



*DICCIONARIO  
GRIEGO-ESPAÑOL*



III a.C.

**Galeomyomachia** (*Galeom.*)

Schibli, H.S., «Fragments of a weasel and mouse war», *ZPE* 53, 1983, pp. 13 (cit. por lín).

Schibli 1983.pdf

---



ZPE LIII 1983

1

# FRAGMENTS OF A WEASEL AND MOUSE WAR<sup>\*)</sup>

P.Mich.Inv.6946  
II-I cent. B.C.

Main fr. 30.8 x 26.5 cm.  
Fr. a 1 x 2 cm.  
Fr. b 3.5 x 1.8 cm  
Fr. c 2 x 2.4 cm  
Fr. d 3.2 x 2.2 cm.

Fr. e 10.5 x 5 cm.  
Fr. f 10.5 x 5.5 cm.  
Fr. g 3 x 1 cm.  
Fr. h 2 x 1 cm.  
Fr. i 2 x 1 cm.

Fayum  
Plate I-IV

P.Mich.inv.6946, dissolved from cartonage by M. Fackelmann, is written in a regular book-hand of second to first cent. B.C. (cf. P.Köln III 126 [pl. I in *Collect. Papyr. in Honour of H.C. Youtie I*], Apollodoros, I B.C. and P.Laur. III 56, epos [?], I B.C. - I A.D.). Writing runs parallel to the fibers. As the papyrus is a palimpsest, irregular remnants of the old writing impede the decipherment of the present writing. Parts of the upper (4.8 cm.) and lower (3.8 cm.) margins are extant, leaving 22.2 cm. for the height of the written column; its width is  $\pm$  13.5 cm. The intercolumnium of coll. i and ii varies between .8 and 1.7 cm.; on fr. a (if correctly placed) 1 cm. of the intercolumnium preceding col. i is extant. There is a kollesis 12 cm. measured from the left edge of line 6. Col. i contains 31 lines (including line 9 which was added later by the same scribe). Col. ii has 29 lines; this number appears as a stichometric subtotal ( $\times\theta$ ) on the lower left margin of the column.<sup>1)</sup> In front of line 40 of col. ii a stichometric  $\Delta = 400$  (see note ad loc.) indicates col. i began with line 361; accordingly, about 12 columns of the beginning of the roll or, at least, of the present poem are lost. Fr. e, line 3, might be either line 100 (stichometric A) or 1100 (A; see note ad loc.);<sup>2)</sup> fr. f, line 4, is marked as line 900 (I). Consequently, our col. ii may have been followed by some 17 or even 24 columns (if we assume A in fr. e), bringing the total to more than 31 or 38 columns respectively. A horizontal stroke between lines 41 and 42 is either a paragraphos marking the end of a section or a pointer indicating the line to which stichometric  $\Delta$  originally belonged (i.e., line 41, before line 9 was inserted in col. i; see note to lines 41-42). The line-beginnings of col. ii swerve increasingly to the left (Maas' Law), and meter requires that the same be assumed for col. i. My indications of missing letters at the beginning of col. i take this fact into account; however, the precise number of missing letters here remains uncertain. No punctuation, breathings, accents, apostrophes, tremata, or other diacritical signs are used. Corrections appear in lines 7, 9, 25, 40 (stichometric sign); 7  $\alpha\lambda\omicron\chi\omega$  and 56  $\mu\omicron\delta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$  remained uncorrected; iota adscript is omitted in 12  $\delta\eta\mu\omega$  and in 59  $\eta\delta\eta$  ( $\eta\delta\eta$ ). Certain letters and combinations of letters are equivocal without

\*) This papyrus was presented to the American Society of Papyrologists at the APA Convention in Philadelphia, Dec. 29, 1982. To the participants in that session, especially M. Haslam, Al. Oikonomides, and Fr.R. Schoder, goes my heartfelt thanks for their unanimous welcome of this piece as a mock-epic poem. I would also like to thank the students of Prof. Ludwig Koenen's papyrology seminar to whom I showed this most recalcitrant papyrus in Nov. 1982 and from whom I received much encouragement in return. Prior to publication I sent photographs and transcripts to several scholars here and abroad; the attention of Profs. W. Burkert, M. Haslam, H. Lloyd-Jones, W. Luppe, M. Marcovich, R. Merkelbach, and M.L. West has been greatly appreciated and their suggestions, where new, acknowledged in the notes. In other cases their remarks have caused me to revise readings I had at one time entertained but in my uncertainty discarded. Finally, I cannot thank Prof. Koenen sufficiently. To mention the days and nights he spent with me over the papyrus only indicates a small proportion of the debt I owe him; it has become impossible to single out individual readings and suggestions and to assign them to his name.

1) See E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1971) 19; K. Ohly, *Stichometrische Untersuchungen* (Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen Beih. 61, 1928) 90-91.

2) 1100 lines would fairly reach the limit for a papyrus roll, Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin 1982) 291ff., gives a range of 700-1100 lines for papyrus rolls of poetry; see also 440ff. For Homeric papyri two or three books on one roll was very much the maximum; F.G. Kenyon, *Paleography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1899) 122, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford<sup>2</sup> 1951) 65. P. Lit. London 27, containing books  $\Upsilon$  and  $\Omega$ , reaches c. 1700 lines, see W. Lameere, *Aperçus de Paléographie Homérique* (Brussels-Amsterdam 1960) 168; J. v. Sickle, *Arethusa* 13.1 (1980) 7. Not even near approximations to this number are found in the Homeric papyri studied by S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Cologne and Opladen 1967) and N.E. Priest, *ZPE* 46 (1982) 51ff.

recognition of the context; for example, α's and λ's or α's and ν's look almost identical.

The back contains a list of persons and payments grouped under villages of the Themistes division of the Arsinoe nome, thus allowing us to establish the Fayum as provenance of this papyrus. No date is extant.

Fr. g wrongly appears on the photograph as lines 36-39 of col. ii.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1. Content and General Characterization

The papyrus is a portion of a mock-epic poem about the conflict between mice and a weasel.<sup>3)</sup> The point at which we enter the narrative (see commentary for details) we meet the two enemies pitted against each other: the weasel (2, γαλήν) and the mouse-hero, Trixos (3). The name of the mouse, Τρίξος, is probably a humorous derivation from τριζω (stem τριγ-), the shrill, squeaky sound uttered, among other animals, by mice.<sup>4)</sup> Trixos, or "Squeaky," fights as a *promachos* warrior, thus earning a reputation of excellence among the mice (4). But, as we are told in mock-pathetic tones, the fatherland would not welcome Trixos again, for the weasel catches him up by the waist (!) and devours him (5-6). His wife, with both cheeks torn, had been left at home (7). This verse is lifted almost entirely from the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (B 700; see note *ad loc.*). In Homer it describes with poignant effect the newly-wedded and now forsaken wife of Protesilaos and his δόμος ἡμιτελής (701). To depict a mouse as a deserted wife who has torn both of her cheeks in grief is the epitome of parody. A taunt may also be intended at the popular developments of the Protesilaos and Laodameia story. The fate of Protesilaos and his wife formed part of the Epic Cycle, furnished the subject for Euripides' *Protesilaos*, and enticed Roman poets well into the Augustan Age.<sup>5)</sup> But beyond its immediate humorous effect, the Homeric quotation casts Trixos in the role of Protesilaos,

3) The surviving fragment points only to a single weasel (lines 2, 6, 10?, 25?, 54), yet the poem as a whole may have dealt with an army of weasels, as in the Egyptian cat and mouse war and the Aesopic fable (see below, pp. 8-9). The weasel (γαλήν/γαλή), wild and domestic, was the traditional enemy of the mice: Aesop 50 Hsr. = 50 Perry = 76 Ch. (first ed.), Babr. 32; 182 Hsr. = 172 Perry = 252 Ch.; 212 Hsr. = 197 Perry = 290 Ch.; 293 Perry, cf. Babr. 27; Babr. 135; Ar. *Vesp.* 1182, Pax 795; Arist. *HA* 580b26; Thphr. fr. 174,7; Ael. *NA* 9,41; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen u. Haustiere* (Berlin 1911) 463ff., W. Marg, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 152f. See further, notes 23 and 30 below.

4) E.g., Batr. 88, Arat. 1132, Babr. 108. 23, Ael. *NA* 7,8 (of both mice and weasels).

5) Homer does not name the wife of Protesilaos nor the Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ, B 701, who killed the hero as he sprang from the ship. Traditionally, the wife was Laodameia and the slayer Hektor. According to Pausanias, however, the wife's name in the *Kypria* was Polydora. The sources for the Protesilaos story: Apollod. *Epit.* 3, 29ff.; Paus. 4.2.7 (Kinkel, p. 28, Allen *Kypr.* 18); Proklos *Chrest.* (Kinkel, p. 14, Allen, p. 104f.); E. Protesilaos Nauck<sup>2</sup> p. 563; Schol. Arist. p. 671 and Hyginus *Fab.* 103, 104 (both quoted in Nauck<sup>2</sup> p. 563); Schol. *Lykophr.* 529 (fr. 457 Nauck<sup>2</sup> = 497 Radt, cf. Tzetzes in *Lykophr.* 245); Cat. 68, 73ff.; Prop. 1.19, 7-12; Ovid *Her.* 13, Servius *ad Aen.* 6.447; Lukian *dial. mort.* 77 (OCT); Quint. *Smyr.* 1.231, 816-18, 4.469, 7.408-411; Tzetzes *Chiliades* 2.759ff., *Antehomerica* 221ff.; Eustath. *Il.* p. 325ff., Od. p. 1697; Philostr. *Her. passim*. For discussion of pictorial evidence, see K. Fittschen, *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagenarstellungen bei den Griechen* (Berlin 1969) 47f.

the first of the Greeks to fight and die on Trojan shores. Next, Trixos' wife is shown frantically turning in circles in her "little-nibble chamber" which can only be a mousehole (8-9). Apparently, she leaves her hole and voices among the other mice her complaint about the painful deeds of the weasel (10). A messenger (either a mouse or Hermes, see on lines 11-12) arrives on swift feet. Although his message is prefaced by the common Homeric formula of "winged words," it is delivered with the dramatic abruptness of Euripidean tragedy: "He has died, blameless Trixos has, in battle!" (13-14). Trixos' widow receives the dire announcement about her husband with groaning and pulling of her hair, though the messenger (?) admonishes her to control herself and heed his advice (? , see notes to 15-18). While the other gods feast on lofty Mt. Olympus, Hermes makes his way to a *trapēda*, a vessel or plank on which figs were set out to dry; here mice, being fig-eaters, would naturally congregate (19-20). Indeed the mice regroup for their military expedition in a nearby vineyard, probably right under Hermes' eyes (21-24a). The marshalling scene is witnessed by the weasel who fears that the great conflict between itself and the mice for the victory will break out anew (24b-29). An illegible line follows that may mark the close of the weasel's soliloquy (30). The column ends with someone (the weasel?) coming to (or even entering) the trunk of an olive tree.

Col. ii, after an extensive interval of missing lines, presents an assembly of field mice, some of them seemingly from Sparta and Pylos (51-54). In the missing portion, other contingents of mice may have been listed. It appears that the Homeric Catalogue of Ships was parodically turned into a catalogue of mice in the assembly (for verbal allusions see on line 51), which in itself would be a mockery of the Greek assembly in B. A certain outstanding mouse, perhaps Myleus by name, who is filled with ancient wisdom like Nestor, speaks among them his fatherly lore. Only a few words of his speech survive (55-60).

From this sketchy picture definite epic patterns emerge: a messenger report of the death of a hero, mourning, a *Götterapparat*, the marshalling of troops, a soliloquy, an assembly, a speech by an old and respected figure.<sup>6)</sup> The particular allusion to Protesilaos helps to specify many of these elements within the structure of the poem. As Trixos represents a Protesilaos-figure, the mice in general will have played the role of Greeks and the weasel(s) that of Trojans. This is borne out when we are told that Trixos did not return to his fatherland, the country where his wife had been left at home, and underscored by the mouse-contingents from Sparta and Pylos, among whom an aged mouse acts much like Nestor among the Achaian chieftains. Consequently, the mice are the

6) Cf. W. Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin 1933) 54ff., 116ff. On the imitation of such scenes in the *Batrachomyomachia*, see H. Wölke, *Untersuchungen zur Batrachomyomachie* (Beitr. z. kl. Philol. 100, Meisenheim 1978) 132ff.

aggressors fighting on foreign territory; in the Egyptian Cat and Mouse War the mice are likewise the assailants (see below, p. 8).

Hermes seems to have been especially concerned for the mice; his role may have been much like Athena's in her patronage of the Greeks before Troy. Hermes' involvement with the mice may stem in part from his capacity as the god of thieves; mice were notorious little thieves (cf. Kall. fr. 177).<sup>7)</sup> Finally, if we may strain the Protesilaos allusion a bit further, an allusion to one of the first incidents of the Trojan War, there may be good reason to suppose that some of the c. 360 lines (see above, p. 1) preceding our narrative dealt with the events which brought about the weasel and mouse war. Here the poet could have drawn on the *Kypria* and other *antehomeric* material. But that remains speculation.

## 2. Language

The language throughout the poem is largely Homeric (see parallels in app.), even to the extent of whole-line formulas to introduce speeches (lines 13 and 58).<sup>8)</sup> Some words and expressions, however, are not found in Homer. *ἐδέξατο*, line 5, is not used in Homer with a country as subject. In line 6, the compound *διέβρυξεν* is a hapax. For *αἰμύλα*, line 8, Homer uses *αἰμύλιος*, and only in the phrase *αἰμυλίουσι λόγουσι*. In line 20 we have *τρακίην*, but in line 24 *τρατιῶν*; unless it is a scribal error, we would again expect the Ionic form. Also, *τρακιά* as well as *τρατιᾶ* do not occur in Homer.<sup>9)</sup> *π' ὅ' οὐδέξατο θυμῷ*, in the next line, is not quite a Homeric expression.<sup>10)</sup> *ἄρ[α]*, line 26, as interrogative particle, is almost wholly restricted to Attic (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 44). *συνελέχθεν ὁλλεῖς*, in the same line, sounds formulaic - observe also epic -εν for -ησαν (Schwyzer I 758) - but the aorist passive of *συλλέγω* does not appear in Homer.<sup>11)</sup> *ὁλλεῖς*, though, occurs frequently, but never contracted and hence never at line-end.<sup>12)</sup> Turning to col. ii, we note the word *πλύνθους*, line 52, which is foreign to both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The adjective *ἀρουραῖος*, line 53, is not found in Homer, neither the dative plural of *πεδῖον*. *ἄρτιος*, line 56, is used by Homer only in neuter plural. *ἐν ἔπρεπε*, line 57, is not Homeric; Homer prefers *πρέπω* with adverbial *μετά*, *ἐπί*, prepo-

7) The gods care especially for those who exemplify their own traits; cf. the delight of Athena, goddess of skill and cunning, in the shrewd and inventive Odysseus, v 287ff.

8) The *Batrach.*, in contrast, employs Homeric half-line formulas and never devotes an entire line to introduce a speech, see Wölke (n. 6, above) 168f.

9) Only the city name *Στρατίνη* occurs, B 606 (in Arcadia? cf. Strabo, 8.8, 2).

10) Instead of *προσελέξατο* (cf. Apoll. Rh. 4.833, Theok. 1.92, and Hesiod parallel in app.), Homer is wont to use *προσεῖπον* (cf. J. LaRoche, *Homerische Studien* [Wien 1861] 212ff.), also with *θυμῶν*; see further, note to line 25.

11) Homer uses only the middle (e.g., Σ 413, β 292). Herodotos, on the other hand, uses *συνελέχθη*, for example, 20 times.

12) The Homeric expression most equivalent to the one in the papyrus is *ὁλλεῖς ἡγερέθοντο*, Ψ 233 (*ἡγερέθοντο* occurs in the papyrus as well, col. ii, l. 54); see also app.

sitional δὲ, or simply μετατρέπω. On the other hand, on a structural level, a very deliberate modelling after Homer may be observed in lines 55-58:

55 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Μυ[.]εὺς ὅς [..]....[  
 ἦν γὰρ τ' οὐδὲ πόδε<ς>σιν ἔτ' ἀρτίος ἀλλὰ [..]ο[.]  
 τοῖσι δ' ἐν ἔπρεπε πᾶσι παλαιὰ τε π[ο]λλὰ τε εἰδώς·  
 ὁ σφιν εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ [μετέειπεν·]

In the Odyssey a speech by Halitherses is introduced as follows (β 157-160):

157 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε γέρων ἦρως Ἀλιθέρης  
 Μαστορίδης· ὁ γὰρ οἷος δηλίκην ἐκέκαστο  
 ὄρνιθας γυνῶναι καὶ ἐναΐσιμα μυθήσασθαι  
 ὁ σφιν εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε·

In both cases, formulaic τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε(ν) is followed by the name of the old speaker; the relative clause of the papyrus, however, is not paralleled in the Homeric formula. The speech does not immediately begin, for first two lines intervene devoted to the speaker's abilities and wisdom; this justification for his speaking is marked by γὰρ. The speech is then finally introduced by the ὁ σφιν εὐφρονέων formula.<sup>13)</sup>

### 3. Meter

The meter of the poem is somewhat rough but does not evidence any marked aberrations from the conventional hexameter.<sup>14)</sup> In lines sufficiently reconstructable for metrical analysis (about 27 lines), we find that each line has a masculine or feminine caesura (B caesurae) and two secondary caesurae, one in the first (A caesura) and the other in the second half (C caesura) of the line (for exceptions, see n. 16c); first and third caesurae are occasionally postponed. Bucolic diaeresis is frequent (10 times).<sup>15)</sup> The caesurae of certain

13) Also of Halitherses, in a three-line sequence, ω 451-53: τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε γέρων ἦρως Ἀλιθέρης / Μαστορίδης· ὁ γὰρ ὄρα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω / ὁ σφιν εὐφρονέων κτλ. More frequent than τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε in this construction is ... τοῖσι δὲ καὶ ἀνέστη / with a various number of lines intervening before ὁ σφιν εὐφρονέων κτλ., but in these instances, too, the speakers are wise and older men: A 68-73, B 76-78, H 365-67, β 224-28, of Kalchas, Nestor, Priam, and Mentor respectively. Cf. similar patterns in A 247-253, B 278-283, H 324-26 (= I 93-95), O 281-85, Σ 249-253, η 155-58, π 394-99.

14) Understandably, observations based on such a modicum of lines cannot be indicative of the poem's consistent metrical pattern.

15) I give here, as far as is possible, the caesurae for these 27 lines (excluding the Homeric formulas, lines 13, 58). The breakdown into four cola separated by A, B, and C caesurae follows H. Fränkel's system, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1955) 100ff.:

col. 1, line	4: masc. caes.	A4(?) B1 C-2
	5: fem. caes. & buc. diaer.	A4 B2 C2
	6: fem. caes.	A-1 B2 C1
	7: masc. caes.	A3 B1 C1
	8: masc. caes. & buc. diaer.	A3(?) B1 C2
	9: masc. caes. & buc. diaer.	A4 B1 C2
	10: masc. caes. (?)	A-1(?) B1(?) C-2
	11: fem. caes.	A3 B2 C1
	14: fem. caes. & buc. diaer.	A-2 B2 C2

lines do not meet the standards of Kallimachean poetry, but then we hardly expect that a mock-epic poet, whose intention it was to approximate the language of the Homeric poems, would adopt the Alexandrian changes in the hexameter (the same applies to the poet of the *Batrachomyomachia*). In fact, the relatively frequent occurrence of a long eighth element before the bucolic diaeresis exaggerates epic practice and could reflect an intentional refusal of Kallimachean metrics.<sup>16)</sup> Epic correction is numerous (7, 8, 9, 23, 25, 26, 29, 53, 54, 59).<sup>17)</sup> [τρωγυδίωι, line 8, is a bit cumbersome as it requires both synizesis and epic correction, though it might be meant humorously.<sup>18)</sup> Hiatus occurs in line 7 between οἴκοι' and ἐλέλειπτο, where it is also found

15: fem. caes. & buc. diaer.	A4 B2 C2
18: fem. caes. & buc. diaer.	? B2 C2
19: fem. caes.	A1 B2 C1
20: masc. caes.	A2 B1 C1
22: masc. caes.	A4? B1?
23: fem. caes.(?) & buc. diaer.(?)	A-1(?) B2(?) C2(?)
24: masc. caes.(?) & buc. diaer.	A2(?) B1 C2
25: masc. caes.	? B1 C1
26: fem. caes.	A4 B2 C1
27: masc. caes.	A4 B1 C1
col.ii, line 51: fem. caes.	A4 B2 C1
52: masc. caes.	A3 B1 C-1
53: masc. caes.	A1 B1 C1
54: fem. caes.	A3 B2 C1
55: fem. caes.	A3 B2 C1
56: fem. caes. & buc. diaer.	A3 B2 C2
57: fem. caes. & buc. diaer.	A2 B2 C2
59: fem. caes.	A4 B2 C1

16) Against Kallimachean practice (references to Wölke indicate the same "violations" in the *Batrach.*):

a) Word-end in the same line after both seventh and ninth element is not avoided in lines 6 and 7; see P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, transl. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford 1962) § 97. In Fränkel's schema (*op. cit.*, 130f.), the less harmonious C1 caesura is compensated by having a long word of five or six morae follow or one that extends even to the end of the line. Cf. Wölke, 73.

b) In line 14 word-end comes after long fourth and long eighth element, in lines 15 and 18 after long eighth element; Maas § 92. Thus a spondee precedes the bucolic diaeresis in three out of ten cases (see n. 15, above). In Homer, preceding spondees are eight times as frequent as dactyls (Maas § 84), though, of course, the frequency varies in different passages (the lower ratio computed by H.N. Porter, *YCS* 12 [1951] 61, table XIX, derives from treating words as semantic units rather than as *Wortbilder*; he counts, for example, enclitics and prepositions as separate units; Porter, 9, 37f.). All three cases of diaeresis after the fourth spondee in the new poem are preceded by a feminine caesura (cf. Wölke, 72f.); in lines 14 and 15 the diaeresis is created by the words ἀμύμων and παρειαῖς which occur in the same position in Homer (see app.). - The spondee of the second foot of line 14 also ignores Giseke's law (τέθνηκεν-δῆ; Maas § 94).

c) Lines 4, 10, and 52 have a masculine caesura but lack a secondary caesura after the seventh or eighth element (ἐμ-μύε[σ]σιν, line 4, sim. line 10, and εἰς-ὄρ[ο]φῆ[ν] are *Wortbilder*); Maas § 93. According to Fränkel (130), the postponement of the C caesura comes only after a B2 caesura, while a B1 caesura is always followed by a caesura in C1 or C2. Cf. Wölke, 73.

d) In line 19, punctuation occurs after the first element (after ἦ δ'; in hexameters, Kallimachos uses ἦ καὶ [h. iv. 153, 228 and fr. 197.47] and ἦ θεός [fr. 75.38]); Maas, § 98.

17) And again, relatively rare in Kallimachos; see Maas, § 129.

18) Cf. Σ 458 πτεῖ ἐμῷ ἀκυμόρω; thereto, LaRoche, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1869) 282f.

in the Homeric counterpart after Φυλάκη. With the substituted οἰκοῖ' digamma is observed (as frequently in Homer, cf. Δ 18, Z 189, I 147, Ψ 229). The same line has Attic correption in ἀμφιδρομή, which also in the Homeric parallel is one of the few instances where the mute-liquid combination δρ within a word does not make a preceding longum (LaRoche [n. 18, above] 7). In line 3, δε or λε before Τριῖς will probably have been a breve, not unusual in Homer (LaRoche, 36f.). δειβουξεν, however, in line 6, besides being a hapax, departs from the Homeric practice which treats syllables before βρ long.<sup>19)</sup> Hermann's Bridge is respected in all legible verses.

#### 4. Date

Although the preceding gleanings of a linguistic and metrical nature do not fix the poem's date, they nonetheless point to a poet not unskilled in adapting the diction, formulaic language, and meter of epic poetry for the composition of a parody.<sup>20)</sup> But to satirize Homer is not the sole intention of this beast epic, for it also entails a delight in miniature worlds, a love of allusions, and a fondness for displays of wit. If these characteristics may still be regarded as particularly Hellenistic, it will not be unreasonable to call the mock-heroic Weasel and Mouse War a post-classical creation.<sup>21)</sup> Significantly, the only other extant poem of the same genre, the *Batrachomyomachia*, is also Hellenistic (see below, n. 37), and may be even later than our Weasel-Mouse War (see next section).

#### 5. Animal Epics in Antiquity

Meagre as the papyrus may be, it helps fill a lacuna in our knowledge about animal epics in antiquity. While we may read the entire *Battle of Frogs and Mice*, we have only the titles of the *Battle of Spiders*, the *Battle of Starlings*, and the *Battle of Cranes*,<sup>22)</sup> and no report of an epic poem, in classical or Hellenistic Greece, about a battle between weasels (or cats)<sup>23)</sup> and mice - a *Galeomyomachia*.

19) Except for words in -βροτος; see LaRoche (n. 18, above) 6f.

20) See Wölke, 178ff. ("Antike Eposparodie"). For remnants of epic parodies see P. Brandt, *Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae* I (Leipzig 1888).

21) Similarly G.S. Kirk about the *Batrach.*, YCS 20 (1966) 161. A good example of Hellenistic playfulness and ingenuity is Kallimachos "Mousetrap" fragment (177P), in which the bothersome little mice are subtly compared to the Nemean lion; see E. Livrea ZPE 34 (1979) 37-42, *Maia* 32 (1980) 225ff. But in cases where neither poet nor date is certain, the divisions between classical and Hellenistic poetry may often be inconsistent and arbitrary; cf. K.J. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems* (Glasgow 1971) lxviff.

22) Ps. Hdt. Vit. Hom. 24 (Allen, p. 207), Suda 3.526.6, 527.28 Adler (Allen, p. 259). Whether or not the *Geranomachia* actually existed is not certain; it may have been an invention based on the fight of pygmies and cranes alluded to in Homer [ 3ff.; see Wölke (n. 6, above) 99f., M.L. West, HSCP 73 (1969) 124, n. 36. In Ps. Hdt. and Suda 3.527, these animal epics are ascribed to Homer and, along with other supposed works of his, summarized as παύνια; cf. Wölke, 176, M. Forderer, *Zum Homerischen Margites* (Amsterdam 1960) 8.

23) Cats may have been known in Greece from the fifth century onwards, but weasels continued for a long time to be regarded the common mouse-catchers (cf. n. 3, above, and n. 30,



Of course, the enmity between the two species was proverbial and the subject of fable; it can be traced back to the cat and mouse war in ancient Egypt. Among the great variety of animal depictions on three picture papyri from the 19th and 20th dynasty (1350-1040), one scene from the Turin papyrus illustrates particularly well this favorite motif of battling cats and mice: a host of mice, some armed with bows and arrows, others carrying shields and lances, besiege a fortress of cats. A war-chariot drawn by dogs carries the mouse-pharaoh. One mouse is scaling a storm ladder, while another seems to be breaking down the portal of the fortress. The cats on top of the castle have their paws raised in capitulation. This scene of a citadel of cats beleaguered by mice also appears on ostraka of the same period.<sup>24)</sup> Although the genre of Egyptian animal stories on the whole - whether fairy tale, satire, or humorous - is difficult to determine, since no written texts exist that could accompany the pictures (Brunner-Traut, *Altägypt. Tiergesch.* [see n. 24] 21), the old-Egyptian cat and mouse war may be best characterized as pure animal humoresque.<sup>25)</sup>

That Egyptian motifs influenced Greek tales of a cat and mouse war, with

below) and therefore also tolerated about the house, cf. S. Benton, *CR* 19 (1969) 260ff., H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women* (Park Ridge, New Jersey 1975) 76f. The γαλή οἰκογενής of Aesop 261 Hsr. boasts in Babrios' version (135): καὶ μ' ἐνδον ἔτεκεν μωκτόνος μήτηρ; cf. Phaedr. 1,22, Ael. NA 11, 19.

24) R. Lepsius, *Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums* (Leipzig 1842) pl. 23; E. Brunner-Traut, *ZaES* 80 (1955) 19f. and pl. 3; Brunner-Traut, *Altägyptische Tiergeschichte und Fabel* (Darmstadt 1968) 2ff., 7-8; H. Kenner, *Das Phänomen der verkehrten Welt in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Klagenfurt 1970) 50-53; J. Vandier d' Abbadie, *Catalogue des Ostraka figures* (Cairo 1937-1946) no. 2304 (pl. 39), no. 2305 (pl. 44), no. 2727 (? pl. 94); S. Curto, *La Satira Nell' Antico Egitto* (Quaderno n. 1 Museo Egizio di Torino 1968) fig. 11. See also Brunner-Traut in *Neues Handbuch d. Literaturwissenschaft I* (Wiesbaden 1978) 33.

The Turin papyrus further includes separate scenes of a pleading cat (?) behind a chariot and a duel between cat (?) and mouse (?) - the duel is definitely attested on ostraka. An individual combat between cat and mouse, this time under supervision of an eagle, appears on a terra-cotta relief from Hellenistic-Roman Egypt: Brunner-Traut, *Altägypt. Tiergesch.* 7; Kenner, *op. cit.* 30, pl. 11, Curto, *La Satira*, pl. 11. The London and Cairo papyri, a temple-relief from the 25th dynasty (7-8th cent.), as well as a number of ostraka, present different depictions of a lady mouse attended upon in various ways (grooming, fanning, serving, etc.) by cats. Possibly these scenes also belong to the same motif of cat and mouse war, as Brunner-Traut believes (one would have to assume then that the cats had been captured and enslaved after battle); see Brunner-Traut, *ZaES* (1955) 19ff., 25, *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 4f., 7f.; *Die altägyptischen Scherbenbilder* (Wiesbaden 1956) 94-97; Curto, *La Satira*, fig. 13; Kenner, *op. cit.*, 53ff.; W. Stevenson-Smith, *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt (The Pelican History of Art, Hammondsworth 1958) 235f.*

25) Brunner-Traut, *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 32. As to the old-Egyptian animal stories in general, Brunner-Traut has argued that they were humorously developed *Tiermärchen*, against the previously prevailing view of them as satires (hence the label "satirical" often prefixed to the papyri from Turin, London, and Cairo); see *ZaES* (1955) 26ff. and esp. *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 21ff. H. Kenner, *Phänomen d. verkehrten Welt*, 57ff., on the other hand, denies that humor in the ancient world was ever simply harmless, and sees the Egyptian animal stories as expression of the inversed world-order and role-reversal by which the populace sought to content itself (cf. M. Pieper, *Die ägyptische Literatur [Hdb. d. Literaturgesch.]* 1927] 84. A sensible and cautious discussion of the problem, in reference to the cat and mouse war specifically, is given by Wölke, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 6, above) Anhang II, 250-56.

the weasel substituting for the Egyptian cat (cf. n. 23, above; Schmid-Stählin I 669, n. 2), is possible, although the idea of such a war may have arisen quite naturally, without dependence on other sources.<sup>26)</sup> All sorts of animal wars occur in Greek fairy tales and fables (see Wölke [n. 6, above] 103). Within this tradition, whatever its origins, we find then the fable of Aesop that begins: *μυὶ καὶ γαλαῖς πόλεμος ἦν.*<sup>27)</sup> The mice, so the fable goes, always being overcome by the weasels, decided in council that their defeats were due to lack of leadership. The generals, elected as a result, wished to be more distinguished than the others and therefore affixed horns to their heads. In battle, however, when routed by the enemy, the generals unlike the other mice were not able to slip into their mouseholes because of those cumbersome horns. Consequently, they were devoured by the weasels. The moral: vainglory is often disastrous.<sup>28)</sup> Most likely this fable predates the collection of Aesopic fables by Demetrios of Phaleron in the fourth century B.C. (Diog. Laert. 5.80-81) and belongs to oral tradition.<sup>29)</sup> Weasel and mouse stories were in fact told in the nurseries of fifth century Athens. In Aristophanes' *Wasps* Philokleon says (1181-82):

ἐγὼ δα τοῖνον τῶν γε πάνυ κατ' οἰκίαν  
ἐκεῖνον ὥς "ὁ οὕτω ποτ' ἦν μῦς καὶ γαλῆ."

And Bdelykleon responds (1184):

μῦς καὶ γαλαῖς μέλλεις λέγειν ἐν ἀνδράσιν;<sup>30)</sup>

26) S. Morenz, *Festschr. B. Schweitzer* (Stuttgart 1954) 87ff., considered that the Egyptian cat and mouse war influenced the *Batrach.*, but his arguments are to a large extent much more applicable to the Aesopic fable of the weasel and mouse war (and possibly now, the *Galeomymachia*); Wölke, *Untersuchungen* (n. 6, above) 101-103, M.L. West, *HSCP* 73 (1969) 125. Not a few Greek fairy tales and fables may have had Egyptian sources, see Brunner-Traut, *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 164f., 176, F.W. v. Bissing, "Eudoxos von Knidos," *Forschungen u. Fortschritte* 19/20 (1949) 225ff., esp. 229. On Egyptian parallels to Archilochos' fable of the eagle and fox, see M. Treu, *Archilochos*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1979) 230ff.

27) 174 Hsr. = 165 Perry = 239 Ch.; Babr. 31, Phaedr. 4, 6. On Greek fable, Aesop, and the Aesopic fable, see Schmid-Stählin I 667ff.; W. Wienert, *Die Typen der griechisch-römischen Fabel* (F.F. Comm. 56; Helsinki 1925); B.E. Perry, *Aesopica* I (Urbana 1952) and his article "Fable," *Studium Generale* 12 (1959) 17-37; K. Meuli, "Herkunft und Wesen der Fabel," *Gesamm. Schr. II* (Basel 1975) 731-756; T. Karodagli, *Fabel und Ainos, Studien zur griechischen Fabel* (Beitr. z. kl. Philol. 135; Königstein, Taunus 1981).

28) Other versions of the fable elaborate upon the martial/epic scenario. Thus in 174 Hsr. (Ib) we are told that the mice had spears and chariots taken from the chaff heap (ἐξ ἀχυρών). Babrios (31) describes the nobility and prowess of the mouse-generals, who proceed to divide the mice into "clans, companies, and phalanxes." We find here also the interesting touch of an individual mouse challenging a weasel in order to renew the conflict.

29) According to B.E. Perry, *TAPA* 93 (1962) 325ff., a fable found in Phaedrus and Babrios, who both profess indebtedness to an "Aesop book," will stem from their common source - in all likelihood the famous collection of Demetrios; the weasel-mouse war occurs in both Phaedrus and Babrios. It is also included in the Augustan recension, the oldest extant collection of fables ascribed to Aesop; Perry, *ibid.* 228, 346, cf. P. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Heft 4: *Demetrios von Phaleron* (Basel 1949) 67f.

30) Cf. Schmid-Stählin I 677, n. 1; O. Keller, *Jhb. kl. Philol. Suppl.* 4 (1862) 381. On οὕτω ποτ' as a reference to fable, see scholia and D.M. MacDowell's commentary (Oxford 1971) ad loc.; Wölke, *Untersuchungen*, 107f.; cf. W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos* (Wiesbaden 1960) 48, n. 1. That Aristophanes has in mind the Aesopic fable of the weasel and mouse war is

The *Batrachomyomachia*<sup>31)</sup> repeatedly presents the weasel as the common enemy of the mice. Psicharpax, in the first line after the prooemium, receives what undoubtedly seemed a fitting introduction for a mouse (9):

μῦς ποτε διψαλέος γαλέης κίνδυνον ἀλύξας.

Psicharpax' father, Troxartes, lamenting the death of his three sons, describes the fate of the first one (113-14):

καὶ τὸν μὲν πρῶτον γε κατέκτανεν ἀρπάξας  
ἐχθιστος γαλέη, τρώγλης ἐκτοσθεν ἐλοῦσα.<sup>32)</sup>

Among the armor of the rodent army it is amusing to find breastplates made of the skin of a weasel the mice themselves had flayed (127-28):

θώρηκας... / οὗς γαλέην δέλραντες ... ἐποίησαν.<sup>33)</sup>

The skinning of the enemy weasel is akin to the stripping off and then wearing the enemy's armor in epic poetry.<sup>34)</sup> This line with its martial associations has been taken as an allusion to the fable material (cf. West, *HSCP* [1969] 125). If a reminiscence is intended, and not simply a joke, it is now much more probable that it harks back to the mock-heroic *Galeomyomachia*, in which the mice defeated a weasel. For the mice in their role as Greeks (see above, p. 3) may have ultimately been victorious over the "Trojan" weasel(s). In the Egyptian

possible but not determinable from the short reference (cf. Wölke, 103, n. 18, Perry TAPA [1962] 328). The precarious relation between weasel and mouse was to become common-place, cf. Aesop 50 Hsr. = 50 Perry = 76 Ch., Babr. 32; 356 Ch. (aliter) = Babr. 135; 182 Hsr. = 172 Perry = 252 Ch.; 293 Perry, Babr. 27, Phaedr. 1.22; 435 Perry; 511 Perry = Phaedr. 4.2, 10-19 (cf. Babr. 17; A. Hausrath, *Hermes* 71 [1936] 78f.).

31) See Wölke's *Untersuchungen* (E. Degani, *Gnomon* 54 [1982] 617-620). Still indispensable is A. Ludwig, *Die Homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase* (Leipzig 1896). See also H. Ahldorn, *Pseudo-Homer, Der Froschmäusekrieg. Theodoros Prodromos, Der Katzenmäusekrieg* (Berlin 1968; Greek text with translation). Full bibliography in Wölke.

32) O<sup>2</sup> (Allen = Z Ludwig), the oldest ms. of the *Batrach.*, has three blank lines after l. 112, two of which have been filled in by a Byzantine scribe (see Allen's app. crit.). The verses given above, however, stand in other mss.; most of these, though, omit γε. On the text-critical problems, see Wölke, *Untersuchungen*, 15-17.

33) The weasel figures significantly in another section (42-52) of the *Batrach.*, which however has been rightly suspected as a Byzantine interpolation; cf. Allen's text; Wölke, 40, n. 112; H. Hunger, *Der Byz. Katz-Mäusekrieg* (Graz 1968) 58. The verses bristle with metrical difficulties and are certainly intrusive where they stand in Psicharpax' account of his diet; it is hard to see how Ludwig, even after his extensive revisions, could consider them quite old (335ff.). Nonetheless, the lines about the weasel (48-49, 51-52) could easily reflect an older source; they illustrate once again the weasel's repute as the foremost enemy of "mousedom":

ἀλλὰ δὴ μάλα πάντα τὰ δείδια πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν  
κίρκον καὶ γαλέην, οἷ μοι μέγα πένθος ἄγουσιν  
...  
πλεῖστον δὲ γαλέην περιδείδια, ἥ τις ἀρίστη,  
ἥ καὶ τραγλοδύνοντα κατὰ τρώγλην ἐρεΐνει.

34) In the Coan epic, the *Meropis* (P.Köln III 126; now also in H. Lloyd-Jones' and P.J. Parsons' *Suppl. Hellenisticum* [nondum vidi]), Athena kills the enemy of Herkules, the giant Asteros, and then flays him; his skin becomes Athena's aegis. Flaying one's opponent and putting on his skin is an old rite, signifying, among other things, that one is thereupon imbued with the enemy's strength. See L. Koenen, *Stud. Papyrol.* 15 (1976) 45ff., *Collectanea Papyrologica* (see above, n. 1) 16ff.; cf. A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 27 (1977) 69ff.

picture papyri, too, the mice overcome the cats,<sup>35)</sup> and in the *Batrach.* the mice worst the frogs (until the intervention of *dei ex machina* - the crabs). The other two references to weasels in the *Batrach.* (9, 113f.), however, do not appear to allude to military encounters between weasels and mice, but rather to the general threat of the weasel under which the mice always lived.<sup>36)</sup>

The question arises in what relation the *Batrach.* stood to the *Galeomyomachia*, both of which may be considered Hellenistic poems.<sup>37)</sup> The passages about weasels in the *Batrach.* are not themselves sufficient to establish the priority of the *Galeomyomachia* (though the line about the flayed weasel could point in that direction). Nonetheless, one would expect a mock-epic poem about the battle of mice with their traditional enemies to precede a poem of the same genre that describes their heroic conflict with frogs.<sup>38)</sup> The *Batrach.* is a step further towards hilarious absurdity, perhaps even designed to surpass the more customary story (or stories) of a weasel and mouse war. In any event, it is within this tradition of the enmity between weasels and mice, with perhaps the Egyptian cat and mouse war hovering in the background, that the *Galeomyomachia* was composed.<sup>39)</sup>

The battle of weasels and mice continued to be popular in various forms throughout the centuries. The Roman fabulist Phaedrus (1st cent. A.D.), in giving his version of the fable, reports that it was pictured in all the tav-

35) Possibly the victory of the mice was only a temporary feature in the Egyptian cat and mouse war, as Brunner-Traut suggests on the basis of later Oriental versions, *ZDMG* (1954) 348f., *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 29ff.

36) On line 9 of the *Batrach.* (Μῦς ... γαλήτης κίνδυνον ἀλύξας), cf. Wölke, 109, n. 1. *Batrach.* 113-14, the weasel's capture of Troxartes' eldest son outside his mousehole, reminds one, albeit remotely, of the generals in the Aesopic fable who were unable to enter their mouseholes and therefore devoured by the weasels.

37) On the dating of the *Batrach.* as Hellenistic, see most recently and comprehensively, Wölke, 46-70; cf. Degani, *Gnomon* (1982) 618. Wölke's discussion of the prooemium (lines 1-8), 59f., 61, n. 63, 84ff., 108f., seems to me a good argument against L.J. Bliquez' thesis, *TAPA* 107 [1977] 11-25, that the *Batrach.* was performed among parody competitions at the Greater Panatheneia in the last quarter of the 5th century; also see Wölke, furtheron, 183 and K. Dowden, *CR* 30 [1980] 136. A. Dihle, *Griech. Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart 1967) 39 dates the *Batrachomyomachia* to the 5th cent., and A. Lesky, *Gesch. d. griech. Literatur* (Bern and München<sup>3</sup> 1971) 111, n. 3, to the middle of the 6th cent.

38) Cf. West, *HSCP* (1969) 125, Wölke, 101. Alexander's reference to the battle at Megalopolis in 331 B.C. as a *μυομαχία* (Plut. *Agesil.* 15) cannot be specified as an allusion either to the *Batrach.* (so, for ex., Ludwig [n. 31, above] 12) or to the Battle of the Mice and the Weasels (so O. Crusius, *Philol.* 58 [1899] 581, cf. West, *HSCP* [1969] 123, n. 35). It is safest to take *myomachia* here as simply meaning a battle of a trivial and diminutive sort; cf. Wölke, 58.

39) Unfortunately, the papyrus fragment has nothing that could link it directly to an Aesopic fable, nor, conversely, do the fables about weasels and mice tell of a specific incident that might have served as the starting point for the mini-epic, as the frog and mouse fable (302 Hsr.) for the *Batrach.* (see Wölke, 91ff.). On the whole, however, the animal battles and animal warriors of beast-fables, fairy tales, and Egyptian picture stories, can easily be imagined as having supplied the mock-epic poet with the idea of an animal war which he could adapt and expand for his Homeric parody.

erns (4.6.1-2; see Schanz-Hosius II 454, n. 1):

Cum victi mures mustelarum exercitu

(historia, quot sunt, in tabernis pingitur)...

A late Coptic mural (7-8th cent.) shows a delegation of mice approaching a grim-looking cat; with banner and tributes (?) the mice appear to be asking for a truce or for mercy.<sup>40)</sup> In the 12th century Theodoros Prodromos wrote a poem in iambic trimeters, the *Katomyomachia*, a parody of classical Greek drama coupled with political satire.<sup>41)</sup> In it the mouse-hero Kreillos, weary of being banished to his mousehole under constant threat of the cat, marshals an army of mice for open combat with the enemy. The cat wreaks terrible havoc upon the mice until it is killed by a falling roof beam - the *deus ex machina* of the poem. In large part the *Katomyomachia* is patterned after the *Batrach.* (Hunger [n. 41, above] 40ff.). Kreillos and another mouse, Tyrokleptes, in their war deliberations even explicitly refer to that former battle against the frogs:

Τυρ. οὐκ οἶσθα, πῶς τὸν πρὶν συνιστῶντες μόθον  
πρὸς τὸ στράτευμα τῶν γαλῶν καὶ βατράχων,  
καὶ συμμάχων κράτιστον εἶχομεν νέφος;

Κρ. ἔσημι, πῶς κἀκίστον εἶδομεν μόρον  
παίδων, ὁμεύων, γνωρίζων, φυτοσπόρων·  
μικροῦ δ' ἀπωλώλειμεν ἡμεῖς τῷ τότε. (71-76)

(text continued on next page)

40) Brunner-Traut, *ZAeS* 80 (1955) 20, *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 6, S. Curto, *La Satira* (above, n. 24) fig. 16. See further, Brunner-Traut, *Neues Hdb. d. Literaturwissenschaft* I 39, *ZDMG* 104 (1954) 347-351, and *Altägypt. Tiergesch.*, 29ff.

41) Ed. H. Hunger, *Der Byzantinische Katz-Mäuse-Krieg* (Graz-Wien-Köln 1968); see also Ahlborn (n. 31, above).

## II a) Diplomatic Text

### col. i

+ ]ε.εικο[.].....[.....].ν.εσ  
]..τι..λησεστ[.]..[  
[.]..[.]..[.]...[.]ωιπ..μαχιζε.ετ[.]ιδετριξος  
4 [.]δησα[.]ακτ[.]ενετ..μυ[.].....το.  
[.]λλουμιν..λιναυτ..εδεξατοπατρισαρουρα  
πρωτονγαρμιν..ουσα..αλημεσσονδιεβ.υξεν  
τουδεκαιαμφιδρυψηκαλοχωιοικωιελελειπτο  
8 [.]ω.ι.ιωιενθαλαμωιφρεσιναιμυλαπολλειδουια

col. i 3 προμάχιζεν, cf. Γ 16, Υ 376 4 γ]ένετ' ἐμ μύε[σ]σιν ἀριστος, cf. *Batr.* 143  
ἐν βατράχοισιν ἀριστῆς γεγάτε 5 μιν πάλιν αὐτίς, as in B 276; cf. Ε 356 πατρίς ἄρου-  
ρα, at line-end, α 407, κ 29, υ ]93 6 πρῶτον γάρ μιν, Δ 480 μέσσον, cf. Υ 413, 486  
7 B 700 8 ἐν θαλάμῳ, 5x II. (Γ 382, 391, Δ 143, Z 321, 336), 1x Od. (p 506), and al-

Here Tyrokleptes also mentions a battle against "the army of the weasels," yet the *Batrach.* entailed no such conflict.<sup>42)</sup> Kreillos' reply, moreover, is strictly speaking more applicable to the weasel and mouse war of fable in which the mice were always being worsted;<sup>43)</sup> in the *Batrach.* the mice were actually winning, until subdued, not by the frogs, but by the crabs sent from Zeus. But more than the resonance of Greek fable may be involved in this passage. Given the unambiguous allusion to the *Batrach.*, the parallel reference to the army of weasels, whom the mice fought with a host of allies, carries a distinct tone. One wonders if it is not a late echo of the *Galeomyomachia* (see also note to line 14).<sup>44)</sup>

42) Hunger, 41, calls the reference to battle against the weasels "eine auffällige Ungenauigkeit," which, however, he attributes not to Theodoros' negligence but rather to Tyrokleptes' deliberate boastfulness. The hyperbolic style of the mouse-heroes is supposedly reflected not only in the accumulation of enemies but also in the great mass of allies. Nevertheless, the reference to the army of weasels, next to the specific allusion to the *Batrach.*, seems to me to hint at more than general braggadocio. There is nothing extraordinarily boastful, moreover, in συμμάχων κράτιστον ... νέφος (Hunger's translation exaggerates: "Mitstreiter wie der Sand am Meer;" Ahlborn [n. 31] is more precise: "sehr großen Haufen von Bundesgenossen"). The phrase is used for its epic connotations, cf. νέφος πελῶν, Δ 274, Ψ 133; Τρώων νέφος, Π 66 (also πολέμοιο νέφος, P 243). The vainglory of the mice is to be seen in their magnificent epic diction and not so much in their exaggerations.

43) In the *Galeomyomachia*, as far as we can tell from this fragment, the mice also seem to be in straits about the victory (cf. n. on 23); a mouse-hero dies in battle and causes his wife grief (3, 7-9). The painful loss of friends and kin, emphasized by Kreillos in the *Katom.*, is then an important element in both poems (cf. *Katom.*, 247ff., the grief of Mrs. Kreillos for her slain son - the prime intent here is, of course, parody of drama). The *Batrach.*, on the other hand, does not make much of the death of loved ones in the melee. Although Psicharpax' drowning distresses his father greatly, it was an accidental death and not the result of battle.

44) Furthermore, in lines 214-15, the "new expedition" (νέαν στρατηγίαν) against the cats may well imply an "old war" against the weasels.

## II b) Restored Text

col. i

[ε νεῖκο[ε] ... ως[ε] [.....] οντες  
[αντι γαλῆς εστ[ε] [.....]  
[.....] επ[ε] ωι προμάχισεν ετ[ε] [.....] ιδε Τρῆχος  
4 [.....] δησα[ε] [.....] ακτη[ε] γλένετ' ἐμ μύε[ε] [.....] αριςτος.  
[ἀ]λλ' οὐ μιν πάλιν αὖτις ἐδέξατο πατρίε δρουρα.  
πρωτον γάρ μιν ἐλοῦσα γαλῆ μέεσον διέβρουεν.  
τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδρυφῆς ἀλοχος οἶκο'ι' ἐλέλειπτο  
8 [τρ]ωγιδῶι ἐν θαλάμωι φρεσὶν αἰμόλα πόλλ' εἰδυῖα

ways in second metron αἰμόλα, cf. Hes. *Erga* 374 αἰμόλα κατῖλλουσα; in the phrase αἰμόλοισι λόγοισι, Hes. *Th.* 890, cf. *Erga* 78, 789. Homer α 56, h. *Herm.* 317, and Theogn. 704 use αἰμόλιος αἰμόλα πόλλ' εἰδυῖα, cf. at line-end ἔργα ἰδυῖαν (Ψ 263, sim. I 128, 270, T 245); κέδν' εἰδυῖα(ν), h. *Dem.* 195 = 202, sim. h. *Apoll.* 313, h. *Aphr.* 44; κέδν' ἰδυῖη, h. *Aphr.* 134

'[...] εωνοσθ[.]γατ[.] καιελισσετοπολλα[.]τ[...]  
 [.]μην[.]τα[.]λης[...].μυες[...].ωνει  
 [.....]δαγγελοςηλθεθεωνποσικαρπαλιμοισι  
 12 fr.a '[.]'[.....]ησοσεν[.]εμ[.....][.....]ενιδημω  
 και[.]νφωνησασεπεαπτερ[.]νταπροσρη[  
 [.....]ηκενδητριξο[.]αμυμ[.....]πολεμ[.....]  
 [.....]στεναχουσαπαρειαστ[.....]τ[.]χα[.....]  
 16 [.....][.....]ποσιναφ[.....][.....]  
 fr.b '[.]'[.....]επηζευγνυκα[.....]απο[.]μ[.....]ν  
 [.....]ν[.....]ειρεχαλινουσειςφ[.....]νασας  
 [.....]οιμ[.....]δαινυντοθεοικατα[.....]κρονολυμπον fr.c  
 20 [.....]επιτρ[.]σιν[.....]ενκν[.....]ιοσερμης  
 [.....]ων[.....]ωνκα[.....]ενεξεγεν[.....]  
 [.....]ρ[.....]αγρουσταφ[.....]καναπαντ[.....]  
 [.....]ων[.....]λιποντ[.....]εουαι[.....]ακυνηγεν  
 24 [.....]επιστρατιαν[.....]δεισιδεναιψα[.....]  
 [.....]λη[.....]αι[.....]π'οσελεξατοθυμ[.....]  
 [.....]τιποταρ[.....]υνελεχθεναολλεις  
 [.....]μηδαυπολ[.....]ουμεγανεικοςαεξη[.....]  
 28 [.....]οροιςιμυσιν[.....]ιπερινικης  
 [.....]δ[.....]καιεγωγενθ[.....]εμ[.....]αιητορ  
 [.....]χ[.....]μενηςφον[.....]λη[.....]  
 [.....]χ[.....]ει[.....]ηλθεμεγ[.....]αδου[.....]πυθμενελαιης

col. ii

→  
 c.[  
 φ.[  
 34 π[  
 η[  
 .[  
 [.  
 38 [.  
 [.  
 Δ c.[  
 π.[  
 42 οι[  
 τω[  
 ..[

9 πολλάκι τ' ἔξω, πολλάκι in same position Batr. 89 and Quint. Sm. 4.583; ἔξω at line-end K 94, P 265, Ω 247, Ψ 138 10 ἔμ μύεσσι γέγωνει, cf. Quint. Sm. 3.427 Αἴας δ' ἐν πρώτοισι μέγα στενάχων ἐγγέγωνει and M 337 with γέγωνεῖν at line-end 11 ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεων, see note ad loc. ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισι, at line-end Π 342, h. Herm. 225, Quint. Sm. 4.556, 7.126 12 ἐνὶ δῆμῳ, at line-end Σ 295, T 324, α 237, β 317, 366, λ 353, υ 210 ψ 118, ω 284

- '[...]ζεωνος θ[υ]γάτηρ καὶ ἐλίσσεται πολλάκι τ' ἔξω'  
 [π]ημῆναγτα γαλῆς [...] ἐμ μύεσσι γέγωνει.  
 [...]δ' ἀγγελος ἦλθε θεων ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισι  
 12 fr.a [...]ης ὅς ἐν ἐμ [...] μὲν ἐνὶ δῆμῳ  
 καὶ [...] φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·  
 ["τέθνηκεν δὴ Τρῖξος ἀμύμων ἐμ πολέμοισιν."  
 [...] στενάχουσα παρειᾶς τ[ε] [λλε] τε χαίτας  
 16 [...]α [...] πόσιν ἀφ[...]  
 fr.b [...]δ' ἐπεπ[...]  
 [...]α [...] εἰρε χαλινούσ' εἰς φ[ρ]ένας ἀμάς.  
 ἦ ῥ', οἳ μὲν δαίνυντο θεοῖ κατὰ [μα]κρόν "Ολυμπον, fr.c  
 20 [ἀλ]λὰ τ' ἐπὶ τρασιῇν [ῆ]εν Κυλλῆ[ν]ιος Ἑρμῆς,  
 [...]ων [...] νων κα[...] ἐν ἐξεγένοντο  
 [...]ρ [...] σταφυ[...] [...] ἀνὰ πάντ[α]ς  
 [ἀμπελε]ῶνα λιποντ[...]. θεοῦ αἶσα συνῆγεν  
 24 [...] ἐπὶ στρατιάν, [το]ύς δ' εἰσίδεν αἶψα κλύον[τα]ς  
 [...] γαλέη καὶ ἐ[ῶ]ι π' ὀσελέετο θυμῷ.  
 [ῶ μοι ἐγώ,] τί ποτ' ἄρ[α] μύ[ε]ς σ[υ]νελέχθεν ἀολλεῖς  
 [...] μὴ δ' αὖ πολ[έ]μου μέγα νεῖκος ἀέξει  
 28 [...]α [...] οροισι μυσὶν [καὶ ἐμ]οῖ περὶ νίκης.  
 [...]δ[...] καὶ ἔγωγ' ἐνθ[...]  
 [...]χ[...] μενηςφον[...] λη[...]  
 [...]χ[...] εἰς ἦλθε μεγ[...] αἶσα πρῶθ' ἐλαίης

13 Homeric formula, 17x Il., 22x Od. (plus 6x with προσήδων), *h. Herm.* 435, *h. Dem.* 320

14 ἀμύμων, same position Z 190, ξ 508, *Batr.* 226 ἐμ πολέμοισιν, cf. *Batr.* 22 (though not at line-end) 15 beginning, cf. Quint. Sm. 5.529 ἡ δὲ μέγα στενάχουσα and 10.414

καῖτο βαρὺ στενάχουσα παρειᾶς, in same position β 153 and σ 200 line-end, *Batr.* 70 τίλλε τε χαίτας; cf. τίλλοντό τε χαίτας (κ 567) 17-18 For reference to yoking and bridling in close succession, cf. T 393 ζεύγνυον ἀμφὶ δὲ καλὰ λῆπαδ' ἔσαν, ἐν δὲ χαλινούσ 18 ἀμάς, at line-end K 448 and N 96 19 ἦ ῥ', οἳ μὲν..., cf. Q 643 ἦ ῥ', 'Αχιλεὺς δ' ... δαίνυντο θεοῖ, cf. I 535 θεοῖ δαίνυνθ'; δαίνυντο in same position, Quint. Sm. 14.141 κατὰ μα]κρόν "Ολυμπον, in same position O 21, ω 351, *h. xii.* 4 20 Κυλλῆ[ν]ιος Ἑρμῆς, ω 1 and *h. Herm.* 304 (line-end), 318, 387 21 ἐξεγένοντο, at line-end E 115, Y 231 and *h. xvii.* 2; frequent in Hesiod 23 θεοῦ αἶσα, cf. Διὸς αἶσαν (P 321, sim. I 604, ι 52, *h. Apoll.* 433, *Apoll. Rh.* 4.1254); δαίμονος αἶσα (λ 61, sim. *h. Dem.* 300); θεοῦ ... αἶσα (*Eur. Andr.* 1203); αἶσα θεῶν (*Apoll. Rh.* 4.1468); Ζηνὸς ... αἶσα (*Apoll. Rh.* 3.328); the passages from *Apoll. Rh.* were compared by Marcovich κλύον[τα]ς, at line-end ρ 254; cf. κλύοντες at line-end T 50 and Y 136 25 line-end, cf. Hes. *Erga* 499 κακὰ προσελέετο θυμῷ (see Willamowitz, *Hesiodos Erga*, ad loc.) 26 [ῶ μοι ἐγώ], see note ad loc. ἀολλεῖς, thus at line-end *Apoll. Rh.* 4.1455 (compared by Marcovich) 27 μέγα νεῖκος, cf. in same metrical position N 122, O 400, P 384 and π 98 = 116 28 περὶ νίκης, at line-end Y 437 = 496, Y 639, Quint. Sm. 1. 90 29 ἦτορ, frequent in Homer at line-end 31 πρῶθ' ἐλαίης, at line-end ν 372 and ψ 204; cf. ν 122



46     τῆ[  
       υπ[  
       οιδ[  
       ει[  
       κ. [

50     ..[.....] εις[.....] ..... fr.d  
       [.] α. τηνεμεμοντο[.] υλουθ[.] νπτολ[  
       ουτεγαρεισπλινθουσο. τεισορ[.] φῆ[.] ν[  
       ..εναρουργιοιςπεδιοιςεμεμοντ[.] υ[

54     ουτοιαρηγερεθοντογαλη[.] φυλ[.] αι[  
       τοιςιδεκαιμετεειπεμ[.] ευσος[.] [.....]  
       ηνγαρτουδεποδεσινεγαρτιοσαλλα[.] ο[.....]  
       τοιςιδεεπρεπεπασιπαλ. ατε[.]

58     οσφινευφρονεωναγορησατοκαι[  
       ηδη. γωταδ[.] ..... υεσπ[  
       ημετερουκειν[.] εδ[.....] α. [

      κθ

col. ii    51    ἐνέμοντο [Π]ύλου, see note ad loc.    ἱ[ερ]ὸν πτολ[ίεθρον], α 2 and ι 165  
 52    ὄρ[ο]φῆ[ν], ὄροφή only once in Homer (χ 298)    54    οὔτοι ἄρ', cf. B 760 ἡγερέθοντο,  
 5x Il., 8x Od. and h. Herm. 326    γαλή[ς] ἐς φύλο[πι]ν αἶ[νήν], cf. Δ 65 ἐς Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν

	fr. e		fr. f		fr. g
	πο[		...[		γ[
	μυ[		αομ[		. [
	μ[		ω. [		π[
4	τη[	4	μυ[		ο[
	τ. [		κυκ[		
	[		οιμ[		fr. h
	[		οιδα[		] . [
8	[	8	ταλ[		] φ. [
	τ. [		..αφ[		
			οιμοι[		fr. i
			εστα[		] / [
		12	ερμ[		] .. [
			αλλα. ε		
			μ. δ[		

fr.d

φύλοπιν αἰνῆν, Π 677 ἐς φύλοπιν αἰνῆν, and Quint. Sm. 6.558 θηῶν ἐς φύλοπιν αἰνῆν 55 τοῦ-  
 σι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε, half-line formula, 9x Il. and 6x Od. 57 παλαιὰ τε π[ολλὰ τε εἰδώς],  
 β 188, η 157 and ω 51 58 Homeric formula, 9x Il. and 6x Od. 59 beginning, δ 745  
 ἦδη ἐγὼ τάδε πάντα πατὴρ ἀκούσας, at line-end δ 114 60 ἡμετέρου, 5x Od. (2x at be-  
 ginning of line); in Il. always ἡμετέρου

## col. i

- 1     $\nu\epsilon\tilde{\tau}\kappa\omicron[\varsigma]$ : cf. line 27).
- 2     $\lambda\upsilon\tau\iota$ : possibly  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota$  (Merkelbach, Burkert) or  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota$ , but both seemingly late forms.
- $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ : after  $\tau$  appears a short down-stroke, coming from the lacuna above; it may be part on an interlinear  $\rho$ ; then follows  $\iota$  or  $\eta$  at normal line level. Perhaps  $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota[\xi\omicron]\nu$ ; Burkert suggests  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta[\sigma]\alpha\upsilon$  (this reading does not account for what seems to be the interlinear  $\rho$ ; cf. note to line 4).
- 3    Between the first and second lacuna:  $\lambda\alpha\iota$  or  $\lambda\nu$ .
- $\pi\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\upsilon\zeta\epsilon\nu$   $\epsilon\tau\iota$  or  $\pi\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\upsilon\zeta\epsilon$   $\epsilon\tau\iota$ . At first sight,  $\pi\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\upsilon\zeta\epsilon(\nu)$  could be taken simply as a comic rather than literal reference to the brave fight Trioxos put up against the weasel as he was caught by the latter outside his mousehole (so West who compares *Batr.* 113f.; thereto see above, p. 10 and note to 6, below). Thus there would be a good motif for lines 21ff.: the weasel's solitary killing of Trioxos in a non-military context prompts the mice to gather an army for a retaliatory expedition, much to the weasel's dismay (but cf. note on line 26).

But this version slights the Protesilaos theme sounded in line 7 (= B 700; see below, on 7) and the accompanying allusions; πατρὺς ἄρουρα, line 5, would refer to no more than the mousehole; πρῶτον, line 6, would have to be taken as "before" (i.e., before Trixos could get back to his mousehole); and ἐμ πολέμοισιν, line 14, would lose its military sense. It seems best therefore to retain the full significance of προμάχε(ν) and find the humor in the literal application of heroic battle terms to little mice. Trixos fights as a *promachos*. This will mean here either one of two things:

a) Trixos fought among the *promachoi*, the front-line fighters, cf. for ex., Δ 253 ἰδομενεὺς μὲν ἐνὶ προμάχοις; also Tyr. 10,30. In the *Batr.* Psicharpax boasts in Homeric tones: προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη, 44 (on lines 42-52 of the *Batr.*, see above, n. 33); a frog hero falls ἐσταότ' ἐν προμάχοις, 203; cf. also 253, ἦλθε δὲ πρὸς προμάχων.

b) Trixos jumps out (see note to line 4) in front of the other mouse-warriors to engage in single combat; cf., of Alexander, Τρωσὶν μὲν προμάχεσεν, Γ 16, cf. also Δ 156. The latter situation may be more in accord with the presentation of Trixos as a Protesilaos figure, the first of the Greeks to fight and the first to die, ...τὸν δ' ἔκτανε Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ / νηὸς ἀποθρόσκοντα πολὺ πρῶτιστον Ἀχαιῶν, B 701-2. (On the status and function of the *promachos*, see J. Latacz, *Kampfparanäse, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios* [Munich 1977] 129ff., 145ff.)

ετ[...].δε: or ετ[...].λε.

Τριξος: on the name ("Squeaky"), see introd., p. 2.

4 [...].δηκα[...].ακτη[: perh. [πη]δήσας [τ'] ἀκτῆ[ν, which would fit the Protesilaos theme (cf. on line 3), but in Homeric use one would expect a preposition with the verb. This interpretation, moreover, assumes that the mice and the weasel have not yet been arrayed in battle (see Burkert's suggestion in line 2).

γ]ένετ' ἐμ μύε[σ]ιν: after Burkert. Here and in line 10 (μῦεσσιν), the υ is long, as in the spurious *Batr.* 261b (ἐν μῦεσσιν), cf. ἐν μῦεσσιν(ν) and ἐν μῦσί, variant readings of 260 (i.e., ἐν μῦσιν, according to W. Schulze, *Quaest. epicae* [Gütersloh 1892] 134). Short υ occurs in *Batr.* 101 (μῦεσσιν); cf. μῦσί(ν) in line 28 of the new papyrus, in *Batr.* 173, 178, and in another variant of 260. Epic dative μῦεσσιν, however, needed long υ after ἐν. For a discussion of *Batr.* 260 and Herodian's μῦσί (opposed by later grammarians), see Wölke, 270ff.

5 This line implies that the expedition of the mice against the weasel(s) was held in foreign territory; for this reason, too, a messenger was needed to bring home the news of Trixos' death (see introd., pp. 4-5). ἄρουρα, as H. Lloyd-Jones points out, has an added significance (besides Homeric imitation), as it cleverly points to a μῦς ἀρουραῖος; cf. n. to line 53.

6 πρῶτον: in context, the adverbial adjective does not so much point to the first in a series of killings as it emphasizes the Protesilaos role of Trixos; cf. note to line 3.

ἐλοῦσθαι μέσσοις approximates the technical term of wrestling, μέσσοι λαμβάνειν (see M. Poliakoff, *Studies in the Terminology of Greek Combat Sports* [Beitr. z. kl. Philol. 100, Meisenheim 1982] 40ff.

γαλῆ: γ appears to be a correction of an original ζ (as in ζάλη).

διέρρυξεν: the prefix δια forms a hapax, the force of which can be taken literally as "gnaw through" or intensively as "utterly devoured."

With the whole line cf. *Batrach.* 113-14 (with n. 32, above): καὶ τὸν μὲν πρῶτον γε κατέκτανεν ἀρπάξασα / ἔχθιστος γαλέη, τρώγλης ἔκτοσθεν ἐλοῦσα.

7 Cf. B 700, τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδρυφῆς ἄλοχος φυλάκη ἐλέλειπτο, and introd., p. 2. ἀμφιδρυφῆς is in itself a rare word (besides this Homeric parallel see Hdt. 6,77,2; cf. A 393, ἀμφιδρυφοῖ ... παρειαί).

ἄλοχος>: pap. αλοχου.

οἴκω'ι: pap. οικω'ι. The substitution of οἴκοι for φυλάκη not only suits the new context, but also reflects a characteristic found in Aesopic fables and the *Batrach.*: the avoidance of geographical (and temporal) specificity; cf. Wölke (n. 6, above) 106ff. (The *Margites*, in specifying Kolophon [Allen, p. 156], follows more the old-epic style; cf. Forderer, *Zum Homerischen Margites*, 35). See below, note on [Π]ύλου, line 51.

8 ]ωγιδίωι: this is the best paleographical reading but does not allow the restoration of any known Greek word. Some blurred ink in the δ gives the impression of α with a clear slope that does not occur elsewhere in the hand. [τρ]ωγιδίωι is a plausible invention, based on the stem τρωγ-, as in τρώγειν, often used of mice (e.g., *Batr.* 34, 53, 182, and mouse-name Τρωξάρτης in 28 and 104, thereto, Wölke, 201f.), τρωγάλια, "dessert nibbles," and τρώγλη, "hole formed by gnawing" (so *LSJ*, cf. *Batr.* 184, 52, *Babr.* 13.17). The suffix -ιδιον denotes not only a diminutive but also "connection" or "belonging" (W. Petersen, *Greek Diminutives in -ion* [Weimar 1910] 225). For τρωγίδιος instead of τρωγλίδιος, W. Burkert compares τρωγοδύται/τρωγλοδύται. On the combination of synizesis and epic correption, see introd., p. 6. In sum, τρωγίδιος, jestingly preceding the lofty and dignified sounding θάλαμος, describes the mousehole of Squeaky's wife as a "little-nibble chamber" (θάλαμος may at the same time correspond to the δόμος ἡμιτελής of Protesilaos' wife in B 701; see introd., p. 2). W. Luppe, however, suggests that the wife's name came here: Τρ]ωγία, written τρωγίαι (after αλοχου, line 7), followed by ὦι θαλάμωι, with the ἐν between the two words being a correction that was originally written above the line but later slipped into the text. The name of the mouse-wife, however, need not appear; daughter of so-and-so (see line 9) may have sufficed. In Homer the wife of Protesilaos is not named either; see introd., n. 5, above. West also deletes ἐν and conjectures [Τρ]ωγλαίωι (on α see above).

φρεσὶν αἰμύλα πόλλ' εἰδυῖα: cf. αἰμυλόφρων, *Krat.* 379b and αἰμυλομήτης, epithet of Hermes, *h. Herm.* 13 (cf. S.C. Shelmerdine, *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes* [diss. Ann Arbor 1981] ad loc.). On Hermes' special relation to mice, see introd., p. 4 and n. 7. αἰμύλα seems to be a comic replacement of κεννά (see app.) and, in the meaning "knowing many wiles," to characterize this mouse as a wife who knows how to help herself (like Penelope, or Laodameia who craftily replaced her husband Protesilaos after his death with an image made of wax; thus Euripides in his *Protesilaos*, *Ps. Apollod.*, and elsewhere; see introd., n. 5); αἰμόλος and αἰμόλιος may be linked to αἶμων, possibly meaning "clever" (cf. H. Frisk, s. vv.). Alternatively, αἰμύλα may refer to the winning pleasantries of the mouse towards her husband (cf. Hes. *Erga* 374 αἰμύλα κωτίλλουσα). Though normally negative in connotation, αἰμύλα at times is used in

a positive sense (see R. Renehan, *Greek Lexicogr. Notes* [*Hypomnemata* 45, Göttingen 1975] 17), and Greek playfulness not infrequently dictates a morally ambivalent aspect.

9 The whole line was later inserted - apparently by the same hand - and written in smaller letters to fit between the lines; end of line rubbed out.

[...]σεωνος: the σ could be the right downstroke of μ or π. The father's name in all probability was a fabricated rather than a historical or mythological name (Θαρσέων, Ἀλκμέων, Ἰππείων, etc. do not satisfy).

ἐλίσσεται: in contrast to the general characterization of the lady mouse as αἰμύλα πόλλ' εἰδυῖα, the verb expresses the present situation; in the perplexity of her mind she turns in circles just as Odysseus tosses to and fro on his bed (v 24 and 28).

ἐξῶ: reading not wholly certain since ω could be οἰ.

10 [π]ημήναντα γαλῆς ...: or possibly [σ]ήμηνεν or [π]ήμηνεν τὰ γαλῆς (hardly τ' ἀταλῆ σ...). Burkert suggests [φ]ήμην καὶ τὰ γαλῆς, but χ is difficult because αἰ is preceded by a horizontal stroke (middle stroke of ε or right leg of α). After γαλῆς, ]ατ or ]π or ]ιτ or ]ιπ may be read, followed by top stroke of a vertical line (ἔργα is not possible). In the middle of the γ of γαλῆς appears a slight horizontal line (which may belong to the original writing of the palimpsest or to a corrected letter.

ἐμ μύεσσιν: μύεσσιν read by Haslam. On ὕ, see note to line 4. The ι looks like a δ on the photograph, but the left diagonal of a δ would be missing.

11 [αὐτίκα] (S. West) or [τῆμος].

ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεῶν: accent either θεῶν or θέων. With the former, the messenger would be Hermes who is mentioned in line 20 and possibly in line 12 (see below); for ἄγγελος ... θεῶν = Hermes, cf. Hes. *Erga* 85 Ἀργεῖφόντην ... θεῶν ταχὺν ἄγγελον and *h. Herm.* 3 ἄγγελον ἀθανάτων. But Hermes is unexpected as messenger of death, and it seems possible that a mouse instead comes rushing (θέων) to bring the dire news to Trixos' widow (cf., of Iris, ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεοῦσ', Σ 167 = Λ 715, of Athena). In this case, however, the attribution and meaning of lines 17-18, especially εἰς φ[ρ]ένας ἀμᾶς (18), becomes even more difficult (see further, *ad loc.*).

12 [.]...[.]ης δς εν.ε: the traces between the lacunae belong to the bottom of π or two other letters; possible are ]ρμ[, ]ρε[, ]ρϕ[, less likely ]το[, ]τε[, ]τω[. If the angelos of line 11 is Hermes, his name may have stood here in either the first or second lacuna: 'Ε]ρμ[ῆς ..] or ]...[. 'Ερμ[ῆς. Alternatively a mouse name may stretch over both lacunae, e.g., ['Αρ]π[αγίδ]ης (West) or [Τ]ρ[ω]ξ[άρτ]ης. The following relative clause probably expressed the status of the messenger among the folk of the mice.

εν.ε: ἐνῆε? (but in Homer always with ν-έφελκ.).

13 see app.

14 [τέθν]ηκεν: the word at verse-beginning mocks tragedy; cf. Eur. *El.* 770 (messenger speech), *Hipp.* 958, *Ion* 951, *IT* 56, 548, *Tr.* 622, 642, *Ph.* 1076, 1349, *Or.* 940, *Aisch. Th.* 1011, fr. 186 Nauck<sup>2</sup>, *Soph. Ant.* 1282. It is verses like these that Theodoros Prodromos parodies in the *Katomyomachia* in which he has the angelos announce to Mrs. Mouse the slaying

of the cat: τέθνηκεν ἡ τάλαινα κᾶτα τῷ μοθῶ (346).

δη: the particle following the verb also has more of a tragic than epic tone (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 214).

The announcement of Trixos' death is pointedly contracted into a single line. The abruptness and tragic directness of this line following the epic expansiveness of the introductory line (13) may have desired a comic effect.

15-18 Lines 15 and 16 are given over to the vehement mourning of the lady mouse for her husband. In lines 17-18 the messenger apparently resumes his speech.

15 τ[λλε] τε χαίτας: suggested by Haslam on the basis of *Batr.* 70 (see app.). If τ[λλε] should be correct, a second verb would precede, e.g., [δρύπτε δέ], [δρύψε δέ] (if followed by τ[λλε] rather than τ[λλε]; cf. *Apoll. Rh.* 3.672 δρύπεν δ' ἐκάτερθε παρειάς), [δάπτε δέ], or [δάψε δέ] (cf. *Aisch. Suppl.* 70 δάπτω τὰν... παρειάν); of these, [δάψε δέ] alone, though non-epic and highly figurative, fits the available space and that only if written narrowly. Burkert suggests different supplements: [ἡ δ' ὄξυ] ([ἡ δέ βαρύ, cf. *A* 364 etc., or [ἡ δέ μέγα], see app., seem to be too long) στενάχουσα παρειὰς τύπτειτο (if narrowly written) χαίτας / [τίλλουσα(α)]. Thus a well-marked transition results at the beginning of 15 from speech to narrative (see preceding note); on the other hand, the phrase παρειὰς τύπτειτο as well as the subordination of τίλλουσα along with στενάχουσα under τύπτειτο would be less welcome. West suggests τέ[μνε]το χ<ηλ>αῖς (but cf. R. Merkelbach, "Lex Youtie," *ZPE* 38 [1980] 294).

16-17 The endings of these lines are barely discernible.

16 ]α.: perhaps αρ, αι, αμ, λμ or λι; traces appear on top of the next one or two letters. πόσιν rather than ποσίν; the mouse laments (a form of κλαίω?) her husband. αφ[αδότηισιν, Haslam.

17-21 It is tempting to move fr. b further to the left, but the lower traces of two letters appear before οἰ in line 19.

17 ]δεπη: also ]αεπη (κ)αῖ or ]λεπη is paleographically possible. Contracted ξπη would be non-epic, although it might have been written instead of ξπεα. Provided ξπη/ξπεα does not depend upon a preceding verb, ξπη ζεύγυς ("yoke or harness words") forms a highly figurative expression. The whole line may yet be part of the messenger's speech or serve to introduce his words of the following line (see note on 18), which would then be a one-line speech (cf. on 14). For the use of original, non-Homeric introductory phrases along with Homeric introductory formulas (see 13 and 58), cf. Wölke, 166ff.

18 ]ον[ or ]ων[, then εἰρε or compound (άν- or συν-) rather than ἐν]εἰρε or χ]εἰρε; Burkert compares *Archil.* 172.2 τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας; next, χαλινούσ' (Haslam) or χαλινούς. For example,

[θυμ]ὸν [δ' αὔτις εἰρε χαλινούσ' εἰς φ[ρ]ένας ἀμάς

(though the supplement of the second lacuna is one letter too long); for δαίρω εἰς..., cf. *Quint. Sm.* 7.323; cf. also αἴρει θυμόν in *S. OT* 914 where, however, it refers to Oedipus overexciting himself. The significance of this and the preceding line is sure to be meta-

phorical rather than literal. The speaker, most likely the messenger again, exhorts Trixos' widow to control her emotions and bring herself into line with his intentions (or check her spirit and raise it to his heart, i.e., be pious again [thus L. Koenen]). One may doubt that it is an exhortation proper for a messenger mouse to utter. εἰς φρένας ἄμᾶς is a curious phrase, moreover, and no direct action appears to result from the speaker's instructions. In the Protesilaos and Laodameia story, the gods pity Laodameia in her excessive grief and send Hermes to bring Protesilaos to her from Hades; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 3,30 (further sources in n. 5, above).

19 The gods are shown feasting on Mt. Olympus; on the *Götterapparat* (involvement or deliberate non-involvement of the gods) in mock-epics see Wölke, 146ff.

20 [ἀλ]λά τ': if correct, ἀλλά τε indicates change of subject (note μέν in line 19) and contrasting action: "The gods were feasting on lofty Mt. Olympus, Hermes, however, etc." This use of ἀλλά τε finds no exact Homeric parallel; cf. Chantraine I 344, 357, Ebeling, s.v. ἀλλά τε.

τρασιῶν: not τρασιῶν (η 127, ω 247). A τρασιῶ was a vessel of some kind, some sources say a wicker-basket, in which figs and other fruit, also cheese, were placed to dry, or a wooden plank or crate on which they were set out to the sun; Eup. 451, Semon. 39 West, Poll. 7,144, 173; 10,129, Suda 4.913 Adler, Hesych. s.v., Greg. Cor. p. 514, sch. Ar. *Nub.* 50. According to Aelian, *NA* 3,10, the hedgehog rolled himself ἐν ταῖς τρασιῶις to catch up and bear away the figs on his spines. In Ar. *Nub.* 50, ὄζων τρασιῶς (which may stand for the figs themselves, cf. Poll. 7,144) is part of being an ἄγρουκος. Figs and cheese were of course a favorite dish with mice (cf. note to fr. f, line 5 συκ[ ]). Hermes, accordingly, is making his way to a place in the country where mice would be wont to gather. Here he himself could have consumed sacri-fices (figs) offered to him, in contrast to the gods feasting on Mt. Olympus (line 19), and, at the same time, overseen the marshalling of the mice.

[ῆ]εν: the space is not sufficient for [ῆ]εν.

Κυλλῆ[ν]ιος: the earliest and most common local epithet of Hermes - but only once in Homer (ω 1); see *The Homeric Hymns*, ed. Allen, Halliday, Sikes (Oxford 1936) 277f., Sheldermine (see note on 8) 48f.

21 ἐξεγένοντο: the verb normally refers to birth (except for the impersonal use of the third singular). But as this yields no sense in the context, it might be used of mice coming out of their holes.

22 ἄγροῦ σταφυ[ ]: this division allows a form of σταφυλή which occurs five times in Homer (B 765, E 561, ε 69, η 121, ω 343).

23 [ἀμπελε]ῶνα: or [ . λευμ]ῶνα or [ . κευθμ]ῶνα, followed by λιπόντα[ς] ὄσου[ς] (or ἐπε[ ]), thus West).

θεοῦ αἶσα συνῆγεν: αἶσα, normally the lot apportioned to men, denotes here, with mock-epic humor, the fate of the mice. In the context of the poem it probably carries a sinister connotation; cf. app.

24 κλύον[τα]ς: West; see app.

25 γαλέη: the only uncontracted form in the extant lines of our poem (contracted forms in 2, 6, 10, 54). The *Batr.*, on the other hand, uses uncontracted γαλέη consistently (9, 49, 51, 114, 128).

ξ[ωι] π'ρ'οσελέξατο θυμῶι: ξ[ωι] (Burkert, Merkelbach, West; cf. ε 76 = η 134, et al.) or ξ[πος] (Haslam); θυμῶι or θυμός (cf. A 407, δισελέξατο θυμός). The traces after μ are very uncertain, seemingly a vertical stroke, with additional ink that, however, cannot be explained by any Greek letter. The present reading follows Hes. *Erga* 499 (see app. and cf. West's commentary). The Homeric soliloquies of A 403ff. and P 91ff. (see next note) are preceded by εἶπε πρὸς δὲν ... θυμόν. On προσελέξατο, see introd., p. 4.

26 [δ μου ἐγώ] suggests itself from A 403, δ μου ἐγώ, τί πάθω (Odysseus) and P 91, δ μου ἐγών (Hektor); also possible, [δ πόποι ῥ] (Burkert; see on 27-28).

ξρ[α] μῶ[ες: so also Haslam.

The weasel is distressed to see the mice assembling again; presumably the mice had scattered after the death of Trixos, one of their foremost heroes (but cf. note to line 3).

27 Two small traces protruding from the first lacuna could be ε or the broken right curve of ω. West suggests [δευμαίνω] (though, of course, a verb of fearing is not needed; see the Homeric examples below, note on 27-28); accordingly, δ' in third position would be δ(ῆ) (δ' αὖ often in manuscripts for δῆ αὖ).

πολ[έμ]ου: Haslam; the letters must be written large to fill the lacuna. Traces of ink above the x of νεῦκος appears to be without significance.

27-28 δέξιη: Haslamalique. For clauses of fearing in speeches beginning with δ μου ἐγώ(v), see Σ 8, φ 563, ε 356 (cf. π 381 with δ πόποι in 365; see also note on 26). δέξιη is intransitive if the subject, probably one of the gods (e.g., Ares) or Zeus himself, follows at the beginning of line 28. On the other hand, δέξιη might be intransitive with μέγα νεῦκος as subject; cf. Quint. Sm. 1,116 μάλα γὰρ μέγα πένθος δέξει 8.176 δῆρις δέξει.

28 ]..[.]οροισι: traces between the lacunae could be ]αη[ (ἀπόροισι, though, will not fill the second lacuna) or ]αγ[; together the traces might form ]ν[, for which Merkelbach has the amusing reading α]ν[οβ]όροισι. Unfortunately, the word is not attested and a small mark before the top of o could not properly belong to β.

29 ]δ[.] καὶ ἔγωγ' ἐνθ[ε: or ]δ[ῆ] καὶ ἔγω γενε[ (West).

εμ...[.]μαι ἦτορ: possibly ἐμπα[χο]μαι ἦτορ (so also West), though in Homer always with negative except α 271 = 305, or ἐμπε[ύ]ρομαι ἦτορ (no parallel). Expressions such as τεύρομαι ἦτορ (Merkelbach) or τέχομαι ἦτορ (cf. κατατήχομαι ἦτορ, T 136) do not seem to fit the remaining traces nor the available space.

30 μενητφον[.: σ could be ε; a small trace after the second v belongs to the bottom of a letter but not o; hence a form of φόνος is excluded. σφονδ[υ]λη might be possible if written largely (as πολ[έμ]ου above, 27). The σφονδύλη, or σπονδύλη - the mss. vary -, may have been a stink-bug (cf. Ar. Pax 1078); Hesychios has the interesting entry: σπονδύλη· ἡ γαλῆ παρ' Ἀπυκοῦς, perhaps because the weasel was likewise known for its bad smell; cf. Ar. Ek. 924, Pl. 693, Ach. 255-56, W. Marg, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 154.



31 ] εἰσῆλθε: εἰς- read by West. Or ]εἰς ἤλθε.

μεγ[...]<sub>αδ</sub>.. πυθμέν' ἐλαίης: the letters between υ and π are almost entirely rubbed out. Restorations so far have had to assume scribal mistakes *iuxta lacunam* (see above on line 15). One might expect μέγαν and a form of δῶ, though the space before δ does not suffice for κατ]α- and the traces after υ do not allow δῶς; δῶγα might be possible. West's supplement, μέγ[αν] δ' ὑπὸ would be welcome (especially ὑπὸ, cf. ὑπὸ πυθμέν' ἐλαίης, ψ 204) but for the unavoidable α or δ before υ.

col. ii

40-41 Stichometric Δ (400), first written between lines 40 and 41, with a horizontal stroke pointing out the precise line (41). After addition of line 9, col. i, the count needed to be corrected, hence a slightly larger delta written flush with line 40 and resting heavily on top of the first delta. Already with 400 lines the poem exceeds the c. 303 lines of the *Batrach.* (a monobiblos).

51 [ο]ῦ Σπάρτην: thus also Burkert and Luppe. For Sparta and Pylos in the same line, cf. α 93, β 214 = 359. With ἐνέμοντο [Π]ύλου ... cf., from the Catalogue of Ships, οἱ δὲ Πύλον ἐνέμοντο, B 591. It seems the preceding lost part of col. ii contained a short catalogue, a list of mice gathering for an assembly (see introd., p. 3). Here, for the sake of parody, the poet breaks with the tendency towards geographical anonymity in mock-epics, contrary to line 7 where he eliminated the place name, Phylake (see note *ad loc.*). Moreover, the use of the names Sparta and Pylos corroborates the general idea that the mice played the role of the Greeks in this expedition (cf. introd., p. 3). With Πύλου Homer uses αἰπύ (not ἑρόν) πτολίεθρον (cf. app.).

52 This line appears to explain that the mice in question were not city mice, that is, house mice, such as lived in garrets and attics. With εἰς ὀρ[ο]φῆ[ν] cf. μῦς ὀροφίας, implied in Ar. *Vesp.* 205-6 (see schol. 206b: λέγονται δὲ μῦς ὀροφίαι καὶ ὀφεις...).

53 ἄλλ': written narrowly or ἄλλ<λ>.

ἀρουραῖους: the second ο is written over a washed-out letter. That the mice inhabited the fields and forests of the country is now made clear; cf. μῦς ἀρουραῖος, Hdt. 2.141, ἀρουραῖος σμίνθος, A. fr. 227 Nauck<sup>2</sup> (Ael. NA. 12.5), αἱ μῦες ἐν ταῖς ἀρούραις, Theophr. fr. 174,7, Μῶν δ' μὲν τις βίον ἔχων ἀρουραῖον, Babr. 108,1. City mice may have been mentioned earlier in the list.

54 ἐς φύλο[πυ]ν αἰ[νήν]: Luppe, sim. Burkert, Lloyd-Jones, and Merkelbach; see app.

55 Μυ[λ]εός? - epithet of Zeus, Lyk. Alex. 435, but here undoubtedly name of a mouse living in a mill.

ὅς [...]: the letters between the lacunae are partly rubbed off, and the first letter is blurred; the second letter is most likely c, followed by a vertical stroke, perhaps ι or, if some of the top horizontal bar is rubbed away, τ; then perhaps α[; possibly [ἀν]ίστατο[ο βαρδός (if one dares to assume this metathesis; for the verb cf. H 94 Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπε, 123 Νέστωρ δ' Ἀργείοισιν ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπεν, et al.). On unformulaic ὅς, see

introd., p. 5.

56 ἦν γάρ τ' οὐδὲ πόδεσσιν ἔτ' ἄρτιος: τ' οὐδὲ Burkert; the τ of ἔτ' looks rather like γ. For the end of the line, perhaps ἀλλὰ [σ]αδόφρων; cf. ἀλλὰ σάδοφρων, δ 158 (at beginning of line); the α is paleographically difficult but not impossible. Burkert suggested [π]ρογ[ή-  
ρως] (which leaves two dots on top of the supposed γ unexplained).

Less persuasive is an attempt to let Myleus (?) jump up quickly in line 55; then 56 ἦν γάρ τοῦδε ποδίσσιν ἔτ' ἄρτιος ἄλμ[α]τος [ἀλκή] (thus also Luppe). ἄρτιος, however, is not usually an adjective of two endings, and the ζ of ἄλμ[α]τος is open to the same paleographical objections as the γ of [π]ρογ[ήρως] (see above). For Myleus (?) as the Nestor of the mice, see introd., p. 3.

57 ἐν ἔπρεπε πᾶσι: see introd., pp. 4-5.

παλαιά ..[. εἰδώς: see app.

58 Cf. introd., p. 5 and app.

59 ἦδη: so also Burkert and Merkelbach; see app.

πα[ρὰ] πατρὸς ἀκούσας: Burkert and Merkelbach; see app.

60 ]λα[.[: ]λαχ[ (]Λαχ[εδαίμων- West) or ]λαυ[

fr. e

3 Before μ, a thick stichometric sign, either a reinforced α or λ (100 or 1100); see introd., n. 2.

fr. f

2 αῖμα[. the mice may have had war chariots, ἄρματα, cf. Aesop 174 (Ib) Hsr. In the light of σῦκ[α below, line 5, ἄρμενα also suggests itself (see West ad Th. 639).

4 μυ[. μῦ[ς ? Before μ, stichometric | (900); see introd., n. 2.

5 συκ[. σῦκ[α or similar; figs were among the favorite victuals of mice, cf. Batr. 31, Babr. 108, 17, Wölke, *Untersuchungen*, 225; see also note on col. i, line 20 τρασιά.

10 οἰμο[. or οἰκο[

12 ερμ[. : Hermes again?

fr. h

2 What appears as a φ projected to the left margin seems, at the top of its slope, to lead into a horizontal stroke to the right.

fr. i

This fragment has a diagonal stroke at the top and unidentified traces at the bottom.

University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor

Hermann S. Schibli