the first word he had omitted. Scribal confusion between κε and και is really too common to require illustration; one example of it that may be less familiar occurs in the first-century P. Leeds 4 of Hom. II. i. 523, which writes και unmetrichally for the correct κε.¹

GEORGE ARNOTT

CRETAN δρωτον

Ι. C. iv. 145 lists various items which are to be dedicated to some god, possibly Ares. The text has been established by M. Guarducci, who dates it to the beginning of the fourth century B.C.² Among the objects mentioned there are vases and cult implements; in particular line 6 reads και καναστραιον δρωτον κε. The meaning of καναστραιον can be inferred from a gloss in the Σίδων (καναστραια: κοιλα των ἄγγελων) and from the comparison with κάναστρον. Hesychius glosses this latter word with ὀστρακοιν, τρυβλιοιν, κανονιν and we have some evidence for it in a Cretan text. It occurs in a description of the property of Asclepius’ sanctuary at Lebena (I.C. i. xviii. 2 a. 9) and seems to indicate one of the σκευα κεράμιν mentioned in the line above. It is likely that both καναστραιον and κάναστρον refer to some container, possibly made of pottery and possibly similar in shape to a basket. The semantic difference between the two, if any, escapes us. In the phrase quoted above the real difficulty is caused by δρωτον. Professor Guarducci tentatively suggests that it may mean ‘wooden’ and compares δρωτός ‘oak’ and Hesychius’ gloss δροιον καλον, Κρήνης, where it would be possible to read καλον ‘wood’ instead of καλον ‘beautiful’. This interpretation has found its way, with a ‘dub. sens.’, into the new (1968) Supplement to L.S.J. (s.v. δρωτος). No doubt it is ingenious, but it is not altogether satisfactory. The vocalism of δροιον is awkward, and in any case δρωτος could only be a derivative of δρωτός (which is not attested in Crete). But even so the formation of the word would appear somewhat peculiar. It is true that -ωτος adjectives exist and are occasionally formed on simple substantives, though this is not the normal pattern and though I do not know of any example built on an -ς-stem.³ Nowhere in Greece, however, do the -ωτος adjectives take the place of the adjectives of material: in Crete in particular we know that these were formed with an -εως suffix⁴ or (conceivably) with an -ων suffix. Thus, even if δρωτός were a derivative of δρωτός it could not mean ‘made of wood’. Hence it may be preferable to look for a completely different explanation.

We have seen that καναστραιον indicates a sort of container and possibly a pottery vessel. In this context we expect not so much an adjective formed with an -ωτος suffix as a compound of ωσ, ωτος: one may compare μονωτος, ἀμφωτος, διωτος, τετραωτος, etc., which indicate respectively vases with one, two, four handles, etc.⁵ We can recognize in δρωτον a by-form of τρωτος ‘three-handed’, a word which is in fact attested, though in a later period. This

¹ The phonetic confusion between ας and ε seems to have begun in the second century B.C.: cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer, 34; K.-B. i. 51 f.; Mayer, Gramm. iv. 107 and the references in his n. 1; Schwyzer, i. 195.
² See the commentary following the text in I.C. and Epigraphica, iv (1942), 177 ff.
³ For the -ωτος adjectives see Chatterlain, Formation des nouns, 305 f. and especially the list of -ωτος formations found in Buck-Petersen, Reverse Index, 524–9.
⁵ These compounds are attested from Homer (ἀμφωτος) onwards both in literature and in the inscriptions. For their origin see now O. Szemerényi in Studi micenei e egeo-anatolici, iii (1967), 47–88 passim.
suggestion would appear acceptable and indeed obvious if two problems could be solved: (a) do we have any evidence for three-handled containers possibly made of pottery and similar to baskets in shape? (b) is δρίωτος, as a by-form of τριωτός, linguistically possible?

To start with the first question. Three-handed vases are not altogether exceptional in Greece. In addition to the more usual hydriai, one may quote, for instance, the cooking pan represented in a terracotta figure from Boeotia (late sixth century), the three-handed goblets (LH III) found by Wace at Mycenae, the similar late-geometric mug from Ithaca described by Robertson, the miniature vases from the Amyclaion in Laconia, and the three-handed votive bowl of local pottery found at Tocra. Nearer to the point are the Cretan three-handed kalathoi of the protogeometric period mentioned by Desborough: it is certainly conceivable that the shape of the καναστραίον was that of a kalathos, i.e. of a basket-like pot. Moreover we have evidence from Crete for a shallower type of dish with three vertical handles on the rim: cf. the seventh-century example published by Platon in A.E. 1945–7, 60, pl. 10 no. 57 and the sixth-century dish of Cretan origin found in the recent excavations of Tocra. Thus it cannot be excluded—and it is in fact likely—that the καναστραίον δρίωτον is to be identified with the three-handed trays or baskets (in pottery or otherwise) which were used in the whole of Greece for the sacrificial offerings given to the gods. The evidence for these has been collected and illustrated by Debner in an article where he showed that one of the common characteristics of these κανά is the presence of three handles. Our three-handed container, mentioned in a list of offerings to a god, is a welcome confirmation of Debner’s findings.

The linguistic problem is less clear-cut. If one excludes, as a pis aller, the possibility that the δ is due to a mistake of the stone-cutter, there are still some suggestions that can be offered. First of all, it is conceivable that the correct formation τριωτός ‘three-handled’ was influenced by διωτός ‘two-handled’.

Similar analogical changes in numerals are well known: in Greece one may quote the Heraclean ἕκτωι with the ἕ of ἐπτά, the Thessalian εξε with the final ε of πέντε, and the Elean ὑπτώ with the -πτ- cluster of ἐπτά. Secondly, one may remember that we have some evidence for Crete in the alternation of an accent and voiceless plosives in clusters of plosive and liquid: cf. ἄντρηιοι in I.C. ii v. 1. 8 vs. ἄνθρηιον, βρυταν[ε]ιοι in I.C. i xvi. 1. 41 vs. πρυτανεύον, ἄλαντος in I.C. i xxii. 2.8 vs. -κλυτός, and forms κλεωρος and ἀφλονια[ (vs. γλευκος and ἀβλομα) of a Cretan inscription of the British Museum. All these forms,

1 Cf. Greek, Etruscan and Roman Art in the Class. Collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 1963, p. 70 no. 59 (Mus. No. 01. 7788).
2 B.S.A. xxv (1921–3), p. 53 pl. xi a–c.
3 B.S.A. xliii (1948), p. 105 pl. 29 No. 538.
I am grateful to Professor Robertson for this reference and for the help that he has given me with this note.
7 Boardman–Hayes, op. cit., pp. 79 f. no. 930, pl. 56; I owe this reference to Mr. Boardman.
8 Arch. Jahrbuch, xi (1925), 210 ff. To the evidence quoted add now the Rhodian tray illustrated and discussed by Friis Johansen in Acta Archaeologica (Copenhagen), xxviii (1957), 129 ff. (Abb. 137).
9 ἕκτω in I.C. xiv. 645, i. 34; εξε in S.E.G. xiii. 394. 10; ἐπτώ in Schwzyer D.G.E. 419. 4.
10 Cf. L. H. Jeffery, A. Morpurgo-Davies, Kadmos, ix (1970) forthcoming, where the evidence is discussed more thoroughly.
except the first, may be taken as instances of assimilation or dissimilation of voice; a similar explanation could apply to δριωτος too (τ-τ > δ-τ). However, in view of the number of examples, we may wonder whether the different spellings could point to a phonetic change which neutralized the contrast between /tr/ and /dr/, /kl/ and /gl/ etc. If so, δριωτος would cease to cause any difficulty.

St. Hilda's College, Oxford

Anna Morpurgo-Davies

PERSIANA

'Age' words in Sat. 1

(a) 8–11

nam Romae quis non—a, si fas dicere—sed fas
tum cum ad canitiem et nostrum istud uiuere triste
asperxi ac nucibus facimus quae cumque relictis,
cum sapimus patruos.

Since canities and uiuere triste are widely prevalent features of Roman life, canities cannot have its usual meaning, viz. 'the grey hair of elderly men'. Most editors, while abandoning literal old age, hold on to literal grey hair, saying that the men in question are prematurely grey. And why are they prematurely grey? As a result, we are told, of their sensual indulgence. So Jahn, Némethy, Villeneuve, and others. But the poet says nothing about sensual indulgence, and such an idea would distract attention from his real target, which is at this point hypocrisy.

It is generally acknowledged that the next phrase (uiuere triste) cannot be taken literally, and so the editors speak of 'the austerity of affected morality' (Conington), simulata tristitia (Némethy), 'notre affectation d'austérité' (Villeneuve). So too sapimus patruos is rightly taken to mean 'we put on the wise airs of uncles' (Ramsay). But what is true of uiuere triste and sapimus patruos ought also to be true of canitiem, and so it too must be used in a non-literal way to denote an affected gravity. 'Venerable hairs' is Nisbet's translation.1

(b) 26–7

en pallor seniumque! o mores, usque adeone
scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter?

The adversary has just said in effect 'What's the point of all my studying if this inner ferment is not given expression?' Persius replies 'So that's the reason for your pallor and senium! You're just a show-off!' The pallor is the result of study,2 which is motivated by the desire for applause. It has nothing to do with old age or illness. Nor has senium, which refers to a morose and gloomy manner. Persius himself provides a parallel in vi. 16:

usque recusem
curus ob id minui senio aut cenare sine uncto.

Jahn and Conington refer to Horace, Epist. i. 18. 47: inhumanae senium depone Camenae.3

2 Cf. Persius i. 124.
3 E. K. Borthwick in C.Q. lxi (1967), 45 takes senium in Epist. i. 18. 47 as 'languor'.
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