

similar type (preverb + verb—verb alone, e.g., *ser . . . sarnikmi—sarnikzi*) appears to vouchsafe the Indo-European origin of this feature as an inherited syntactic archaism.

To the epigraphic Attic attestation we may append a passage from the Arcadian regulations on building contracts published in *IG*, V, 2. 6 (34–35):

ει δ'αν ινδικαζητοι απυτειστω το χρεος διπλασιον το  
αν δικαζητοι.....;

(37–43):

ει δ'αν τις εργωνησας εργον τι ποσκατυβλαψη τι αλλυ  
των υπαρχοντων εργων ειτε δαμοσιον ειτε ιδιον παρ ταν  
συγγραφον τας εσδοκαν απυκαθιστατω το κατυβλα-  
φθεν τοις ιδιοις αναλωμασιν μη ησσον η υπαρχει ιν τοι  
χρονοι τας εργωνιαν. ει δ'αμ μη κατυσταση τα  
επιζαμμα απυτειετω

If he is sued, let him pay double the sum for which  
he is sued . . . If anyone who has contracted for a  
work damages any other of existing works, either  
public or private, against the terms of the contract,

let him make good the damages at his private  
expense, no less than (= to be as good as) they were  
at the time of the contracting. But if he does not  
make good, let him pay the fine.

Here *ινδικαζητοι—δικαζητοι* parallel the At-  
tic attestation. *ποσκατυβλαψη—κατυβλαφθεν*  
and *απυκαθιστατω—κατυσταση*, however, add  
the hitherto unnoticed feature of forms with  
two preverbs versus resumptive forms with one,  
rather than the mere compound: simplex  
opposition.

There is evidently more to be discovered  
about this phenomenon than the present  
corpus indicates. Also, until its presence or  
absence in at least Indo-Iranian has been  
verified, Hittite alone remains an interesting  
but somewhat shaky *tertium* for an Indo-  
European comparison.

JAAN PUHVEL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

## THE WORD ANOTATON

The word *ἀνούατον* occurs only in Theoc-  
ritus *Epigram* 4. 3 (Gow; *Anth. Pal* 9. 437).  
The meaning given to it is “without ears”  
(see *LSJ s.v.*, also *Supplement* ed. Barber  
*s.v.*), which troubled Gow in his commentary  
to Theocritus, where on p. 531 he writes:  
“It indicates extreme roughness of execution,  
for, since the figure has a head, the ears might  
be expected to have been carved.”

There is no doubt that *ἀνούατον*, “without  
ears,” makes no sense in the description of  
that Priapus; for firstly, the head and the  
phallus of the effigies of that god, however  
roughly hewn, were what the artists concen-  
trated on (see Herter in *RE*, XXII: 2 (1954),  
1923, *s.v.* “Priapus”); and secondly, an  
earless effigy could not “lend its ears” to  
the prayer to be addressed to it in 11. 13 f., nor  
to the wish, *αἰοι δ'εὐμενέως ὁ θεός*, with  
which the poem so pungently concludes.

I would, therefore, like to emend *ἀνούατον*  
to *ἀνούατος*, a Homeric word (*Il.* 4. 540; cf.  
22. 371), which was widely used in Hellenistic  
poetry, as can be seen from Apollonius  
Rhodius *Arg.* 2. 75, Nicander *Ther.* 718,

Quintus Smyrnaeus 3. 445, and Nonnus  
*Dion.* 37. 774, etc., in the sense of “unscathed,”  
“unwounded.” In Nonnus *Dion.* 16. 157 and  
382, it also occurs as an adjective of Dionysus  
(the father of Priapus) in the sense of “in-  
vulnerable.” The emended Theocritean line  
would thus read: *τρισκελές αὐτόφλοιον*  
*ἀνούατον, ἀλλὰ φάλλῃτι*, etc. (for I am not  
inclined to accept the emendation of *τρισκελές*  
to *ἀσκελές* suggested by Jahn, but believe that  
*τρισκελές* refers to the phallus). *Ἀνούατος*,  
“unscathed,” could either be directly con-  
nected with the *ἀρτυγλυφές* of 1. 2—for we  
know from the *Priapea* and other sources  
how soon the wooden Priapi were damaged  
—or it could be seen as a compliment to the  
rustic artist, who did not damage the bark of  
the wood when carving it (cf. Pauly-Wissowa,  
*loc. cit.*).

Should this emendation be accepted, then  
the word *ἀνούατος* ought to be deleted from  
the dictionaries of the Greek language.

C. A. TRYPANIS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO