

Shane Hawkins
Studies in the Language of Hipponax

Münchner Forschungen
zur historischen Sprachwissenschaft

herausgegeben von

Olav Hackstein, Peter-Arnold Mumm
und Peter Schrijver

Band 14

Studies in the
Language of Hipponax

by

Shane Hawkins



BUSKE

Im Digitaldruck »on demand« hergestelltes, inhaltlich mit der ursprünglichen Ausgabe identisches Exemplar.

Für Links mit Verweisen auf Webseiten Dritter übernimmt der Verlag keine inhaltliche Haftung. Zudem behält er sich die Verwertung der urheberrechtlich geschützten Inhalte dieses Werkes für Zwecke des Text- und Data-Minings (§ 44 b UrhG) vor. Jegliche unbefugte Nutzung ist hiermit ausgeschlossen.

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über *portal.dnb.de* abrufbar.

ISBN 978-3-96769-754-4

ISBN eBook 978-3-96769-738-4

© Helmut Buske Verlag GmbH, Hamburg 2013. Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Dies gilt auch für Vervielfältigungen, Übertragungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen, soweit es nicht §§ 53 und 54 UrhG ausdrücklich gestatten. Gesamtherstellung: Libri Plureos GmbH. Gedruckt in Deutschland.

Kontaktadresse nach EU-Produktsicherheitsverordnung:
Helmut Buske Verlag GmbH
Richardstraße 47, 22081 Hamburg
info@buske.de

Contents

Preface	xi
Abbreviations	xiv
Chapter One: The Alphabet	1
1.1. Hipponax writes	1
1.2. The prehistory of the Greek alphabet and early Ionic writing.....	2
1.3. Hipponax's alphabet	4
1.4. Lydian Ϝ	6
1.5. Conclusion	6
1.6. Excursus on <i>sampi</i>	7
1.6.1. The name and shape of the letter.....	7
1.6.2. Inscriptional attestations of <i>sampi</i>	9
1.6.3. Literary examples of <i>sampi</i>	11
1.6.4. Some doubtful and falsely claimed occurrences of <i>sampi</i>	12
1.6.4.1. Selinountine ϜΥΛΛΣ	12
1.6.4.2. Sappho	13
1.6.4.3. Tegean ΛΕΥΤΟΝ	14
1.6.4.4. Gordion graffito	15
1.6.4.5. Massaliote coins	15
1.6.4.6. Pamphylian Ϝ	16
1.6.4.7. Himera, Axos (Crete), Gela	16
1.6.5. Post-classical, non-Greek <i>sampi</i>	16
1.6.6. The phonetic value of <i>sampi</i>	17
1.6.7. Possible sources of <i>sampi</i>	18
1.6.7.1. Carian	19
1.6.7.2. Lycian	21
1.6.7.3. Lydian	21
1.6.7.4. Phrygian	21
1.6.7.5. Sidetic	23
1.6.7.6. Summary	25
1.6.8. Conclusion	27
Chapter Two: Phonology	28
2.1. Vowels	28
2.1.1. Eta	28
2.1.2. υ for \omicron	28
2.1.2.1. $\ast\omicron > \upsilon$ via Cowgill's Law	29
2.1.2.2. $\ast\omicron > \upsilon$ or \omicron/υ without Cowgill's Law	30

2.1.2.3. Other words	31
2.1.2.4. υ for ο in Hipponax.....	31
2.1.2.4.1. ὄυφεῖν (175).....	31
2.1.2.4.1.1. Excursus: Homeric ἀναρροιβδέω	34
2.1.2.4.2. κερκύδιλος (40, 135)	36
2.1.2.4.3. κυλληβής (168).....	41
2.1.2.4.4. ὑπέατι (78.6)	44
2.1.2.4.5. Conclusion	45
2.1.3. Vowels in contact	46
2.1.3.1. Hiatus	47
2.1.3.2. Contraction, Internal Synecphonesis and Synaeresis	47
2.1.3.3. External Synecphonesis	54
2.1.3.4. Crasis	55
2.1.3.5. Elision.....	55
2.1.3.6. Aphaeresis	57
2.1.3.7. Summary: Vowel Combination and Stylistic Effect.....	58
2.2. Consonants	59
2.2.1. Aspiration	59
2.2.1.1. Psilosis	59
2.2.1.2. Aspirated stops	60
2.2.2. ɸ /w/	63
2.2.3. *k ^h > π/κ.....	63
2.2.4. γλήχων (86.4).....	65
2.2.5. Consonants in contact.....	65
2.2.5.1. -δμ-, -θμ-, -σμ-.....	65
2.2.5.2. Ionic -σσ-, Attic -ττ-.....	66
2.2.5.3. Compensatory lengthening (CL).....	69
2.2.5.3.1. The first compensatory lengthening (1CL)	69
2.2.5.3.2. The second compensatory lengthening (2CL)	72
2.2.5.3.3. The third compensatory lengthening (3CL).....	73
2.2.5.4. ν ἐφελκυστικόν	73
2.3. Excursus: some additional examples of the change *ο > υ.....	76
2.3.1. ἄγυρις, ὀμήγυρις, πανήγυρις / ἀγορά	76
2.3.2. ἀργύφειος, ἄργυφος / ἀργός	77
2.3.3. ἀσύφηλος/σοφός.....	77
2.3.4. Some πρυ- and προ- words	79
2.3.4.1. διαπρύσιος	79
2.3.4.2. πρύτανις	81
2.3.4.3. πρυλής	81
2.3.4.4. πρυμνός, πρύμνη.....	83
2.3.4.5. προμνηστῖνοι, πρόμνοι	87

2.3.5. ἐπισμυγερός/μογερός	89
2.3.6. μορμύρω and πορφύρω	91
2.3.7. ὄλλυς/*ὄλλος	92
2.3.8. πτόρομαι	92
2.3.9. ὑπόβρυχα / βρέχω.....	92
2.3.10. An <i>*-orí-</i> > -υρι- rule	96
Chapter Three: Morphology	98
3.1. Nouns	98
3.1.1. Number	98
3.1.2. Gender	98
3.1.3. <i>ā</i> -stems	99
3.1.3.1. Feminine nouns in -η.....	99
3.1.3.2. Contract nouns in -έη.....	100
3.1.3.3. Masculine <i>ā</i> -stems.....	101
3.1.4. <i>o</i> -stems	102
3.1.5. Consonant Stems.....	104
3.1.5.1. Dental stems	104
3.1.5.2. <i>ντ</i> -stems	104
3.1.5.3. <i>ν</i> -stems.....	104
3.1.5.4. <i>ρ</i> -stems	105
3.1.5.5. <i>σ</i> -stems	106
3.1.5.6. <i>ι</i> -stems	107
3.1.5.7. <i>υ</i> -stems	107
3.1.5.8. <i>ηϝ</i> -stems	108
3.1.5.9. <i>οι</i> -stems	108
3.1.5.10. Hypocoristics in - <i>ās</i>	109
3.1.5.11. Pronouns	109
3.1.5.12. Numerals.....	110
3.1.6. Compounds.....	111
3.1.6.1. Possessive compounds (<i>bahuvrīhi</i>)	111
3.1.6.2. Prepositional governing compounds.....	112
3.1.6.3. Verbal governing compounds.....	112
3.1.6.4. Nomina post verbalia	115
3.1.6.5. Determinative compounds	115
3.1.6.6. Compounds in ἡμί-	117
3.1.6.7. Triple-member compounds	117
3.1.6.8. Unclear compounds	119
3.1.7. Proper Names	120
3.1.7.1. Place Names.....	120
3.1.7.2. Names of people-groups	121

3.1.7.3. Gods and goddesses	121
3.1.7.3.1. Βενδῆς	121
3.1.7.3.2. Κάβειροι	123
3.1.7.3.3. Κυβήβη	124
3.1.7.3.4. Κύβηλις, Κύβελις	125
3.1.7.3.5. Μαλῆς (49.2)	126
3.1.7.4. Greek names	129
3.1.7.5. Non-Greek personal names	133
3.1.7.6. Other Names	134
3.2. Verbs	135
3.2.1. The augment	135
3.2.2. Reduplication	136
3.2.3. Personal endings	136
3.2.4. Stem formation	136
3.2.5. -μι verbs	137
3.2.6. The subjunctive	137
3.2.7. The optative	137
3.2.8. Prefixed verbs	138
3.2.9. Tmesis	139
3.2.10. ἀλίσκομαι (41.1)	139
3.2.11. ἐσθίω (28, 126.2)	140
3.2.12. θηρεύω (5)	140
Chapter Four: Foreign Lexicon	141
4.1. Words of Afroasiatic origin	141
4.1.1. Words likely or possibly Afroasiatic	141
4.1.1.1. βῆκος (16)	141
4.1.1.2. ἔρπις (79.18)	142
4.1.1.3. κασωρῆτις (165)	143
4.1.1.4. μνέας, acc. pl. (44.3)	144
4.1.1.5. σάκκος (59)	145
4.1.1.6. σήσαμον (37.2)	145
4.1.1.7. σῦκον (36.5), σῦκη (52)	149
4.1.2. Words unlikely to be Afroasiatic	151
4.1.2.1. μάκαρ (5, 196.6 <i>dubia</i>)	151
4.2. Words from Asia Minor	151
4.2.1. Words possibly from Asia Minor	151
4.2.1.1. ἀσκερίσκα (42b.2, 43.3)	151
4.2.1.2. κύμινδις (63)	153
4.2.1.3. σαμβάλισκα (42ab)	154
4.2.2. Words likely or possibly of Lydian origin	155

4.2.2.1. ἀρφύτνον	155
4.2.2.2. βάκκαρις (107.21)	156
4.2.2.3. βασχι (95)	157
4.2.2.4. βύκκων (199).....	166
4.2.2.5. Καμανδωλοῦ (123).....	167
4.2.2.6. Κανδαύλης (2)	167
4.2.2.7. καύης (3.1)	183
4.2.2.8. μαυλιστήριον (170).....	187
4.2.2.9. nom. πάλμυς (1), gen. πάλμυδος (7), voc. πάλμυ (47)	188
4.2.2.10. σκαπερδεῦσαι (2).....	190
4.2.3. Words of Phrygian origin.....	194
4.2.3.1. Words possibly or likely of Phrygian origin	194
4.2.3.1.1. βέκος (124).....	194
4.2.3.1.2. δοῦμος (41.2)	197
4.2.3.1.3. νηνίατος (173).....	198
4.2.3.2. Words unlikely to be of Phrygian origin	201
4.2.3.2.1. τετρακίνη (178).....	201
4.3. Words of unknown origin	201
4.3.1. ἄγγελος (57)	201
4.3.2. βεβρός (49)	202
4.3.3. κόλλιξ (36)	202
4.3.4. κονίσκε (49).....	204
4.3.5. κύλιξ (21.2)	205
4.3.6. κυπασσίσκον (42ab).....	205
4.3.7. νικύρτας (39.5)	207
4.3.8. πίθηκος (135).....	208
4.3.9. σάβαννι (39.5)	209
4.3.10. τεαρ[ε]. . . .]δευειε (7)	209
4.3.11. φῦκίον (194).....	210
4.3.12. χλαῖνα (42b.1, 43.1, 87c.3, 107.17, 196.2)	210
Bibliography	213
Tabula Comparationis	248
Index Verborum	249
Index Locorum	269
Index Inscriptionum et Papyrorum.....	280
Index Generalis	282

Preface

Hipponax of Ephesus was a Greek poet who lived in the middle of the sixth century BCE. He composed iambic verse, a form of verbal art known for its distinctive meter and for its content, which in Hipponax's case included sharp invective, a self-demeaning portrayal of the author engaged in unflattering escapades or suffering ignoble tortures, and a creative use of language that is coarse, parodic, barbaric, and sometimes delightfully obscene. His poetry survives only in short pieces of tattered papyri or in snippets quoted by other ancient writers, such as the grammarians who were interested in the many peculiarities of his meter and language. About two hundred such fragments survive today.

Sixth-century Ephesus was an important port city on the western coast of Asia Minor situated at the mouth of the Cayster River. For centuries its streets had echoed with the sounds of different languages: in the Late Bronze Age it was the royal seat of the Arzawa until it was conquered by the Hittite king Mursilis II in the late 14th century BCE, and subsequently it enjoyed or suffered the attentions of several non-Greek populations, including Luwians, Carians, Cimmerians, and Lydians (whose king Croesus supported the rebuilding of the temple to Artemis probably during Hipponax's *floruit*). Some of these influences surface in Hipponax's work, from the name of the city itself, whose distant origin the poet would not have known (Hittite *Apaša*), to the direct borrowing of Lydian and Phrygian words he self-consciously displays to great effect. Therefore many factors—parody, obscenity, meter, register, lexical rarities and borrowings—invite the interested linguist to take a close look at this poetry.

Chapter One briefly touches on the issues of performance and writing before turning to the question of what form of the alphabet Hipponax may have used. I investigate the possibility that he used the Lydian letter δ , and I discuss at greater length the letter known as 'sampi', most familiar in the shape σ or τ . An excursus on that letter gathers evidence of dating and distribution from texts (including the supposed use of the letter in the name of Sappho), inscriptions, and coins, and attempts to identify its most probable source (Carian).

Chapter Two examines phonology. The first half of the chapter is dedicated to the treatment of vowels, and includes a discussion of Cowgill's Law and four words in Hipponax, an excursus on the Homeric form $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\rho\omicron\upsilon\beta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, and sections on vowels in contact (hiatus, contraction, synecphonesis, synaeresis, crasis, elision, aphaeresis). In a section on vowel coalescence and stylistic effect I note that a high rate of coalescence is characteristic of iambic. The speech of Thersites in the *Iliad*, the *Urtext* for writers of invective, is notable for its extensive correction, and so coalescence in Hipponax is

probably therefore generic and traditional. The second half of the chapter treats consonants: aspiration, dialect markers (the use of *digamma*, the outcome of the labio-velars, -σσ- vs. -ττ), the three compensatory lengthenings, and the use of ν ἐφέλκυστικόν. The chapter ends with an excursus on Cowgill's Law in which I study thirteen words in order to determine whether or not they participate in this law. At the end of the chapter I propose a new sound rule (*-orj- > -υρι-), in order to account for the development of some words examined in this chapter.

Chapter Three is about morphology. I provide a detailed description of all nouns, (number, gender, declensional types, hypocoristics), pronouns, and numerals. I place all compounds into their different compositional types and discuss at some length all proper names. Discussion of the verb is divided into sections on the augment, reduplication, personal endings, stem forms, the moods, prefixed forms, and tmesis.

Chapter Four is a study of non-Greek lexica used by Hipponax, which fall into four groups: words of Afroasiatic origin (βίκος, ἔρπις, κασωρίτις, μνᾶ, σάκκος, σήσαμον, σῦκον; μάκαρ is unlikely), words from Asia Minor (ἀσκερίσκα, κύμινδης, σαμβάλισκα) including words whose origin is Lydian (ἀρφύτνον, βάκκαρις, βασχῆ, βύκκων, Καμανδωλός, Κανδαύλης, καύης, μαυλιστήριον, πάλμυς, σκαπεροδεῦσαι) and Phrygian (βέκος, δοῦμος, νηνιάτος; τετρακίνη is unlikely), and words of unknown origin (ἄγγελος, βεβρός, κόλλιξ, κονίσκα, κύλιξ, κυπασσίσκον, νικύρτας, πίθηκος, σάβαννι, τεαρει[. . . .] δευειε, φῦκίον, γλαῖνα).

In several places in the course of this study I also put forward ideas that I believe are original, most of which I can mention here *in nuce*. I suggest that the letter name *agma* may derive by speculative etymology from Ion of Chios's philosophical (Pythagorean) treatise on thirds called Τριγυμός (pp. 7-8). I note that the name Sappho may be connected to the Hesychian gloss ψάφα· κνέφας 'psapha: darkness' or, given the name Δικαπφώ attested at Assos, Σαπφώ may have been a hypocoristic formed by reanalysis of a compound name (p. 13). I suggest there is evidence of a t-extension of **leu-* outside of Greek in Hittite *luttāi-* 'window' and Tocharian B *lyauto-* 'hole, opening' (pp. 14-5).

In Chapter Two I give reasons for thinking the variation ὄυφειν/ὄοφειν pre-dates the Attic-Ionic breakup. The Homeric *variae lectiones* giving ἀναρροιβδε- for forms of ἀναρροιβδέω show Attic hands at work upon the text (pp. 34-6). I argue that there is no good evidence for a form κερκύδιλος, and that Hipponax may have used κερκόδιλος, a neologism punning on κέρκος 'tail' *sensu obsceno* (pp. 36-41). Fragment 168 is corrupt and difficult, but κυλ(λ)ηβίς (or -ής) probably means 'dry, withered' and may refer to the 'shriveled horn/penis' of Hipponax's arch-enemy Boupalus (βου- 'bull') (pp. 41-4). I connect πρὺλῆς 'infantry man' to πρῦλις, a type of dance, and suggest an etymology based on the root **preu-* 'to spring' (p. 82). The υ of Homeric ἐπισμυγερός (as opposed

to the *o* of μόγις, μογέω and μογοστόκος) is either an example of Aeolic vocalism or the product of reanalysis (cf. Hsch. σμογερόν, Ap. Rhod. σμυγερώς) and contamination with στυγερός ‘hateful, wretched’ (pp. 89-91). At *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 116 I read ὑποβρυχίας with a long *upsilon* and non-syllabic *iota*, and take the scansion as the author’s attempt to capture the synzesis of an earlier model, Hes. *Theog.* 832 ταύρου ἐριβρυχέω (pp. 93-4). I suggest the βρυχ- of ὑπόβρυχα ‘under water’ is built from a root **mer-* ‘to flicker, shimmer’, perhaps related to βρέχω < **merg^h-* (p. 94). I argue against the Zenodotean ἀναβέβροχεν at P 54 in favor of ἀναβέβρουχεν, and show that the latter forms a word-play with the immediately following βρούω ‘to swell, teem’ (pp. 94-6).

The word ὑπόσφαγμα ‘ink of a cuttlefish’ was probably originally a determinative compound meaning ‘a σφάγμα [gill cavity] underneath’, and came to mean ‘ink’ by metonymy (p. 116). The name of the goddess Bendis perhaps ultimately derives from **men-* ‘desire’ (pp. 121-3). The name Boupalos could be formed from the elements βου- ‘cow’ and the root **peh₂-* ‘protect’, i.e., ‘cowherd’, which would make a sharp contrast to Hipponax Ἴππο(-)νάξ ‘horse-lord’ (pp. 129-32). The name Kodalos (Κώδαλος) is comparable to Lycian *Xudali*, Luwo-Hittite *hūda* ‘alacrity’ and Luwian *hutarlā-* ‘slave, servant’, *hutarli(ya)-* ‘of a slave/servant’ (p. 134).

In Chapter Four I show that earlier attempts to reconcile Gk. σῦκον and Lat. *ficus* may be improved by supposing that Gk. σνκ-/τυκ- forms and Lat. *ficus* stem from a borrowed original **pūk-* (> pre-Greek **bjūk-*); τυκον, however, is possibly a hyper-correct form (p. 150). I suggest that Hesychius’ gloss ἀρφύτνον ‘Lydian word for discus’, which has been explained as a reflection of an actual Lydian form, is plausibly linked to Hipponax and the Thargelia festival (pp. 155-6). The etymology of *bákkaris*, an unguent and powder, is perhaps related to Hittite *pakkušš-* ‘stamp, crush’, ^(GIŠ)*pakkuššumar* ‘pestle’, and Lydian (*wc*)-*baq-(ēn)-* ‘trample on’, all from the root **peh₂k-* (pp. 156-7). I argue that an incomplete Lydian word βασϰ[in fr. 95 may reproduce the Lydian preverb *fa-* (< PA **pe/o-*), which is matched in the following line by a Greek verbal form in παρά- (pp. 165-6). In a long discussion of Κανδαύλης (pp. 167-82) I provide some additional support for Solmsen’s analysis of the name as a Lydian compound **kūon* + **d^heuH-* ‘dog throttler’ (compare the Cilician royal title Συέννεσις < Luwian **zuwannassi-* ‘of the dog; hunter’), and I suggest that Hipponax fashioned a rather complex punning folk-etymology on Hermes as dog-choker and god of dicing (κύων, Lat. *canis* ‘worst throw in a dice game’, Vedic *śvaghñin-* ‘gamester, professional gambler’, literally ‘dog-killer’). The word μαυλιστήριον, supposedly the name of a small Lydian coin but also a word for ‘brothel’, is possibly related to words for ‘four’: Hittite *mēu-*, Luw. *māwa-*, *mawalla/i-* ‘four-span’; cf. English *farthing* (pp. 187-8). I argue that νηνίατος, supposedly the name of a Phrygian song, is connected to νηνία ‘lament’ and Latin *nēnia* ‘dirge’, all of which perhaps ultimately originate from the name of the Near Eastern goddess Nanaia/Nana, the mourning mother of Attis (pp. 198-201). βεβρός

‘stupid’ may be either an expressive word or from **g^heg^hrh₂-o-*, a reduplicated form of **g^herh₂-* ‘heavy’ (p. 202). I explain *νικύστας* ‘slave (born) of a slave’ as **ni-g^hrd^h-o-* ‘(dwelling) in the enclosure/household’ → ‘born domestic’; **ni-* ‘in’, Cuneiform Luwian *gurta-* ‘citadel; enclosure, precinct’, ^{LÚ}*gurtawann(i)-* ‘man of the citadel’ (p. 207).

I hope none of my friends and colleagues in Classics will expect contrition for writing such a technical book about an ancient language we both study. This book is not a commentary in the Classical philological tradition, not because of antipathy (on the contrary!), but because I could not imagine beginning that sort of book without first doing the work of this one, and because most of what is contained in this one would be out of place in the other.

I owe a great deal of thanks to many people, but to no one so much as to Michael Weiss, who suggested the topic to me when I was a graduate student and who has been a constant guide in all of my work. I also wish to thank all those who have generously read and commented on the book or offered other improvements and forms of help: Craig Melchert, William Race, Philip Stadter, Kenneth Reckford, Olav Hackstein, Peter-Arnold Mumm, Ute Hengen, Alan Nussbaum, Martin Peters, Heiner Eichner, Joshua Katz, Brent Vine, Jeremy Rau, Crawford Greenewalt, Stephanie Jamison, and Noel Robertson. At some point they eradicated all errors from this book, but through constant tinkering I have allowed several to creep back in, lest the gods be offended. I am very pleased to thank John Osborne, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Carleton University, who has long been a staunch and unstinting supporter of Classics at Carleton and whose office generously provided a subvention for this book. Lucky for me I married a fellow academic who is both wiser and more patient than myself, and my deepest gratitude goes to Victoria Burke and our daughter Isabelle.

Abbreviations

For general abbreviations and citations of Greek and Latin authors I have followed the practice of the OCD³. In cases where no abbreviation is given my model was LSJ⁹, with the exception of citations from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which are noted by capital and lower case Greek letters respectively. The fragments of Hipponax are cited from the edition of Degani, but since West's edition is commonly used I have provided a *tabula comparationis* at the end of the book. I use West's enumeration for all other lyric poets. "Hipponactia" refers to fragments cited by ancient authorities as examples of Hipponactean meter but which are of doubtful authorship. All dates are BCE unless otherwise noted. Additional abbreviations found in the book are as follows:

Aeol.	Aeolic	Lyd.	Lydian
Akk.	Akkadian	MidP	Middle Persian
Alb.	Albanian	ModEng	Modern English
Arm.	Armenian	ModGerm	Modern German
Att.	Attic	ModGk	Modern Greek
Att.-Ion.	Attic-Ionic	ModLowGerm	Modern Low German
Av.	Avestan	ModP	Modern Persian
C	any obstruent	NHG	New High German
CLuw.	Cuneiform Luwian	OCS	Old Church Slavonic
Dor.	Doric	OE	Old English
Germ.	Germanic	OFr	Old French
Gk.	Greek	OHG	Old High German
Goth.	Gothic	OIr	Old Irish
<i>H</i>	a laryngeal, the exact value of which is unknown	OIran	Old Iranian
<i>h₁, h₂, h₃</i>	the three laryngeals of PIE	ON	Old Norse
Hebr.	Hebrew	PA	Proto-Anatolian
Hitt.	Hittite	PGk	Proto-Greek
IE	Indo-European	Phryg.	Phrygian
Ion.	Ionic	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Ital.	Italian	Rum.	Rumanian
Lat.	Latin	Russ.	Russian
Latv.	Latvian	RV	R̥g-Veda/ R̥g-Vedic
Lesb.	Lesbian	Skt.	Sanskrit
Lith.	Lithuanian	Toch.	Tocharian
Luw.	Luwian	V	any vowel
Lyc.	Lycian	Ved.	Vedic
		YAv	Young Avestan

- > “becomes by regular phonological processes”
- < “comes from by regular phonological processes”
- * indicates a reconstructed form
- is used to segment a word without consideration of morphological units

angular brackets < > enclose letter as they are written

slashes // enclose phonemes

brackets [] enclose phones in phonetic transcription

Chapter One: The Alphabet

1.1. Hipponax writes

Evidence gathered from ancient literary sources and the content of lyric poetry itself suggests that *iambos* was performed by solo voice and was usually spoken or recited unaccompanied by music.¹ Ancient tradition complicates this picture, however, because it depicts Archilochus as a lyre player, and evidence suggests that *iambos* was sometimes spoken to music and even occasionally sung.² It may be true that *iambos* was usually delivered in small, private, and informal symposia, “as opposed to the formal setting of the agora, the civic assembly, or the festival-contest,” but ancient testimony claims that the poems of Archilochus were also recited at festivals by rhapsodes.³ Given the ritual associations of Iambe and *iambos*, it is difficult to believe that the poetry of Hipponax, with its *aischrologia*, scapegoats, *kykeon*, and its invocation of the Thargelia, is not closely connected to the festival of that name.⁴

It is generally assumed that, as in the case of all archaic Greek poetry, the performance of iambic was an oral recitation made without the aid of written material. It is less clear whether the lyric poets composed orally. The manner of their composition, however, must not have been oral-formulaic in the sense that we have now come to understand the composition of the Homeric epics, for there is no comparable use of formulae to be found among the lyricists.

Whether or not Hipponax used writing as part of his compositional method, there is good evidence that writing was available to him.⁵ Hecataeus (ca. 550), a contemporary of Hipponax, claimed in his preface to write (γράφειν) things as they seemed to him to be true.⁶ Jeffery (LSAG 327) sees in the small and careless Ionic writing of the early sixth-century inscriptions indications of familiarity “with the practice of writing on leather (and later papyrus) rolls,” and the development of a “‘book hand’ which was

1 On the performance of iambos see Herington 1985:38-9, Gentili 1988:7, 19-20, 35-6, 179-96, Bartol 1992, Nagy 1990:17-28, 1996:162-4, 217-21, Brown 1997a and b, Carey 2009a and b, and especially Rotstein 2011:229-78. Bartol 1992:65 notes succinctly, “No surviving ancient testimony describes directly the circumstances of performance of literary iambus in the archaic period.”

2 Budelmann 2009:13, Rotstein 2011:229-78. For the possibility of *iambos* sung by a chorus in Sicily see Brown 1997a:38.

3 Herington 1985:35.

4 So also West, OCD³ s.v. ‘Iambic poetry, Greek’, and Carey 2009b:166. See Brown 1997a on the ritual background of *iambos*; “ἴαμβος of the sort practiced by Archilochus and the other Ionian iambists is clearly a ‘literary’ crystallization of cult-song or, in other words, a poetic genre that has developed from cult-song” (p. 36). On Hipponax and Iambe see Brown 1988, Rosen 1990.

5 Thomas 1992:102 calls the debate over when the archaic poets began to write down their own works and the improvisational nature of their performance “probably insoluble.” The earliest ancient testimony that describes the composition of a poem comes from Ar. *Ach.* 383-479 and *Thesm.* 25ff., neither of which mentions writing. For discussion of these passages see Herington 1985:46-7.

6 FGrHist I A, p. 7-8: τάδε γράφω, ὡς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι.

already influencing their inscriptions on stone.” Elsewhere (1982:831) she has noted that “the Ionians must have made some use of the leather and papyrus scrolls used by their neighbours in the East and Egypt; indeed, these media may have affected the archaic Ionic lettering, which tends to be smaller and more hasty than the mainland script.” We should, therefore, take seriously the possibility that Hipponax at some point wrote down (or had written down) his own poetry, perhaps not as a method of composition, but as a permanent record of its product. This being the case, a linguistic study of his work might begin by investigating the kind of alphabet that would have been at his disposal.

1.2. The prehistory of the Greek alphabet and early Ionic writing

It is now generally accepted that the letters *alpha* through *tau* of the Greek alphabet as it first appears in inscriptions of the eighth century are descended from a West Semitic script.⁷ The exact time, place, and many details of the alphabet’s transmission have been and continue to be subjects of research and debate, but most scholarship now works within the framework of either of two reconstructions of the development of the alphabet in Greece. Arguably the most prominent view is that the transmission of the alphabet took place near the middle of the eighth century and that it occurred in a single location.⁸ The argument for this date rests on the fact that the earliest alphabetic Greek inscriptions date to ca. 750 BCE. The conviction that the transmission occurred in a single location rests on the notion that certain changes common to all the local scripts (especially the use of Semitic consonants for vowels and the treatment of the Semitic sibilants) “seem too remarkable to have been made in several places independently.”⁹

More recently a date of 1100-1050 has been proposed primarily on the basis of epigraphical comparison between the early scripts of Greece and a growing number of West Semitic exemplars.¹⁰ According to this view, Greeks learned West Semitic writing at a time contemporaneous with the beginning of Hebrew and Aramaean literacy, and the Greek epichoric alphabets developed from a single West Semitic script.¹¹

7 E.g., Jeffery 1990:5f., Naveh 1997:175.

8 This view is associated with Carpenter, who detailed his position in his 1933 and 1938 articles, and has been upheld by Jeffery 1982 and 1990 and Wachter 1996. It should be noted that the arguments which led Carpenter to assert a date around 700 are still those used by Jeffery and Wachter, even though refinements in dating vases and letter-shapes and newly discovered inscriptions have by necessity pushed the date back past 750. At present, the earliest known example of Greek alphabetic writing comes from Gabii in Latium and is datable to ca. 770 (see Peruzzi 1992).

9 Jeffery 1982:822. Isserlin 1982:816-7 and 1983 argues against the notion of transmission from a single location.

10 This theory is associated particularly with the Semiticist Joseph Naveh 1973 and 1997; he is supported by Cross 1980:17.

11 Among Classicists the later dating seems to have won a consensus, while the earlier dating is still preferred among some Semiticists. However, there are a range of views in print. For example, Millard 1976 insists that no more precise date can be given for the adoption of the alphabet than

There is little agreement on where the transmission occurred, or if in fact it is even correct to think of the transmission as being limited to a single locality. Favored nominees currently include places like Cyprus, Thera, Crete, Rhodes, and Al Mina, but also broader designations such as Euboea, North Syria or even the Levant as a whole.¹² The divergent expert opinions and the paucity of conclusive evidence indicate that this is still a problem without resolution.¹³

In spite of this situation, much of the early history of the alphabet has been reconstructed through epigraphical studies of the last century. When the first alphabetic inscriptions begin to appear, one may already note marked differences in the various alphabets used throughout Greece. It is relatively certain that the group of alphabets known as the 'primitives' or 'green' alphabets (those of Crete, Thera (with Anaphe), Melos, and Sicinos) form a particular group whose common type is nearest to the West Semitic model.¹⁴ This alphabet lacked individual symbols for /p^h/, /k^h/, /p/+/s/ or /k/+/s/, but did have the letter *san* (M). According to Jeffery, "It is plain that one member of the group first received this 'primitive' alphabet and passed it on to the rest."¹⁵ In contrast, the earliest alphabet to appear in Ionia is noticeably different. It lacked *san*, which dropped from the abecedarium relatively early, and had a special symbol for both /k/ + /s/ and symbols for /p^h/, /k^h/, /ps/, the 'supplementals' Φ, Χ, Ψ.¹⁶

1100-750 BCE. Isserlin 1983 argues on epigraphical grounds that several non-contemporaneous localities must have served as the Semitic prototypes for the Greek alphabet, that continued contact with Semitic sources influenced the Greek alphabet over a considerable length of time, that the earliest appearance of the Greek alphabet already showed internal developments, and that vowel signs were created in the ninth century in a Greek area that was already using consonantal writing.

12 Carpenter 1933:19, 23, 27-8 argues for Rhodes; Jeffery (LSAG) argues for Al Mina through either Rhodes or Crete; Naveh 1997:185 for Crete and Thera; Isserlin 1982:817 for the Levant; for Cyprus see Woodard 1997.

13 Wachter 1996:542, "Eine Entscheidung wird—außer wir finden einen (wohl eher phöniz. als griech.) Tatsachenbericht—nie möglich sein, denn die neue Errungenschaft konnte innert weniger Tage oder Wochen im ganzen Mittelmeer verbreitet werden." It is beyond my purposes here to rehearse further the various views taken on these issues. Bibliographies may be found in Wachter 1989 and LSAG, with supplement.

14 LSAG 9. The local alphabets of Greece are traditionally placed into groups labeled red, blue (with a light and dark variety), and green, depending on the different orthographic treatments the phonemes receive. The green group lacks the supplementals, φ, χ, ψ (which were later additions to the borrowed Phoenician alphabet) and a single sign for [ks]. The practice of ascribing colors to these divisions stems from a color-coded map in the 1887 edition of Kirchhoff's influential work.

15 LSAG 8.

16 *Ibid.* 325-7.

1.3. Hipponax's alphabet

Under consideration here are the letters of the archaic East Ionic alphabet that may or may not have been available for use in the earliest written form of Hipponax's poetry.¹⁷ The usual explanation for Greek Ϝαῦ (or *digamma*) and *upsilon* is that they are doublets of the Phoenician *wāw*; the semi-vowel *digamma* was taken from the cursive form of the Semitic letter and the vowel *upsilon* was added later to the end of the alphabet. East Ionic shows no trace of *wāw/digamma* outside of abecedaria and the Milesian numeral system.¹⁸ *Upsilon* appears as early as the second quarter of the sixth century in Ionic inscriptions (LSAG 325) and in the earliest Ephesian inscription, a silver plaque dated to ca. 550 (IvE 1). We may therefore assume that Hipponax made use of *upsilon* but not *digamma*.

Phoenician *ḥêṯ* must have been borrowed into the psilotic East Ionic dialect, without its initial aspirate, as ἥτα.¹⁹ By the usual acrophonic principle this letter would have represented the sound [ĕ]. Its shape was originally Β, but Η appears in Ephesus already by the middle of the sixth century. Conceivably either form (or both) may have been used in the writings of Hipponax.

Qoppa Ϟ was used in Ionic at least until the middle of the sixth century. The letter appears in the Ephesian silver plaque, in an inscription at Abu Simbel by a mercenary from Colophon dated ca. 591 (LSAG 340, 344 no. 56, pl. 66), in inscriptions from Smyrna dating to the 7th (IvSmyrna 800) and 6th centuries (IvSmyrna 799, 801), and in an inscription from Miletus dated "c. 525?" (LSAG 325, 343).²⁰ These dates make it likely that the first text (or early texts) of Hipponax employed the letter *qoppa*.

The origin of the supplementals Φ, Χ and Ψ is unknown. They are usually considered late additions to the Greek alphabet; they have no Semitic parallels, they do not appear in the earliest 'primitive' Greek alphabets, and they appear at the end of the alphabetic sequence after the *upsilon*, which is itself clearly secondary. Jeffery has suggested that they may have been taken from an Anatolian script such as Carian.²¹

17 For the letter shapes themselves see LSAG 325ff.

18 Jeffery suggests that Ϝ may have been known in Ionia as late as the sixth century in verse "and so may have provided some faint shadow of justification for the retention of the letter in the abecedarium" (LSAG 326-7). But this is, so far as I can tell, conjecture.

19 Carpenter 1935:293, "The date of the introduction of the symbol for long E into Asiatic Ionic writing is therefore the same as the introduction of the alphabet itself into Ionia. Even if the exact date of this event be disputed, the important conclusion still holds: *no Asiatic Ionic manuscript can ever have written Β or Η for "h" or failed to distinguish between long E and short.*"

20 The *qoppa* is already replaced by *kappa* on Colophonian coins dated to as early as 490 (LSAG 340, 344, no. 57).

21 Jeffery 1982:824: "The sounds could be written πη, χη, and πης [sic] – *except* in the psilotic dialect of the eastern Ionic Greeks Thus it was perhaps they who first added these three signs, taking them, conceivably from some neighbouring Anatolian script (Carian?) because they occurred in local words—names of persons, peoples, places, objects—which the eastern Greeks had added to

It is usually assumed that *omega* is a late addition because it is placed at or toward the end of the alphabet and plainly non-Phoenician in origin. The letter shape is probably a development of *omicron*, formed by breaking the circle, and may have originated in the Ionic inscriptions of south-west Asia Minor.²² It appears in Smyrna already in the 7th century (LSAG 341) and in the earliest evidence from Ephesus (IvE 1, ca. 550). One may assume that Hipponax used it.²³

The final letter to be adopted into some of the East Ionic scripts was Υ , sometimes referred to as ‘*sampi*.’ This letter was used to represent the cluster that is spelled with - $\tau\tau$ - or - $\sigma\sigma$ - in later Attic and Ionic, respectively, and is found in several inscriptions in the region of Halicarnassus, Samos, Ephesus, Teos and Erythrae. The evidence for Υ in Hipponax is based on a single reading from papyrus POxy 2175, fr. 2 (=106.7 Degani). In the *editio princeps* of this papyrus Lobel printed $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau[\dots]\zeta$, despite noting that such a reading was “against the dialect” and that the supposed $[\tau\eta]$ was “rather broad for the room.” Consequently, Latte suggested a reading with *sampi*, $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\Upsilon[\eta]\zeta$.²⁴ Latte’s suggested reading has been challenged by West, who dismissed the Υ in favor of reading $\tau\tau$: “But it [sc. a hypothetical $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\Upsilon\eta\zeta$] is too isolated; we see $\sigma\sigma$ in Hipponactean papyri in 92.16; 104.7; 118E.12²⁵; so that this was surely the norm for post-Alexandrian copies, and $\tau\tau$ must be looked upon as an aberration, not a survival.”²⁶

Contra West, I think the approach one must take is to ask whether it is more likely that a scribe confronted with a strange $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\Upsilon\eta\zeta$ would correct it to a recognizable form like $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\eta\zeta$, or whether he mistakenly wrote $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\eta\zeta$ for the mss. $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\zeta$, which was the normal form in post-Alexandrian copies. If the latter, then the scribe carelessly overlooked one of the most obvious and characteristic dialect markers known in the

their vocabulary.” Letters similar to φ , χ and ψ do appear in the Carian alphabet, but the values given to them differ from those given the Greek letters. No. 20 Φ is a nasal (transliterated \bar{n} ; Schürr 1992:137), no. 21 X or + a voiceless velar stop (Adiego 1993:153), no. 22 Υ or Ψ is probably /n/ (Adiego 1990:134-7). Note also that the shape Ω appears in Carian at Caunus, but it is not a vowel (Adiego 2007:20, 252-3; On the Carian alphabet in general, Adiego 2007).

22 LSAG 38.

23 It is true that *omega* is not represented in the graffito of the Colophonian among the Abu Simbel graffiti, ca. 591 BCE (Carpenter 1935:296f.). Jeffery (LSAG 340) considers that it is “unlikely, however, that this was because *omega* had not yet reached Kolophon; for it has been recently attested in a graffito from Smyrna which antedates the sack of Smyrna c. 585. It is possible therefore that $\varphi\omicron\lambda\omicron\varphi\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ here is merely a mis-spelling.” Other scenarios may also be imagined, such as, perhaps, that the traveler to Abu-Simbel left Colophon before *omega* was introduced into the local alphabet.

24 Latte 1948:46-7 = 1968:475-7.

25 These are Degani 95.16, 107.7, 130D.13, respectively.

26 West 1974:91. The first two parallels invoked by West, 92.16 $\text{ἰ}\varrho\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ and 104.7 $\text{ἰ}\varrho\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, belong to the fringes of the papyri and no widely accepted supplements have been made for them. The third reference, to 118E.12 $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, is the comparative of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\iota$, which is formed from **ankʰjon* and is therefore an assured comparison. Degani follows West and prints - $\sigma\sigma$ - in 106.7. Jeffery’s argument (LSAG 39) that Hipponax of Chios could not have used Υ since the earliest Chian inscription shows $\varphi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ is irrelevant; Hipponax was from Ephesus, not Chios.

ancient world. Further, given that the *koiné* form was θάλασσα, it is hard to see why he would have mistakenly wrote θαλάττης.²⁷ I would argue then, that Latte's reading is a distinct possibility. *Sampi* is discussed in further detail in an excursus at the end of this chapter.

1.4. Lydian ⚡

The first line of the fragmentary papyrus PSI 1089 (= POxy 2174) is printed at Degani 95 as follows: ἡῦδα δὲ λυδίζουσα· “βασκ. . . κρολεα” ‘and she spoke in Lydian fashion, *Bask . . . krolea*’.²⁸ Commenting on the broken final word, West noted of its first letter that, “It is conceivable that Hipponax even wrote the Lydian letter ⚡ = f, though the sound could appear in Greek as β, cf. fr. 127 [Degani 125] Κυβήβη = Lyd. *Kufafa*.”²⁹ Unfortunately the state of the papyrus does not allow us to read the entire word. Note however that the equation Κυβήβη = Lyd. *Kufafa* is inaccurate in that the only Lydian forms of the goddess's name so far attested are *kufaw-* (i.e., the letter ⚡ is uncertain) or *kuwaw-*.³⁰ The word, along with West's theory, is examined in further detail below in §4.2.2.3.

1.5. Conclusion

There is no reason to suppose that Hipponax used anything other than the epichoric alphabet of Ephesus that is known from the few archaic inscriptions surviving from the city and surrounding areas. There is no evidence for the use of *digamma* either in this alphabet or in the writings of Hipponax. Hipponax may have known either or both of the signs ⚡ and Η. It is probable that Hipponax did use *qoppa*, though naturally enough it no longer survives in any of the citations or any of the papyri that quote him. *Omega* was in use by the time of his writing. There is indirect evidence to suggest he used the sign ⚡ (*sampi*). It has been suggested that Hipponax made use of the Lydian letter ⚡. While there is nothing to suggest that he could not have done so, positive proof is lacking.

27 One might argue that the copier of this papyrus was working from an Atticized text and that this led to his use of a form with -ττ-. However, there is no evidence for any Atticized text of Hipponax and elsewhere the fragment gives the non-Attic form κάγοσῆ[(line 4).

28 The siglum indicates that the remaining letters of the line are lost in the papyrus but reported by another source (“littera deperdita in papyro, sed alio fonte tradita,” p. xxv).

29 West 1974:145.

30 For Lydian *kufaw-/kuwaw-* see Gusmani 1980:68-9, 1986:134, 148 no. 4a, 153 no. 72.

1.6. Excursus on *sampi*³¹

1.6.1. The name and shape of the letter

It was suggested above that there are some reasons for believing Hipponax used the letter *sampi*. This excursus is a study of the evidence for the currency of this letter in Greece of the classical period or earlier, the contexts in which it was used, and its possible origins.

The most likely explanation of the name σαμπι ‘sampi’ is that it comes from later Greek σαν ‘like’ + πι, that is ‘like *pi*.’ The name was probably a Byzantine creation that was applied to Ϻ, which is the form that Ϻ took in later MSS., because of the letter’s resemblance to *pi*.³² At Σ *Dion. Thrax* 496.5 and Cramer *An. Gr.* iv. p. 325.33 a letter, often equated with *sampi*, is called παρακλίσιμα, i.e. the slanting letter. The convenient practice of referring to the letter as *sampi*, however incorrect, is followed here.³³

31 Important studies of *sampi* include Foat 1902, 1905, 1906, Jannaris 1907, Neppi Modona 1928 (who favors a connection to Carian), Genzardi 1987, and Soldati 2006 (specifically on signs for 900 in Greek documents from Egypt dating from the fourth century BCE to the dawn of the Islamic era).

32 The loss of pretonic initial vowels (e.g., ὠσαν > ὄαν) took place some time in the early middle ages, 600-1100 (Browning 1983:57). The form ὄαν is attested as early as the 11th cent. *Cosmas Hieromonachus Alchem.* The name *sampi* does not appear in any Greek author from antiquity. This is stated by Sophocles 1887:974 and supported by corpus searches for *sampi* and *sanpi* on the on-line version of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. According to Keil 1894:254n2, the name ‘sampi’ first appears in the second half of the 17th cent. CE. This is called into question by Brixhe 1982:222n1, who points out that Keil provides no evidence for this assertion, but Sophocles 1887:974 notes correctly that the letter is discussed by Scaliger 1606:II 108 and Corsinus 1749:xxv ff. Scaliger derived the letter from *tsade*, but he explained the name as ὄαν πι. Corsinus also calls it ὄαν π̄, and “Sam pi”, and records the shapes Ϻ and Ϻ. Others have imagined the name is somehow connected to the letter ὄαν; Einarson 1967:13 calls the form Ϻ “a *ssán carefully distorted to distinguish it from M.” Ruijgh 1997:565 claims that the letter ὄαν, which had the numeric value of 900 in the Milesian system, later took the forms Ϻ and Ϻ, “Comme elle ressemblait à la forme du πε̄, les Grecs ont changé le nom ὄαν en σαμπῑ > σανπῑ, nom qui n’est attesté qu’à partir du XV^e s. ap. J.-C.” See further Foat 1905, Jannaris 1907, Larfeld 1914:225.

33 A recent article (Willi 2008) repeats without correction Jeffrey’s mistaken identification of Hipponax as Chian, and claims that Zuntz’s theory (rejected below) that Sappho’s name was originally written with a *sampi* “remains a possibility.” The article sites Liberman 1988, who is not sympathetic to Zuntz’s view, but does not cite the counterargument to Zuntz offered at LSAG 361 and reproduced in fact by Liberman. At any rate, Willi argues that the original name of the character Ϻ was *agma*. The claim is based on his idea that Varro has catastrophically misinterpreted some words of Ion of Chios when he writes (fr. 3 Funaioli = fr. 46 p. 201.4-9 Goetz-Schoell): *ut Ion scribit, quinta uicesima est littera, quam uocant agma, cuius forma nulla est et uox communis est Graecis et Latinis, ut his uerbis: aggulus, aggens, agguilla, iggerunt* ‘As Ion writes, there is a 25th letter, which is called ‘agma’, which has no shape, but a phonetic value that is the same in Greek and Latin, as in the following words . . .’ (trans. Willi). As Willi notes, this fragment is universally understood to be a description of the sound [ŋ] in Greek and Latin that is represented with γ in the former and n in the latter. But according to Willi, Ion’s twenty-fifth letter, referred to as ἄγμα, actually must have been Ϻ, and since Varro would not have known this letter “he inferred that his

The shape of sampi in archaic inscriptions is always Υ . A variant of the shape, 𐀓 , appears on coins dating from the middle of the fifth century and later.³⁴ Jeffery lists four different shapes of this letter, Υ , \uparrow (approximately, with perhaps a flatter tip), \uparrow , and 𐀓 ; however, I have only found evidence of the first in archaic Greek inscriptions.³⁵ Post-classical examples show the letter with its numerical value (900) in evolving forms.³⁶ The shape 𐀓 appears in a second cent. CE papyrus and a similarly shaped Υ appears in an undated Athenian lead tablet. Another that is similar to the last has also been reported (IG III¹ 61, undated); it differs in having the cross-arch about one-third of the distance from the top of the stem (in other words, it is similar in shape to Φ but without the lower half of the circle). A ninth cent. miniscule bears the form resembling 𐀓 , but the ends of the cross-bar flange outward on each side. In some old MSS. can be found the shape Λ . A very poorly written example dated to 642 CE survives on a small jug from the Attic agora.³⁷ The familiar 𐀓 appears to be a late form found first in mediaeval MSS., the double stroke beneath the top loop being rare before the ninth century, though appearing earlier on ostraca.³⁸ Foat discovered about fifty examples of the numeral among the early, mostly Ptolemaic, papyri. Here most of the letter shapes are \uparrow (with a flatter tip) with a tendency toward \uparrow , though he estimated that 12% of the letters were Υ : “I conclude that both Υ and \uparrow are well established forms, contemporary in the whole papyrus period, and alternative in use.”³⁹ One may conclude from these examples that the earliest shape of the letter was Υ or 𐀓 and that this evolved through various stages

source must be thinking of the graphemic peculiarity in spelling the sound [ŋ], which happened to occur in the name $\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha = [\text{a}\eta\text{ma}]$ ” (p. 421). The “proof” of this is Willi’s etymology of $\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$, which is a derivative in $-\mu\alpha$ of $*ank-$ ‘bend, curve’, and thus $*ank-ma > \alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ ‘curved/crooked object’, which he takes as an apt description of the shape of the letter. On the contrary, however, there is nothing about Υ , the original form and probably the only one that Ion would have known, that makes one think ‘curved’ or ‘crooked’ would be a fitting name for it. It seems unlikely that Varro would claim that Ion described a letter and then deny that the letter had any shape; for *littera* understand ‘letter as pronounced’ (OLD 1b), not ‘letter as written, character’ (OLD 2). I suggest that the name *agma* must ultimately somehow (perhaps by speculative etymology) be connected to Ion’s philosophical (Pythagorean) treatise on thirds called Τριταγμός (i.e., $\text{Τρι-}\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$).

34 The shape 𐀓 , reported with an exaggeratedly long left leg by Keil 1894:271 and Larfeld 1914:226, is not a unique third shape but is probably a form of Υ made because of an irregular coin strike.

35 For these four shapes see LSAG 38. Allen 1987:60 also claims that a variant 𐀓 existed, but he offers no evidence for it and I have found none. Perhaps he meant the letter described above (Φ without the bottom half of the circle), a shape which appears in later papyri.

36 Except where otherwise noted, the letter-forms and dates reported in this paragraph come from Foat 1905, Larfeld 1914:225-7 and Keil 1894. No attempt is made here either to verify these shapes or search for additional later examples since the present concern is principally with the archaic and classical letter forms.

37 First noted in Thompson 1956:56, with the *Erratum* in *Hesperia* 25.2 (1956). See Lang 1976:72, Hc 25 for dating (where, however, 𐀓 is printed backwards) and a sketch on pl. 40.

38 See Viereck 1901.

39 Foat 1905:344. Soldati 2006 offers a very full account of examples from Egyptian papyri.

(Ϝ, ϝ, etc.) and eventually led to the more familiar Ϟ. None of the forms mentioned aside from Ϝ, Ϝ or Ϟ are found before the first century CE.

1.6.2. Inscriptional attestations of *sampi*

Besides the potential evidence in Hipponax for Ϝ, one may note that *sampi* was a letter in contemporary use in mostly neighboring areas but also in some distant locations. The following table lists all inscriptional occurrences of the letter from the classical period known to the author.⁴⁰

	READING	LOCATION	DATE	SOURCE
1.	(abecedarium)	Samos	660-650?	LSAG 428, 471, pl. 79
2.	ΝεΠος ?	Attica	625-600	Boegehold 1962
3.	τεΠαράροντα τέΠαρρας	Ephesus	6 th cent.	DGE 707
4.	Π, Ϟ	Smyrna	7 th -5 th cent.	Jeffrey 1964
5.	ΑΠησίηι	Assesos	550-500	Wachter 1998 ⁴¹
6.	ναυ:Ϟῶ	Cyzicus	525-500	LSAG 367, 372, 416
7.	[θ]αλάΠης	Teos	475-450	DGE 710, LSAG 345
8.	ἐλάΠονος	Erythrae	ca. 465	DGE 701.A16
9.	ἈλικαρναΠέ[ω]ν ὈαΠάΠιος Σα[ρυνΠ]ώλλο Π[α]νυάΠιος	Halicarnassus	before 454	DGE 744.2, 5, 6, 12
10.	ΜεΠ(α) ΜεΠαμβριανῶν	Mesambria	ca. 450 and later	LSAG 38, 368, 372 no. 56 ⁴²
11.	Π (tokens)	Athens	4 th cent.	Boegehold 1960

The following comments correspond to the entries in the table above.

1. Only the top portion of the letter, which follows *omega*, is visible.

40 I leave to the side any discussion on the variation in the spelling of the name Odysseus or the Carian name Βουασσις (Halicarnassus, 5th cent. and Athens, 4th cent.)/Βουαξις (Colophon and Iasos, 4th cent.) and the words κιάλα(λ)ης/κιτάλης ‘highway robber,’ ἰξάλη/ἰξάλη/ισσέλα/ιτθέλα/ισθλή, etc. ‘goat skin.’ These words are never spelled with *sampi*, but they are often invoked in discussions of the letter since they seem to indicate attempts to represent the same or a similar sound. For all these see Gr.Gr. I 318, Brixhe 1982:228-9, Furnée 1972:286n72, Zgusta 1964:§196-1, 2.

41 See further Brixhe 2000:542.

42 These were dated by Larfeld to 476 BCE(?), but Head 1911:278-9 reports that they date from 450 down to the second century BCE. There are two sets of coins. Those now in the British Museum were published in BMC (vol. 3, Thrace, p. 132 f. nos 2, 5-8 also described by Foat 1905, who had access to them. Those in Berlin were published by Staatliche Museen zu Berlin 1888:188-91, and pl. 5 no. 51. Several examples are also published in Babelon 1901-, IV 1031-36, pl. CCCLII.

2. The reading ΝεΠος on this amphora is by no means secure. Boegehold argued that *sampi* had been written originally and then wiped out and replaced by a single *tau*.⁴³ The letter or letters were rubbed out before the *tau* was written, but it is not obvious that a *sampi* was the original letter.⁴⁴ Brixhe argued that the inscriber wrote the letter *san*, not *sampi*, the symbol for /s/ at Corinth, Sicyon, Phlius, Argos, and elsewhere.⁴⁵ In that case, however, he probably should have written *san* as the final consonant of this name and that of Heracles, which also appears on this same vase. That he has not seems a clear indication that *san* was not intended by him in the name Nessos. Given the state of the reading, however, ΝεΠος remains here only an unconfirmed possibility.

4. Three examples from pottery sherds. The first (Jeffrey 1964:42, no. 15) dates to the seventh century, but is possibly an E rather than a *sampi*. The second (44, no. 49) is more clearly a *sampi* and dates to the fifth century. The third (46 no. 6) is possible and dates from 530-500.

5. Ἀθησίη, ethnicon of *Ἀθησός, elsewhere spelled Ἀσσησός ‘Assesus.’⁴⁶ The name is etymologically opaque but comparable to names in -ησ(σ)ός, like Παρνησ(σ)ός (τ 394, IG II² 1258.24), Ὑμησός (Hdt. 6.137), Λυρνησ(σ)ός (B 690 +, Dionys. Per. 875), Ἀλικαρνησ(σ)ός (variants at Hdt. 1.1, 2.178, 3.7, 8.104; non-Ionic vocalism -ασός and -ασσός at Thuc. 8.42, 108.2). According to Wachter, there are no toponyms in Asia Minor in -ησός that do not also appear with the variant form -ησσός, some of which are spelled with *sampi*.⁴⁷ Therefore, we might have expected *Ἀθηπίη in the inscription. Wachter assumes that a simplification of a double consonant after the long vowel has led to the spelling with -σ-. However, given the propensity of early inscribers to write geminates singly, it is conceivable that -σ- represents here -σσ- and that the inscriber was merely inconsistent in his use of the rare letter (as at DGE 744: Ἀλικαρναπέων, Ἀλικαρνησόν, Ἀλικαρνασέων).

Although the temple of Athena at Assesus is situated over neolithic remains, Wachter finds no connection between the name Assesus and earlier Hittite names. Zgusta had doubtfully suggested Hessassa, but the reading of this name is out of date and the city, correctly read as *Hišašhapa*, does not lie in western Asia Minor.⁴⁸

6. ναυ:λλῶ, gen. sg. of ναῦσσον. The word appears in a 1st or 2nd cent. CE copy of an earlier incomplete inscription on the same stone that is datable to ca. 525-500 (SIG 4). It is assumed that the *sampi* existed in the earlier inscription and was carried over into

43 Boegehold 1962.

44 The picture in Boegehold 1962 is printed upside-down. There is also a reproduction of the scene, right-side up, in Charbonneaux, Martin, and Villard 1971:47, fig. 50 and a picture of the entire vase in Hurwit 1985:19. The vase is kept in the National Art Museum in Athens, where I had the opportunity to view it first hand in May 2010 and again in May 2012.

45 Brixhe 1982:220-1.

46 Identified as modern Mengerevtepe, about seven kilometers south-east of Miletus.

47 Wachter 1998:5, following Zgusta 1984.

48 Zgusta 1984:§108-3; See del Monte and Tischler 1978 and HEG 2:111-2.

the later copy.⁴⁹ The word is rare. It appears again in the first century CE in an inscription from Cos (SIG 1000.1, 2 *bis* = Töpffer 1891), spelled with -σσ-. While discussing this latter inscription, Töpffer suggested a connection to ναῦσθλον = ναῦλ-(λ)ον ‘passage-money, fare, freight.’⁵⁰ In later usage ναῦλον appears as the name of a tax paid on boats provided by the state. Wackernagel first connected the examples from both inscriptions and argued on the basis of *sampi* that the word was a foreign borrowing, perhaps Carian, and therefore should not be connected to ναῦσθλον/ναῦλον.⁵¹ Chantraine (DELG, s.v.) is skeptical of Wackernagel’s proposal and maintains that a connection to ναῦς ‘ship’ cannot be excluded. From the context of the two inscriptions it is not possible to tell if the word had anything to do with ships or shipping, only that the word served as a technical term designating a kind of tax.

9. On the names Ὀαῖτιος and Π[α]λυάτιος see Zgusta 1964: §§1145-8 and 1198, respectively, and Adiego 1993:38, 35, 252.

10. Mesambria, located on the western coast of the Euxine, was a colony of Chalcedon but was populated by citizens from Byzantium and Megara, this last city having founded both Chalcedon and Byzantium.⁵² This suggests the possibility that the use of *sampi* was brought from Megara, but it has been claimed instead that its use was taken from Apollonia, a neighboring colony founded by Miletus.⁵³ The bronze coins bear inscriptions that read Μεῖ, Μεῖα, and Μεῖαμβριανῶν. In addition to the letter τ these coins also give the variant shapes Ϡ and ϡ, along with the normal Greek *tau* and, in later examples, a single Σ.

11. The letter appears on a number of examples of a fourth century Athenian bronze token (the σύμβολον δημοσίᾳ of Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 65.2), which may have been used to determine seating in the popular courts that contained as many as 1,000 citizen jurists at a single time. According to Boegehold, the examples are not monograms but instances of an imported letter, and he insists that “τ does not in fact have any numerical value on these tokens, and cannot be considered a numeral.”⁵⁴

1.6.3. Literary examples of *sampi*

There are no surviving examples of *sampi* in early literary texts. Nevertheless, some scholars have seen evidence for the use of *sampi* in certain cases, such as the transmission of -ττ- for -σσ- in authors who employ the latter exclusively. So, at Alcaeus

49 Larfeld 1914:226 explained the punctuation within the word as follows, “Da er [the transcriber] den Buchstaben Ϡ offenbar nur noch als das Zahlzeichen ϡ kannte, so fasste er ϠΟ als Zahl (= 970) und ΝΑΥ als Abbriviatur, die er von dem Zahlzeichen durch die Interpunktion : schied.”

50 Töpffer 1891:417.

51 Wackernagel 1893:299f.

52 DKP, s.v. Mesambria.

53 Gercke 1906:542, Larfeld 1914:226.

54 Boegehold 1960:398-9.

354.7LP, although $\kappa\upsilon\pi\alpha\tau\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ is transmitted, it is generally corrected to $\kappa\upsilon\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1890:226n2, however, suggested that since the word is read everywhere else as $\kappa\upsilon\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, Alcaeus may have originally written *sampi*. One assumes that this was then mistaken for a single *tau* and subsequently (incorrectly) written as $-\tau\tau-$. One objection to this idea is that there are no other examples of *sampi* in Aeolic inscriptions or literature.

Likewise at Hdt. 5.37 one reads Ὀλίαιον (acc. sg.) Ἴβανώλλιος (v.l. Ἴβανώλιος) Μυλάσεια ‘Oliatus son of Ibanol(l)is of Mylasa’. The name Oliatus has a parallel in the name Ὀλιάσας found in an inscription located in a shrine to Zeus Labrandeus on Cyprus and dated between the 3rd and 5th century CE.⁵⁵ As Zeus Labrandeus’ temple was located at Labranda, just North-West of Mylasa, Hall has argued that the Cyprian shrine was founded by Lycian or Carian settlers from Mylasa or its immediate neighborhood.⁵⁶ Both individuals bearing this name come from the same region and may therefore have had Carian connections.⁵⁷ The variant spelling has led some to suppose that the name was spelled with a *sampi* by Herodotus.⁵⁸

1.6.4. Some doubtful and falsely claimed occurrences of *sampi*

There are a number of cases in which scholars have identified or supposed a Ϻ , but which are almost certainly to be excluded from a list of genuine examples. For the sake of completeness these are discussed here.

1.6.4.1. Selinountine ϮΥΛΑΣ

Froehner’s identification of *sampi* on coins from Selinous has been refuted by Jeffery: “I cannot agree . . . with the suggestion by Froehner . . . that it was used at Selinous, because certain Selinountine coins appear to show the letter instead of *psi* for the normal Ϯυψας [‘Hypsas’]. . . . Inversion of letters is common in coin legends, and this letter is surely an inverted *psi*.”⁵⁹ That is to say, one finds a letter of the shape Λ rather than Ψ , the usual sign for *psi* at Selinous, and the former is simply an inversion of the latter, not an example of *sampi*.

55 Hall 1883:clxvii.

56 Hall 1883 first published the inscription. Mylasa is located midway between Miletus and Halicarnassus, east of Iasos and south-east of Labranda.

57 It is unclear whether Zgusta 1964:§§1085-2, 1086-1, 2 is right to relate Ολις and Ολλις to Ολιατος ; cf. Adiego 1993:243.

58 So Schulze 1897:886; Zuntz 1951:21.

59 LSAG 39n2, see also 262, 271; Froehner 1907:100f.

1.6.4.2. Sappho

Zuntz 1951 argued that the poetess Sappho wrote the first letter of her name with *sampi*. His contention is based on the idea that explanations and etymologies of the name are unconvincing and that “nearly all bearers of the name hail from Asia Minor.”⁶⁰ Accordingly, he assumes the name is “Asiatic” rather than Greek.

According to Zuntz, even though the MSS. indicate that Sappho always spelled her own name with an initial Ψ, it is unlikely that she herself used this letter because it was unknown in archaic Lesbian script.⁶¹ Instead, he surmises that Sappho used a sign that could have been mistaken later for *psi*, and the most likely such sign is a *sampi* shaped Ψ. This leads him to the (somewhat fantastical) conclusion that the name Sappho is related to dozens of names spread throughout the Mediterranean and beyond that allegedly contain a root *sap-*, such as, to cite a few, Etruscan *Sapu*, Latin *Sappinius*, *Sabinus*, “Lydo-Phrygian” Σαβυς, Pisidian Σαβινα, Celtic *Sa(p)pius*, *Sapis* (name of a river), Illyrian *Sabulus*, Punic *Saphonis*, etc. Finally, all of these, including the name of the poetess, are said to have originated from *Špn* (= *Šapōn*), the name of a Ugaritic deity.

In the first place, it is not true that nearly all bearers of the name come from Asia Minor. Fraser and Matthews record fourteen certain examples of the name, five of which occur in Cyrene (from the 4th cent. on) and only two of which appear on Lesbos (7th/6th cent. and ca. 400).⁶² Later examples occur at Rhodes (310-240), Athens (2nd cent. CE), twice at Delos (279 and 106/5), once each in Illyria (Hellenistic), Argolis (2nd-

60 Previous explanations of the name include Baunack and Baunack 1886:56, who took it from a hypothetical *Ψαλλεφίλα ‘lover of the harp’, a derivation Zuntz calls, correctly I think, “at best a curiosity”; Prellwitz 1887:441 connected it to the name of an Attic deme, Ψαφίς. Fick 1899:115 agreed with this and as support cited the name of the Arcadian town Ψωφίς. However, neither of these words has a clear explanation and they by no means provide any real explanation for the name Sappho. Solmsen 1901:502 and still in 1922:131 took the name as a form of ψαφαρός, which normally indicates a friable or crumbling substance like sand (see LSJ⁹, s.v.). He imagined that Sappho was named for her dry, brittle skin or hair (“trockene, spröde Haut oder Haare”). More recently E. Brown 1991 put forward the idea that the name relates to the Hittite name *Šapalli-*, which in turn he thinks may be of Hattian origin (he compares the variously transliterated Hatt. *(a)šhap*, *šhab*, and *šhav-* ‘god’). I find none of these options particularly convincing and briefly mention two ideas. The name may have something to do with the Hesychian gloss ψάφα: *νέφας* ‘*psapha*: darkness’. This would accord with the testimonium POxy 1800 fr. 1 (see also Max. Tyr. 18.7, schol. Luc. *Imag.* 18, Ov. *Her.* 15.31-6), which records that the poetess was ὄψιν φαϊώδης ‘dark in complexion’. On the other hand, a recently published undated inscription from Assos, located on the coast of the Troad across from Lesbos, contains the name Δικαπρώ. This leads one to think that the name Σαπρώ may have been a hypocoristic, perhaps from mis- or re-analysis of a compound name.

61 Liberman’s emendation of Alcaeus 384LP from μελλιχόμειδε Σάπφοι to μελλιχόμειδες Ἄφροι is persuasive (Liberman 1988).

62 Fraser and Matthews 1987-2000.