In 1954 E. Lobel and C. Roberts published *P. Oxy. 2330*, which they ascribed to Ctesias of Cnidus, an author of the 5th/4th centuries BC. The identification was made possible by a reference by Demetrius, *De Elocutione (= On Style)*, 212-4. Demetrius writes about repetition in order to make a greater impression. Subsequently he describes the situation and then quotes the relevant sentence as written by Ctesias: “Ἐγὼ μὲν σὲ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ μὲν δι᾽ ἐμὲ ἐσώθης...”. These same words we also find on the papyrus, lines 7-8. Up to the present day, this fragment is nearly the only surviving part of Ctesias’ *Persica*. In 2003 Rosa Giannattasio Andria made a new collation, but preparing my forthcoming edition of Ctesias’ *Persian History* (Stronk 2010), I made a collation as well (cf. www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk, online database sub authors a-z > Ctesias).

### P. Oxy. 2330:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transcription</th>
<th>text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[.a.c...λε.]αια[γυτεςδ...].</td>
<td>[.a.σ...λε.]αια[γυς τες δ’ όσ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τινοτια[γ...κενελιες οδει</td>
<td>τιν δι ηγ[ο]ς ενελιεις ο δ’ ηλ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πενφερετογουνπροτον</td>
<td>πεν φερε το γονη προτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.ραμματ[α].ραφπροςζαρει</td>
<td>[.γραμμαι[α] γραψω προς Ζαρει-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ναιαν-καγραφε-ετρογ</td>
<td>ναιαν και γραφε Στραγ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαιοζαραι...αιαινοτολεγει</td>
<td>γαιος Ζαρεηναιαιν ουτο λεγει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εγομενεεοκακακυδει</td>
<td>εγω μεν σε εσωσα και συ δι έ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεει[α.θης-εγωδεδιαεε</td>
<td>με έσωθης εγω δε δια σε ά-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πο[...]μηνκειεκεια</td>
<td>πο[...]μηνκειεκεια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αυτοεματον-συγαρμουε</td>
<td>αυτος εμαςτον ου γαρ μοι συ έ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουλουχα[...]εσαθαι-γωδεταω</td>
<td>βουλου χαρ[i]σαθαι εγω δε ταθ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τατα[κακ]ακατονερωτατον</td>
<td>τα τα [κακ]θαι και τον έρωτα τον-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lobel/Roberts 1954.
3. There are also some other sentences preserved in Demetrius, *On Style*, 215-216.
The fragment is part of the Median history, discussed in books 4-6 of Ctesias’ *Persian History*. The main characters of the fragment are Zarinaea, the queen of the Sacae, and Stryangaeus, a Mede (who is in love with the queen). From the fragments of Ctesias preserved by Nicholas of Damascus (*FGrH* No. 90 F. 5) we know that Stryangaeus has declared his love to the queen, but that she declined his proposal, very kindly but very clearly as well. It leads to the following translation, from the end of line 2: “He said: ‘Now, first of all, I will write a letter to Zarinaea’; and he wrote: ‘Stryangaeus speaks to Zarinaea as follows: I saved you and you were saved by me, but I have perished because of you and I kill myself, since you did not wish to be kind to me. I myself did not choose this evil fate nor this love, but love has destroyed me. This god is common to you as well as to all mankind. Whomever he approaches favourably, he gives the utmost pleasures and contrives for him very many other benefits, but whomever he comes to in anger, as he does now with me, he finally turns him out and causes his complete breakdown and reduces him to nothing. I come to this conclusion from my own death. I will not curse you in any way, but I will address the most righteous prayer to you: if you did right things towards me many beautiful and good things may occur to you, but if you treated me wrongly, …’”.

The text is written on a piece of papyrus of medium brown colour, measuring max. c. 16 cm x max. c. 8 cm. It appears to have been a complete column (σελίς), in width as well as in length, of a text, which continued further on the sheet. The last letters of the column, “πολ.”, suggest the continuation in the following one like: “λὰ καλὰ καὶ ἁγαθά σοι γίγνοιτο, εἰ δὲ ἄδικα …” kτλ. (cf. also the text of Nicholas of Damascus: *FGrH* No. 90 F 5), which has already
been implemented in the translation above. Neither above nor under the text of
the column traces of writing are visible, showing a rather broad upper and lower
margin, perhaps suggesting an origin as part of a literary scroll. The margin is
clearly discernable to the right, to the left is somewhat more damage, though
the completeness of the sentences is obvious. The signs of wear which are vis-
ible look at least partly consistent with the mechanical damage caused by fre-
quent unrolling and rolling up of the scroll on the so-called umbilicus
(ὀµφαλός: cf., e.g., Hunger 1975, 43 sq.). The writing is to be dated to the sec-
ond century AD, most likely the second part. The papyrus is, as stated, quite
worn, but generally well legible. Problems occur in line 1, which is badly dam-
aged. The ink of lines 17 and 18 is somewhat less well preserved compared with
that of the rest of the text.

1. In line 2 a clear space is visible between the closing sigma of ἐνέλει
pες and the following pronomen personale ὁ: it is unclear whether an ‘ano teleia’ had
been written in this space. Rosa Giannattasio Andria (2003, 16, note 12) suggests
that this space might indicate the beginning of a new paragraph.

2. In their collation of this text Lobel and Roberts [= LR](1954) read, in lines
4-5 and 6 the proper name Ζαρειναία. I completely agree with Giannattasio
Andria (2003) that the text is unmistakably clear and reads Ζαρειναία.

3. In lines 13-4 LR omit the phrase ἀλλὰ µε ἔρως ἀ
pώλεσεν.
4. In line 20 LR read ὅτῳ in stead of ὅταν. The former reading would stylis-
tically be thoroughly possible (reiteration, and the construction ὅτῳ µὲν …, ὅτῳ
δὲ ….), but the τ and the α are very clear and therefore ὅταν is the appropriate
reading.

5. In line 21 LR give οἰονπερ in stead of ὅσπερ: given the space available
and the slightly varying width of the letters in the writer’s hand both options
are possible. The damage to the first letter, moreover (visible is the lower left part
of the letter: a stroke of the pen, rounded at the bottom side; the upper side of the let-
ter has disappeared in a gap, which continues to the right; it is not to be deter-
mined whether the next penstroke would have been the finishing of the omicron
or the omega), is such that the reading of an o or an ω are equally possible: I how-
ever, like Giannattasio Andria, prefer the latter option, if only because of the clar-
ity of the meaning of the sentence. Stylistically it fits in with the remarks of
Dionysius of Halicarnassus (D.H. Comp. 10) and Photius (Phot. Bibl. [72] 45a5-
7) regarding Ctesias’ simple style.

6. The text in the void of line 22 can be supplemented by the intended con-
tradiction between this sentence and line 19: there Stryangaeus writes about
ἀγαθὰ, so κακὰ appears the appropriate suppletion for the first part of the void
and ἐρ the logical suppletion for γασάµενος.

7. In the right margin of line 23 a correction is indicated for
ρόριζον to be
changed into
ρόρριζον.

8. For line 24 Lenfant proposes to read ἐξέτριψεν in stead of ἐξέτρεψεν,
though the relevant ε is perfectly clear on the papyrus. In the context, however,
the verb ἐκτρίβω makes more sense than ἐκτρέπω: hence I support her suggestion
and will use it in the text. After the ‘\textit{ano teleia}’ after \textit{ἐξέτριψεν} appears before \textit{τεκµαίροµαι} another space, though less wide than the one in line 2. One may wonder, like Giannattasio Andria (2003, 16, note 12) does regarding line 2, whether this space here, too, may indicate the beginning of a (another) new paragraph in Stryangaeus’ letter.

9. The void of four letters in line 29 can be supplemented by the context and looking at Ctesias’ style: especially his characteristic to repeat central notions makes, after \textit{δικαιοτάτην} in line 28, \textit{δίκα} a suppletion logical in context and meaning (especially after the preceding \textit{µὲν} in line 26: after \textit{δὲ} \textit{ἀδίκ} would have been the obvious choice).

Though it is only a relatively small fragment, it offers – certainly comparing it with texts transmitted by others, regarding this fragment especially Diodorus of Sicily (2.34.3-6) and Nicholas of Damascus - valuable information regarding style and aims of Ctesias.
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