of the table—while we can.[29] A striking parallel in Archestratus 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 ἑταίροις πατρικῶς συμβουλεύων*) to get their hands on a thresher shark even if they have to die for it. If the fishmonger won't sell, he urges, just steal it and then suffer the consequences (*καῖτα | ὕστερον ἤδη πάσχ' ὅ τί σοι πεπρωμένον ἐστίν*). 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 *faba 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 TROIZEN

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.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

word is not necessarily a trace of 'official and archaic language', as suggested by Lewis,[2] has already been argued by Kennelly in a short note in the *Classical Quarterly* in 1990.[3] Kennelly convincingly shows that μεθίστημι in the sense of banish is commonly used by Demosthenes, Ps.-Demosthenes, and Aeschines, and 'employed in the decree in a manner standard to the fourth century'. Lewis stated that μεθίστημι was used officially for ostracize in the early fifth century B.C. and that ἐξοστρακίζω was not (although the latter is found in Hdt. 8.79.1 ἐξωστρακισμένος),[4] and also that μεθίστημι is attested in sources that 'depend, directly or indirectly, on documents'. Unfortunately, none of the documents that Lewis claims to be underlying the literary sources[5] can be traced back to as early as 480 B.C., and therefore they should rather serve as arguments against the use of μεθίστημι in the sense of ostracize in 480 B.C. I believe we can say for certain that this word is not 'the clearest single piece of evidence for authenticity'.

In lines 45–6 of the inscription we read τοὺς μὲν μεθεστηκότας τὰ [δέκα] ἔτη ἀπιέναι εἰς Σαλαμῖνα, and here the perfect participle μεθεστηκότας must be considered anachronistic for an Athenian decree of the early fifth century B.C., not in the first case because of its meaning, but rather because of its unusual form. Jameson,[6] in the first article published on the inscription, did not comment on this, despite devoting a large section in his article to the recall of the ostracized. The perfect participle of ἵστημι is generally ἑστώς in early Greek, while the κ-perfect participle ἑστηκώς is rather uncommon.[7] Threatte[8] states that in Attic inscriptions the κ-perfect participle is attested for the first time in 408/7 B.C. (*IG* 1^3 476.177 εἱστεκότα). In the fourth century B.C. it is more frequently used in inscriptions, 'but the perfect without κ is certainly still in use even in later Roman times'. Based on this, two things may be argued: (i) the perfect participle μεθεστηκότας was probably not found in an original decree of Themistocles of 480 B.C. engraved on stone; (ii) a modernization (which is the usual way for the defenders of the decree's genuineness to explain the anachronisms of the decree) of a possible μεθεστῶτας in a decree of 480 B.C. to μεθεστηκότας in our decree would not have been necessary since both forms of the participle were used during the third century B.C. when the inscription from Troizen was being fabricated. Finally it

[2] D. M. Lewis, 'Notes on the decree of Themistocles', *CQ* n.s. 11 (1961), 66.

[3] J. Kennelly, 'Archaisms in the Troizen decree', *CQ* n.s. 40 (1990), 539–41.

[4] Lewis (n. 2), 65 on ἐξοστρακίζω: 'It is not used because it is not the official word, perhaps even because it does not yet exist.'

[5] Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 30 (the last Atthidographer [*OCD* s.v.], d. *c.* 260 B.C., in whom, of course depending on how much that really belongs to him, we read both ὁ δὲ ὀστρα[κισμὸς τοιοῦτος], and μεταστῆναι τῆς πόλεως ἔτη δέκα, ὕστερον δὲ ἐγένοντο πέντε and ἐξωστρακίσθη); Schol. Ar. *Knights* 855 (this text has also ἐξοστρακισμοῦ); Arist. *Pol.* 1284a21 (μεθίστασαν but also ὠστράκιζον); Plut. *Them.* 11.1 and *Arist.* 8.1; Aristides 46, p. 248 Dind.

[6] M. Jameson, 'A decree of Themistokles from Troizen', *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 221–2.

[7] Cf. LSJ s.v.: 'ἑστηκώς rare in early Gr.' Aeschylus and Sophocles do not use the κ-perfect participle but only the perfect participle without κ, as a *TLG* search shows, while Euripides uses the κ-perfect participle once in his play *Helena*, dated to 412 B.C. The oldest Attic orator Antiphon uses the feminine participle καθεστηκυῖα once, in a fragment of a speech delivered in 411 B.C. Herodotus occasionally uses the κ-perfect participle, but mostly he uses the Ionic uncontracted forms without κ. Thucydides uses both forms, but mostly the perfect participle without κ. From the last decades of the fifth century B.C. both forms are used.

[8] L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (Berlin and New York, 1996), 2.608 (73.05b). Cf. also K. Meisterhans (*Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften* [Berlin, 1900], 189, §76.8): 'Von den Perfektstämmen ἑστα- und ἑστηκ- ist im V.J. v. Chr. der erstere durch zwei nicht ganz gesicherte Formen ἐνεστᾶσι und προσεστῶτα, der letzere, wenn wir vom Singular absehen, durch eine Form ἑστηκότα vertreten.'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may be added that neither *μεθίστημι* nor *μεθεστηκότας* seem to be found in other Athenian inscriptions down to 403 B.C., at least judged from the indices of *IG* 1^3 (fasc. 3).

Göteborg University MIKAEL JOHANSSON
mikael.johansson@class.gu.se

CYCLOPEA: PHILOXENUS, THEOCRITUS, CALLIMACHUS, BION[1]

The four passages I discuss here are linked by their treatment of the Polyphemus–Galatea story, first introduced to Greek literature by Philoxenus of Cythera, probably in the early fourth century B.C. and certainly before 388, when his dithyrambic *Cyclops* was parodied in Aristophanes' *Wealth*.[2] Subsequent versions of the story, however they develop the theme, all depend wholly or in part on Philoxenus' poem. His dithyramb, unusually for the period, was a humorous piece; other contemporary dithyramb was primarily concerned with heroic narrative.[3] However, the element of romantic fantasy finds parallels in other fourth-century lyric. Somewhat similar seem Licymnius' lyric *Nanis* and the erotic poems (*Calyce*, *Rhadine*, *Daphnis*) attributed to Stesichorus, but in fact almost certainly by his fourth-century namesake, also from Himera and the author of a dithyrambic *Cyclops* (*PMG* 841).[4] Philoxenus' *Cyclops* possibly contained an element of political satire aimed at his patron, the Syracusan tyrant Dionysius; several sources, of doubtful reliability, claim that the three main characters in the love-drama—Polyphemus, Odysseus, Galatea—stood respectively for Dionysius, Philoxenus, and an auletris, also called Galatea. The evidence for this is, however, by no means strong,[5] and the love-story was evidently no more than a sub-plot; Philoxenus largely retained the framework of the familiar Homeric narrative, the character and central role of Odysseus (cf. *PMG* 823–4), and the blinding of Polyphemus (*PMG* 920; *Σ* Ar. *Pl.* 290).

1. Synesius of Cyrene, *Epist*. 121 (Philox. *PMG* 818)

Ἀθανασίωι ὑδρομίκτηι. Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔπειθε τὸν Πολύφημον διαφεῖναι αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ σπηλαίου· "γόης γάρ εἰμι καὶ ἐς καιρὸν ἄν σοι παρείην οὐκ εὐτυχοῦντι τὰ εἰς τὸν θαλάττιον ἔρωτα· ἀλλ' ἐγώ τοι καὶ ἐπωιδὰς οἶδα καὶ καταδέσμους καὶ ἐρωτικὰς κατανάγκας, αἷς οὐκ εἰκὸς ἀντισχεῖν οὐδὲ πρὸς βραχὺ τὴν Γαλάτειν. μόνον ὑπόστηθι σὺ τὴν θύραν ἀποκινῆσαι, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸν θυρεὸν τοῦτον· ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀκρωτήριον εἶναι φαίνεται· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπανήξω σοι θᾶττον ἢ λόγος τὴν παῖδα κατεργασάμενος· τί λέγω κατεργασάμενος; αὐτὴν ἐκείνην ἀποφανῶ σοι δεῦρο πολλαῖς ἴυγξι γενομένην ἀγώγιμον. καὶ δεήσεταί σου καὶ ἀντιβολήσει, σὺ δὲ ἀκκιῆι καὶ κατειρωνεύσηι. ἀτὰρ μεταξύ μέ τι καὶ τοιοῦτον ἔθραξε, μὴ τῶν κωδίων ὁ γράσος ἀηδὴς γένηται κόρηι τρυφώσηι καὶ λουομένηι τῆς ἡμέρας πολλάκις· καλὸν οὖν εἰ πάντα εὐθετήσας ἐκκορήσειάς τε καὶ

[1] The following works are cited by author's name alone: R. Hunter, *Theocritus. A Selection* (Cambridge, 1999); J. H. Hordern, 'The *Cyclops* of Philoxenus', *CQ* 49 (1999), 445–55; G. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988); K. J. Dover, *Theocritus. Select Poems* (London, 1971); A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* (Cambridge, 1952^2).

I am grateful to Ian Repath and *CQ*'s anonymous referee for their comments on this article, and to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for their continued financial support.

[2] Cf. Hordern, 445; A. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes. Wealth* (Warminster, 2001), 1.

[3] Cf. my *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford, 2002), 17ff. (hereafter *Timotheus*).

[4] Licymn. *PMG* 772; Stesich. *PMG* 277–9. Lamynthius' lyric *Lyde* (*PMG* 839) may be another example.

[5] Hordern, 445–8.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.283 Published online by Cambridge University Press