

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.

stipendio privignum agnoscens, filium ignorabat.”⁶ Alan’s use of *curuca* in this context gives the reader a clear understanding of the peculiar nature of a bird whose nest was robbed of its young when the cuckoo deceived the owner and left its egg to be hatched and its young to be reared by the *curuca* as its own.⁷ Theodorus of Gaza (ca. 1450), who avers in his preface that he names the various species according to the practice of the best ancient authors, employs *curuca* to translate Aristotle’s *ὑπολαίς*, referring to a bird whose nest the cuckoo invades.⁸ Interest in ornithology during Juvenal’s lifetime is evident from the writings of the elder Pliny.⁹ Latin translations of Greek works on birds are known to have existed in the early Middle Ages and are thought to have been used by Fathers of the Church as the basis for allegorical teachings on faith and morals.¹⁰ Authors of the sixteenth century agree with Alan and Theodorus in their definitions of *curuca*.¹¹

To judge from the content of the poem as a whole, its imagery, and Juvenal’s characteristic style, *curuca* is intrinsically more probable than *urucu* as an address to the groom in line 276. The poet, in a dramatic, last-minute attempt to dissuade Postumus from marrying, insists that his hope of begetting a legitimate son is doomed because of the bride’s infidelity. His view of woman’s basic tendency is disclosed through words and images reflecting her likeness to birds;¹² other birds are explicitly mentioned or are suggested through literary allusion.¹³ Given the prominence of birds in this satire and the meaning of *curuca* consistently attested, *curuca* fits line 276 with admirable point: it is directed to Postumus precisely as a husband allowing himself to be betrayed by an adulterer. Such vivid particularity is characteristic of Juvenal’s diction.

In summary, *curuca* is the common reading of the “interpolated” manuscripts of Juvenal at *Satire* 6. 276. The word is used by Alan and is employed in translations from Greek and in original late Latin works to describe a bird having the characteristics outlined by Alan and attributed to a bird called *ὑπολαίς* by Aristotle and Theophrastus. It is probable that the meaning of *curuca* given in Papias and assumed by writers of the medieval and Renaissance periods is consistent with the meaning of the word in Juvenal’s day. It is likely also that *curuca* had a life independent of Juvenal, thereby making it a vivid addition to a unifying system of

6. *PL*, 210:436C.

7. The existence of such a bird called *ὑπολαίς* by the Greeks is attested by Arist. *HA* 564a2, 618a8; Theophr. *Caus. pl.* 2. 17. 9; Pliny *NH* 10. 11. 26. See also D. W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*² (Oxford, 1936), p. 295. As victim-host the bird bears a general resemblance to the cuckolded husband.

8. *Aristotelis libri omnes, ad animalium cognitionem attinentes*, vol. 6 (Venice, 1562), ad 6. 7 (564a2) and 9. 29 (618a8).

9. *NH* 10; cf. 8. 41, 11. 79, 11. 102, 11. 112, 17. 6, 18. 87, 29. 13, 29. 24–26, 29. 38; see also E. Stresemann, *Ornithology from Aristotle to the Present*, trans. H. and C. Epstein, ed. G. W. Cottrell (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), p. 7.

10. M. Wellman, *Der Physiologus. Eine religionsgeschichtlich-naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*, Philologus, Suppl. 22 (Leipzig, 1930).

11. R. Stephanus, *Dictionarium seu Latinae Linguae Thesaurus* (Paris, 1536), p. 387; W. Turner, *Avium praecipuarum, quarum apud Plinium et Aristotelem mentio est brevis et succincta historia* (Cologne, 1544), D iiiii v; C. Gesner, “*Historiae animalium*” liber III, qui est de avium natura (Zurich, 1555), p. 355.

12. E.g., lines 88, 165, 197–98, 226, 398.

13. E.g., lines 8, 39, 63, 518, 540, 549, 551, 644, and line 6 of the Oxford fragment.

comparison which operates throughout *Satire* 6. For these reasons *curuca* is to be preferred to the reading of P and its kin.

MECHTILDE O'MARA
St. Michael's College,
University of Toronto

POET OR PLATO IN PLUTARCH?

ἔοικε γὰρ ὄντως χαλεπὸν εἶναι φωνὴν ἐχούσῃ πόλει καὶ μοῦσαν ἀπεχθάνεσθαι. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Μίνως ἀεὶ διετέλει κακῶς ἀκούων καὶ λοιδορούμενος ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς θεάτροις κτλ.

[Plut. *Thes.* 16. 3]

Lindskog and Ziegler in their Teubner edition pose a question here: “φωνήν—μοῦσαν ex aliquo poeta petitum?” Scholars have recognized that in this passage Plutarch has in mind the *Minos*, one of the spurious dialogues in the Platonic corpus; see 320D–321B, especially 320E: . . . μηδέποτε ἀπεχθάνεσθαι ἀνδρὶ ποιητικῷ μηδενί. οἱ γὰρ ποιηταὶ μέγα δύνανται εἰς δόξαν . . . ἢ εὐλογοῦντες ἢ κακηγοροῦντες. ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐξήμαρτεν ὁ Μίνως. In 321A tragedy is mentioned: ἐν ᾗ δὲ καὶ ἐντείνοντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Μίνων τιμωρούμεθα (Socrates is the speaker).

Nothing in the *Minos* can be the source of φωνήν ἐχούσῃ πόλει καὶ μοῦσαν. The collocation φωνή . . . καὶ μοῦσα is, in fact, an unusual and elevated one, and it is proof of a certain *Stilgefühl* to have perceived this.¹ But the language is borrowed, not from a lost work of poetry, but from Plato. At *Laws* 667A we read: . . . ἔχομεν μοῦσαν τῆς τῶν χορῶν καλλίῳ καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς θεάτροις. . . . There is a twofold correspondence: ἔχομεν μοῦσαν answers to Plutarch's ἐχούσῃ . . . μοῦσαν, and ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς θεάτροις to ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς θεάτροις. (The change from κοινοῖς to Ἀττικοῖς was necessitated by the change of context; Plutarch, in contrast to Plato, had to refer specifically to the Athenian theater.) These two correspondences, of themselves, are perhaps not decisive. What clinches the case is that in this same passage of the *Laws*—and apparently nowhere else—we find the same collocation of φωνή and μοῦσα: ποίαν δὲ ἡσοῦσιν² οἱ ἄνδρες φωνήν ἢ μοῦσαν; (666D). This gives us a tantalizing glimpse of Plutarch the stylist at work; he has here blended together phrases from the *Minos* and the *Laws*. Ἀπεχθάνεσθαι comes from the *Minos*, but in place of ἀνδρὶ ποιητικῷ (*Minos*) Plutarch substitutes φωνήν ἐχούσῃ πόλει καὶ μοῦσαν. The latter phrase contains elements taken from two separate sentences in the same passage of the *Laws* (666D, 667A). In Plutarch's next sentence, ἐν τοῖς . . . θεάτροις comes from one of the same two sentences (667A).

The story does not end here. At *Laws* 666D the unusual combination φωνήν ἢ μοῦσαν has troubled scholars. Burnet placed a full stop after φωνήν and began a new sentence with ἢ μοῦσαν [ᾗ] κτλ.; England took a similar approach. Wilamowitz went so far as to delete φωνήν ἢ μοῦσαν as “zwei Ergänzungsversuche.” I have dis-

1. Whether Lindskog or Ziegler made this observation is unclear. The title page of the 1969 edition states that “. . . recensuit Konrat Ziegler, . . .,” whereas the 1914 edition reads “. . . recensuit Cl. Lindskog. . . .” It was more probably Lindskog who remarked, “ex aliquo poeta petitum?” but it cannot be absolutely excluded that his fellow editor Ziegler made the suggestion to him.

2. ἡσοῦσιν Porson, Cobet: αἰσοῦσιν MSS. The future active of ᾔδω is a barbarism in Attic Greek. See my *Studies in Greek Texts*, Hypomnemata, vol. 43 (Göttingen, 1975), pp. 140–42.