

investigated and elucidated in the last few decades.⁴ Indeed, Aristotle's observation was cited in a specialist journal in 1961, though at second hand,⁵ but I do not think that the three passages have previously been cited together in this connection, and since they may not be familiar to classicists, it seems worth seeking wider publicity for another case in which Aristotle's empirical observations of biology, though apparently bizarre, have been vindicated by modern science.⁶

University of Leeds

ROGER BROCK
r.w.brock@leeds.ac.uk

⁴ Birkhead and Møller (n. 2), esp. 69–81; more recent developments are surveyed in T. R. Birkhead, 'Sperm competition in birds: mechanisms and function', in id. and A. P. Møller (edd.), *Sperm Competition and Sexual Selection* (London, 1998), 579–622, esp. 580, 598–604.

⁵ L. F. Payne and A. J. Kahrs, 'Competitive efficiency of turkey sperm', *Poultry Science* 40 (1961), 1598–1604 refer to 'Aristotle G. A., 2. 3 737 a30' [sic] as quoted by 'U. Aldrovandi (1599–1603) Ornithology [i.e. *Ornithologiae hoc est de avibus historiae*, Bologna] Volume II Book XIV pp. 183–352. Translated from the Latin by L. R. Lind, 1960 (Manuscript in Kansas State University Library); this was subsequently published as L. R. Lind, *Aldrovandi on Chickens* (Norman, 1963), the relevant passage being on pp. 74–5. There is some confusion here: the erroneous citation of Aristotle in Payne and Kahrs (and so presumably in Lind (1960) [non vidī]) is the immediately preceding one in Aldrovandi ('*Lib. 2 de Generat. c. 3*'); this is correctly placed in Lind (1963), but the relevant citation ('*Lib. 1 de Generat. c. 20*') is missing there. Aldrovandi's account of the passage reads: 'longe aliter docet Aristoteles, dum avem quae ovem coitu conceptum gerit, si cum alio mare coierit, simile eius, quocum postea coivit, omne pullorum genus excludere statuit, ideoque nonnullos, qui, ut Gallinae generosae procreentur, operam dant, ita mutatis admissariis facere' (cited from *Ulyssis Aldrovandi Ornithologiae* [Frankfurt, 1610], XIV, 99a11–18, abbreviations resolved; I am grateful to the Bodleian Library for allowing me access to John Locke's copy of the work).

⁶ A similar case concerns reproduction in octopuses (specifically, the transfer of the sperm from male to female through hectocotylization of one of the male's tentacles), which had been confirmed by 1910 (see Platt [n. 1] on *GA* 720b32–6; also J. Barnes, *Aristotle* [Oxford, 1982], 10–11), though here Aristotle disagrees with the fishermen whose correct account he reports.

A PUN IN ANTIPHANES (fr. 225 K-A = ATH. 60C-D)

τὸ δεῖπνόν ἐστι μᾶζα κεχαρακωμένη
ἀχύροις, πρὸς εὐτέλειαν ἐξωπλισμένη,
καὶ βολβὸς εἰς <τις> καὶ παροψίδες τινές,
σόγχος τις ἢ μύκης τις ἢ τοιαῦθ' ἃ δὴ
δίδωσιν ἡμῖν ὁ τόπος ἄθλι' ἀθλίοις.
τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος, ἀπύρετος, φλέγμ' οὐκ ἔχων

οὐδεὶς κρέως παρόντος ἐσθίει θύμον,
οὐδ' οἱ δοκοῦντες πυθαγορίζειν

τίς γὰρ + οἷδ' ἡμῶν τὸ μέλλον ὃ τι παθῆιν
πέπρωθ' ἐκάστωι τῶν φίλων; ταχὺ δὴ λαβὼν
ὅπτα μύκητας πρηνίνοὺς τουσδὶ δύο

Our dinner is barley-cake palissaded with chaff, armed for cheapness, and one bulb and some side-plate dainties: some sow-thistle or a mushroom or the sort of wretched things the locality provides for wretched us. Such is our life, unfevered and uninflamed.

Nobody eats *thymon* when there's meat on the table, not even those who make out that they are Pythagoreans.

For who knows our future and what it has been granted to each of our friends to endure? Quickly then just take these two holm-oak mushrooms and roast them.

The verses printed derive from a discussion of mushrooms in Athenaeus and are cited according to the edition of Kassel and Austin.¹ The breaks between lines 6 and 7 and 8 and 9 indicate scepticism as to the continuity of the fragment. This derives in part from the ancient tradition, for the trimeter quoted by Athenaeus in line 8 is incomplete and the phrase 'and going on' (καὶ προελθών) is interjected before the start of verse 9. The suspicion of discontinuity between lines 6 and 7 is first expressed by Dobree and is shared by Meineke, who therefore prints these lines as three separate fragments.² Kock, by contrast, prints lines 1–8 as one single fragment (fr. 226) and 9–11 as a second (fr. 227). He argues that the speaker of lines 1–6 is a Pythagorean and that lines 7–8 are spoken by a second speaker B who is an opponent of his discipline.³ Edmonds adopts the same solution.⁴ This paper will in turn argue for the presence of at least two speakers but will suggest that they are rather different from those identified by Kock. It will further suggest that, not only are lines 1–8 part of a continuous fragment, but that 9–11, though not a direct continuation from them, derive from the same scene and respond to concerns raised in lines 1–8. A hitherto unnoticed pun will further help clarify the matter.

The first six verses of the passage quoted appear to describe a local community and the miserable diet which they enjoy. The unhappiness is most evident in the line 5 reference to the wretched stuff provided by the neighbourhood for wretched us, but everything else about the food described conforms to this impression. Barley-cake or *maza*, for instance, is a noted staple of the Attic diet, and this particular variety is evidently not the most sophisticated: it is 'armed' for cheapness and is 'palissaded' with chaff.⁵ Quite apart from the explicit reference to the cheapness of the *maza*, the presence of chaff suggests the use of unwinnowed grain, and the metaphor of palissading implies that it will make war on the stomach.⁶ The bulb (*bolbos*) is equated with *thymon*⁷ as a staple of the rural poor by the scholia to Aristophanes, and it is part of the deliberately unluxurious side-dish (*opson*) proposed by Socrates for his ideal virtuous community.⁸ The aristocratic Glaucon, accustomed to the *opson* as a manifestation of culinary refinement, asks whether Socrates would suggest anything different

¹ R. Kassel and C. Austin (edd.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin and New York, 1983–), 2.445–6.

² P. P. Dobree, *Adversaria* (Cambridge, 1831–3), 2.298, cf. A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicarum Graecorum* (Berlin, 1840), 3.133 'Vs. 7. Abhinc manifestum est novam citationem ordiri: separavi igitur a praecedentibus.'

³ T. Kock, *Comicarum Atticorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1884), 2.111.

⁴ J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* (Leiden, 1959), 2.283–4.

⁵ See Arnott at Alex. fr. 145.7 K-A; T. Braun, 'Barley cakes and emmer bread', in J. Wilkins, D. Harvey, and M. Dobson (edd.), *Food in Antiquity* (Exeter, 1995), 25–37, esp. 31–2. Note that Polioch. fr. 2.2 K-A = Ath. 60B–C refers to μᾶζαν ἡχυρωμένην as part of an equally unappetising dinner (see esp. lines 7–8 on drinking οἰνάριον . . . | ἀμφίβολον. The juxtaposition of the two fragments is telling.

⁶ *LSJ* s.v. *χαράκω*. That the metaphor implies a war on the stomach may further be inferred from line 2 ἐξωπισμένη. For this metaphor of arming, cf. Antiph. fr. 216. 19 K-A = Ath. 622F–623C and the reference to a squid ξιφηφόροισι χερσὶν ἐξωπισμένη. See also Olson at Ar. *Pax* 566.

⁷ I have found no clear view in scholarship as to the precise identity of *thymon* and therefore do not hazard a translation. For more, see Olson at Ar. *Pax* 1169; Arnott at Alex. fr. 122.2 K-A; A. Marchiori at Ath. 60D in L. Canfora (ed.), *Ateneo. I Deipnosophisti* (Rome, 2001).

⁸ Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 283, cf. Plat. *Rep.* 372C. See also Archestr. fr. 9. 1 Olson–Sens and the editors' excellent note ad loc.

were he preparing a city of pigs.⁹ The side-plates (*paropsides*) cited here in line 3 must themselves have the same ironic effect as those proposed by Socrates, for their ingredients are far from the most refined:¹⁰ the culinary level of sow-thistle may be inferred from the fact that the humble Hecale makes it part of the meal which she prepares for Theseus, and what recommends the mushroom is that it grows wild and is therefore free.¹¹

The humble character of the dinner and of each of the ingredients suggests an important point of continuity with lines 7–8. For here the speaker claims that nobody eats *thymon* when there is meat on the table, not even those who make out that they are Pythagoreans. It is surely this reference to Pythagoreans which inclined Kock to identify the speaker of lines 1–6 as a member of the sect; the validity of this claim will be tested later on and can for now be passed over. What matters most here is the contrast between meat, which is the stuff of festival at least for the Attic poor, and *thymon*, which is again regarded as typical of their diet. Antiphanes himself represents *thymon* as the very cheapest food;¹² the countrymen summoned in the *Plutus* are addressed by the slave as men who have often eaten the same *thymon* as his master, and the scholia interpret this as meaning that they have often borne the same poverty;¹³ when they themselves observe that they have passed by many roots of *thymon* in order to come as bidden, the obvious contrast is with the poor man's instinct to stop and gather this foodstuff for himself.¹⁴

A further point of continuity may also be observed between lines 1–6 and 9–11. For line 6 closes the catalogue of sorry foodstuffs with the statement that 'Such is our life, unfevered and uninflamed' (τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος, ἀπύρετος, φλέγμα' οὐκ ἔχων). These words appear to allude to the language of Hippocratic medicine and to comment, if with little enthusiasm, on the doctrine that excessive or excessively complicated food will provoke fever.¹⁵ A further resonance may, however, be detectable. For no food is simpler than that eaten raw,¹⁶ and the term employed for uncooked food (*ἄνυρος*) is also commonplace in Hippocratic literature as an alternative form to *ἀπύρετος* mean-

⁹ Plat. *Rep.* 372D. J. N. Davidson, 'Opsophagia. Revolutionary eating at Athens', in Wilkins et al. (n. 5), 204–13, cf. J. N. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes. The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (London, 1997), 3–35 offers a fascinating analysis of *opson* as the necessary but also suspect supplement to *sitos*, i.e. the farinaceous basis of the Attic diet.

¹⁰ See also Lucian, *Fug.* 14 for two types of *opson* contrasted: καὶ τὰ ἄλφιστα οὐκέτ' ὀλίγα οὐδὲ ὡς πρὸ τοῦ μᾶζα ψιλή, τὸ δὲ ὄψον οὐ τάριχος ἢ θύμον, ἀλλὰ κρέα παντοδαπά καὶ οἶνος οἶος ἡδιστος, καὶ χρυσίον παρ' ὅτου ἂν ἐθέλωσι.

¹¹ For sow-thistle, see Callim. *Hec.* fr. 39 Hollis = Pliny, *HN* 22. 88. The statement that the plant is similar to lettuce is perhaps significant in the light of ps.-Virg. *Moret.* 74: *grataque nobilium requies lactuca ciborum*.

¹² Antiph. fr. 166.8 K-A = Ath. 108E-F. See also Men. *Dysc.* 604–6.

¹³ Ar. *Plut.* 253 ὦ πολλὰ δὴ τῷ δεσπότῃ ταῦτόν θύμον φαγόντες, cf. Schol. ad loc. θύμος τὸ ἀγριοκρόμμυον, ὡς δὲ ἄκραν ἀπορίαν χρώνται οἱ πένητες.

¹⁴ Ar. *Plut.* 283 πολλῶν θύμων ρίζας διεκπερώντες, cf. Schol. ad loc. πολλῶν θύμων ρίζας διεκπερώντες τοιοῦτον ἔχει τὸν νοῦν: οἱ τὴν Ἀττικὴν οἰκοῦντες πένητες, ἐπεὶ μὴ εἶχον τὰς ἐκ τῶν σπερμάτων τροφάς, — ἀνεπιτήδειος γὰρ ὁ τόπος εἰς γεωργίαν ἦν, κατάξηρος ὦν —, ἡσθιον θύμους οὓς οἱ κοῦοι βολβοὺς ἢ ἀγριοκρόμμυά φασι. λέγει γοῦν ὁ χορὸς τῶν πενήτων ὅτι ἡμεῖς πολλὰ κοπιάσαντες καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ οὔσης ἀδείας ἡμῶν, ἤλθομεν μετὰ προθυμίας ὧδε, διεκπερώντες, ἀντὶ τοῦ παρορώντες καὶ παρατρέχοντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαν σπουδῆς, καὶ αὐτὰς δὴ τὰς τῶν θύμων ρίζας πολλῶν ὄντων, ἃς ἐξ ἔθους εἴχομεν συλλέγεω.

¹⁵ Hippoc. *Flat.* 6.1, cf. 7.1. For a similar doctrine attributed to Pythagoras, see Diod. Sic. 10.7.1.

¹⁶ See esp. Plut. *Mor.* 349A and the contrast between the basic rations (*ἄνυρα σιτία*) granted to the Athenian fleet and the luxurious diet lavished on the dramatic chorus.

ing 'free from fever' or 'not promoting fever'.¹⁷ One possible inference, therefore, is that line 6 also reflects on the rarity of cooked food in the speaker's unhappy home, and this has important implications for the situation depicted in lines 9–11. For the request in lines 10–11, that the interlocutor take a couple of holm-oak mushrooms and roast them, implies that the latter has access to the very fire which the former claims not to enjoy.

The conclusions drawn above cohere with separate evidence for the identity of the speaker of lines 7–8. For the comic character most closely associated with the fire is, needless to say, the boastful chef, and the words of the speaker of lines 7–8 are almost certainly those of a chef. The claim, that not even a self-styled Pythagorean eats *thymon* if there is meat on the table, is most clearly paralleled in the words of a comic chef in Aristophon, who suggests that Pythagorean dress and diet make a virtue out of the poverty which forces them to live as such and asks to be hanged ten times over if they do not eat even their own fingers should you put a plate of meat or fish before them.¹⁸

The obvious conclusion, therefore, is that these lines all stem from a dialogue between a singularly morose rustic deploring the poverty of his rations and a chef whom he asks to help him cook the mushroom he normally eats raw. Kock is therefore right to identify a new speaker at lines 7–8, but his identification of the speaker of lines 1–6 as a Pythagorean is considerably less secure. For, although lines 7–8 might work as a joshing response to one solemnly professing a doctrinal refusal of meat, the speaker of lines 1–6 has merely lamented his diet and associated it with the deprivation of the region in which he lives. If there is continuity between the lines, then it derives from the second speaker's implication that his unhappy interlocutor would like nothing better than a good plate of meat; for that is so even in the case of self-styled Pythagoreans.¹⁹

One matter remains to be discussed. It has been established that the root *thymon* is commonly consumed by the poor and that it therefore corresponds to all the other foodstuffs listed by the speaker of lines 1–6. For lines 1–8 to make sense as an exchange, therefore, *thymon* must be understood as encapsulating all such poor food: nobody eats stuff *like that* when there is meat on the table. That, at least, must be the case unless we are willing to consider the possible presence of a pun and, in particular, that sort of pun which can cause a degree of discomfort inasmuch as it depends on our readiness to read against the metre.²⁰ For the poor man's root *thymon* is written *θύμον*

¹⁷ Hippoc. *Epid.* 1.1, 1.5, 3.1, etc. G. Maloney and W. Frohn, *Concordantia in Corpus Hippocraticum* (Hildesheim, 1985) cite 54 instances of *ἄπυρος* and 34 of *ἀπύρετος*. Note also Diod. Sic. 10.7.1–2 where the belief of Pythagoras, that excessive complexity of diet is unhealthy, is linked to the injunction to employ *ἀπύροις σιτίοις*.

¹⁸ Aristophon fr. 9 K-A = Ath. 161E–F, esp. line 6 *τῆς εὐτελείας πρόφασιν*, line 7 *ὅρους ἔπρξαν τοῖς πένησι χρήσιμους*, lines 8–10 *ἐπεὶ παράβες αὐτοῖσιν ἰχθύς ἢ κρέας, | κἂν μὴ κατεσθίωσι καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους, | ἐθέλω κρέμασθαι δεκάκις*. See also the chefs at Alex. fr. 178.4–5 K-A and Plaut. *Pseud.* 881–4.

¹⁹ Antiphanes appears to specialize in jokes mocking the culinary deprivation of Pythagoreans. See Antiph. fr. 133 K-A = Ath. 161A, cf. Alex. fr. 223.16–17 K-A with Arnott ad loc.; fr. 158 K-A = Ath. 160F–161A, esp. verse 1 *τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν . . . ἄθλιοι τῶες*; Antiph. fr. 166 K-A = Ath. 108E–F.

²⁰ For such play in Latin, see esp. F. Ahl, *Metaformations. Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Latin Poets* (Cornell, 1985), 54–7. The figure might be described as a form of internal enantiometria, i.e. one in which the term printed brings to mind the alternative sense it might have if scanned differently. For enantiometria proper, see Hom. *Il.* 5.31 = 455 *Ἄρες Ἄρες βροτολογέ, μαιφόνε, τειχεσιπλήτα*, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.44 *clamassent ut litus 'Hyla Hyla' omne sonaret* and the body of material assembled in N. Hopkinson, 'Juxtaposed prosodic variants in

and its first syllable is consequently short. The much more familiar word for the spirit is *θυμός* and it would produce the accusative singular *θυμόν* with a long first syllable.²¹ Understood this way, the sentence emerges as ‘Nobody eats his spirit when there’s meat on the table, not even those who make out that they are Pythagoreans’, and the sense is ‘Nobody is miserable when there’s meat on the table, not even those who make out that they are Pythagoreans.’ Where the speaker of lines 1–6 associates the misery of his life with the scant quality of his victuals, the chef, whose job it is to bring cheer through the preparation of sacrificial meat, offers his own more optimistic commentary on life.

Greek offers a variety of similar expressions associating misery and care with eating up one’s spirit, one’s heart, oneself. At *Iliad* 6.202, Bellerophon is described as eating up his spirit (*ὄν θυμόν κατέδων*) and the same idea recurs at *Odyssey* 9.75 = 10.143 (*θυμόν ἐδοντες*) and at 10.379 (*θυμόν ἐδων*). In the last instance, eating up one’s spirit is coupled with fasting as an expression of lament, and this is also the case with Achilles who eats his heart at *Iliad* 24.129 (*σὴν ἔδεται κραδίην*).²² Such phrases are also common in comedy.²³ More intriguing still—though it is hard to see how the association works in our context—they also have a place in ancient Pythagoreanism and the interpretation of the philosopher’s injunctions regarding diet.²⁴ For while popular belief may associate the movement with strict vegetarianism, other sources regard this as holding only for the most advanced adherents and suggest that those less pure are subject only to the various more specific injunctions that widespread tradition records.²⁵ Prominent in this latter category is the rule which forbids the Pythagorean to eat heart.²⁶ Aristotle may report this entirely literally, but the version which sees it as a warning against dismay is a commonplace in later sources.²⁷

The identification of this play on words also has implications for the speaker of the first sentence in lines 9–10: ‘For who knows our future and what it has been granted to each of our friends to endure?’²⁸ This may not satisfy as a direct continuation of lines 7–8—and good reasons have already been noted for identifying a break between lines 8 and 9—but such reflections on the uncertainty of human destiny are very much at one with the assertion that we should enjoy life’s pleasures—and amongst these those

Greek and Latin poetry’, *Glotta* 60 (1982), 162–77. For the sensitivity of Greek audiences to accentual change even where there is no change in quantity, see Arist. *Soph. El.* 165b23–7, 166b1–9; Ar. *Ran.* 302–4, cf. Sann. fr. 8 K-A and Stratt. fr. 1 and 63 K-A for the mockery heaped on the actor Hegelochos for reciting *γαλήν* instead of *γαλήν’* at Eur. *Or.* 279. Note also Schol. Dem. 18.52 for the claim that the orator deliberately mispronounced *μισθωτός* as *μίσθωτος* in order to induce the jury to call out the correct version.

²¹ The suggestion is not that the eleven perfectly regular iambic trimeters of this fragment are disrupted by the intrusion of a scazon in verse 7. Rather, verse 7 too is an iambic trimeter but one pregnant with the awareness of what it might mean were it able to be a scazon instead.

²² Eust. p. 1342 *ἐσθίεται γάρ τις τὴν καρδίαν ἀχνύων. ἔχει δέ τι καὶ ἀντιθετικὸν ὁ τόπος οὗτος. οἰονεῖ γάρ φησιν ὡς, τί δή ποτε τὴν καρδίαν ὀδυρμοῖς ἐδόμμενος αὐτὸς ἄσπιτος μένει;* cf. Richardson ad loc. and M. Clarke, *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer* (Oxford, 1999), 88, n. 71.

²³ See Starkie at Ar. *Vesp.* 287.

²⁴ See esp. W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, trans. E. L. Minar, Jr (Cambridge, MA, 1972), 174–5, 180–3.

²⁵ For this version, see esp. Iambl. *VP* 107–9.

²⁶ For the specific injunctions, see esp. Arist. fr. 194 Rose = Gell. 4.11.11; Porph. *Plot.* 45; Diog. Laert. 8.19, cf. Ael. *VH* 4. 17.

²⁷ Diog. Laert. 8.17–18; Plut. *Mor.* 12E; Schol. Hom. *Il.* 24.129.

²⁸ The Greek text is problematic inasmuch as line 9 will not scan as printed. The most economical correction appears to be that of A. Meineke, *Analecta Critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Leipzig, 1867), 32, who proposes *τίς γὰρ κάποιδ’ ἡμῶν* in place of *τίς γὰρ + οἷδ’ ἡμῶν*.

of the table—while we can.²⁹ A striking parallel in Arcestratus is particularly suggestive in this context.³⁰ Understood in these terms, the sentence may therefore be attributed to B. Alternatively, the gap between lines 8 and 9 may leave room for a defence of the very Pythagorean vegetarianism mocked in lines 7–8, and the reference to the uncertain destiny of one's friends may recall the Pythagorean devotion to friendship and refusal to eat flesh lest it be the home by metempsychosis to the soul of a friend or relative now deceased.³¹ In this context, a holm-oak mushroom may seem the safe alternative. The speaker here seems unlikely to be identical with either the rustic of 1–6 or the cook of 7–8, but may well be a third character again.

To conclude, this fragment is most likely from a dialogue between a morose rustic A and a more cheerful chef B. A speaks lines 1–6 and B the immediate reply at lines 7–8. B also speaks the first sentence at lines 9–10 and A answers with the second sentence at 10–11. A viable alternative hypothesis for lines 9–11 is that they are spoken by a third character ready to stand up for the Pythagoreans mocked in lines 7–8. The pun on *θύμον/θυμόν* at 7–8 plays on the status of *thymon* as the classic food of the poor and on the clear evidence that the wretched diet and unhappy life of A induces him to eat up his soul.³²

St Anne's College, Oxford

MATTHEW LEIGH
matthew.leigh@st-annes.ox.ac.uk

²⁹ For such commentary as a commonplace of sympotic literature, see Nisbet-Hubbard at Hor. *Carm.* 1.9.13, 1.11 introduction, 1.11.8.

³⁰ Archest. fr. 22 Olson–Sens = Ath. 294F–295A has the speaker urge his companions (τοῖς ἐταίροις πατρικῶς συμβουλευῶν) to get their hands on a threshing machine even if they have to die for it. If the fishmonger won't sell, he urges, just steal it and then suffer the consequences (κατὰ | ὕστερον ἤδη πάσχει ὃ τί σοι πεπωρωμένον ἔσταιν). Olson–Sens ad loc. note the similarity to Antiph. fr. 225.9–10 K–A.

³¹ For Pythagorean friendship, see Diod. Sic. 10.8. For the relationship between metempsychosis and Pythagorean vegetarianism, see Burkert (n. 24), 120–3 and 180–2, who points to Xenoph. DK 21B7 = Diog. Laert. 8.36 and Pythagoras' objection to the beating of a dog on the grounds that he hears in its cries the voice of a dear friend (φίλου ἀνέρος) now dead. Similarly, Sen. *Ep.* 108.19, cf. Tertull. *Apol.* 48 refer to the reluctance to eat meat lest the flesh be home to the spirit of a relative (for similar anxieties regarding beans, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.63 *fabā Pythagorae cognata*; Plin. *HN* 18.118). I owe this suggestion to the *CQ* reader.

³² This note was composed in the course of a period of academic leave made possible by the award of a Philip Leverhulme prize. The final version owes much to the inspiring intervention of Professor Oddone Longo.

SOME NOTES ON *ΜΕΘΙΣΤΗΜΙ* IN THE INSCRIPTION FROM TROIEN

The inscription from Troizen (EM 13330), dated with some uncertainty to the early third century B.C. and falsely claiming to be a genuine decree of Themistocles of the year 480 B.C., is so full of anachronistic features that it is hard to believe that anyone could ever have thought it authentic. I would nevertheless still like to emphasize one of its most overlooked anachronistic features,¹ namely the use of the perfect participle *μεθεστηκότας*. The verb *μεθίστημι*, used in the decree and commonly elsewhere in literature in the sense of banish or ostracize, has been discussed earlier. That the

¹ See my article 'The inscription from Troizen: a decree of Themistocles?', *ZPE* 137 (2001), 69–92, esp. 91–2, for a summary of the arguments against the inscription's authenticity.