

A new papyrus text of Thucydides

(I 90,3 - 91,3)

In the spring of 1969 the University of Amsterdam acquired a collection of papyri, containing several literary papyri, the majority of which have not yet been identified. The present text, with the inventory number 50, consists of two small fragments, respectively of 4.4×2 cm. and 1.4×1.7 cm., and one large fragment of 13×6 cm. The text is on the light brown recto-side. The papyrus seems to have been used before. Also on the verso-side there are ink traces, which cannot be identified anymore, though. The papyrus is irregularly broken off on all sides and displays many holes. In various places the text has been rubbed off. Our fragments come from one and the same scroll. Before lines 11-13 one can still distinguish the ends of the lines in the preceding column. It is evident that hardly any space was left between the various columns. The width of a column was 6 cm. and each line contained 16 to 22 letters. It is not possible anymore to determine the height of the column, because both top and bottom of the papyrus have got lost.

The papyrus dates from the second century A.D., in all probability from the middle of the century. The hand of our papyrus displays the same characteristics as that of P.Oxy. VI, 853 (= C. H. ROBERTS, *Greek Literary Hands* 17^a). The papyrus does not contain any diacritics. A. R. PACK, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, 2nd edition, Ann. Arbor, 1965, mentions six fragments on papyrus of the first book of Thucydides: 1504-1509. None of these contains the passage on the present papyrus. Since the publication of the second edition of Pack's work, only two papyrus fragments of Thucydides have been added to the 33 given by Pack, viz. P.Yale 19 = Thuc. VII 34,8-36,5 and P.Berol. Inv. Nr. 11 519 (published by W. MÜLLER in *Forschungen und Berichte der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, 10, 1968, p. 127/8) = Thuc. VII 60,5-62,3. Pack² 1518 has been republished as P.Mil. Vogl. IV, 205.

For the papyri of Thucydides cf. Thuk. Hist. Ed. altera corr. Teubner, Leipzig, 1960 (O. LUSCHNAT), p. 24 sq. and Add. p. 206 sq.

For the manuscript tradition of Thucydides, see W. EBERHARDT in *Gymnasium* 67, 1960, pp. 209-223 and A. KLEINLOGEL, *Geschichte des Thucydidestextes im Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1965.

- approx. 9 letters φειδομέ]νο[υς]
 [μήτε ιδίου μήτε δ]ημοσ[ίου]
 [οικοδομήματος] ὅθεν [τις]
 [ὠφελία ἔστ]αι ἐς τ[ὸ ἔργον,]
 5 [ἀλλὰ καθα]ίρ[ου]ντα[ς πάν-]
 [τα. καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτ]α διδά[ξας]
 [καὶ ὑπειπών,] τᾶλλα [ὅ]τ[ι αὐ-]
 [τὸς τὰ κεῖ πράξοι,] ᾤχετο. [καὶ]
 [ἐς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα ἐλθὼν]
 10 [οὐ προσ]ῆει [πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς,]
 [ἀλλὰ δι]ῆγε καὶ πρ[ουφασί-]
 [ζετο. καὶ ὁπότε τ]ις αὐτὸν ἔ-
 [ρο[ιτο τ]ῶν ἐν τ[έλει ὄντων]
 [ὅτ]ι οὐκ ἐπέρχ[εται ἐπὶ τὸ]
 15 κοινόν, ἔφη τοὺς [ξυμπρέσ-]
 [βεις ἀναμένει]ν, ἀσχολίας]
 [δέ τινος οὐ]σ[ης [αὐτοὺς ὑπο-]
 [λημφθῆν]αι, προσδέχεσθαι]
 [μέντοι ἐν [τάχει ἤξειν]
 20 καὶ θαυμά[ζειν ὡς οὐπω]
 [πάρεισιν. οἱ [δ]ὲ ἀκ[ούοντες]
 [τῷ μὲν Θεμιστ[ο]κλεῖ ἐ-]
 [πίθοντο δι[ὰ] φιλίαν αὐτ[οῦ,]
 [τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἀφικνου-]
 25 μένων καὶ σαφῶς κατη-
 [γορούντων ὅτι τειχί]ζε-
 [ταί τε ἤδη καὶ ὑψο[ς] λ[αμ-]
 [βάνει, οὐκ εἶχον ὅπως χρ[ῆ]
 [ἀπιστ[ῆ]σαι. γνοὺς [δὲ ἐκεῖ-]
 30 νος [κελ]εῦει αὐτο[ὺς μὴ λό-]
 [γο[ις μ]ᾶλλον παρ[άγεσθαι]
 [. . . ἢ π]έμψαι σφῶ[ν αὐτῶν]
 [ἄνδρα]ς οἵτινε[ς χρηστοὶ]
 [καὶ πιστῶς ἀν]αγ[γελοῦσι]
 35 [σκεψάμενοι. ἀποστέλλου-]
 [σι οὖν, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ]

[Θεμιστοκλῆς τοῖς Ἀθηναί-]
 [οῖς κρύφ]α πέμπ[ει κελεύ-]
 [ων ὡς] ἤκιστ[α ἐπιφανῶς]

The text of the papyrus has been compared with the editions of TH. ARNOLD (Oxford, 1874), J. DE ROMILLY (Paris, 1953) and O. LUSCHNAT (Leipzig, 1954).

- Line 1 The words καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γυναικας καὶ παῖδας immediately preceding φειδομένους are usually cancelled, because they were not read by the scholiastic. The papyrus, unfortunately, does not get us any further here.
- Line 8 The first small fragment ends here.
- Line 18 Only G. reads ὑποληφθῆναι, all the other MMS have the correct form ὑπολειφθῆναι. Our papyrus has the Hellenistic form ὑπολημφθῆναι. This is the wrong verb.
- Lines 22/23 All the MMS have the imperfect ἐπέθοντο. Should it be true, as seems to be the case here, that we are not dealing here with a case of iotacism, we have to reject the aorist of the papyrus.
- Line 24 All the MMS read here δὲ ἄλλων.
- Line 27 All the MMS read here καὶ ἤδη.
- Line 32 The reading of the papyrus seems to vary here from that of the MMS. It is not the fact that this line is supposed to have contained only 16 letters (this is also the number of letters of the completely preserved line 24) which gives rise to this supposition, but the space before πέμψαι is too large to have contained only two letters. At the beginning of this line, moreover, there are traces of at least two letters. A composite of πέμπειν has possibly been used in the text.
- Line 34 The large fragment ends here.
- Lines 38/39 As in the MMS, the papyrus had κελεύων and does not support the omission of this word in Lex. Vindob. 91,7.
 The second small fragment contains remnants of these two lines.

Amsterdam

P. J. Sijpesteijn

Addendum.

After writing this article in the spring of 1969 two more Thucydides-papyri have come to my notice: P.Oxy. XXXIV, 2703 = Thuc. I, 110, 1-2 and P.Oxy. XXXVI, 2749 = Thuc. II, 90, 2-92,2.