small portion of the top was touched by the tools of the fashioner (I hesitate to call him an artist), the bark was largely intact. The ἀλλά φάλητι tips the scale in favor of ἀσκελές, for were the first word of the line τρισκελές these last two would be redundant. In fact, there is an adversative idea here; Theocritus is modifying the impression of complete primitiveness conveyed by the three adjectives.

Gow is correct when he writes that ἀνούατον "indicates extreme roughness of execution." Since the word makes sense, it should be kept in the dictionaries of the Greek language.

WALTER O. MOELLER

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

AN EMENDATION IN THE *AEGRITUDO PERDICAE*

> Oedipodem thalamos matris uult fama subisse
> [126].

For the transmitted *Et ipodent talamus* Baehrens and subsequent editors write *Oedipodem thalamos*. I would correct to *Oedipoden thal-*. On paleographical grounds, it is true, one might elicit either form. Whereas Baehrens assumes the error *m* to *nt*, I assume, with equal if not more ease, a dittography of the *t* in the following *talamus*.[1] It should be observed that while there is no example of *m* to *nt* in the MS tradition of this poem, there are many examples of dittography: e.g., 6, *dirum* (*dirum* IN); 14, *cetera templa* (*terra*T *templa*); 19, *Perdica* (*P*-*dica* BIS); 44, *dicens olim* (*dicens*

solim); 77, *somno reparant* (*somno*S *reparant*); 115, *mortal-* (IN*mortal-*); 238, *certa furorem* (*certa*S *furore*); and 283, *praedixi tormenta* (*praedixi*T *tormenta*). As for usage which is decisive, we find no instance of acc. *Oedipodem* (from *Oedipus*, -*podis*) in Latin verse,[2] so that of the two *Oedipoden* (from *Oedipodes*, -*ae*) must be regarded as standard and preferred: cf. Mart. 10. 4. 1; Stat. *Theb.* 2. 436, 8. 242, 11. 491, and 11. 666; Claud. *In Ruf.* 1. 84. (See D. C. Swanson, *The Names in Roman Verse*, and Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre*, I, 858 f.)

J. M. HUNT

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

1. Baehrens, relying on E. M. Thompson's transcription, misreports the MS as having *calamus* when in fact it has the unaspirated *talamus* (so Nolte *apud* Riese, Vollmer). It is for this reason, I suppose, that he missed the obvious correction.
2. Probably it occurs only in Suet. *Nero* 21 and 46.

TWO NOTES ON THE TEXT OF JUVENAL: *SAT.* 12. 32 AND 16. 18
I. *Sat.* 12. 32

> cum plenus fluctu medius foret alveus et iam
> alternum puppis latus evertentibus undis
> arboris incertae, nullam prudentia cani
> rectoris cum ferret opem, decidere iactu
> coepit cum ventis   [12. 30–34].

Although the manuscripts are unanimous in reading *arboris*, there are four variants of the second word in verse 32: *incertae* PO; *incerta* F; *incerto* Φ; and *incerti* A Vat. 2810. The awkwardness of construing the only combination that agrees in case (*arboris incertae*) has prompted the conjectures of Jacobs (*aequoris incerti*), Weidner (*arboris interitu*), and Lachmann (*arbori incertae*— which Jahn printed). If the genitive is correct, it must be descriptive of *alveus* (30) or *puppis* (31). It could be reminiscent of an expression

such as *incertae sortis vivimus* (Sen. Maior *Suas.* 4. 3). But it is difficult to account for the variants in the adjective. Lachmann's conjecture is textually easy, but imports its own metrical difficulties: hiatus without caesura, which is not found in Juvenal. A simpler solution is still wanted.

The scholia offer as a gloss here *nec arbore coacta*, which is excellent in the context as an ablative absolute parallel with *alternum . . . undis* (31). What the ancient commentator probably read in his text was *arbore ⟨et⟩ incerta*, which he interpreted only to the extent of supplying an explanation for *incerta*. The ablative is further supported by the reading of F: *incerta*. The original corruption could be explained by the loss of the *et*, followed by