P. OXY. 2330: A NEW COLLATION

(Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum 34)

Jan P. Stronk

In 1954 E. Lobel and C. Roberts published *P. Oxy.* 2330¹, which they ascribed to Ctesias of Cnidus, an author of the 5th/4th centuries BC². 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: "Έγὰ μὲν σὲ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὰ 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*³. 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:

transcription

text

-		
[.α.ςλε.]απα[νψτεςδ].	1	[.α.σλε.]απα[νψ.τες δ'έσ]
τινοτιαγ[.] εενελειπες οδει	2	τιν ὅτι ἄγ[ο]ς ἐνέλειπες. ὁ δ'εἶ-
πενφερετογουνπρωτον	3	πεν· φέρε τὸ γοῦν πρῶτον
[.]ραμματ[α.]ραψωπροςζαρει	4	[γ]ράμματ[α γ]ράψω πρός Ζαρει-
ναιαν·καιγραφει·ετρυαγ	5	ναίαν· καὶ γράφει· Στρυαγ-
γαιοςζαρε[]αιαιουτωλεγει	6	γαῖος Ζαρε[ιν]αία οὕτω λέγει·
εγωμενεεεεωεακαιευδιε	7	έγω μὲν σὲ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ δι'έ-
μεες[.]θης εγωδεδιαςεα	8	με ἐσ[ώ]θης. ἐγὼ δὲ δ̞ιὰ σὲ ἀ-
πω[]μηνκαιεπεκτεινα	9	πω[λό]μην, καὶ ἀπέκτεινα
αυτος εμαυτον · ουγαρμοις υε	10	αὐτὸς ἐμαυτόν· οὐ γάρ μοι σὺ ἐ-
βουλουχαρ[.] cacθαι εγωδεταυ	11	βούλου χαρ[ί]σασθαι. ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦ-
τατα[κακ]ακαιτονερωτατον	12	τα τα [κακ]ὰ καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα τόν-

¹ Lobel/Roberts 1954.

² See, i.a., Stronk 2004-05, Stronk 2007, and Stronk 2010.

³ There are also some other sentences preserved in Demetrius, *On Style*, 215-216.

δεουκαυτοςειλομηναλλα	13	δε οὐκ αὐτὸς είλόμην, ἀλλὰ
μεερως απωλες εν οδεθεος	14	με ἔρως ἀπώλεσεν. ὁ δὲ θεὸς
ουτο[.]εςτινκοινοςκαιςοικαι	15	οὖτό[ς] ἐστιν κοινὸς καὶ σοὶ καὶ
απαςινανθρωποιειν·οτωι	16	ἄπασιν ἀνθρώποισιν. ὅτῷ
μενουνειλεως[.]λθηιπλει	17	μὲν οὖν εἵλεως [ἔ]λθη, πλεί
ςτας γεηδονας δ[ι δ] φςινκαιαλ	18	στας γε ήδονὰς δ[ι δ]φσιν, καὶ ἄλ-
λαπλειστααγαθαε[.]οιησεναυ	19	λὰ πλεῖστα ἀγαθὰ ἐ[π]οίησεν αὐ-
[τ]ον·[ο]τα[ν]δεοργιζομενος	20	[τ]όν. [ὅ]τα[ν] δὲ ὀργιζόμενος
[ε]λθηιφ[.]περεμοινυνπλει	21	[ἔ]λθη ὥ[σ]περ ἐμοὶ νῦν, πλεῖ-
ςτακ[]γαςαμε[ν]οςτοτελευ	22	στα κ[ακὰ ἐρ]γασάμε[ν]ος τὸ τελευ-
ταιο[νπ]ροριζον[απ]ωλεςεν ρρ	23	ταῖο[ν π]ρόρριζον [ἀπ]ώλεσεν
καιε[.ετ.]εψεν· τ[ε]κμαιρομαι	24	καὶ ἐ[ξέτρ]ιψεν. τ[ε]κμαίρομαι
δετ[ωιεμ]ωιθαν[α]τωι[.]γω	25	δὲ τ[ῷ ἐμ]ῷ θαν[ά]τῳ. [ἐ]γὼ
γαρςοι[κατ]αραςομαιμενου	26	γάρ σοι [κατ]αράσομαι μέν οὐ-
δεν [επ] ευξομαιδες οιτ [ην]	27	δέν.[ἐπ]εύξομαι δέ σοι τ[ὴν]
δικαιο[]ην[ε]υχην·ειμ[ε]ν	28	δικαιο[τάτ]ην [ε]ὐχήν· εἰ μ[ὲ]ν
ςυεμε[]ιαε[π]οιηςαςπολ	29	σὺ ἐμε [δίκα]ια ἐ[π]οίησας πολ

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 Zareinaea'; and he wrote: 'Stryangaeus speaks to Zareinaea 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 ma<ny 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, " π ολ", suggest the continuation in the following one like: " λ à καλà καὶ ἀγαθὰ σοι γίγνοιντο, εὶ δὲ ἀδίκια ..." κτλ. (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 visible look at least partly consistent with the mechanical damage caused by frequent unrolling and rolling up of the scroll on the so-called umbilicus ($\partial \mu \varphi \alpha \lambda \delta \varsigma$: cf., e.g., Hunger 1975, 43 sq.). The writing is to be dated to the second 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 damaged. 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 ἐνέλειπες 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 Ζαρειεναία. 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 άλλὰ με ἔρως ἀπώλεσεν.
- 4. In line 20 LR read $\delta\tau \phi$ in stead of $\delta\tau \alpha \nu$. The former reading would stylistically be thoroughly possible (reiteration, and the construction $\delta\tau \phi$ $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$..., $\delta\tau \phi$ $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$...), but the τ and the α are very clear and therefore $\delta\tau \alpha \nu$ is the appropriate reading.
- 5. In line 21 LR give oiov $\pi\epsilon\rho$ in stead of $\omega \pi\epsilon\rho$: 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 letter has disappeared in a gap, which continues to the right; it is not to be determined 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 however, like Giannattasio Andria, prefer the latter option, if only because of the clarity 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 contradiction between this sentence and line 19: there Stryangaeus writes about ἀγαθὰ, so κ[ακὰ 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 πρόριζον to be changed into πρόρριζον.
- 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

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 δικαιοτάτην in line 28, [δίκα]ια a suppletion logical in context and meaning (especially after the preceding μèν in line 26: after δὲ [ἀδίκ]ια 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

FGrH = Jacoby, F. 1923-1958: Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, vol. IIA No. 90 (=Nikolaos), 324-430 (text); vol. IIC, 229-291 (commentary), Berlin 1926; vol. IIIC No. 688 (=Ktesias), Leiden 1958.

Giannattasio Andria, R. 2003: Novità testuali su P. Oxy. 2330 (Ctesias Cnidius, *FGrHist* 688 F 8b), *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigrafik* 144, 15-18.

Hunger, H. 1975: Antikes und mittelalterliches Buch- und Schriftwesen, in: Meier, M./F. Hindermann/A. Schindler (eds.) 1975, 25-148.

Lenfant, D. 2004: Ctésias de Cnide: La Perse, l'Inde, autres fragments, texte établi, traduit et commenté par D. Lenfant, Paris.

Lobel E./C. Roberts 1954: 2330. Ctesias, Persica, in: Lobel, E./C. Roberts (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XXII, London, 81-84.

Meier, M./F. Hindermann/A. Schindler (eds.) 1975: Die Textüberlieferung der antiken Literatur und der Bibel, München [paperback edition].

Stronk, J.P. 2004-05: Ctesias of Cnidus. From Physician to Author, *Talanta* 36-37, 101-122. Stronk, J.P. 2007: Ctesias of Cnidus: a Reappraisal, *Mnemosyne* 60, 25-58.

Stronk, J.P. 2010: Ctesias' Persian History, Part 1: Introduction, Text, and Translation, Düsseldorf.

Jan P. Stronk
Oude Geschiedenis, Universiteit van Amsterdam
c/o "Phoenix"
Reestein 9
NL- 2151 KB Nieuw-Vennep
j.p.stronk@uva.nl