. "Douris' Cup and the Stages of Schooling in Classical Athens," *EchCl* 29, pp. 274–280.

Bowra, C. M. 1963. "Two Lines of Eumelus," *CQ* 13, pp. 145–153 [= *On Greek Margins,* Oxford 1970, pp. 46–58].

Buitron-Oliver, D. 1995. *Douris: A Master-Painter of Athenian Red-Figure Vases* (Kerameus 9), Mainz.

Buxton, R. G. A. 2009. *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis,* Oxford.

Calame, C. 1989. "Apprendre à boire, apprendre à chanter: L'inférence énonciative dans une image grecque," *La part de l'oeil* 5, pp. 45–53.

Campbell, D. A., ed. 1993. *Greek Lyric* 5: *The New School of Poetry, and Anonymous Songs and Hymns* (Loeb Classical Library 144), Cambridge, Mass.

CAVI = *Corpus of Athenian Vase Inscriptions,* ed. H. R. Immerwahr, http://www.unc.edu/~hri/Inscriptions.pdf (accessed November 12, 2010).

CEG = *Carmina epigraphica graeca* 1: *Saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.* (Texte und Kommentare 12), ed. P. A. Hansen, Berlin 1983.

Chamoux, F. 1970. "Un vers épique mal lu," *RPhil* 44, pp. 7–10.

Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The Laws of Indo-European,* Amsterdam.

Connelly, J. B. 1993. "Narrative and Image in Attic Vase Painting: Ajax and Kassandra at the Trojan Palladion," in *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art,* ed. P. J. Holliday, Cambridge, pp. 88–129.

Cribiore, R. 1994. "A Homeric Writing Exercise and Reading Homer in School," *Tyche* 9, pp. 1–8.

———. 1996. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 36), Atlanta.

Csapo, E., and M. C. Miller. 1991. "The 'Kottabos-Toast' and an Inscribed Red-Figured Cup," *Hesperia* 60, pp. 367–382.

D'Angour, A. J. 1999. "Archinus, Eucleides, and the Reform of the Athenian Alphabet," *BICS* 43, pp. 109–130.

Diehl, E., ed. 1925. *Anthologia lyrica graeca* 2: *Poeta melici,* Leipzig.

Dubois, L. 1996. *Inscriptions grecques dialectales d'Olbia du Pont* (Haut études du monde gréco-romain 22), Geneva.

Faulkner, A. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite,* Oxford.

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. 2003. *L'homme-cerf et la femme-araignée: Figures grecques de la métamorphose,* Paris.

Furley, W. D., and J. M. Bremer. 2001. *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period* (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 9–10), 2 vols., Tübingen.

Gallavotti, C. 1979. *Metri e ritmi nelle iscrizioni greche* (Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Bolletino dei Classici, Suppl. 2), Rome.

Godart, L., and S. De Caro. 2007. *Nostoi: Capolavori ritrovati* (Exhibition catalogue, Palazzo del Quirinale, Galleria di Alessando VII, December 21, 2007–March 2, 2008), Rome.

Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary* 3: *Books 9–12,* Cambridge.

Hartwig, P. 1893. *Die griechischen Meisterschalen der Blüthezeit des strengen rothfigurigen Stiles,* Berlin.

Hauser, F. 1902. Rev. of A. Furtwängler and C. Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei: Auswahl hervorragender Vasenbilder,* in *BPW* 22, cols. 1578–1586.

Havelock, E. A. 1982. *The Literate Revolution in Greece and Its Cultural Consequences,* Princeton.

Hemelrijk, J. M. 1984. *Caeretan Hydriae* (Kerameus 5), 2 vols., Amsterdam.

———. 2009. *More about Caeretan Hydriae: Addenda et clarificanda* (Allard Pierson Series 17), Amsterdam.

Heubeck, A. 1979. *Schrift* (*ArchHom* 3.X), Göttingen.

Hildebrandt, F. 2006. *Die attischen Namenstelen: Untersuchungen zu Stelen des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.,* Berlin.

Immerwahr, H. R. 1964. "Book Rolls on Attic Vases," in *Classical, Mediaeval, and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman,* ed. C. Henderson Jr., Rome, pp. 17–48.

———. 1973. "More Book Rolls on Attic Vases," *AntK* 16, pp. 143–147.

———. 1990. *Attic Script: A Survey,* Oxford.

Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and Its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries* B.C., rev. ed., with a supplement by A. W. Johnston, Oxford.

Johns, C. 1982. *Sex or Symbol: Erotic Images of Greece and Rome,* London.

Kretschmer, P. 1894. *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften: Ihrer Sprache nach Untersucht,* Gütersloh.

Lissarague, F. 1990. *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual,* trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak, Princeton.

Lowenstam, S. 1997. "Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth," *TAPA* 127, pp. 21–76.

Méndez Dosuna, J. 2007. "The Doric Dialects," in *A History of Ancient*

Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity, ed. A.-F. Christidis, Cambridge, pp. 444–459.
Mitchell, A. G. 2009. *Greek Vase-Painting and the Origins of Visual Humour,* Cambridge.
Neils, J., and J. H. Oakley. 2003. *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past,* New Haven.
Osborne, R., and A. Pappas. 2007. "Writing on Archaic Greek Pottery," in *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World,* ed. Z. Newby and R. Leader-Newby, Cambridge, pp. 131–155.
Palumbo Stracca, B. M. 1994. "Sull' iscrizione della coppa di Duride (*PMG* adesp. 938e)," *SMEA* 33, pp. 119–129.
Pavese, C. O. 1991. "L'inno rapsodico: Analisi tematica degli *Inni omerici,*" in *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico. Atti di un colloquio, Napoli, 21–24 ottobre 1991* (*AION* 13), ed. A. C. Cassio and G. Cerri, Rome, pp. 155–178.
PMG = D. L. Page, ed., *Poetae melici graeci,* Oxford 1962.
Raalte, M. van. 1986. *Rhythm and Metre: Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse* (Studies in Greek and Latin Linguistics 3), Assen.
Shapiro, H. A. 1992. "Narrative Strategies in Euphronios," in *Euphronios. Atti del seminario internazionale di studi, Arezzo, 27–28 maggio 1990,* ed. M. Cygielman, M. Iozzo, F. Nicosia, and P. Zamarchi Grassi, Florence, pp. 37–43.
———. 1995. "Literacy and Social Status of Archaic Attic Vase-Painters," *Revista do Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia* 5, pp. 211–222.
Sicking, C. M. J. 1993. *Griechische Verslehre* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.4), Munich.
Snodgrass, A. M. 1982. *Narration and Allusion in Archaic Greek Art: A Lecture Delivered at New College Oxford, on 29th May, 1981,* London.
———. 2000. "The Uses of Writing on Early Greek Painted Pottery," in *Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 1), ed. N. K. Rutter and B. A. Sparkes, Edinburgh, pp. 22–34.
Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. 1999. *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art,* Cambridge.
Steiner, A. 2007. *Reading Greek Vases,* Cambridge.
Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* 1: *Phonology,* Berlin.
Turner, E. G. 1978. *The Terms Recto and Verso: The Anatomy of the Papyrus Roll* (Papyrologica bruxellensia 16.1), ed. J. Bingen and G. Nachtergael, Brussels.
Verdier, C. 1972. *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 7), Innsbruck.
Vinogradov, J. G. 1997. "Kyklische Dichtung in Olbia," in *Pontische Studien: Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes,* Mainz, pp. 385–396 [originally published in Russian in *VDI* 109, 1969, pp. 142–150].
Wachter, R. 2001. *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions,* Oxford.
Wackernagel, J. 1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch, und Deutsch* 1, Basel.
Walsh, D. 2009. *Distorted Ideals in Greek Vase-Painting: The World of Mythological Burlesque,* Cambridge.
Webster, T. B. L. 1960. "Notes on the Writing of Early Greek Poetry," *Glotta* 38, pp. 251–262.
Wegner, M. 1968. *Duris: Ein künstlermonographischer Versuch,* Münster.
West, M. L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony,* Oxford.
———. 1982. *Greek Metre,* Oxford.
Young, D., ed. 1961. *Theognis, Ps.-Pythagoras, Ps.-Phocylides, Chares, Anonymi Aulodia, Fragmentum Teliambicum,* 2nd ed., Leipzig.
Ziebarth, E. 1910. *Aus der antiken Schule: Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus, Holztafeln, Ostraka,* Bonn.

David Sider

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
100 WASHINGTON SQUARE EAST, ROOM 503
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10003

david.sider@nyu.edu