

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE *PERSAE* OF  
TIMOTHEUS (PMG 791)\*

7–13

	ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν [ἐ]νθένδε [. . . .]ισ-	2 ia.?
	τος ἐπ[ιφ]έροιτο πλαγὰ	ia. ba.
	ῥηξ[ίκωπ]ος, <sup>1</sup> πάντες [ᾄμ'] <sup>2</sup> ἀνέ-	2 tro.?
10	πιπτον] ἐκείσε να[ύ]ται·	cho. ba. <sup>3</sup>
	εἰ δ' ἀντίτοιχος ἀκτ[ά].	ia. ba.
	..]ος [ᾄ]ξειεμ [πο]λυκροτο[ι].	tro. cr. ba.?
	..]σιμον πεύκας, πάλιν ἐφέροντο·	“ ?

At lines 7–10 the description of the sea-battle appears to involve the destruction of the oars of the enemy ship (accepting Page's ῥηξί[κωπ]ος at 9), with the result that the sailors fall over (9–10 suppl. Danielsson). We would expect lines 11–13 to provide some sort of contrast with this description, since εἰ δέ at 11 contrasts with 7 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν, but the exact sense is not quite clear.

Page assumes that the coast is somehow involved, and paraphrases *remos frangebat hinc plaga hostilis, illinc litus, ita ut remiges subito retrorsum caderent*, comparing Virg. *A.* 5.205ff., Caes. *Bell. Civ.* 1.58 to support the supplement ἀκτ[ά]. At 12–13 he tentatively suggests μῆ]χος ᾄξειεμ [πο]λυκρότο[ιο | πλώ]σιμον πεύκας, and explains *machinam pinus navalem* = *remum*. Although the general sense obtained is not objectionable, the circumlocution is highly doubtful, and it seems unlikely, despite Timotheus' general fondness for obscure periphrases, that μῆ]χος can really be used in this way. Furthermore, Page prints ]σιμον, but my own inspection of the papyrus instead supports ]σιμ . . . . Wilamowitz rightly prints [.]ξειεμ rather than ἀξειεμ (Page), and suggests ἀκτ[ίς | πρ]οσ[ά]ξειεμ, understanding ἀκτίς to refer to the blow of a weapon (εἰ δὲ ἡ ἐμβολὴ ἀκτίνος κεραυνίας τρόπον . . .), although there are no obvious parallels for the usage and it may be doubted whether ἀκτίς alone can provide the required sense. Danielsson (11, n. 2) refers to Hesychius' gloss ἀκτίς· οἰκέτου ὄνομα. παρὰ δὲ Συρακουσίοις ὁδηγός. ἡ ναῦς, but it seems less sure that 'ship' is the expected sense, and the gloss in fact probably refers to the fact that Ἀκτίς could be the name of a ship (as it is at e.g. *CIA* 2.809c.171). It does not support the view

\* I am indebted to Dr M. L. West for his assistance with the work which lies behind this paper, and some of whose suggestions are included here, and to Dr G. Poethke of the Ägyptisches Museum and Papyrussammlung in Berlin for his permission to examine the Timotheus papyrus (P. Berol. 9875) in Easter 1997. My D.Phil. examiners, Professors P. J. Parsons and J. Diggle, also provided useful corrections and suggestions, and final debt of thanks is owed to Professor C. Collard and *CQ*'s anonymous referee. The following works are referred to only by the author's name: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Timotheos. Die Perser* (Leipzig, 1903); O. A. Danielsson, *Eranos* 5 (1903), 1–39, 98–128; K. Aron, *Beiträge zu den Persern von Timotheos* (diss. Erlangen, 1920); J. M. Edmonds, *PCPS* 130 (1925), 4–17; D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962); T. Janssen, *Timotheus. Persae* (Amsterdam, 1984). I give the text after Page and include his metrical analyses, but I have indicated period-end and made some corrections to his text.

<sup>1</sup> Page prints ῥηξί[, but the iota is no longer visible in the papyrus.

<sup>2</sup> [ᾄμ'] suppl. M. L. West (p.c.).

<sup>3</sup> Page wrongly prints cho. ia.

that the word regularly meant 'ship' or that it does so here. Wilamowitz then prints a comma after [πρ]οσ[αί]ξιειμ, and conjectures *ex. grat.* πολυκρότου ρίπαῖσι τάχα πλευρᾶς, which, however, bears little relationship to the papyrus text.

It seems clear that the object must be either 'ship' or a particular part of a ship. We should restore something like πολυκρότο[υς | πλω]σίμους πεύκας 'the many-banked, sea-going pines' (i.e. ships). Although πλώσιμος is a classical hapax with a passive sense 'navigable' at S. O.C. 662–3 φανήσεται μακρὸν τὸ δεῦρο πέλαγος οὐδὲ πλώσιμον, adjectives in -μος have a tendency to function as either active or passive, and in later Greek we find the active sense at Diogenian. 6.78 (1.282 Leutsch-Schneidewin) ναῦς παλαιὰ πόντῳ οὐχὶ πλωσίμῃ.<sup>4</sup> There can be no strong objection to the word here, nor to the accusative plural instead of Page's singular; the papyrus text is severely damaged at this point, and the traces inconclusive. For πολυκρότο[υς] 'many-banked', cf. the nautical terms μονόκροτος, δίκροτος, τρίκροτος, which refer either to the number of banks of rowers in a ship or to their division into squads.<sup>5</sup> We may also compare ῥοθίοις . . . δικρότοισι 'with double-beaten surge' at E. I.T. 407ff., where passive δίκροτος may refer to the beat of two banks of oars (rather than, with Platnauer, to 'the oars on each side of the ship'). Wilamowitz's punctuation is difficult to defend in view of the parallel expected with 7–10; the subject of πάλιν ἐφέροντο should clearly be understood from 10 ναῦται.<sup>6</sup>

Thus 11–12 must describe something which would cause the sailors to fall back again; this I assume with Campbell and others to be a blow of some sort. Page's ἀκτ[ά] will not do, since it requires the support of the dubious μῆχος. Janssen tentatively suggests a compound of the type ἀκτ[. -φο]ρος or -β[ο]λος, but it is hard to imagine what the first term might be; not, in this case, derived from ἀκτίς, which regularly forms compounds in ἀκτινο-. At this stage I can see no better solution than Wilamowitz' ἀκτ[ίς | πρ]οσ[αί]ξιειμ, and we can roughly translate: 'but if a blow against the side dashed against the many-banked sea-going pines, [the sailors] all fell back again'. This also produces a more plausible metrical analysis; accepting Page's treatment of 7–10, we can analyse 11–13 as ia. ba | ba. ia. | tr. ith. ||. Ithyphallics are common at period-end in the *Persae* (e.g. 61, 85, 149, 155, 161).

#### 14–20

	αἰ δε[. . .]αι .η γυῖα [δ]ιαφέρονσα[ι	2 ia. ba.
15	πλ]ευρᾶς λι[νο]ζώστους ἔφαι-	2 ia. }
	νον, τασ. [. . .].[. . .].[. . .]ις	[ ]
	σκηπτ[. .] ἐπεμβάλλ[ο]ντες ἀνε-	2 ia.?
	[χ]αίτιζον, αἰ δὲ πρα[νέες	"
	. . . . .[. . .]ας ἀπηγ<λ>αῖ-	"
20	σμένα[ι] σιδα[ρ]<έ>ωι κράνει.	"

The syntax is slightly confused. The opening αἰ δε[ probably refers to the Greek ships, while τὰς at 16 and αἰ at 18 no doubt refer to Persian ships. At 16–18 I understand the subject of both ἀνε[χ]αίτιζον and ἐπεμβάλλ[ο]ντες to be ναῦται (last at 13):<sup>7</sup> 'and some (sc. ships), ripping apart the [. . .] limbs, revealed the linen-bound

<sup>4</sup> Although πλώσιμος is regarded as three-termination by Diogenian., adjectives in -μος are usually two-termination in Timotheus; cf. *PMG* 791.64, 112–3.

<sup>5</sup> See W. W. Tarn, *JHS* 25 (1905), 143ff.; J. S. Morrison, *CQ* 41 (1947), 122–5.

<sup>6</sup> The referee suggests that the ships could be the subject of ἐφέροντο, which is possible, but I think ναῦται is to be preferred because of the parallel with 7–10.

sides, then they would capsize some, throwing . . . , and others (sank) bottom-upwards . . . stripped of their ornaments by the iron helmet (i.e. the ram)'.<sup>7</sup>

At 14 Page tentatively suggests αἱ δ' ε[ὕτ' ἀ]ναιδῆ γυνῖα, but I fail to see why the limbs of the ship should be regarded as 'shameless', and the connective εὕτε, although also conjectured by Wilamowitz at Timoth. *PMG* 802.1 (for codd. ὅτε), is not otherwise attested in Timotheus. The γυνῖα must be the oars (not, *pace* Janssen, 35, the hull), whose removal, referred to in the preceding lines, would naturally reveal the sides of the ship. Page leaves space for four letters in the lacuna, but inspection of the papyrus suggests that this may be somewhat generous, and that three would not be impossible: read (*ex. grat.*) [ἀκρ]αυῆ, given by Hsch. s.v. as a synonym for ἀκρατές, more suitable for oars in any case, and used of paralysed limbs at *IG* 4.951.22 (Epidauros): ἀνὴρ τοὺς τὰς χηρὸς δακτύλους ἀκρατεῖς ἔχων πλὰν ἐνὸς ἀ[φ]ίκετο ποῖ τὸν Θεὸν ἰκέτας. Line 14 is thus a trochee followed by an ithyphallic.

The next line contains no problems which have not been solved, but 16 is seriously damaged. Page's text is again misleading in the amount of space he allows in the lacunae, and he accordingly supplements τὰς μ[έν, αἰόλας ὕβρε]ις σκηπτ[ῶν] ἐπεμβ., 'throwing the glittering outrages of thunderbolts', which is indefensible not only because of the size of the lacuna but also because of the sense. Between τασ and ]ις there in fact seems to be space for only about a dozen letters. There can be little doubt that Wilamowitz (57) was correct to see a reference to δελφίνες, leaden weights, apparently roughly in the shape of a dolphin, which were hung from a ship's yard-arm and dropped or swung onto enemy vessels (cf. *Ar. Eq.* 761f. with Σ, *Pherecr.* fr. 12 K.-A., *Thuc.* 7.41);<sup>8</sup> although these were an innovation in naval warfare of the later fifth century,<sup>9</sup> Timotheus several times appears to be describing not the actual battle of Salamis, but a typical sea-battle as may have happened in his own day.<sup>10</sup> An accusative might be desiderated after ἐπεμβάλλ[ο]ντες, but the iota in 16 ]ις is clearly legible and the dative therefore seems certain; we must assume that the participle is being used absolutely. Read -νον, τὰς μ[έν μολυβδίν]ις | σκηπτ[οῖς] ἐπεμβάλλ[ο]ντες ἀνε- | [χ]αίτιζον 'they capsized some with leaden thunderbolts, throwing (sc. them)', then *ex. grat.* αἱ δὲ πρ[αν]εῖς ἔδνον καθ' ἄλμ]ας 'and others sank bottom upwards beneath the brine . . .', which gives mol. ia. | 2 ia. | 2 ba. | 2 ba. ia. for the whole passage. Although καταδύ(ν)ω is the more common word for 'sink', the non-compound form of the verb might be supported by *Il.* 6.136 δύσεθ' ἄλδος κατὰ κύμα, 18.145 ὑπὸ κύμα θαλάσσης αὐτίκ' ἔδυσαν, *Od.* 5.352 ἐς πόντον ἐδύσετο, although admittedly none of these passages refers to the sinking of ships. The verb can be followed by a variety of prepositions, often κατά, normally with an accusative, but the genitive is also attested (e.g. *Od.* 12.93).<sup>11</sup> The contracted form πρ[αν]εῖς, historically early enough to be assumed, at least in scansion, is to be preferred to Page's πρ[αν]έες, since the open orthography -εε- is never attested in the papyrus. Page's supplement [βάπτουσι δέμ]ας lacks good parallels.

<sup>7</sup> The referee suggests that 'a masculine nominative may be lurking in line 16', which is also possible.

<sup>8</sup> B. Gildersleeve, *AJP* 24 (1903), 232–3.

<sup>9</sup> See L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Baltimore and London, 1995<sup>2</sup>), 239, n. 67.

<sup>10</sup> Wilamowitz, 57–9.

<sup>11</sup> See P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique* (Paris, 1958–63), 2.113–4, for the similar sense of κατὰ c. accusative and genitive.

## 21-4

ἵσος δὲ πυρὶ δαμ[. . . .	ia. [ ]
ἄκω] γ ἀγκυλῆν δετ[ο]ς	ba. ia. ?
μεθίετο χερσίν, ἐν δ' ἔπιπτε γυίοις	2 ia. ba.
αἰθε[. . . .] ὦμα διακρα[[ι]] [δ]αίνων·	" ?

'Like fire the man-slaying, thong-bound javelin was hurled from their hands, and fell among their limbs, shaking . . . (?)'. In lines 21-3 the (probably Greek) sailors have hurled thong-bound javelins from their hands; the result of this action is described in the following one and a half lines, in which the javelins fall among the limbs of the enemy. Read (perhaps) δαμ[ασίφως (ia. cr.) with Wilamowitz, and ἄκων with Jurenka,<sup>12</sup> the latter to be preferred for Wilamowitz's improbable ἄρης, which is incompatible with the traces of the nu. Janssen believes that γυίοις means 'bodies' not 'limbs', but I fail to see why 'one is surprised at the javelins hitting the "arms and legs" '.

The real problems are in line 24. Wilamowitz prints αἰθε[ροφόρητον] σῶμα διακραδαίνων, which he paraphrases τρέμοντα ἔτι ὑπὸ τῆς δι' ἀέρος φορᾶς. But the sense 'shaking their airborne bodies' (i.e. of the spears) seems unlikely, and in the context we would most naturally expect [σ]ῶμα to refer to the bodies of the sailors, shaken by the impact of the spear, in which case αἰθε[ροφόρητον], though a plausible if otherwise unattested formation, will not do. Page suggests αἰθε[ρία δούρατ'] ὦμα διακρ. or even ὠμάδια κραδ., although ὠμάδια is an extremely unusual word largely restricted to Nonnus and occasionally attested elsewhere as a cult-title of Dionysus. No doubt Page intended the sense to be '(the javelins) fell among their limbs, shaking the shafts (sc. of the javelins)', but there is no parallel for ὠμός in such a context, and I find δούρατ' an odd object in this context. The verb is otherwise only attested at Arius Didymus in Stob. 1.36.2 [Diels, *Doxogr.* 453.15]. Wilamowitz more plausibly suggests [σ]ῶμα. This leaves αἰθε[, for which Janssen suggests \*αἰθε[ροφόρητος] 'airborne'. Preferable might be αἰθε[ροδρόμος], which is used by [Cinesias] in the parody of dithyrambic lyric at Ar. Av. 1393. Thus the sense is 'and, flying through the air, fell amongst their limbs, shaking their bodies (sc. those of the sailors)'; line 24 would be an iambic metron followed by an ithyphallic.

## 25-8

25	στερεοπαγῇ δ' ἐφέρετο φόνι-	2 ia.
	α [ . . . . . ] α [ . . ] τά τε περίβολα	?
	πυρὶ φλεγ[όμ]εν' ἐν ἀποτομάσι	lec.
	βουδό[ροισι]·	tro.

I can do nothing with 26, except to note that although Edmonds' restoration here, λίθια πισσ[ά]ν[τα] 'stones and tarred (covers)', is superficially attractive, it is doubtful whether such artillery would have been used in a sea-battle before the Hellenistic period. Stone-throwing catapults and larger artillery of this sort are attested for the classical period (cf. e.g. Thuc. 6.69), but only in the context of a siege on land.<sup>13</sup>

At 28 Wilamowitz proposed βουδό[ροις], which Page writes as βουδό[ροισι] 'ox-flaying'. Babrius 97.7 has μαχαίρας βουδόρους 'knives for flaying', while Hsch. gives

<sup>12</sup> H. Jurenka, *ZÖG* 54 (1903), 579.

<sup>13</sup> See E. W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery: Historical Development* (Oxford, 1969), 171.

a substantive βουδόρωι· μοχλῶι, ὧι βοῦς δέρουσιν; cf. also Hes. *Op.* 504 μῆνα δὲ Ἀθηναίωνα, κάκ' ἤματα, βουδόρα πάντα. But it is somewhat unclear how 'splinters of wood' would be used for flaying oxen; Edmonds obscurely refers to the 'skewer-like pegs used by tanners' (presumably for stretching hides, but not therefore for flaying). Janssen prefers \*βουόδο[ρα, which he takes as a passive 'stripped from oxen', and agreeing with περιβόλα 'covers', but there are no parallels for this sense, and the adjective is in any case too strongly divorced from the noun for such a connection. The only other attested compound in βου-δο- is βουδόκος 'receiving oxen' (Callim. *Aet.* 58.2), which does not suit the required sense. I think a reference to a goad is expected (cf. Wilamowitz, 45: 'ein Stecken, mit dem man die Ochsen prügelt'), e.g. \*βουδό[νο]ις (-οισι) 'ox-driving', a possible (although unattested) formation; cf. the forms at Leonidas *AP* 6.305.6 = *HE* 2318, Ariston *AP* 6.306.2 = *HE* 777 ἐτνοδόνος 'soup-stirring' (although compounds in -δονος are otherwise passive, e.g. οἰστροδόνος, ἀλίδονος). An ox-goad would usually be a straight stick with a sharp spike at one end. We might also note E. *Andr.* 1133-4 ἔκλυτοι τ' ἀμφώβολοι σφαγῆς . . . βουπόροι 'ox-piercing spits pulled from the slaughtered beasts' (and used as missiles); see Stevens on the passage. At E. *Cyc.* 302, Hdt. 2.135 βουπόρος is also used as an epithet for a spit.

60-4

60	ὅ]τε δὲ τᾷ λείποιεν αὔραι <sup>14</sup>	2 tro.
	τᾷ δ' ἐπεισέπιπτον, ἀφρώι	2 tro.
	δ' <δ'> ἀβακχίωτος ὁμ-	lec.]
	βρος, εἰς δὲ τρόφιμον ἄγγος	ia. ba.
	ἐχέιτ'.	

'Whenever the winds left off in one place, they attacked in another, and the unbacchic water rained down with foam, and poured into his alimentary vessel.' Here, in the first lines of column iii, Timotheus describes a drowning Asiatic, who appears to have been introduced in the fragmentary passage at 40ff.

At 61-2 the papyrus has αφρωι[[σ]]δε| αβακχιωτοσομβ., although the scribal expunction of sigma, noted by both Wilamowitz and Page, is not quite clear. Wilamowitz objected to αὔραι as the subject of ἐπεισέπιπτον, and emended to ἐπεισέπιπτεν ἀφρώδης ἀβακχ. ὁμβ., but cf. Hes. *Th.* 872ff. αἱ δ' ἄλλαι μὰψ αὔραι ἐπιπνεῖουσι θάλασσαν· | αἱ δὲ τοι πίπτουσαι ἐς ἥεροειδέα πόντον, | πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι, κακῇ θνίουσιν ἀέλλῃ. We are therefore obliged to supplement a verb in the clause at 61-3. Page's <δ'>, with the correction ἀφρώι, will not do, as there is no parallel for ὦω with ὁμβρος *vel sim.* as the subject; we usually expect Ζεύς, unless the verb is used impersonally. Sudhaus proposes ἀφρώι δὲ <περιέζεσεν>, but the size of the omission would be surprising.<sup>15</sup> This is improved by Gargiulo's ἐ<ζε>,<sup>16</sup> though the elision here looks odd: Gargiulo must assume that the form used is ἐ<ζε>, but the 'open' Ionic orthography -εε- is never found in the papyrus (although conjectured by Page at 18 πρα[νέες; see above), and we would not expect elision of contracted -ει. Read ἄφρει with Danielsson (100-1) or, perhaps less convincingly, ἄφριζε(ν) with

<sup>14</sup> Page wrongly prints αὔραι.

<sup>15</sup> S. Sudhaus, *RhM* 58 (1903), 482.

<sup>16</sup> T. Gargiulo, *QUCC* 54 (1996), 73-81.

Sitzler;<sup>17</sup> thus, ‘. . . the unbacchic water foamed, and poured into his alimentary vessel (i.e. the stomach, or perhaps the whole of the oesophagus)’. We should print ὅτε δὲ τᾷ λείποιν αὖραι, | τᾷ δ’ ἐπεισέπιπτον, ἄφ- | ρει δ’ ἀβακχίωτος ὄμβρος, | εἰς δὲ τρόφιμον ἄγγος | ἐχέιτ’, which may be scanned 2 tro. | lec. | 2 tro. | ith. ||.

68–71

	κατακορῆς ἀπείλει	cr. ba.
	γόμφοισ<ιν> ἐμπρίων	ia. sp.
70	†μιμουμένος† λυμεῶ-	ia. cr.
	νι σώματος θαλάσσαι.	ia. ba.

‘He (sc. the drowning Asiatic) immoderately hurled insults, gnashing his teeth at the sea, the destroyer of his body (?)’. Page restores γόμφοισ<ιν> at 69 for the papyrus γόμφοις, but an accusative is desiderated after ἐμπρίων as at D.S. 17.92.3 ὀδόντας ἐμπεπρικώς (cf. the accusative with other compound forms of the verb at Lucian. *Somn.* 14 ὀδόντας συνέπριε, *Ar. Ra.* 927 μὴ πρίε τοὺς ὀδόντας), and it is worth reviving Sitzler’s γόμφους,<sup>18</sup> since this is not recorded by Page. However, it may just be possible that the case has been influenced by the prefix ἐν- (the sense ‘bite deep into’ as at D.S. 10.17 τὸ οὖς ἐνέπρισε τοῖς ὀδοῦσι is clearly not required). Wilamowitz (53) cites Opp. *H.* 5.185–6 γένυν σκολοῖσι χαλινοῖς ἐμπρίει ‘it gnashes its jaws on the curved bridle’, where the verb is construed differently and the direct object still in the accusative, and Inama compares Lat. *infrendere dentibus* (e.g. Verg. *A.* 3.664),<sup>19</sup> but it is not clear that the two phrases are genuinely comparable. We are in the middle of a sequence of dochmiacs (which Page excluded from his analysis, but which are admitted by Wilamowitz and West), and γόμφους ἐμπρίων is a dochmiac of the form – – – u –. Of 70 †μιμούμενος† I despair.

University College Dublin

J. H. HORDERN

<sup>17</sup> J. Sitzler, *Bursians Jahresb.* 133 (1907), 250.

<sup>18</sup> J. Sitzler (n. 17), 251.

<sup>19</sup> V. Inama, *RIL* 36 (1903), 615.