

contagia in the *Georgics*. It is also possible that Juvenal might have referred to Lucretius' account of the plague of Athens (6. 1139 *ad fin.*);³ however, the only parallels are phrases first imitated by Virgil, who incorporated much of the language and atmosphere of Lucretius' description in his own narrative; for example, the striking final words *sacer ignis*, in Lucr. 6. 660 and 1167, and *contagia morbi* in 1236. Indeed, no separate borrowings by Juvenal are discernible. Rather, Juvenal emphasizes the rustic imagery, both with the three similes, and with the antithesis of line 74: *montanum positus audiret vulgus aratris*. But in direct contrast to Virgil's humane, sympathetic treatment of the suffering animals, Juvenal's similes suggest a more satirical symbolism; Creticus' victims are sheepish gluttons and purple-faced drunkards.

However, the third simile is less easily evaluated, with its variant reading for *conspecta*. Certainly the hyperbole in *conspecta*, and its association with the visual contamination by Creticus, together with P's authority, make the reading seem acceptable. However,

the hyperbole is less effective when one considers the triteness of the proverb, *uva uvam videndo varia fit*,⁴ and the Virgilian atmosphere of the passage suggests that V's *contacta* is the better reading; besides echoing *contactos* in the last line of *Georgics* 3, its link with *contagio* helps to integrate the theme of the passage; and considering Juvenal's liking for the unexpected, and his penchant for parody,⁵ a Virgilian reminiscence that avoided the obvious proverb would seem likely. By contrast, the third possibility, *confecta*,⁶ merely spells out the obvious, unlikely in Juvenal. Admittedly, it is easy to accept P's reading, and to treat the third simile as Juvenal's own use of a well-worn but humorous conceit; however, as Elizabeth Thomas showed in her study of *Ovidian Echoes in Juvenal*,⁷ probable imitations can well influence textual decisions, and in this case the imitation seems very probable.

J. R. C. MARTYN

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

3. Cf. W. Liebeschuetz, "Beast and Man in the Third Book of Virgil's *Georgics*," *G. and R.*, XII (1965), 74.

4. Quoted by A. J. Macleane, *Juvenalis et Persii Satirae* (London, 1867), p. 32. He also mentions a Persian proverb, "One plum gets colour by looking at another." He reads V's *contacta* in his text.

5. For parody, cf. D. Joly, "Juvénal et les *Géorgiques*," in *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, *Latomus*, LXX (1964), 290-308;

also, F. J. Lelièvre, "Parody in Juvenal and T. S. Eliot," *CP*, LIII (1958), 22-26. This passage is mentioned neither by Lelièvre nor by Joly nor by any of the authors she cites.

6. Recently adopted by P. Green, *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires* (Baltimore, 1967), p. 83. Modern editors accept P's *conspecta*.

7. In *Ovidiana*, ed. N. I. Herescu (Paris, 1958), esp. p. 523.

AN "INDO-EUROPEAN CONSTRUCTION" IN ARCADIAN

In his recent article, "An Indo-European Construction in Greek and Latin" (*HSCP*, LXXI [1966], 115-19), Calvert Watkins has drawn renewed attention to instances where a compound verb is iterated in a closely following resumptive employment by the corresponding simplex (or occasionally its quasi synonym). Watkins discusses the Greek and Latin material gathered by J. Wackernagel (Attic legal epigraphic *εγκτησασθαι—καταται* and *υποθεμενω—τιθηται* in *IG*, II, 17. 36-42, with literary Attic parallels), W. Clausen (Latin literary attestations, typically Catullus *consurgite—surgere*), and E. Fraenkel (Greek

instances and especially Latin, notably *occisit—caesus* in the Twelve Tables). He agrees with Fraenkel that the phenomenon is in origin linguistic and popular rather than stylistic and literary, pointing to its perceptibly archaic and preterliterary presence in Attic and early Latin legal usage. He argues for literary convention as the reason for its apparent avoidance in Homer on the one hand, and studied elaboration in Latin poetry on the other. While offering no additions to the previously recognized classical attestations, Watkins introduces a *tertium comparationis* in the form of Hittite, where legal usage of a

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 εσδοκαυ απυκαθιστατω το κατυβλα-
φθεν τοις ιδιοις αναλωμασιν μη ησσον η υπαρχε 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 Theocritus *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 concentrated 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 “invulnerable.” 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 connected 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