

[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 γυναῖκας 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 ἐπεῖθοντο. 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.

