This sequence gives a regular use of *dum*, and it has the further advantage that *in vallem Egeriae descendimus* is preceded by what is surely needed, an indication of where the two friends were before they went down into the valley. It is true that such an indication would be provided indirectly by the parenthesis *substitit (raeda) ... Capenam*, but this parenthesis is questionable on other grounds, and the information is conveyed more straightforwardly by a clause with a personal subject (*amicus*). Another consideration which perhaps tells in favour of the suggested order of lines is that in it the reader is told where the *raeda* is before he is told that it is being loaded up, surely a more natural arrangement than the other way round.

However this suggestion is not free from difficulties. Clearly *substitit ... Capenam* cannot follow *9 urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetae* immediately, so I suggest a lacuna after 9 with the sense ‘So when my friend had made his way through the city.’ It is also true that the adversative particle *sed* is awkward after *substitit ... Capenam*, whereas in the transmitted order of lines it is resumptive after the digression in 4-9. In its place *hinc* might be suggested, giving ‘From here (the porta Capena) we went down into the valley of Egeria.’ In the transmitted order of lines, *hinc* is inappropriate at the beginning of 10, and *sed* could have been substituted for it to provide a better link with what precedes, when the lines were rearranged.

1) For these meetings see the references given by E. Courtney on Juvenal 3.13 (*A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980).

2) See E. Courtney’s notes (n.c.) on Juvenal 3.10 and 236.

3) For the possibilities of parenthesis in Latin poetry Nisbet refers to M. von Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Function* (Hildesheim 1964). On pp. 29-35 von Albrecht lists 179 parentheses in the *Metamorphoses*. But none of these is parallel to Juvenal 3.11, in the sense that it would be possible to take it as the apodosis of a preceding subordinate clause, rather than as a parenthesis.


5) I am greatly indebted to Drs Susanna Braund and Adrian Gratwick for their kind interest in this article. Neither of them necessarily accepts its thesis.

**JUENAL, SAT. 10.150: ATROSQUE NON ALIOSQUE**

(Rursus ad Aethiopum populos aliosque elephantos)

In the past hundred years editors have almost unanimously preferred the reading *aliosque* found in the *deteriores* to *altosque* provided by the best manuscript *P*, Pithoeanus Montepessulanus bibl. med. 125†). Nevertheless the various explanations as to the meaning and use of this phrase ‘other elephants’ remain more ingenious than convincing. Laughton

interpreting this in terms of the geographical boundaries of Africa sees a reference to the city Elephantine\(^2\). Triantaphyllopoulos thinks that \textit{aliosque} modifies both \textit{populus} and \textit{elephantos} while Nisbet would delete the entire line\(^3\). Ullman sees the influence of Statius, \textit{Theb.} 10.85 \textit{Aethiopasque alios, nulli penetrabilis astro}, and suggests that Juvenal’s use of Statisus may be worthy of further study\(^4\). However with the exception of Bower this idea has not born fruit\(^5\). Nadeau agrees with the geographical interpretation and sees this as an erudite parody of Homer, \textit{Od.} 1.23-24:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Αθηνος, τοι διχθά δεδαίατα, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν, οἱ μὲν δυσομένου Ἕπεριονος, οἱ δ’ Ἀνιόνος.}
\end{quote}

and Vergil, \textit{Aen.} 4.480-482:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Oceani finem iuxta solemque cadentem ultimus Aethiopum locus est, ubi maximus Atlas axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.}
\end{quote}

that influenced both Lucan and Statius\(^6\). Astbury explains that Juvenal, having accepted Homer’s references to Ethiopians in general, separates them into two distinct groups, those dwelling in the East and those in the West\(^7\). Barr (1973) has determined that \textit{aliosque} is a special construction using \textit{άλλος, η, ο} whose meaning becomes also or as well when placed in apposition to a noun\(^8\). Finkelpearl seemingly unaware of Barr’s work comes to the same conclusion: \textit{aliosque} is a Grecism that is not uncommon in Latin\(^9\). Unsatisfied with these explanations I have taken an entirely different approach to this problem and conceived of a conjecture, \textit{atrosque}, that:

1) fits literatim into the line in question,
2) corrects a type of scribal error common to P and manuscripts in general,
3) makes sense in its Juvenalian context.

My arguments are given below.

Through a careful examination of \textit{aliosque} we concur with Astbury that the reading “other” is wrong because it implies a previous reference to some other type of elephant which is not found in Juvenal and is only suggested by P’s gloss \textit{praeter Indicos}\(^10\). Moreover Toynbee has made it clear that the Romans very often failed to discriminate accurately between the Indian and African elephants in art and literature\(^11\). And however often \textit{aliosque} appears by itself in prose, it never appears separately in the satires of Lucilius, Horace and Persius or the epics of Lucretius, Lucan and Statius. When it is used in poetry, it takes the correlative form as in Tibullus, \textit{Car.} 3.7.17 \textit{inde alios aliosque memor componere versus} and Vergil, \textit{Aen.} 5.583 \textit{inde alios ineunt cursus aliosque recursus}. Thus Juvenal, the satirist with epic tendencies, must have used a different adjective. Which one?

Elephants are nowhere else modified in Latin by \textit{aliosque}. Lucretius, \textit{DRN} 2.537 writes \textit{anquimanus elephantos}, and Suetonius, \textit{Gal.} 6.1.3