

πρᾶτος need not mean “first” in the sense of “earliest”; taken predicatively, it can also signify “for the first time,” as it does in lines 43 and 45 of this same poem.

Taken together, these observations suggest a plausible version of 56–57: “when a minstrel for the first time raises his well-tressed neck from the marriage-bed and crows.” Strange way to describe a rooster. But another subject presents itself when we recognize in εὔτριχα at 57 (the final line of the poem, apart from the conventional invocation to Hymen) an echo of ξανθότριχι πᾶρ Μενελάω in the first verse. Thus, the strained periphrasis for “rooster” conceals a witty comment on Menelaus’ exuberant pride in the consummation of his marriage to the divine Helen—he tosses his mane and howls aloud (a reference to his famous war cry?) as though he had just learned to sing.²

The comic treatment of Menelaus may conform to a Fescennine convention, although there is no certain evidence for such a convention in Greek epithalamia. Nowhere, moreover, is the groom presented as sluggish or reluctant. He is more likely, in what survives of Sappho’s epithalamia, to be the subject of extravagant praise (frags. 111, 115). In the poem which by all accounts is thematically closest to Theocritus *Idyll* 18 (Sappho frag. 44, on the wedding of Hector and Andromache), the bride and groom are both likened to gods (vv. 21, 34). I suggest that the disparity between the lovers conveyed by the epithalamium for Helen and Menelaus is rather in keeping with Theocritus’ treatment of love in several other idylls, such as those devoted to Polyphemus and Galatea, or the third on Amaryllis and her enamored goatherd. I am inclined to venture an additional interpretative point. Theocritus has refrained from anything more than a hint at Helen’s future elopement: the hint occurs at 37 τὰς πάντες ἐπ’ ὀμμασιν ἱμεροὶ ἐντί. Dover, following Gow, explains that “‘on whose eyes are all desires’ means ‘whose eyes kindle a desire surpassing all others.’”³ Surely, however, the phrase—for which there is no precise parallel—is ambiguous, and also suggests Helen’s passions. Perhaps, too, the contrast between bride and groom intimates the denouement. When Menelaus, astonished at his good fortune, bellows after possessing the divine Helen, the reader may be entitled to suspect that Helen, idealized and transcendent, must ultimately exceed and elude him.

DAVID KONSTAN
Wesleyan University

2. Shall we also retain the scholiast’s interpretation and treat the verse and a half as an elaborate play on words? I tend to think we should, although I do not feel confident about the matter.

3. *Theocritus*, p. 235.

THE THREE HUNDRED AT THASOS, 411 B.C.

The overthrow in 411 B.C. of democracy and the establishment of the oligarchy of the Four Hundred in Athens were accompanied by simultaneous plots—carried out in conjunction with local collaborators—to set up oligarchies elsewhere in the Athenian empire. The Athenian conspirators apparently reasoned that they could rule oligarchically at home and at the same time preserve the empire by establishing cooperating oligarchies in the allied states (Thuc. 8. 48. 5; cf. 8. 91. 3). Thu-

cydides, our main source for these events, characteristically tells us less than we would like to know about the happenings in allied cities, concentrating instead on the train of events in Athens. The information he does provide, however, is of great interest, especially the brief chronicle of events on Thasos, where the conspirators met with success (8. 64. 2-4).¹ Thucydides says,

They [i.e., the Athenian oligarchic conspirators on Samos] also sent Diitrephes, who had been elected to command in the Thracian district but who was then in the neighborhood of Chios, to his command. When he arrived at Thasos, he overthrew the democracy. Within two months of his departure, however, the Thasians began to wall their city on the grounds that they no longer wanted aristocracy in association with the Athenians and that they were in daily expectation of freedom coming from the Lacedaemonians. They felt this way because a group of Thasians, exiled by the Athenians, were in the Peloponnese and were, in collaboration with their friends in the city, exerting every effort to send ships and effect the revolution of Thasos. Thus these Thasians realized the goal they most desired: the establishment of their state on a proper foundation with no danger and the destruction of the democracy which would have opposed them.²

Thucydides tells us no more about this oligarchy, but we know from other sources that these events triggered a turbulent period in Thasian history when there were violent conflicts within the state. Oligarchy appears to have remained the form of government until 407 B.C., at which time the state was brought back into the Athenian alliance.³ Several inscriptions discovered at Thasos are generally agreed to pertain to this period of oligarchic rule, but their exact place in the history of these years is still unsettled.

The key document is an inscription seen and copied by Cyriacus of Ancona in the fifteenth century and rediscovered by the French excavators of Thasos.⁴ This inscription records a list of the six men, four from Thasos and two from Neapolis on the mainland opposite Thasos, whose property was confiscated and dedicated

1. In addition, Thucydides describes at some length the failure to subvert democracy on Samos (8. 73. 1-6); he tells us that attempts to substitute oligarchy for democracy occurred in an unspecified number of other cities (8. 64. 1, 5); he provides material to render reasonably certain the inference that such attempts succeeded at Andros, Tenos, Karystos, and Aegina (8. 64. 1; 65. 1; 69. 3). Diodorus 13. 47. 8 allows us to add Paros to this list.

2. It should be no cause for concern that Thucydides does not use the word oligarchy to describe the form of government which succeeded the overthrow of democracy. Since he explicitly states (8. 64. 1) that the Athenian oligarchic conspirators planned to establish oligarchies in the subject states, and since Diitrephes' mission was part of this plan, it is certain that an oligarchy was set up at Thasos. That Thucydides calls the type of government rejected by Thasian oligarchs aristocracy indicates that that term had been employed by Diitrephes and his supporters as a propaganda device in order to put the best possible interpretation on the dissolution of democracy (cf. J. Classen and J. Steup [eds.], *Thukydides: Achter Band*³ [Berlin, 1922], ad 8. 64. 3; and A. Fuks, *The Ancestral Constitution* [London, 1953], pp. 11-12). In this regard it is significant that Theramenes, one of the chief oligarchic movers in Athens (Thuc. 8. 68. 4), later used the term aristocracy to describe the oligarchy of the Thirty (Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 47).

3. Xen. *Hell.* 1. 4. 9 and Diod. 13. 72. 1. The reference to Thasos at Xen. *Hell.* 1. 1. 32 appears to be mistaken: see A. Andrewes, "The Generals in the Hellespont, 410-407 B.C.," *JHS* 73 (1953): 7, n. 21 (but for arguments in support of the received text, see F. Chamoux, "L'île de Thasos et son histoire," *REG* 72 [1959]: 355, n. 1). For an account of this period, see R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 574-78.

4. *IG*, 12.8. 263; cf. *IG*, 12, supp., p. 151, and J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, vol. 1: *De la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C.*, Études thasiennes, 3 (Paris, 1954), p. 145 and n. 3, pl. 13, no. 4.

to Apollo "at the behest of the Three Hundred" (κατὰ τὸν ἄδον τῶν τριηκοσίων). One of the proscribed, Apemantus son of Philon, is widely regarded as the same individual whose name appears on an Attic inscription of the early fourth century B.C. as the father of five men who had been granted *proxenia* sometime before the oligarchy of the Thirty in Athens.⁵ The original stele had been destroyed at the time of the Thirty, and the grant was inscribed anew on the extant stone at the expense of one of the sons. Another son, Amytor, almost certainly appears in another document, dated to 390–385 B.C.,⁶ which awards tax benefits to Thasians exiled from their native land for Athenian sympathies.⁷ The confluence of names on these three inscriptions makes it extremely probable that the six men in the first were proscribed for loyalty to Athens and that this event took place during the period of oligarchic rule on Thasos.

Three other Thasian epigraphical documents have been tied to the proscription list because they also refer to groups of three hundred individuals in judicial or administrative contexts. The first, dated much earlier in the fifth century,⁸ mentions a group of three hundred in regard to regulations for the wine industry. The other two, inscribed on the same stone and usually dated late in the fifth century, offer rewards for information about plots against the state. In cases where two informers appear, a jury of three hundred is to render judgment.⁹ J. Pouilloux, on the basis of the four documents mentioning groups of three hundred, has argued that the Three Hundred were the oligarchic instrument of government for the period 411 to 407 and that the oligarchs had at that time looked to their own history for the precedent which they followed in regard to the number of participants in the oligarchy. It has been pointed out, however, that Pouilloux's argument is seriously, perhaps fatally, flawed by the fact that, whereas the list of proscribed refers to *the* Three Hundred, the other three documents refer merely to a three hundred, with no article.¹⁰ The absence of the article breaks the connection which Pouilloux sought to establish between the group which ordered the proscriptions and those mentioned in the other documents, with the result that the regulations about wine become less relevant to our period and the two laws on informers are less securely moored to the period of the oligarchy. We are left, however, with the Three Hundred of the proscription list, which is fairly firmly set in our period. Who were these Three Hundred?

In order to answer this question we must first make certain distinctions which to my knowledge have not been made in regard to the Thasian oligarchy established in 411 B.C. Although our information (primarily Thuc. 8. 64. 2–4) is too sparse to allow the establishment of many details, it permits us to infer that the oligarchy did go through three separate and distinct phases in the first nine months of its

5. *IG*, 2². 6 (= Tod, 2. 98), line 10.

6. *IG*, 2². 33, line 26; for the date, see Chamoux, "L'île de Thasos," p. 358, who argues convincingly against Pouilloux's attempt (*Thasos*, pp. 195–204) to place it earlier.

7. *IG*, 2². 33, lines 6–7: [ἐπ' Ἀ] / τρικισμῶν. Meiggs, *Athenian Empire*, p. 576 (cf. pp. 219, 365) erroneously implies that this phrase appears in *IG*, 12.8. 263.

8. Pouilloux, *Thasos*, pp. 37–40, no. 7. The date is uncertain: cf. Pouilloux, *Thasos*, p. 38, and L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 302–3.

9. Pouilloux, *Thasos*, pp. 139–42, no. 18 (= R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* [Oxford, 1969], no. 83). Pouilloux discusses the historical setting of these laws on pp. 142–62.

10. Chamoux, "L'île de Thasos," pp. 352–54; Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI*, p. 254.

existence.¹¹ The first phase, lasting from one to two months, began when Diitrephes overthrew democracy and helped establish oligarchic government in April 411.¹² During this period the oligarchic government was loyal, ostensibly at least, to Athens or, more precisely, to the Athenian oligarchic planners who were at that time implanting oligarchies in other allied states and who were conspiring to establish an oligarchy in Athens itself. Since the Thasian oligarchy was set up in order to keep the state within the Athenian empire, we may assume that Diitrephes chose as participants in the oligarchy those he thought would remain loyal to Athens. At the same time it is reasonable to suppose that he would have excluded those who were loyal to Athens but hostile to oligarchy. The first phase ended in the second month after Diitrephes' departure.¹³ At this time the Thasians¹⁴ began to wall their city, rejected Athenian control of their oligarchy, and awaited outside help.

At this point, sometime between mid-May and mid-June, the second phase began. During this period the Thasian oligarchs were particularly vulnerable, for, having frankly signaled their rebellious intent by rebuilding their walls, they were open to attack until their walls were completed. Since the old walls probably had not been taken down altogether (Thuc. 1. 101. 3) but had only been breached (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 2. 2. 15 and Lys. 13. 8), this period of extreme danger was relatively brief. But even afterward Thasos remained exposed because it had no ships. Happily for the Thasian oligarchy, the Athenian fleet was occupied elsewhere during this period; and the first indication we have of Athenians in Thasian waters is in the late winter or early spring of 410 (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 1. 12), after the Thasians had received help from their friends abroad. We do not know how different the oligarchic government in the second phase was from that in the first, but there must have been a change in at least one respect. The basis on which the oligarchy was initially established, loyalty to Athens and Athenian oligarchs, was abandoned. This decision must have caused some internal dissension and struggle among the oligarchs set in place by Diitrephes, and it probably resulted in the

11. There may have been other disruptions and phases afterward, but the evidence is very uncertain; see n. 3.

12. I arrive at this date (on which depend the dates for the oligarchy's second phase) by the following process. The oligarchic revolution in Athens took place in Thargelion of Callias' year (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 32. 1–2), that is, in the late spring or early summer—June—of 411. Therefore, Peisander and his fellow envoys must have arrived in Athens toward the end of May to set in motion the final events leading to the establishment of the Four Hundred (cf. G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, vol. 3.2 [Gotha, 1904], p. 1476). Since Peisander and his colleagues set up oligarchies in a number of cities on their way from Samos to Athens (cf. n. 1), I calculate that they left Samos in early April. Diitrephes was dispatched to Thasos at about the same time Peisander left Samos, but went directly and appears to have set about instituting an oligarchic government immediately on his arrival (Thuc. 8. 64. 1–2). Accordingly, the event probably occurred in April.

13. One may assume that Diitrephes left Thasos as soon as the new political system was in place, since his duties extended to the whole Thracian district.

14. I agree with H. W. Pleket, "Thasos and the Popularity of the Athenian Empire," *Historia* 12 (1963): 74–76, that Thucydides is obscure here, seeming to give the impression that he is referring to all the Thasians. But inasmuch as he has already said that democracy was overthrown and mentions two sentences later that the demos was hostile toward those who had rejected Athenian control, it is clear that he means the oligarchic government of Thasos, not the city as a whole. For similar usage in an Athenian official document, see *IG*, 1². 298 (= Meiggs–Lewis, *GHI*, no. 81), recording transactions of the Treasurers of Athena during the oligarchy of the Four Hundred. Though the oligarchs are in charge (lines 2, 14–15), the expenditures are made in the name of Athenians collectively (line 1: if the generally accepted restoration is correct, as I believe it is).

removal from power of those individuals who wished to remain loyal to Athens. But the disruption cannot have been very great because the success of the oligarchs in establishing independence from Athens in the face of a hostile demos argues a high degree of unity among them. For these reasons, I believe that the number of ruling oligarchs during the second phase was reduced because of the loss of Athenian loyalists, but not by a substantial number. Although Thucydides gives us no indication how long this second stage lasted, we do find help elsewhere. The Oxyrhynchus historian tells us (7[2]. 4; cf. schol. Aeschin. 2. 31) that the Corinthian admiral Timolaus brought about the defection of Thasos from the Athenians. It is usually, and probably correctly, assumed that Timolaus commanded the ships raised by Thasian exiles in the Peloponnese that Thucydides mentions. Since the Oxyrhynchus historian was a continuator of Thucydides,¹⁵ an event recounted by him must have taken place after the end of Thucydides' narrative in the late fall of 411 B.C. We cannot be certain when Timolaus arrived at Thasos (except that it was before the events of 396–395 recorded in the London papyrus), but it is very likely that the event took place before the end of the year.¹⁶ The main argument for this position is the vulnerability already mentioned. It seems reasonable to suppose that in this hazardous situation the exiles in the Peloponnese would have pressed hard for the dispatch of help as soon as possible. Timolaus probably left before the advent of bad weather; and, given that he sailed north with only two triremes, it is unlikely that he delayed on the way. We may reasonably assume that the second phase lasted about six months, from, say, early June to about the beginning of December.

The third stage began when Timolaus and the Thasian exiles entered the city, and it lasted, so far as we know, until the recapture of Thasos by the Athenians in 407 B.C. This period would have seen the tightest oligarchic control of the state and probably the bitterest internal conflicts resulting in the miserable situation mentioned by Xenophon (*Hell.* 1. 4. 9). During this time the number of oligarchs participating in the government must have been considerably larger than in the first phase (and—if our arguments are correct—larger than in the second phase). This view is based on the assumption that most, if not all, of the exiled Thasians would have returned home with Timolaus and that they would have participated in the government they had helped put on a firm foundation (cf. Thuc. 8. 64. 4). Though we have no means of assessing the number of returning oligarchs, it seems reasonable to suppose that the group was fairly large, especially if it consisted of all Thasians exiled during the years of Athenian control.

Having distinguished among the three phases of oligarchic government on Thasos, we may now consider the identity of the Three Hundred of *IG*, 12.8. 263. It is my contention that this group constituted the instrument of government in the first phase, but not in the second, when the number of participants was smaller,

15. See I. A. F. Bruce, *An Historical Commentary on the "Hellenica Oxyrhynchia"* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 3–4.

16. Not, however, for the reason often cited (see, e.g., E. Meyer, *Theopompos "Hellenika"* [Halle, 1909], pp. 47–48, n. 2), namely, that the island had a Spartan harmost in 410 B.C. The evidence for this view (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 1. 32) is very doubtful; cf. n. 3.

or in the third, when it was larger.¹⁷ In support of this position there are three main arguments.

First, let us take up the source for the figure three hundred as the number of ruling oligarchs. Pouilloux, as we have seen, sought it in earlier Thasian history, but he was unable to establish the earlier existence of a specific governing body of three hundred, merely the existence of a group of three hundred exercising a judicial or administrative function. A more probable source is near to hand. The Samian conspirators who failed to overthrow democracy on Samos in 411 B.C. numbered three hundred (Thuc. 8. 73. 2, 6), and it is a fair assumption that, had they succeeded, they would have constituted an oligarchy of three hundred. Thucydides does not tell us the origin of this number on Samos, but his narrative makes it abundantly clear that the Athenian oligarchic conspirators played the dominant role in instigating, in planning, and even in attempting to execute the Samian coup d'état (8. 63. 3, 73. 2–5). On the other hand, the Samian magnates who collaborated with the Athenians appear to have had no particular political or emotional bias in favor of oligarchy. Just one year earlier these same individuals had emerged as leaders of the revolution which had overthrown the previous government, probably oligarchic, and established a democracy loyal to Athens (Thuc. 8. 21; cf. *IG*, 1². 101). In view of this and of the need for Peisander and his fellow Athenian conspirators to exhort and persuade the Samians to undertake the coup,¹⁸ it does not seem imprudent to suppose that the figure three hundred arose, not from local Samian conditions or traditions, but from an appraisal by the Athenian oligarchic planners of the figure which would constitute a suitable oligarchy, sufficient to control the situation in Samos and at the same time circumscribed enough to be regulated by the oligarchic government in Athens.¹⁹ Diitrephes himself could not have been party to these negotiations, for he was occupied in Chios at that time (Thuc. 8. 64. 2). It is clear from Thucydides' account, however, that, although the abortive revolution at Samos may have taken place after the establishment of oligarchy in Thasos, the plans were decided upon before Diitrephes left for Thrace. It is also plain that Diitrephes received his instructions about how to proceed on Thasos after the details of the oligarchic revolutions in Samos and other allied cities had been worked out by the Athenian planners (Thuc. 8. 63. 3–64. 2). Under these circumstances it seems reasonable to suggest that Diitrephes' instructions specified the number of Thasians to be included in the newly established oligarchy and that this figure—if the considerations in regard to Thasos were analogous to those operating at Samos—would have been three hundred.

17. One might argue that the ruling body continued to be called the Three Hundred even when the number of participants was larger or smaller than three hundred, on the analogy of the Four Hundred and the Thirty in Athens: both bodies retained their original designations after their numbers had been reduced by death or defection. But would the Thasian oligarchs have wished to preserve the name and number imposed upon them by the Athenians from whom they had revolted?

18. Thuc. 8. 63. 3 *προυτρέψαντο*, 8. 73. 2 *πεισθέντες*.

19. If the government in Samos before the democratic revolution of 412 consisted of six hundred members (Thuc. 8. 21; cf. G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* [London, 1972], p. 42), then the new oligarchy would have been much more restricted—probably at the insistence of the Athenian conspirators.

Second, I believe that we can determine with greater precision than heretofore the date of *IG*, 12.8. 263. The original stele recording the award of *proxenia* to the five sons of Apemantus was destroyed during the rule of the Thirty in 404/403 B.C.²⁰ We cannot be certain why the stele was destroyed or whether such destruction was widespread;²¹ but it is at least possible—perhaps even probable—that, in view of the deep commitment to oligarchic theory and practice on the part of the Thirty,²² the stele in question was pulled down by the oligarchs on doctrinal grounds, that is, because its existence was somehow offensive to oligarchic sentiments and sensibilities.²³ What in this particular inscription gave offense? The answer would seem to be that the persons honored by the Athenian democracy were viewed with hostility by the Thirty. On what grounds? We know nothing about the activities of Apemantus' sons before they were awarded *proxenia*, but it is usually—and in my view correctly—assumed that the sons shared the father's political coloration and that they suffered his fate in 411: confiscation of property and probable exile from Thasos by the Thasian oligarchs. We have seen that there was a significant change in the relationship between Athens and the Thasian oligarchs in the course of the oligarchy: the oligarchs in Thasos were pro-Athenian in the first phase and anti-Athenian in the two succeeding phases. Thus, if Apemantus' property was confiscated and his family exiled in either the second or third phase, we would have indications of their Athenian sympathies but no grounds for animosity against them by the Thirty. For, had Apemantus and his family been punished in the second or third stage, they must, at the least, have acquiesced in the overthrow of democracy and the establishment of oligarchy by

20. *IG*, 2². 6, lines 11–13: ἐπειδὴ καθιέρθη / ἢ στήλη [ἐ]πὶ τῶν τριάκοντ' / α.

21. For a highly uncertain restoration indicating that a second stele suffered the same fate, see *IG*, 2². 9; cf. *IG*, 2². 52.

22. See, e.g., Critias' epitaph, 88 A 13 D.–K. (= schol. Aeschin. 1. 39); and Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 25–26.

23. The possibility that the earlier stele was destroyed accidentally, not deliberately demolished by the Thirty, cannot be ruled out; but the following considerations make it extremely remote. The first decree honoring the sons of Apemantus was in all probability set up on the Acropolis where the extant stone was found (cf. *IG*, 1². 118 [= Meiggs–Lewis, *GHI*, no. 90], lines 20–24 for the practice of placing honorary decrees there). Though the Spartan garrison supporting the Thirty was stationed on the Acropolis (Lys. 12. 94, 13. 46; Isoc. 15. 319; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 37. 2; Plut. *Lys.* 15. 5; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 13–14, 20, 42; Aeschin. 2. 77; and Diod. 14. 4. 3–4), there is no indication that it caused damage there. Furthermore, we know of no warfare or rioting on the Acropolis or in its vicinity during the time of the Thirty. The procession mentioned at Xen. *Hell.* 2. 4. 39 could well have involved considerable commotion and perhaps some accidental damage, but that event took place, strictly speaking, after the rule of the Thirty. Use of the temple on the Acropolis by the Thirty to store confiscated arms (Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 20) suggests that the common citizen might not have had free access to the sanctuary during the Spartan occupation. Thus, there appears to be no basis for violent but accidental destruction. On the other hand, accidental destruction unaccompanied by violence seems highly improbable in view of the durable material on which the document was inscribed. Moreover, since the Acropolis was holy ground, it is unlikely that any private agent would have demolished the stele. The most probable alternative, therefore, seems to be deliberate destruction, carried out at the command of the government in power, the Thirty, perhaps by the Spartan garrison.

The Thirty are said (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 2) to have “taken down” (καθεῖλον) the laws of Ephialtes and Archestratus from the Areopagus. The exact meaning is uncertain: see J. E. Sandys, *Aristotle's “Constitution of Athens”*¹² (London, 1912), ad loc.; A. Fuks, *The Ancestral Constitution*, pp. 22, 77; and J. Day and M. Chambers, *Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962), pp. 128–29. It seems clear, however, that the Thirty had both the power and the will to overthrow official documents of the Athenian state. For the hypothesis that they also erased part of the newly inscribed law code, see A. Fingarette, “A New Look at the Wall of Nikomakhos,” *Hesperia* 40 (1971): 330–35.

Dieitrephe. In that case, the Thirty ought to have deemed the family well disposed to their cause, with the consequence that their animus would remain inexplicable. If, however, the confiscations took place during the first stage of the oligarchy, then Apemantus and his family would have been at odds with the Thasian oligarchs during the pro-Athenian phase. Since the family was honored by the Athenian democracy, it is justifiable to assume that they could not have opposed the pro-Athenian aspect of the new government imposed by Dieitrephe. They must, then, have stood in opposition to the overthrow of democracy and the establishment of oligarchy. It follows that, when the sons were awarded *proxenia* (had the father died before their arrival in Athens?) in the years before the establishment of the Thirty, they were honored not merely because they were friendly to Athens—as indeed they must have been—but more particularly because they had opposed oligarchy and stood loyal to democracy. In this case the Thirty would have had ample grounds for considering the family anathema to the cause of oligarchy and for wishing to destroy the visible monument on the Acropolis to the family's loyalty to democracy—both Thasian and Athenian. The restored democracy, for its part, would also have had cause to renew the honors and to fete Eurypylus, one of the sons, in the Prytaneion. If these arguments are cogent, then the circumstances behind the destruction of the predecessor to *IG*, 1². 6 seem to preclude the possibility that the confiscations recorded in *IG*, 12.8. 263 occurred during the second or third phase of the Thasian oligarchy, with the result that the document must be dated to the first phase. Placing it in the first phase helps to corroborate our contention that the Athenian oligarchs established an oligarchy of three hundred on Thasos, since in this document we see the Three Hundred in action.

Third, Pouilloux has noted that *IG*, 12.8. 263 is written in Attic script (as are other documents dated to this time), whereas the two laws offering rewards to informers are written in the local Parian script.²⁴ This anachronistic recrudescence of localism has been attributed to a "burst of patriotic insularity," and this may well have been the case. But if it is, the relationship developed by Pouilloux between the act of confiscation and the laws about informers seems somewhat odd. Pouilloux believes that the laws were promulgated first and that the confiscations came about as a result of denunciations arising from them. In order to support this position, he is forced to posit a distinction between "more official" documents and other, less official, ones which were not touched by the wave of local pride. But this distinction appears arbitrary in view of the official nature of the act of confiscation, which begins with a list of the three *theoroi* for the year in question.²⁵ A simpler hypothesis is to ascribe the document written in Attic script to the first stage of the oligarchy, when Athenian domination was still recognized. The two laws could then be placed, with Pouilloux, in one of the later phases (most likely the third), when pride of independence from Athens would provide a plausible setting for them. If this line of reasoning is sound, it gives us another indication that *IG*, 12.8. 263 records an action taken in the first month or two of the oligarchy.

Our discussion leads to the following conclusions: that the oligarchy established

24. *Thasos*, pp. 139–47, 440; Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, p. 303.

25. These same magistrates are listed in the official catalog of *theoroi*: *IG*, 12.8. 277, lines 81–83 = Pouilloux, *Thasos*, p. 262, cat. 1, col. 5, lines 26–28. Note, too, that Carl Fredrich, the editor of *IG*. 12.8, places 263 among the decrees of state.

by Dietrephes at Thasos in 411 B.C. consisted of three hundred members, that this number was imposed by Athenian oligarchic planners, that the nature and composition of the oligarchy changed within two months of its inception, and that *IG*, 12.8. 263 is to be dated to the period before the Thasian oligarchs cut their ties with Athens.²⁶

HARRY C. AVERY

University of Pittsburgh

26. I wish to thank two anonymous referees for helpful criticism and comments.

CURUCA AND JUVENAL SATIRE 6

Modern editors of Juvenal adopt the following version at *Satire* 6. 276: "tu tibi tunc, uruca, places fletumque labellis."¹ Manuscripts show two main variants: *uruca* appears in P and its closest kin, *curuca* in the majority of other manuscripts. I propose that *curuca* be restored to the text.² The nature of the variants makes it likely that the original was *tum curuca*. Since scribes tended to change *tum* to *tunc* before a guttural,³ the change from *tum curuca* to *tunc uruca* was an easy step.

The sense of neither *curuca* nor *uruca* is securely established in classical Latin. Scholia attached to both readings indicate that neither word was common and that the scholiasts were not agreed on the meaning of *uruca*, for which three glosses have been provided.⁴ One of these scholiastic interpretations, that *uruca* denotes a worm or caterpillar, has been adopted in most recent translations. This definition of *uruca*, however, has little evident relevance to the poem as a whole or to the section in which the word appears. *Curuca*, on the other hand, is well suited to the imagery of the poem. Its meaning is found in texts of the medieval period, which have the advantage of being consistent and definite. Without citing his sources, Papias (fl. 1053–1063) writes opposite *currucula*: "est avicula: quae alterius filios educat. haec dicitur linosa vel cucula eo quod cuculus dum eius ova sorbeat sua relinquit quae curruca tam diu fovet; donec extracti pulli eam comedant."⁵ Alan of Lille (ca. 1116–1202), whose reputation for extensive learning makes his witness especially valuable, seems not to have been noted previously in discussions of the word. His *Liber de planctu naturae* states: "Illic curruca novercam exuens, materno pietatis ubere, alienam cuculi prolem adoptabat in filium; quae tamen capitali praemiata

I should like to thank Professor G. P. Goold for constructive criticism of an earlier version of this paper.

1. E.g., W. V. Clausen (ed.), *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iunii Iuvenalis "Saturnae"* (Oxford, 1959); A. E. Housman (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis "Saturnae"*² (Cambridge, 1931); U. Knoche (ed.), *D. Iunius Iuvenalis "Saturnae" mit kritischem Apparat* (Munich, 1950).

2. It was removed by O. Jahn (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis "Saturnarum" libri V* (Berlin, 1851), p. 58.

3. Housman, "Saturnae"², p. xxi, n. 1.

4. P. Wessner (ed.), *Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora* (Leipzig, 1931), p. 91; for additional glosses and commentaries on the line, see idem, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, vol. 1, ed. G. Goetz (Leipzig, 1923), p. 389; C. F. Heinrich (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis "Saturnae"*, vol. 2 (Bonn, 1839), pp. 244–46; L. Friedlaender (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis "Saturnarum" libri V*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1895), p. 316.

5. Papias *Vocabulista* (Venice, 1496), p. 83. The definition extends beyond the relevant scholia: Wessner, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 1:389. *Curruca* is a common variation in spelling for *curuca*; the contexts in which the two words appear show that they designate the same species of bird regardless of the spelling.