

J. M. BIGWOOD

WHEN A FRAGMENT OF PAPYRUS bearing 28 short lines of Ctesias' *Persica* came to light in Oxyrhynchus, this was a discovery of some interest.<sup>1</sup> Although the summaries and allusions of later authors provide a great deal of information about Ctesias' history, very few of his actual words survive. Hence the fragment has a significant contribution to make to what we know of the language and style of this work, as well as to our appreciation of its general nature.<sup>2</sup>

The text preserved by the papyrus is a remarkable one—first some mutilated lines of dialogue, then the first part of a love-letter, in which a rejected suitor writes of the agony which leads him to suicide. In Jacoby's edition it appears as follows:

/1[.α.σ.[.].λε.απανη.τες δ' ἐ[σ]/τιν ὅτι ἄγρος ἐνέλειπες'. ὁ δ' εἰ/πεν· 'φέρε τὸ γοῦν πρῶτον / [γ]ράμματ[α] [γ]ράψω πρὸς Ζαρεῖ/<sup>5</sup>εναίαν(?)'. καὶ γράφει·

'Στρηναγ/γαῖος Ζαρε[ιεν]αῖαι σὺτ[ω]ν λέγει· / ἐγὼ μὲν σέ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ δι' ἐ/μέ ἐσ[ώ]θης, ἐγὼ δέ διὰ σέ ἀ/πω[λ]όμην, καὶ ἀπέκτεινα /<sup>10</sup> αὐτὸς ἐμαυτόν· οὐ γάρ μοι σὺ ἐ/βούλου χαρ[ι]σασθαι. ἐγὼ δέ ταύ/τα τὰ κακὰ καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα τόν/δε οὐκ αὐτὸς εἰλόμην, ὁ δὲ θεὸς / οὗτό[ς] ἐστιν κοινὸς καὶ σοὶ καὶ /<sup>15</sup> ἄψαριν ἀνθρώποισιν. ὅτ[ω]ι μὲν οὖν εἰλεως ἔλθῃ, πλεί/στας γε ἡδονὰς διδῶσιν, καὶ ἄλ/λα πλείστα ἀγαθὰ ἐποίησεν αὐ/τόν, ὅτ[ω]ι δὲ ὀργιζόμενος/<sup>20</sup> ἔλθῃ(ι) οἷον/περ ἐμοὶ νῦν, πλεί/στα κ[ακὰ] ἐργασάμενος τὸ τελευ/ταῖον πρόρριζον ἀπώ-  
λεσεν / καὶ ἐξέτ[ρ]εψεν. τεκμαίρομαι / δὲ τῶι ἐμῶι θανάτῳ. [ἐ]γὼ /<sup>25</sup> γάρ σοι καταράσο-  
μαι μὲν σὺ/δέν, ἐπεύξομαι δὲ σοὶ τήν / δικαιο[τ]ά[τ]η[ν] εὐχὴν· εἰ μὲν σὺ ἐμέ [δ]ί[κ]α[ι]α  
ἐποίησας, πολ\*\*\*

But can we be certain that these notable lines come from Ctesias and from what was after all a historical work? Giangrande, rejecting the view of earlier

<sup>1</sup>POxy 2330 (2nd century A.D.), first published by C. H. Roberts, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22 (1954) 81 ff. F. Jacoby re-edited it for his edition of the fragments of Ctesias in *FGH Hist III C* (Leiden 1958) 688 F 8b. However, no photograph existed and the fragment could not be located, hence a fresh collation was not possible (Jacoby, *app. crit.* p. 453). In R. A. Coles, *Location-list of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London 1974), it is described as "not found (March 1974)." For brief comments see G. J. D. Aalders, *Hermeneus* 28 (1956–7) 1–6, R. Merkelbach, *ArchPap* 16 (1956) 109–110, and K. Latte, *Gnomon* 27 (1955) 497–498. More extensive discussion is provided by M. Gigante, "Lettera alla regina o dello stile di Ctesia," *RFIC* 40 (1962) 249–272, D. Del Corno, "La lingua di Ctesia," *Athenaeum* ns 40 (1962) 126–141, and most recently by G. Giangrande, "On an Alleged Fragment of Ctesias," *QUCC* 23 (1976) 31–46. In the following pages the last three discussions will be referred to by author's name only.

<sup>2</sup>The papyrus also sheds some interesting light on the methods of Nicolaus of Damascus, whose history of Assyria and Media is based on that of Ctesias: cf. D. A. W. Biltcliffe, "P. Ox. no. 2330 and its Importance for the Study of Nicolaus of Damascus," *RhM* NF 112 (1969) 85–93. Recent bibliography on Ctesias is given in my article, "The Ancient Accounts of the Battle of Cunaxa," *AJP* 104 (1983) 340–357.

scholars, has argued that we must be dealing with a later author, one who has substantially embroidered on Ctesias' tale. A reexamination of the issue is in order and will perhaps add to our knowledge of Ionian historical writing in general, as well as to our knowledge of Ctesias.

Giangrande concentrates on the dialect. The papyrus, he claims, is in Attic, or as he would prefer to say, in Atticistic Greek. It cannot, therefore, belong to the work of Ctesias whom we know to have written in Ionic. The question of the dialect is a crucial one and we must examine it with care. However, first some preliminary matters. On what grounds has the papyrus been attributed to Ctesias? Does it conform in every way to its alleged context? There are also stylistic questions. Giangrande (38) believes that certain rhetorical artifices, in addition to the dialect, point to a comparatively late date. Is the style consistent with what we know of Ctesias' writing?

#### I. ATTRIBUTION TO CTESIAS

The protagonists of the papyrus, the ill-starred Median general Stryangaeus, who is writing the letter, and the intended recipient, a queen of the Sacae named Zarinaea, are not unknown to us from other sources.<sup>3</sup> We meet them in fact in a number of authors, each of whom in some fashion reproduces Ctesias' account of the war between the Medes and the Sacae, and his tale of the unrequited love of the Mede for his former opponent. Tzetzes, for example, refers to these events, but very briefly (*Chil.* 12.893–898). In Diodorus (2.34.1 ff. = F 5), we have a general description of the reign of Zarinaea, although Diodorus does not include Stryangaeus or the love-story.<sup>4</sup> Further details and an account of the love-affair are provided by the anonymous author of a tract on famous women (*De mul.* 2 = F 7), who cites Ctesias by name. Even more interesting is the story recounted by Nicolaus of Damascus, who includes a version of the letter supposedly written by Stryangaeus (90 F 5). Finally, but no less important, there is the evidence of Demetrius (*Eloc.* 212–214 = T 14a and F 8a). In a discussion of the vividness of Ctesias' writing, Demetrius summarises the story, quoting verbatim a large part of the first sentence of the letter—ἐγὼ μὲν σέ ἔσωσα, καὶ σὺ μὲν δι' ἐμέ ἔσωθης, ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ σέ ἀπωλόμην (F 8a).

It was the striking agreement between Demetrius' quotation and the papyrus that convinced Roberts that the papyrus was from Ctesias.<sup>5</sup> Gian-

<sup>3</sup>For the variant readings of the general's name see F 7 lines 3–4 *app. crit.* The queen's name was probably Ζαρναία: cf. Anon. *De mul.* 2 = F 7 and Nic. Dam. 90 F 5. In Diod. 2.34.3 = F 5 we have ζαρίνναν D ζαρίναν C. In F 8b line 5 the nu above the 2nd epsilon in Ζαρειαίαν suggests perhaps that the reading should be Ζαρειαίαν.

<sup>4</sup>On Diodorus' use of Ctesias see my "Diodorus and Ctesias," *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 195–207.

<sup>5</sup>The correspondence is exact except for a second μὲν after σὺ in Demetrius, which may in fact be correct. This is the *lectio difficilior* (cf. Giangrande 39–40). The first μὲν will then be balanced by καί, the second by δέ: cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1954) 374, who gives an example of the structure μὲν . . . καὶ . . . μὲν . . . δέ from Antiphon.

grande, who believes, as we saw, that this is not the original version of Ctesias' story, does not adequately explain why a later author should so crudely repeat fourteen words from Ctesias' first sentence before continuing with his own letter. Nor does he explain the close relationship between Nicolaus' story and the papyrus. Although Nicolaus' account lacks the initial dialogue and also a portion of the letter, there are some striking verbal similarities. We note that the words γράφειν, ἀποκτείνειν, ἀγαθὰ, δικαίως occur in some form in both versions. In both we have the statement ἐγὼ μὲν σέ ἔσωσα. Nicolaus' letter also employs a variant of the opening formula found in the papyrus—Στρυαγγαῖος Ζαρ[ειν]αία οὕτω λέγει (below 000),<sup>6</sup> and it is not the usual formula. Clearly there is a very close connection between the accounts of Nicolaus, the papyrus, and Demetrius. The most obvious explanation, and the most economical one, is that Demetrius and Nicolaus are both drawing upon Ctesias and that the papyrus is a fragment of Ctesias.<sup>7</sup>

## II. VOCABULARY AND STYLISTIC FEATURES

There are no major discrepancies between the various authors who relate the story of Stryangaeus and Zarinaea,<sup>8</sup> and there is no discrepancy between these sources and the papyrus fragment. Nor is there anything in the subject matter of the papyrus which is alien to Ctesias. The ruthlessness of the god, for example, in lines 19–23, is as appropriate to Ctesias as it is to many an earlier or later author, as may be seen from the conduct of the goddesses Aphrodite and Derceto in fragment 1 (= Diod. 2.4.3 ff.). Moreover, even the vocabulary and, despite Giangrande, the style of the papyrus, although they will not prove that this is a comparatively early piece of writing, fit quite well with the supposition that the author is Ctesias.

The vocabulary, as has been pointed out by Gigante (250 f.), is very similar to that of Herodotus. Almost every word in fact appears in Herodotus in a comparable sense. Exceptions are few—namely ὀργίζομαι, λείπω compounded with ἐν, and, if ἐξέτρεψεν is read,<sup>9</sup> ἐκτρέπω with the meaning "overthrow." Herodotus uses ἀνατρέπω in this sense (in 1.32 he uses it along with πρόρριζος).<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Nicolaus' words λέγει τάδε involve of course a slight change in the word order.

<sup>7</sup>If this hypothesis is correct, Nicolaus, although he rewrites the story, has adhered to Ctesias' account with remarkable fidelity.

<sup>8</sup>Differences are trivial. In F 7 = Anon. *De Mul.* 2 we twice have "Persian" instead of "Mede." We also have the name Marmaros where Nicolaus 90 F 5 has Mermeres. R. Schmitt, "Die Wiedergabe iranischer Namen bei Ktesias," in *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of PreIslamic Central Asia*, ed. J. Harmatta (Budapest 1979) 122 f., believes the latter to be the original form.

<sup>9</sup>Maas is doubtful (*app. crit.* p. 454). My discussion disregards the last line where δίκαια is very uncertain.

<sup>10</sup>The number of 1st and 2nd person pronouns in the papyrus is very large, but this is not unusual in a letter (cf. Hdt. 1.124 etc.), letters being very closely related to direct speech.

But more interesting than the individual words, none of which is particularly unusual or restricted to earlier prose,<sup>11</sup> is the formula which opens the actual letter. This formula—ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι οὕτω λέγει, with its variants (γράφει for λέγει, and ὥδε or τάδε for οὕτω), is an uncommon one. It occurs a number of times in the fifth century (e.g., in Hdt. 3.40 etc.), being almost wholly replaced thereafter, in genuine as well as in fictitious letters, by expressions such as ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν or the simple ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι.<sup>12</sup> One or two examples, it is true, are found in later times, chiefly in letters ascribed to oriental kings, although even here it is not obligatory.<sup>13</sup> But this is not the wording which one would normally expect from a Hellenistic author.

The formula will not of course prove that we are dealing with a comparatively early work, since a later author could have borrowed it, as Nicolaus does, from an earlier authority. But at least neither this nor any other expression in the papyrus is unsuitable for Ctesias. What then of stylistic matters?

The question of whether the style of the papyrus is consistent with that of Ctesias is a complex issue and we may conveniently begin with a brief look at what ancient critics thought of Ctesias' writing, men after all who had access to his history in its original form. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, provides a description (*Comp.* 10 = T 12) which clearly suggests an unsophisticated author, one untouched on the whole by the rhetorical developments of the last part of the fifth century. Ctesias' writing, we are told, possesses ἡδονή, but like that of Xenophon, it lacks on the whole κάλλος, whereas Herodotus combines the two.<sup>14</sup> In Dionysius' view, we note, Ctesias belongs to the same stylistic category as Hecataeus and other primitive historians. These have (*Thuc.* 5) freshness (ὥρα) and grace (χάρις), characteristics of the style which is ἡδύς (*Comp.* 11), but not qualities such as σεμνολογία and μεγαλοπρέπεια (*Thuc.* 23), the qualities which constitute κάλλος (*Comp.* 11). Moreover, like Ctesias, they are also the inferiors of Herodotus (*Thuc.* 5 and 23).

Some of the comments made by Photius in his important discussion of Ctesias' style (T 13) remind us of Dionysius.<sup>15</sup> Again we hear of Ctesias'

<sup>11</sup>F. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache*<sup>5</sup> (Leipzig 1841) gives some examples of πρόρριζος in later prose.

<sup>12</sup>M. van den Hout, "Studies in Early Greek Letter-writing," *Mnemo.*<sup>4</sup> 2 (1949) 19–41 and 138–153 and H. Koskeniemi, "Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.," *Annal. Acad. Scient. Fennic.* ser. B 102 (Helsinki 1956) 155 ff.

<sup>13</sup>Van den Hout (above, n. 12) 141 ff. It does not appear, we may note, in any of the twenty-one fictitious letters of our Greek novels.

<sup>14</sup>On the distinction between καλόν and ἡδύ see W. Kroll, "Randbemerkungen," *RhM* NF 62 (1907) 91–101.

<sup>15</sup>The terminology used by Photius in his literary assessments has been influenced by critics such as Dionysius. N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 104 ff., briefly discusses the extent of this influence.

charm (ἡδονή). Moreover, like Dionysius' early historians, to whom the labels ἀφελής and σαφής as well as others are applied (*Thuc.* 23: cf. 5), Ctesias is σαφής τε καὶ ἀφελής λίαν. In addition, despite some virtues, he is in a number of respects the inferior of Herodotus, and very notably in sentence construction. Ctesias' writing is "looser" than it should be, says Photius, using the term διαλελυμένος, which is a term commonly given to the *lexis eiromene* or non-periodic style.<sup>16</sup> It is a manner of writing which Photius finds too close to ordinary speech. In Photius' view, as in the view of Dionysius, Ctesias is an author lacking in sophistication.

We have very few literal quotations to compare with these assessments. Moreover, since the longer quotations on the whole comprise ethnographical description, not narrative, they may not be entirely representative of Ctesias' writing.<sup>17</sup> Yet however defective it may be, our evidence does agree remarkably well with the comments of Dionysius and Photius. In addition, it also harmonises very well with our papyrus fragment.

One of the most striking features of the quotations from Ctesias is their very simple sentence structure. In F 45 i, for example, we have the *lexis eiromene* par excellence. There is a notable lack of hypotaxis—four participles, three subordinate clauses, but eighteen main clauses. F 11 is comparable. F 45 f has somewhat more subordination, but all the literal quotations exhibit a style for which the most apt label is Photius' term διαλελυμένος.

The style of the papyrus is remarkably similar. Clauses are mostly very short, as in F 45 i, and there is the same absence of hypotaxis. Of twenty-three verbs only four occur in subordinate clauses and there are no more than two participles. This simplicity could of course be a reflection of the epistolary form (cf. the brief letter in Xenophon *Hellenica* 1.1.23), rather than of the author's normal manner of writing, for Stryangaeus' words occupy a large portion of our fragment.<sup>18</sup> It could be, but it need not be.

<sup>16</sup>For διαλελυμένος or λελυμένος in this sense see for example D. H. *Lysias* 8 and Demetrius *Eloc.* 12, 13, 15 etc.

<sup>17</sup>F 1 h, F 8 a, F 24, and F 41 preserve words of narrative. Ethnographical description is represented by F 11, F 12, F 40, F 45 i (β), F 45 k (γ), F 58, and F 60. F 68 is from a medical work. But not even these citations are necessarily exact in every detail: on the question of how adequately the original dialect has been preserved see below, 000.

Del Corno's list (131 f.) omits F 45 f (α), which like F 45 i (β) and F 45 k (γ) comes from the *Exc. const. de an.* Although here the source reference has been omitted, the very striking verbal correspondences between this excerpt and the parallel passage in Photius make it plain that the source must again be Ctesias: cf. *Supplementum Aristotelicum* 1.1 ed. Sp. P. Lambros (Berlin 1885) XIV and Lambros, *Historika Meletemata* (Athens 1884) 61–68. The relationship is so close that almost every word used by Photius appears in the excerpt, although Photius has done a certain amount of rearranging of the words within individual sentences and has omitted some sentences.

<sup>18</sup>Extreme simplicity of style is not characteristic of our earliest literary letters. Despite the lack of complexity of its opening lines, Harpagus' letter to Cyrus (Hdt. 1.124) has 4 participles, 8 subordinate clauses and only 12 main verbs. Amasis' letter to Polycrates (Hdt. 3.40) and

After all the style, it should be emphasised, is also entirely consistent with anything that we know of Ctesias' work. We may add that the simple sentence structure extends beyond the actual letter to the fragmentary sentences which introduce it, whereas in Nicolaus' account quite an elaborate period precedes the letter.

So much for sentence structure. A few words should also be said about hiatus. If we disregard the numerous short vowels where elision is possible,<sup>19</sup> we find in the papyrus the following instances of hiatus—after καί (four times), after a form of the article (once), after ὅτι (once) and at the sentence-end (twice). But these are all types of hiatus which are freely admitted by many, if not by most authors. More interesting is σὺ ἐβούλου and also σὺ ἐμέ, although hiatus after σύ is sometimes tolerated.<sup>20</sup> In addition, we have the easily avoided Ζαρ[ε]ν]αία οὔτω and ἐλθη οἶονπερ.

Our fragment is short and may not be representative. The examples of hiatus are perhaps not as striking as might have been expected.<sup>21</sup> But they are considerably in excess of what is normally tolerated by those who are scrupulous about such issues. This is clearly not the work of an author who laboured to avoid hiatus. In this matter once more there is no inconsistency with what we know of Ctesias' writing. The fragments are of course too meagre to provide meaningful statistics, but instances of hiatus may be observed in all the literal excerpts.

Other aspects of the papyrus deserve attention.<sup>22</sup> We note throughout (apart from lines 15–22) the primitive-sounding changes of subject, which occur almost with each new verb. Frequent changes of subject are also a conspicuous feature of Ctesias F 45 i, in particular of lines 11–21.<sup>23</sup> But such excesses are avoided in the version of the letter given by the more sophisticated Nicolaus.

---

Themistocles' message to the Ionians (Hdt. 8.22, if we may consider this a letter) have an even higher proportion of subordinate clauses to main clauses. These letters are stylistically more elaborate than many parts of Herodotus, particularly narrative sections, as well as being more complex than POxy 2330.

<sup>19</sup>These are not always disregarded, and L. Pearson, "Hiatus and its Purpose in Attic Oratory," *AJP* 96 (1975) 138–159, disregards some only. On hiatus in general see Kühner-Blass 1.1 p. 198 ff. and F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* 2 (Leipzig 1874) 129 ff.

<sup>20</sup>It occurs some six times in the Greek novelists who pay great attention to the question of hiatus; see M. D. Reeve, "Hiatus in the Greek Novelists," *CQ* ns 21 (1971) 514–539.

<sup>21</sup>Gigante (270) seems to find them notable, but his definition is probably different from the above.

<sup>22</sup>The author has an apparent fondness for the clausula -~~~~ (cf. lines 10, 11, and 20), an ending to which Hdt. is indifferent, and also seemingly Ctesias (there is one example in F 68). Many later authors avoid it: see W. H. Shewring and K. J. Dover, "Prose-Rhythm," *OCD*<sup>2</sup> (1970) and W. H. Shewring, "Prose-Rhythm and the Comparative Method," *CQ* 25 (1931) 12–22. But our fragment is much too brief for any conclusions in this regard.

<sup>23</sup>S. Lilja, "On the Style of the Earliest Greek Prose," *Commentat. Hum. Lit. Soc. Scient. Fenn.* 41 no. 3 (Helsinki 1968) 100, comments on this feature in Hecataeus and other early writers.

Equally significant in the papyrus are the inelegant repetitions—γράμματα γράψω . . . καὶ γράφει, πλείστας . . . πλείστα . . . πλείστα, as well as the famous ἔσωσα . . . ἐσώθης and the repeated relative clauses. These too, it will be observed, are avoided by Nicolaus, apart from γράφας and two lines later ἐγγέγραπτο. Our anonymous author, if he is not Ctesias, has adopted a noted feature of his writing, for the historian's fondness for repetition was celebrated. Even Demetrius (*Eloc.* 212 = T 14a) who labours to defend ἔσωσα . . . ἐσώθης on the ground that it creates vividness, has to admit that the critics who censured Ctesias for his verbosity were often right.

The fragments provide some impressive examples of repetition. There is an archaic ring, for example, to F 45 i, where sub tantives and verbs (οὖς, αἶξ, οὐρά, κέρκος, ἀποτέμνειν, ἔλαιον etc.) are repeated instead of being omitted or replaced by a synonym or pronoun.<sup>24</sup> ποιεῖν, it may be noted, occurs four times in the last sentences, suggesting perhaps (like the repetitions of the papyrus) a certain poverty of vocabulary. Despite its simple, paratactic style, Aelian's rendering of the passage (*NA* 4.32) significantly avoids most of the repetitions.

Comparison of the papyrus with the fragments of Ctesias reveals further similarities. The word order of the papyrus can be chiasmic—ταῦτα τὰ κακὰ καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα τόνδε: σοι καταράσομαι . . . ἐπεύχομαι δέ σοι: cf. Ctesias F 45 i ἔλαιον δέ ποιοῦσιν . . . χρῶνται τῷ ἐλαίῳ and F 41 διαρρηξαμένη τὸν σάραπιν καὶ τὰς τρίχας καθειμένη. We also observe in the letter a fondness for pairs linked by καί—κακὰ καὶ . . . ἔρωτα, δίδωσιν καὶ . . . ἐποίησεν, ἀπώλεσεν καὶ ἐξέτρεψεν, and the pair which we know to be from Ctesias—ἔσωσα καὶ . . . ἐσώθης. F 41 of Ctesias provides two examples—διαρρηξαμένη . . . καὶ . . . καθειμένη, ἐτίλλετό τε καὶ βοήν ἐποίει. No less evident in the letter is the antithetically arranged pair—καταράσομαι μὲν οὐδέν, ἐπεύχομαι δέ, as well as the sentence quoted by Demetrius. In addition, there is the carefully balanced antithesis with repetition—ὅτῳ μὲν . . . ἔλθῃ, ὅτῳ δέ . . . ἔλθῃ. A similarly elaborate antithesis occurs in the otherwise primitive F 45 f—τὰς τρίχας τὰς μὲν (ἐκ) τῆς κεφαλῆς ὀπισθεν καθιένται, τὰς δέ ἐκ τοῦ πώγωνος ἔμπροσθεν.

All the stylistic "devices" in fact which can be singled out in the letter (as well as the most important features of the sentence structure) can be amply illustrated in the fragments of Ctesias.<sup>25</sup> So far from providing a reason for denying that the papyrus comes from Ctesias, they predispose one to favour the attribution. But they do not, it must be added, betray the influence of Gorgias and his contemporaries, as alleged by Del Corno (135 ff., who

<sup>24</sup>Cf. the repetition of κόμη, πῶγων, θρίξ in F 45 f. For such repetitions in early Greek prose see D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin 1969) 137 f. and S. Lilja, "Indebtedness to Hecataeus in Herodotus II 70–3," *Arctos* 5 (1967) 88. In Ctesias, striking repetitions occur also in F 45.45 p. 506 lines 1–4 (Photius) and in F 68.

<sup>25</sup>According to Giangrande (38), Ctesias could not be responsible for them.

includes the papyrus among the fragments of Ctesias). These are techniques after all which, although they belong par excellence to the sophistic period, can also be found in the earliest prose.<sup>26</sup> We have no evidence which suggests that Ctesias' writing ever advanced beyond a primitive level.<sup>27</sup>

### III. DIALECT

If vocabulary, sentence structure and other stylistic features of the papyrus all fit a work written in the early fourth century and what we know of Ctesias' *Persica*, what about the important question of dialect?<sup>28</sup> This is the issue to which Giangrande has devoted most of his attention and it is the most puzzling feature of the fragment.

That the dialect is markedly different from that of Herodotus hardly needs to be stated. We are presented with a series of unHerodotean forms—οὖν and γοῦν, not ὦν and γῶν, καταράσσομαι and Ζαρε[ιεν]αία, not καταρήσσομαι and Ζαρε[ιεν]αίη, ὄτῳ for ὅτεω, ἐβούλου for ἐβούλοο, ἐμαντόν instead of ἐμεωντόν, εἰλεως instead of ἰλεος.<sup>29</sup> However, it should be noted that the dialect is not so far removed from the less rigorous Ionic of the Hippocratic corpus,<sup>30</sup> where after all οὖν and γοῦν are normal, where we

<sup>26</sup>For chiasmus see Lilja (above, n. 23) 72. Fehling (above, n. 24) discusses antithesis with repetition (298 f.). Del Corno also treats the alliteration of F 60—σκέλη σκιαζονται (which may not be intentional) as a sophistic device, but this too is a feature of early prose (Lilja 50). He cites καταράσσομαι . . . ἐπεύξομαι in the papyrus as an example of homoioteleuton, and also οὔτοι . . . πλούσιοι . . . δίκαιοι etc. in F 11, but this is not very persuasive. More plausible is the example from F 68—τῶν τε πινόντων πολλοὶ μὲν ἀπεπνίγοντο, ὀλίγοι δὲ περιεγίνοντο. On homoioteleuton in literature before Gorgias see Fehling 86 ff. and 257 ff.

<sup>27</sup>He had of course remarkable talents as a sensationaliser: see *AJP* 104 (1983) 346.

<sup>28</sup>Movable nu is employed throughout both at pauses and also (as is not unusual) in mid-sentence before consonants and vowels. But this is a reflection of scribal practice and tells us nothing about the author and date. We may compare the papyri of Herodotus, for although the Mediaeval mss of Herodotus on the whole avoid -ν, it occurs in a substantial number of the papyri: see M. Untersteiner, *La lingua di Erodoto* (Bari 1949) 78 f. and, among more recently published papyri, *POxy* 3380–3383 etc. For the inconsistency of papyri in general in the use of -ν, see E. Mayer, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 1<sup>2</sup>.1 (Berlin 1970) 210 ff. and F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* 1 (Milan 1976) 114.

<sup>29</sup>Forms of the reflexive with stems in -αυ- as well as -ων- occur in inscriptions from the 5th century onwards: A. Thumb and A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* 2<sup>2</sup> (Heidelberg 1959) 276. I. C. Cunningham, *Herodas, Mimiambi* (Oxford 1971) 216 retains both types.

The initial vowel of εἰλεως (Att. ἰλεως) presumably results from the common confusion of ι and ε: cf. Ζαρειεαίαν. In Hdt. 4.94 and 6.91 we find ἰλεος (in both cases there is a variant with omega). A 4th-century inscription from Metropolis in Ionia has εἰλως (LSJ Supp., ed. E. A. Barber [Oxford 1968]); cf. ἰλεως and ἰλεω in Herodas 4.25 and 4.11. For the "Attic" declension in Ionic see Thumb-Scherer 271.

<sup>30</sup>How accurately the dialect of our Ionic texts has been transmitted is of course a major problem. There is clearly a tendency on the one hand for Ionic forms to be replaced by Atticisms, and on the other, for Ionic colouring to be reinforced by the introduction of hyperionisms. For the problems of the Hippocratic corpus in particular see the brief discussion of J. Jouanna, *Hippocrate, La Nature de l'Homme* CMG 1.1.3 (Berlin 1975) 133 ff.



may find  $\alpha$  instead of Ionic  $\eta$ , and where there is considerable MS authority for the contraction of  $\epsilon\omicron$  to  $\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>31</sup> It should also be emphasised that Ionic features are not wholly absent. Several scholars have labelled the dialect Attic,<sup>32</sup> and Giangrande, as noted above, calls it Atticistic. However, two Ionisms must be explained before such terms are applicable.

First of all we have  $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$  in line 15. As Giangrande rightly points out (39), the dative plural in  $-\omicron\upsilon\iota$  is very rare in Attic prose apart from Plato.<sup>33</sup> However, his claim that such datives are not unexpected in Atticistic authors is hardly persuasive. It depends in fact solely on J. P. D'Orville's discussion of a passage in Chariton (3.1.5)—most unsatisfactory evidence.<sup>34</sup> No modern editor accepts the long dative in Chariton 3.1.5 or indeed any of D'Orville's alleged parallels, apart from the passages which he cites from Plato.<sup>35</sup> A dative in  $-\omicron\upsilon\iota$  in fact would not normally be expected in Atticistic prose, except of course where the author (like Arrian in the *Indike* or Lucian in a number of satires) deliberately adopts the Ionic dialect, or where he quotes an epic or Ionic source.<sup>36</sup>

Secondly there is the repeated conditional relative clause ( $\delta\tau\omega \dots \epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ ),

<sup>31</sup>For  $\omicron\upsilon\nu$  and  $\gamma\omicron\upsilon\nu$  in Hippocrates see A. Rüst, *Monographie der Sprache des hippokratischen Traktates περὶ ἀερῶν* . . . (Freiburg 1952) 102. For the retention of  $\alpha$  see Rüst 26: K. A. Garbrah, *A Grammar of the Ionic Inscriptions from Erythrae* (Meisenheim am Glan 1978) 22, gives inscriptional examples from the 5th century onwards. H. Kühlewein, *Hippocratis Opera* 1 (Leipzig 1894) XCVIII ff. lists examples of  $\omicron\upsilon$  for  $\epsilon\omicron$  but nowhere accepts this. There is also some evidence in Hippocrates of  $\delta\tau\omega$  for  $\delta\tau\epsilon\omega$ : see Rüst 70 f. and H. W. Smyth, *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects; Ionic* (Oxford 1894) 456. For a similarly unrigorous form of Ionic cf. Arrian's *Indike* and A. G. Roos, "De Arriani Indicae Dialecto Ionica," *Mnemo.* NS 55 (1927) 23–43.

<sup>32</sup>E.g., Latte (above, n. 1) 497, Del Corno 128, Gigante 250.

<sup>33</sup>Long dative plurals disappear from Attic inscriptions well before the end of the 5th century: K. J. Dover, "The Language of Classical Attic Documentary Inscriptions," *TPS* (1981) 4. Wilamowitz, "Homerische Untersuchungen," *Philol. Unters.* 7 (1884) 314, gives one or two examples from fifth-century prose authors. His only example from later prose (apart from Plato) is Athenaeus 251e quoting Phylarchus τοῖς θεοῖσιν ἔχθροί (*FGrHist* 81 F 11), a formula familiar from verse; see A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander, a Commentary* (Oxford 1973) 480. For long datives in Plato see H. Thesleff, *Studies in the Styles of Plato* (Helsinki 1967) 90.

<sup>34</sup>J. P. D'Orville, *Chariton* 2 (Amsterdam 1750) 237. Giangrande also refers to P. Buttmann, *Ausführliche Griechische Sprachlehre* (Berlin 1819) 1.147, who in turn cites D'Orville. The presence of a second Ionism in the papyrus militates against the suggestion that ἀπασιν ἀνθρωποῦσιν is simply "a formula."

<sup>35</sup>At Chariton 3.1.5 for D'Orville's τοῖσι ἰδίοις G. Molinié, *Chariton* (Paris 1979) reads τοῖς ἰδίοις: cf. W. E. Blake (Oxford 1938). For D'Orville's ἐν κακοῖσιν at Achilles Tatius 5.17.4, E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius* (Stockholm 1955) reads ἐν κακοῖς, and for σχοῖνοις at 5.17.3 he reads χοῖνυ: cf. J. N. O'Sullivan, *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (Berlin 1980) s.v. σχοῖνος. For τούτοις in Heliodorus 7.23.1, R. M. Rattenbury and T. W. Lumb, *Héliodore les Éthiopiennes* (Paris 1938) read τούτοις: cf. A. Colonna (Rome 1938). For τούτοις in Lucian *Menipp.* 8, M. D. MacLeod (Oxford 1974) reads τούτοις.

<sup>36</sup>For Chariton's quotations from Homer see A. Papanikolaou, *Chariton-Studien* (Göttingen 1973) 14 f. No long datives are listed by W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinem Hauptvertretern* 4 (Stuttgart 1896) 579 ff., in his summary of non-Attic forms used in the Atticistic period. But

with subjunctive but without the modal particle ἄν. Giangrande claims (39) that this too points to the Atticistic period, but again he is unconvincing. Clauses of this type are of course very infrequent in Attic prose.<sup>37</sup> Isolated examples occur in New Testament Greek and in Egyptian Koine.<sup>38</sup> Examples in Atticistic authors are again seemingly sporadic.<sup>39</sup> But such clauses are not unexpected in early Greek. We find them in verse of all kinds, and they are relatively well attested in Ionic prose, occurring in Herodotus, and in Hippocrates, as well as in Ionic (and other) inscriptions.<sup>40</sup>

The long dative then and the relative with pure subjunctive suggest an Ionic work. They would of course fit one written in the Atticistic period, although nothing else in the papyrus points to such a late date. They would be entirely unexceptional in an earlier work, such as the history of Ctesias, with which, as we saw in section one, there is reason to connect the fragment. However, these are the only Ionisms and the very attenuated form of Ionic which we meet in the papyrus calls for further comment. Could this be the result of the way in which the text has been transmitted?

It is of course unlikely that copyists are responsible to any significant degree for the lack of dialect colouring. Papyri of Herodotus of similar date, although they contain some Atticisms, on the whole preserve the Ionic forms.<sup>41</sup> However, our papyrus may come from a work which contained literal excerpts, rather than directly from Ctesias' history. Even if accurate in other respects, excerpts can be wholly unreliable over dialectal forms, as is amply illustrated by the quotations from Herodotus which we meet in "Longinus" (*Subl.* 22.1 etc.). These, like Hecataeus' tale of Orestheus, which is preserved for us by Athenaeus (1 F 15), have been considerably Atticised. We may add that Ionic forms are remarkably few in any of the supposedly literal quotations which our excerptors supply from Ctesias.<sup>42</sup> In

---

Gignac (above, n. 28) 2 *Morphology* (1981) 23 gives one example from a non-literary papyrus of the 6th century A.D.

<sup>37</sup>Schwyzler GG<sup>2</sup> 2.312. V. Bers, *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age* (New Haven, Conn. 1984) 142 ff.

<sup>38</sup>N. Turner in J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* 3 (Edinburgh 1963) 107 f. L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*<sup>2</sup> (Tübingen 1925) 177, gives one or two examples from Hellenistic inscriptions.

<sup>39</sup>Schmid (above, n. 36) 4.90 (cf. 621) gives one example from Philostratus: at 1.244 he refers to A. du Mesnil, *Grammatica quam Lucianus in scriptis suis secutus est* (Stolp 1867) 23, who gives one example from Lucian. K. Dürr, "Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Dialexeis des Maximus von Tyrus," *Philologus* Supp. 8 (1899–1901) 42, gives 3 examples. In Roman imperial times the omission of ἄν in temporal clauses with subjunctive is tolerably frequent: L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, Vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament* (Uppsala 1967) 144 ff.

<sup>40</sup>Schwyzler GG<sup>2</sup> 2.312 and F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte 3: Der ionische Dialekt* (Berlin 1924) 261.

<sup>41</sup>See A. H. Paap, *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis* (Lyons 1948) and, for some more recent papyri, M. Chambers et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 48 (1981) 22–73.

<sup>42</sup>See n. 49 below.

fact there are none at all in Demetrius' quotation (*Eloc.* 216 = F 24) and none in the Constantinian excerpts F 45 f, F 45 i and F 45 k.

An excerptor may thus be to blame for the fact that our papyrus is relatively lacking in Ionic forms. However, there is an alternative explanation and one that is perhaps preferable, for it may plausibly be argued that this in fact is the manner in which Ctesias wrote. We must after all bear in mind the probable date of Ctesias' works and also our very defective knowledge of much of Ionic prose. Although Ctesias chose to employ the dialect which his rivals Herodotus and Hellanicus had employed and which was originally the traditional one for a history, he was writing at the beginning of the fourth century.<sup>43</sup> The great days of Ionic prose were well in the past. Attic and Koine were more and more replacing Ionic, at least as far as philosophical and historical writing is concerned.<sup>44</sup>

If at this period Ctesias wrote a history strongly influenced by Attic, this should hardly surprise us.<sup>45</sup> There might well have been other works of this kind. After all we know virtually nothing about the dialect of any of the fragmentary Ionian historians, or indeed about the dialect of any Ionic prose of the fifth and first part of the fourth centuries, apart from Herodotus and the earlier Hippocratic writings. As we saw above, literal citations, which are not necessarily at first hand and which in any case are very sparse, cannot be relied upon as far as linguistic matters are concerned. The dialect colouring of a number of the lost works was not necessarily very strong.<sup>46</sup>

But we have better reasons for believing that Ctesias wrote in the half-hearted variety of Ionic which the papyrus attests. This is exactly what evidence provided by Photius would lead us to expect, evidence which consists partly of details from the original work and partly of Photius' explicit statements about the dialect.

First of all Photius' statements. In his literary assessment of Ctesias' *Persica*, to which we made reference earlier, Photius tells us that Ctesias employed the Ionic dialect not throughout like Herodotus, but in certain expressions—*κέχρηται δὲ τῇ Ἰωνικῇ διαλέκτῳ, εἰ καὶ μὴ δι' ὅλου, καθάπερ Ἡρόδοτος, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐνίας τινὰς λέξεις* (T 13). Photius later adds that Ionisms were more frequent in the single volume on India—*τὰ Ἰνδικά . . . ἐν οἷς μάλλον ἰωνίζει* (T 10).

It is not likely that Photius is mistaken on these points. We have every

<sup>43</sup>Cf. F. Jacoby, "Ktesias," *RE* 11 (1922) 2036. Exact dates are not known. For his attitude to Herodotus and Hellanicus cf. F 16.62.

<sup>44</sup>For the ever increasing influence of Attic attested (from the 5th century onwards) by inscriptions, and for the dominance of Attic in most forms of prose by the 4th century see A. Debrunner and A. Scherer, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* 2<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1969) 27 ff.

<sup>45</sup>Nor would it be strange if a doctor from Dorian Cnidus employed a non-rigorous Ionic similar to that of his fellow-doctors.

<sup>46</sup>The dialect of Herodotus would of course have been untypical, and some ancient critics distinguish it from the dialect of other Ionic writers (see F. Jacoby, "Herodotos," *RE* Suppl. 2 [1913] 502 ff.), although their comments are not very helpful.

reason to suppose that he possessed Ctesias' *Persica* and *Indica* in the original,<sup>47</sup> and when he comments on the Ionic dialect of other works, he is certainly correct.<sup>48</sup> Besides, in so far as he states that Ctesias wrote a form of Ionic, the sporadic Ionisms in his summary, and those in the excerpts made by others, bear him out.<sup>49</sup> However, he has not always been correctly understood.

Photius clearly is not making the simple claim that the dialect of Ctesias' *Persica* was Ionic, as Giangrande seems to argue (31). Rather he is drawing attention to the fact that the Ionic of this work was not a rigorous Ionic. There was evidently a marked difference between the dialect of Ctesias' *Persica* and that of Herodotus, and also between the dialect of Ctesias' *Persica* and that of his book on India.

Nor, it should be added, do Photius' observations refer to vocabulary alone.<sup>50</sup> Although *διάλεκτος* no doubt signifies "mode of expression" or "manner of writing" rather than our word "dialect," it must include phonological points and the inflections as well as lexical items. This is clearly what it means for the ancient grammarian.<sup>51</sup> It may very well be its meaning for the rhetorician, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus for example makes plain, when he translates Herodotus into Attic (*Comp.* 3). Here Dionysius makes one or two lexical changes, but, as one would expect, he also transforms all the Ionic forms into the appropriate Attic ones.<sup>52</sup> The word should have a similar sense for Photius. When he comments on the dialect of Ctesias' *Persica*, surely he does not refer only to lexical items. Surely he means that the dialect in all its aspects (phonological, morphological, and lexical) was noticeably less rigorous than that of Herodotus.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>47</sup>See my "Ctesias' Account of the Revolt of Inarus," *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 2. R. Schmitt (above, n. 8) 119 has accepted an outmoded theory. Moreover, since Photius' copy of the *Indica* apparently preserved the dialect very well, it seems unlikely that the paucity of Ionisms in the *Persica* was due to Photius' manuscript.

<sup>48</sup>He is right about Arrian's *Indike* cod. 91 p. 68 b, and about Cephalion cod. 68 (*FGrHist* 93 T 2): cf. Suidas' comment (T 1) and the occasional Ionisms of F 1. We cannot substantiate his statement about the Ionic dialect of Praxagoras cod. 62 p. 21 b (*FGrHist* 219).

<sup>49</sup>F 13.28 Σπαρτιήτας and at line 32 στεινότατον (στεννότατον M), F 14.44 ὑστέρης, F 15.48 προθυμῆ, F 16.67 δοκέοντα, F 45.36 δυνδρέω (for the form cf. Kühner-Blass 1.1 505 f.) In addition there is the name Σπαρέρης F 9.3 and 8 genitives in -εω like Ταυνοξάρκεω (F 13.13). In other fragments we have ἀρτοποιέουσιν (F 11) and in F 60 πλατέας (acc. pl. masc.—for similar forms in Herodotus see Kühner-Blass 1.1.447). In Nic. Dam. 90 FF 1–5 and F 66 there are a number of Ionic genitives in -εω.

<sup>50</sup>Jacoby's suggestion (above, n. 43, 2064). Giangrande rightly rejects this interpretation (32).

<sup>51</sup>Cf. the fragments of a 2nd-century A.D. papyrus which preserve part of a tractate on the Aeolic dialect; A. Wouters, *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Brussels 1979) 274 ff. For the Byzantine manuals of dialect which derive ultimately from much earlier work see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* 2 (Munich 1978) 29 ff.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. also *Comp.* 4 and *Dem.* 41. Writers of the Roman imperial period like Arrian and Lucian adopt the forms as well as the vocabulary of Ionic when they imitate Herodotus.

<sup>53</sup>Some of Photius' comments on dialect, like some of his stylistic comments (cf. above,

But Photius gives us some additional information which is relevant to the question of the dialect in which Ctesias wrote, for he provides some interesting details about the form of some of the Iranian names in Ctesias. Names, of course, when they are carried over from one language into another, often defy normal linguistic rules. However, the apparent inconsistencies of the names in Ctesias, as well as the fact that some of them are very different in form from those in Herodotus, demand at least some comment.

We cannot, to be sure, always be certain that the various authors who have summarised Ctesias' history reproduce the names exactly as they once appeared. Common names are sometimes given in the form familiar to the summariser, not in that of the original.<sup>54</sup> Moreover, foreign names are particularly liable to corruption. A number of these in Photius' summary are obviously erroneous.<sup>55</sup> But we should note that Photius says expressly that Ctesias called the last Median king Astuigas not Astuages.<sup>56</sup> The termination is to be observed. Normally Old Persian masculine personal names with nominative singular in -a or -ā become, in Ionic and in Attic, nouns of the first or third declension with a nominative singular in -ης (e.g., Vištāspa becomes Ὑστάσπης).<sup>57</sup> Ctesias' Astuigas abandons the usual termination.

Moreover, although a majority of the other Persian names in Photius' summary of Ctesias end in -ης, a significant number end in -ας (Oibaras, Spitamas etc.).<sup>58</sup> We may also note that a significant number of the Persian

n. 15), echo those of Dionysius. With his statement that Herodotus is the canon of Ionic as Thucydides is of Attic (cod. 60 p. 19 b) compare cod. 72 p. 45 a = 688 T 13 and D.H. *Pomp.* 3.

<sup>54</sup>This seems to be true of some of the names in Diodorus: see *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 200 f. Moreover, both Nic. Dam. 90 F 66.1 ff. and Diod. (2.34.6) give the familiar Astuages for Ctesias' Astuigas, while in Photius F 9.5 and F 13.26 we find Ekbatana (cf. F 1 = Diod. 2.13.5–7 etc.) when according to Stephanus, Ctesias used Agbatana (F 42). R. Schmitt does not take enough account of such normalisations (above, n. 8, 119 ff.).

<sup>55</sup>See *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 8. The ms tradition of Photius is inconsistent over the name Ἀρσάκης F 15.55 (cf. 15.56 and 57): in F 15.51 we have Ἀρσάκων (cf. Ἀρσάκας in Plutarch —F 15 a). And there are some peculiarities of declension. E.g., at F 16.66 we have Παρυσάτιος (not Παρυσάτιδος); otherwise for this name we find mostly the forms in -ιδ-. For ms unreliability over names of this type see T. Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler Antiker Literatur* (Uppsala 1975) 73. At F. 16.59 the mss read Τισσαφέρωνος (gen.) Elsewhere it is declined as a 1st declension noun. For Ionic genitives see above, n. 49.

<sup>56</sup>On the etymology see R. Schmitt (above, n. 8) 124.

<sup>57</sup>R. Schmitt, "Medisches und persisches Sprachgut bei Herodot," *ZDMG* 117 (1967) 139 and *Probleme der Eingliederung fremden Sprachgutes in das grammatische System einer Sprache* (Innsbruck 1973) 13. In Attic -ης is frequently found even after a vowel or -ρ, e.g., in Aeschylus *Persae* Artembares (line 29 etc.) and Oibares (line 984): on the Persian names in this play see R. Schmitt, "Die Iranier-Namen bei Aischylos," *SBAk Wien* 337 (1978). Exceptions of course occur: e.g., Gadatas in *SG*<sup>3</sup> 1.22, and one or two of the names in authors who write of Alexander's expedition.

<sup>58</sup>F 9.1 ff. For the former Nicolaus of Damascus gives the same termination (90 F 66.13 ff.), whereas in Hdt. 3.85 etc. we have Oibares. Some examples of names ending in -ας in Ctesias are listed by Schmitt in *Probleme* (above, n. 57) at n. 36, although he does not indicate the source for individual names.

names in Ctesias reported by Diodorus and by Nicolaus also end in -ας.<sup>59</sup> And this may be the form that such names had in the original. Ctesias, as befits a man from Dorian Cnidus,<sup>60</sup> may quite often have given Iranian names, not in the Ionic guise in which they appear in Herodotus, but in a non-Ionian form, as his contemporary Xenophon does with some frequency.<sup>61</sup>

The Persian names in Ctesias' history suggest, and Photius' comments about the dialect make it clear, that the percentage of Ionisms in this work was noticeably low. Our papyrus fragment, with its seemingly Attic forms and relative lack of Ionic colouring, fits this very well. There is in fact no linguistic feature, just as earlier we saw that there was no stylistic consideration, which gives us reason to deny attribution of the fragment to Ctesias.

What can we conclude from the foregoing discussion? In language Ctesias was obviously no innovator, as Del Corno tries to suggest (140). He did not write in Attic. He wrote, following the example of Herodotus, Hellanicus, and others, in the traditional dialect, even though in the *Persica* he employed a very modified form of this dialect. Nor is there anything innovative, or even up to date, about his style. Aspects of it, in particular the sentence structure, are clearly old-fashioned. But the papyrus is of interest in another respect. It provides us in fact with invaluable additional evidence of the treatment which erotic themes could receive at Ctesias' hands and in a historical work. Our fragment is clearly a small portion of a very elaborate love-story. Whatever the origin of the Greek novel,<sup>62</sup> those who have seen Ctesias as one of its precursors are certainly correct.

VICTORIA COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
TORONTO M5S 1K7

<sup>59</sup>E.g., in Diodorus Artukas (F 5.32.6) and Astibaras (F 5.34.1) etc.: cf. in Nicolaus of Damascus Ἀστυβάρα (gen.) 90 F 5 p. 336 line 12 and Artasuras F 66. 45 etc. But the ms tradition of Nicolaus is inconsistent over Atradates F 66.3 ff., which is given both an -ης and -ας termination.

<sup>60</sup>Cf. Schmitt, *Probleme* (above, n. 57) 14 f., he also notes that these non-Ionic forms are closer to the O.P. forms.

<sup>61</sup>See L. Gautier, *La langue de Xénophon* (Geneva 1911) 83 f. The feminine Persian names in Photius also show some inconsistency: e.g., at F 9.2 we have Σπαρέθρης (gen.), but at F 15.47 Δαμασπίας (gen.) etc.

<sup>62</sup>When Giangrande (41) comments on this problem, he considerably underestimates the erotic element in pre-Hellenistic histories, apparently forgetting (among other matters) that even without *POxy* 2330 we know that Ctesias' tale was elaborate enough to contain a letter (cf. F 8a = Demetr. *Eloc.* 213).

I am very grateful to Professors C. I. R. Rubincam and M. B. Wallace for their criticisms of an earlier version of this article.