

ARIEL LOFTUS

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE THERAMENES PAPYRUS (P. MICH. 5796B)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 133 (2000) 11–20

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE THERAMENES PAPYRUS (P. MICH. 5796B)¹

A. The New Papyrus Fragment

I. Introduction

P. Mich. inv. 5796b

2.3 x 3.2 cm.

Karanis
II AD

This papyrus text was discovered in the photo archives of Karanis texts stored in the Papyrology Room at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor by G. Schwendner. The original is in the Cairo Museum. The excavation label, 30-B224Ba*-M, shows that *P. Mich. 5796* was found either "underneath the room" or "between levels" in house B224.² House B224 was built on top of the street CS 190 and therefore, very near the place where the Michigan Theramenes papyrus, inv. no. 5982 was found.³ That text, put together from four smaller fragments forming a single column with an unplaced fragment, was published in 1968 by Herbert C. Youtie and Reinhold Merkelbach. This new piece makes a perfect join to the left-hand side of the unplaced fragment. The new combined fragment now consists of the entire left half of the column; we now can read between 8 and 11 letters of lines that are between 17 and 22 letters long.

The new piece has a clear upper left-hand margin beginning in the middle of the word ending in -κτωβ. Thus the new piece shows that the unplaced fragment does not physically join the main text. Further placement of the text depends on the contents (below).

Two other literary texts from Karanis have a similar hand (*P. Mich. Koenen 761* as noted by Merkelbach and *P. Mich. inv. no. 4733* as noted by Gronewald, *ZPE* 66 [1989] 1); perhaps also *P. Mich. inv. 5451a*.

To the original editors the text appeared to be a fragment of an historical work which included a description of the end of the Peloponnesian War in 404 BC; the main column reconstructed by the editors contains a narrative of the debate in the assembly over sending Theramenes, later to be one of the Thirty tyrants, to negotiate the peace. Since its publication, the text has attracted a long bibliography mostly over the question of authorship and authority; the various positions taken on the piece since the original publication have been well summarized by J. Engels (*ZPE* 99 [1993] 125-155; 102 [1994] 262). The restored text supports the conclusions of the original editors that the Theramenes papyrus is part of an historical work.

More specifically, R. Sealey argued from the military vocabulary, detectable even in the original publication of the unplaced fragment, that the fragment might describe the Spartan military activities surrounding the surrender of Athens to Sparta.⁴ He assumed that the unplaced fragment belonged to a column in close proximity to the fragments of the restored column.⁵ However, as I will argue, the contents of the newly reconstructed unplaced fragment seem to have something to do with events around

¹ I would like to thank G. Schwendner for bringing this text to my attention and for sharing with me his work on the history of education and literacy in Graeco-Roman Egypt as well as his knowledge of the texts from Karanis and his papyrological expertise. Dr. P.A. Heilporn, then Assistant Archivist at the University of Michigan Papyrology Room, rechecked the original for me and provided much needed assistance in the final draft.

² According to E.M. Husselman, *Karanis Excavations of the University of Michigan in Egypt 1928-1935: Topography and Architecture*, University of Michigan Kelsey Museum of Archaeology Studies 5, (Ann Arbor 1979) 21 and maps 10 and 15.

³ For a detailed discussion of the relationship between the archaeology and the papyri at Karanis see T. Gagos and T. Wilfong, "The Archaeology of Karanis" (in preparation). A list of papyri found in this house is given below, n. 32.

⁴ R. Sealey, (*ZPE* 16 [1975] 278-288) suggested Pausanias' armed intervention in Athenian affairs at the request of the Thirty in 403 BC as a possible subject matter; his *exempli gratia* text is reproduced in M. Chambers (ed.), *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (1989).

⁵ Although fragments of closely related columns are often found together, this is not a generally applicable rule. Several texts excavated at Oxyrhynchus are composed of fragments from different parts of a roll or even from more than one roll. For example, *P. Oxy.* 15.1810 (II Oxy.) consists of fragments from five speeches of Demosthenes; *P. Oxy.* 15.1819 (II, Oxy.) is made up of fragments from Books 10, 11 and 12 of the *Odyssey*; *P. Oxy.* 17.2100 (II, Oxy.) contains varied fragments from Books 4, 5 and 8 of *Thucydides*. For a discussion of the length of literary papyrus rolls see W.A. Johnson, *The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions. An Analysis of the Evidence from Oxyrhynchus* (dissertation, Yale 1992).

the time of the Corinthian War, at least ten years after the dramatic date of Theramenes' speech presented in the main fragment. This suggests that the fragment came from further down the roll.

As Sealey pointed out, the word τριήρω[ν] *trireme* in line 6 suggests that the papyrus contained a narrative of a military encounter, probably a naval encounter. The number of proper nouns now readable and the reference to cities may suggest a muster of forces before a more detailed description of a battle.⁶ The papyrus names at least two military contingents, Corinthians and Argives, and a third contingent, Peloponnesians is possible.⁷ The range of relations possible in a military context between these two or three groups in the years between 431 BC and 386 BC is fairly limited. During the Archedamian War, Corinth was ally of Sparta, and Argos was neutral. For a brief period during the Peace of Nikias Corinth and Argos formed a Peloponnesian alliance based on hoplite forces, but by 416 BC the Argives had become Athenian allies. Corinth remained allied to Sparta until around 397 BC and Argos to Athens until 404 BC or shortly afterwards.⁸ However after the battle of Cnidus in 395 BC, having received enough Persian money to fund a fleet, Corinth first became allied with Argos again against the Spartans, and then the two cities merged in a sympolity.⁹ After the battle of Cnidus and the outbreak of the Corinthian War the Corinthians and Argives could well be expected to take part in a naval encounter against the Peloponnesian forces.¹⁰

This historical question is complicated by the fact, that our sources, Diodorus XIV and Xenophon, *Hell.* IV.8, offer very different versions of the Corinthian War.¹¹ Despite Xenophon's disclaimer that he is narrating only the high points of the naval campaigns of the Corinthian War, his narrative is fuller than Diodorus. At 4.8.10 Xenophon states that the Corinthians used the money from Pharnabazus to acquire a fleet and actively policed the Corinthian gulf under the admirals, Agathinus and then, Proainus. He also provides a list of Spartan admirals who engaged with the Corinthian fleet from 393 to 391 BC, Podanemus, Herippidas, and finally Teleutias who regained control of the Corinthian gulf in 391 BC by winning a naval battle on the same day that Agesilaus defeated the combined land forces of the allies to take the walls of Corinth (*Xen. Hell.* IV.4.19). In addition Xenophon refers in passing to at least one and perhaps two battles before Agesilaus' and Teleutias' victory, the one in which the Spartan admiral Podanemus was killed and his secretary Pollis wounded, and perhaps a second, the capture of Rhion at the western entrance to the Corinthian Gulf. Diodorus' account on the other hand is more concise; the events of the war are split up into three sections between much longer accounts of Sicilian events. In Diodorus, the Spartans simply give up their control of the sea after Cnidus in 394 BC and do not possess a fleet again until the revolt of Rhodes in 390 BC.¹²

⁶ This is further suggested by the new reading διαπέμψαι "disperse" which in this context would seem to have a specific military meaning.

⁷ The number of ethnics ending in -sioi is actually very small; *Syracusioi*, *Milesioi*, *Ephesioi*, *Thasioi* are attested. None of these fits with the historical context.

⁸ D.M. Lewis (ed.), *Cambridge Ancient History*² V, (1992), ch. 9 (D.M. Lewis) and ch. 10 (A. Andrewes). For the short-lived quadruple alliance between Argos, Thebes, Corinth and Elis in 421 BC., see *Thuc.* V.27-30, *Diod. Sic.* XII.75.4.1.

⁹ For the order of events see most recently D.M. Lewis, *Cambridge Ancient History*², VI (1994), ch. 4, The Corinthian War (R. Seager); for dating of the sympolity between Corinth and Argos see J. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth* (Oxford 1984) 340-362, and C. Tuplin, *CQ* 32 (1982) 75-83.

¹⁰ The general likelihood of this context for the unplaced fragment has also been confirmed by an all Greek search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*; Corinthians and Argives appear frequently within three lines of one another almost only in narratives of this period.

¹¹ See also *Dem.* XX.52-53 and *Paus.* III.9.9.

¹² As Underhill, *Xenophon's Hellenica* (*ad. loc.*) points out, the two accounts cannot be reconciled; in Diodorus the stasis in Corinth results in the armed take-over of Corinth by Argos, whereas in Xenophon the Corinthian oligarchs betray the city to the Spartans and we only hear of the Argive garrison in passing. In Diodorus, Thrasybulus' Asian mission is the most significant event for the years after 390; in Xenophon Agesilaus's campaigns take the spotlight.

Despite these uncertainties, I believe that the narrow columns, the clarity of the writing, and the known constraints on the content of the piece as part of a larger work permit an *exempli gratia* reconstruction of the text. What little remains of the text of the fragment does not allow an identification of the battle narrated here. However, the taking of Lechaem and the dockyards by the Corinthian oligarchs and the Lacedaemonians in 392 BC narrated by Diodorus at XIV, 86 and Teleutias' naval victory in the harbor of Corinth in next year 391 BC, mentioned by Xenophon are the most frequently mentioned naval encounters of the Corinthian War (also see Andoc. III., 18).¹³ I shall use these two battles to illustrate the sketchy details of the papyrus.

II. The Text of the Unplaced fragment

	Merkelbach/Youtie text:	With new piece:
	1]εἰς τὸν [κίων εἰς τὸν [
] ἱερῶν [Κορινθίων [
]ν πόλεω[ν	τῶν πόλεω[ν
	4]ων καὶ [Ἀργείων καὶ τ[
]ν δύο μ. [ὡς ἂν δύο μ. [
]ν τριήρω[ν	τῶν τριήρω[ν
	π]έμψα[διαπέμψα[

1 [: this is a long vertical upright.

2: The *editio princeps* read ἱερῶν but what was read as iota is now clearly identifiable as the final hasta of the ν of Κορινθίων on the new fragment.

4 [: τ or π.

5 μ [: the horizontal stroke of ink visible at the upper edge could be part of either an epsilon or an omicron.¹⁴

Text Restored *Exempli Gratia*

end of previous col.	[εἰσελθόντων Πελοποννη-]
begin of col.	κίων (?) εἰς τὸν ν[αύσταθμον]
	Κορινθίων τ[ε τὰς ναῦς παρὰ]
	τῶν πόλεω[ν ἀγόντων μετὰ]
4.	Ἀργείων καὶ τ[ῶν συμμάχων]
	ὡς ἂν δύο μέ[ρη]
	τῶν τριήρω[ν]
	διαπέμψα[.]

"Because the Peloponnesians (?) had entered the dockyards (?) and the Corinthians were bringing up the ships from the cities along with the Argives and their allies, NN (the Corinthian admiral), since he had dispersed two divisions of triremes, ..."

III. Historical Commentary

1 εἰς τὸν ν[αύσταθμον]: for the vocabulary see Diodorus' narrative of the stasis at Corinth at XIV.86.3: καὶ οἱ μὲν φύγαδες μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἐπὶ τὸ Λέχαιον καὶ τὸν ναύσταθμον ἐπελθόντες. Xen. (*Hell.* IV.4.19) uses τὰ νεώρια to describe Teleutias' victory. Reconstructing the campaign is not easy; according to Xenophon the Spartan commander called in from Sicily by the pro-Spartan faction tears down part of the long walls to Lechaem and leaves behind a garrison. At some later date (Xen. *Hell.* IV.4.18) the Athenians intervene; they probably expel the exiles and rebuild the walls of Lechaion.¹⁵ Finally in 391/90 BC Agesilaos returns and retakes the walls and the dockyards with the help of his brother Teleutias. But at Diod. XIV.91.2, the exiles holding the port attack the city walls, but Iphicrates and his men drive

¹³ Most lines are a consistent 19 or 20 letters; the supplements below in the *exempli gratia* have been kept to this standard line length.

¹⁴ I would like to thank P.A. Heilporn (above, n. 1) for checking this reading in the original for me.

¹⁵ Diodorus mentions neither Agesilaos or Teleutias.

them back to the dockyards. This might be an additional episode not mentioned by Xen. or part of Agesilaus' final campaign with a different ending.

2f. Κορινθίων [δὲ τὰς ναῦς παρὰ] | τῶν πόλεω[ν ἀγόντων: Xen. says simply that using the King's gold, the Corinthians manned ships and appointed Agathinus as admiral, but is silent about the organization of the new Corinthian navy or its relationship to the allied cities of Athens, Argos and Boiotia or the other cities that had been won over by Conon on his return from Cyprus to Athens after the battle of Cnidus. It is possible that Corinth built its own ships and then elected its own admirals to command a force including contingents from other cities as well; the land forces seem to have been organized this way (Diod. XIV.82.10).

The number of ships involved in these operations is unknown. According to Xen. (*Hell.* IV.8.23), Teleutias had twelve ships which he used to police the Corinthian gulf after the victory; after he arrived in Rhodes to help Ecdicus, he obtained further fifteen ships.¹⁶ According to Diod. XI.83.7, the Spartan fleet numbered thirty five ships after Cnidus. The Corinthian oligarchs had occupied the port in 392 BC and it seems likely that their intention was to disable the original Corinthian navy funded by Persia, but there are no references to the number of Corinthian ships, either before or after the attack.

παρὰ] | τῶν πόλεω[ν: also possible ἐκ παρῶν / τῶν πόλεω[ν. Diod. XIV.82.10, describing the organization of the land forces by the quadruple alliance against Sparta before the battle of Nemea in 395 BC, has: οἱ δ' εἰς Κόρινθον τὸ συνέδριον ἀγαγόντες, ἐπεὶ κατὰ νοῦν αὐτοῖς προεχώρει τὰ πράγματα, συνήγαγον ἐξ ἀπαρῶν τῶν πόλεων στρατιώτας εἰς Κόρινθον. Also Diod. XIV.82.2-3 puts the common meeting place of the alliance at Corinth.

3 ἀγόντων: for this use of the verb see Thuc. VII.21.1 ἄγων ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων ὧν ἔπεισε στρατίαν.

3f. μετὰ] Ἀργείων καὶ τ[ῶν συμμάχων]: "along with the Argives and their allies" would mean that the Corinthians had command, but the Argives and the rest of the allies manned their own ships alongside the Corinthian forces.¹⁷ Even at the time of the sympolity the two cities continue to be referred to as separate entities and to function separately (Tuplin, *CQ* 32 [1982] 77 and 79).

5-7 ὡς ἂν δύο μ[έρη]] | τῶν τριήρω[ν]] διαπέμψα[: the construction is not recoverable. Since, however, ὡς ἂν is most commonly used with a participle in the meaning "since" (both in genitive absolute and conjunct participle constructions)¹⁸ it is tempting to take ὡς ἂν with διαπέμψα and/or another participle in line 5 or 6 (see below).

5 δύο μέρη: This phrase could mean either two thirds or two sections of a contingent, but would seem to go with triremes in the next line. Thuc. describes the division of the huge armada to Sicily between the three generals at Corcyra at VI.42.1 καὶ τρία μέρη νείμαντες ἐν ἐκάτῳ ἐκλήρωσαν, ἵνα μήτε ἅμα πλέοντες ἀπορῶν ὕδατος καὶ λιμένων καὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἐν ταῖς καταγωγαῖς, πρὸς τε τὰλλα εὐκομότεροι καὶ ῥάους ἄρχειν ὧσι, κατὰ τέλος στρατηγῶ προσεταγμένοι. Although ships in line of battle are more usually described in terms of a center flanked by two wings (J.F. Lazenby, *Greece and Rome* 34 [1987] 169-177, esp. 171), Greek admirals occasionally did split their forces for battle; Alcibiades split the fleet at Cyzicus as part of an ambush. In Diodorus' description of the battle of Arginousai (XIII.98.4-5), the Spartan admiral, Callicratides seems to have decided to divide his fleet to avoid stretching his line too thin: οὐ δυνάμενος δὲ τὴν τάξιν ἐξισῶσαι τοῖς πολεμίοις διὰ τὸ τὰς νήους πολλὴν ἐπέχειν τόπον, διείλατο τὴν δύναμιν καὶ δύο ποιήσας στόλους πρὸς ἐκάτερον μέρος δίχα διηγωνίζετο.¹⁹ Similarly ποιήσας may have stood at the end of line 5 or 6, perhaps followed by καὶ.

6: The name of the Corinthian admiral, either Proainus or Agathinus (Xen. *Hell.* IV.8.10) might go here or into line 7.

7 διαπέμψα: The word is used in military contexts of guards (Xen. *Cyr.* IV.5.5), cavalry (VII.5.31) and raiders (Xen. *Hell.* IV.8.35). Aeneas Tacticus (20.5) uses it of night watchmen stationed on the city wall. Here, the word seems to indicate that the two divisions were placed in different position. If in a naval context the word can mean "put into position at intervals", it may imply the decision of how thin to spread a line of ships. This was an important preliminary to naval encounters.²⁰

¹⁶ Twelve ships is the standard number for a squadron, not a fleet; when Teleutias arrives in Rhodes, Ecdicus, the Spartan admiral in fact tells Teleutias to go away and come back with more ships if he expects to be of any use. According to Diodorus, the Spartans obtained 100 ships from Egypt before Cnidus; they blockade Conon at Caunus with 120 ships, and sail off; Peisander, the Spartan nauarch fights at Cnidus with 85 ships; Conon captures 50. The 35 remaining ships escape to safety at Cnidus. Xenophon's list of admirals makes it clear that even after Cnidus the Spartans had some sort of fleet.

¹⁷ Andoc. III.18 places the Argives, Corinthians, Athenians and Boiotians at the first battle of Lechaenum.

¹⁸ e.g. Diod. I.57.7, 81.7, 88.1, 98.9; II.13.7, 36.1 etc.; in military context e.g. XIII.17.5, 51.7 ἀναρίθμητον δὲ πλήθος λαφύρων ἤθροισαν ὡς ἂν δύο δυνάμει ἅμα τηλικαύτας νενικηκότας.

¹⁹ Xenophon's account of Arginousai does not mention the detail of the divided fleet; P. Krentz, *Xenophon*, Hellenika I-II.3.10 (Warminster 1989) argues against Xenophon that Diodorus's disposition of the forces gives a more plausible explanation of how the Athenians managed to avoid *diekplous*. Schwartz argued that fixed battle narratives, where one battle appears to be more or less interchangeable with another, were characteristic of Ephorus. He identified these doublets in Diodorus (*RE* VI s.v. Ephorus, col. 15). His criticism has been taken up by V.J. Gray, *Hermes* 115 (1983) 72-88.

²⁰ J. F. Lazenby, *Greece & Rome* (1987) 169-177. The more usual vocabulary for describing forming two lines of triremes to avoid the *diekplous* is a compound with "ἐπί", "side by side". Xenophon describes the double Athenian line at Argi-

B. The Authorship of the Theramenes Papyrus

The question of the authorship of the Theramenes papyrus has up to now been argued on the basis of the style and content of Theramenes' speech and the conclusions drawn from these about the author's attitude toward Theramenes in the main fragment (Engels, *loc. cit.* [above A.I.]). This section will not address the arguments about the main fragment directly but will focus what the unplaced fragment can now contribute to the debate.

I. Argument from findspot

Scholars have occasionally made suggestions about authorship based on the find-spot of the papyrus; Breitenbach, arguing that Ephorus was the author of the Theramenes papyrus, suggested that a find in a small village like Roman Karanis should be a major historian.²¹ The find-spot bears on the question of authorship in two ways; an examination of the findspot may first allow us to determine the general level of Greek culture at Karanis and second, and more specifically, the cultural level of the occupants of the house where the Theramenes papyrus was found.²² In the first case, we cannot yet expect to make a definitive statement about literary texts found at Karanis; as Husselman pointed out (*TAPA* 100 [1970] 227-251), too many of the texts from Karanis remain in scattered collections still unpublished. However, of the literary texts so far identified as being found in Karanis the majority do appear to reflect a taste for classical Greek and Hellenistic learning, although Christian texts have been found.²³ The range of known Greek authors represented is fairly narrow: Homer and other epic poetry, the ancient novel, oratory, tragedy, comedy and history have been found at the site.²⁴ In addition to classical literature, scholarly companions to classical works, school texts and treatises on science and mathematics have been found.²⁵ A far larger range of texts has been found at the metropolis of Oxyrhynchus, but these still consists mostly, although not entirely, of classical Greek texts of the fifth and fourth centuries.²⁶ Literate Oxyrhynchites seem to have preferred the classics even though some of its wealthiest inhabitants were Alexandrian citizens, and were aware of the latest scholarship produced in Alexandria.²⁷

nousai (Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.30-31) ἐπετέτακτο δὲ Πρωτομάχῳ Λυκίας, ἔχων τὰς ἴσας ναῦς, Θρασύλῳ δὲ Ἀριστογένης; οὕτω δ' ἐταχθήσαν ἵνα μὴ διέκπλουν διδοίεν.

²¹ H. R. Breitenbach, "Der Michigan Papyrus 5982 über Theramenes: Historische Probleme und Autorschaft", in H.E. Herzog and R. Frei-Stolba (edd.), *Labor Omnibus Unus* (Stuttgart 1989) 122-135; see also G. Pessey, *AHB* 8 (1994) 38-44.

²² For the house to house approach to studying the papyrus finds from Karanis, see P. Van Minnen, *ZPE* 100 (1994) 227-251.

²³ See G. Schwendner, "Karanis: A Literary Archaeology" (in preparation) for an inventory and discussion of these texts. For a full list, see now the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB), ROM 1998, with 61 entries for Karanis (including the school texts). Thirty-five published Michigan Karanis texts are available on line at the Michigan Apis Project homepage. All together 39 houses in Karanis contained some sort of Greek literature. See P. van Minnen, *JJP* 28 (1998) 123-36) for a detailed discussion.

²⁴ The vast majority date from the second and third centuries except the Christian texts. Known authors recovered from Karanis are: Homer, Hesiod, Menander, Demosthenes, Callimachus, Plato, Herodotus, Isocrates, Xenophon, Aristophanes, Hyperides, Chariton, the Alexander Romance, Aesop, and the Acta Alexandrinorum. For a comparison of Karanis with other Fayum villages see P. van Minnen, *JJP* 28 (1998) 99-184.

²⁵ These include Alcidas' Life of Homer, Apollonius Sophista's Lexicon to Homer and scholia minora and the Hypotheses to the plays of Euripides. For the schooltexts see R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta 1996).

²⁶ For a full list see J. Krüger, *Oxyrhynchus in der Kaiserzeit* (Frankfurt am Main 1990) 162-187 and compare the LDAB mentioned in n. 23.

²⁷ E.G. Turner, *JEA* 38 (1952) 78ff. It is not clear if the collection of literary texts at Oxyrhynchus, some found together, were in the possession of a single individual or belonged to a gymnasium library, if in fact gymnasia had libraries. In May 1906 Grenfell and Hunt discovered papyrus rolls placed together in a basket; in addition to the London fragments of the Oxyrhynchus Historian, they found Book II of Thucydides with commentary, Euripides' Hypsipyle, Pindar, Plato's Phaedrus (2 copies) and Symposium, Isocrates' Panegyricus, and a speech of Demosthenes. See B. Grenfell and A. Hunt, *Excavation Report of the Egyptian Exploration Society* (1906) 110, 180. A higher level of education may have been available at Oxyrhynchus; *P. Oxy.* XLVII 3366 shows that in the 3rd century the city elected a *demosios grammaticos*. See R. Cribiore, *op. cit.* (n. 25), Appendix 1.

Karanis was a village; whatever readers in Karanis possessed were probably the most popular texts of the time.²⁸ Indeed many of the literary texts recovered from Karanis may have been the sort of texts read in schools.²⁹

The Theramenes papyrus was discovered in an archaeological context, in the so-called House of the Nilometer.³⁰ Relating a specific papyrus text to its precise archaeological context involves risk; there is always the possibility that the piece did not originate where it was found especially in site like Karanis where there was much illicit excavation before the archaeologists arrived. Papyrus could also be reused and so could be possessed by its last owner merely for recycling purposes.³¹ Nonetheless, according to the original inventory and the topographical plan, the excavators at Karanis appear to have found in the house of the Nilometer a text in Hieratic and Greek texts referring to Egyptian priests. There is reason to suggest that the entire area may have been associated with traditional Egyptian religious buildings.³² Despite E.G. Turner's dictum that Greek literary texts in Egypt were read by Greeks, scholars have occasionally suggested that Egyptian priests elsewhere in Roman Egypt, as the most literate segment of

²⁸ Very few of known authors found in Fayum villages (where more than one literary text has been found) are not also attested in at least one copy among the Oxyrhynchus papyri; the authors not attested so far at Oxyrhynchus are Alcaeus of Mesene, and Apollodorus Ath. (on Homer; Tebtynis) Alcidamas (Karanis), Herodotus Medicus (Tebtynis), Hadrian's autobiography (Bacchias). Rare works are Euclid (Euhemeria), Apollonius Mys (Tebtunis), Dictys Cretensis (Tebtunis) and Astydamos (Sok. Nes.). Most of the authors found in the villages are among those most frequently found in Oxyrhynchus: Homer, Hesiod (78), Menander (75), Demosthenes (76), Thucydides (70), Euripides (63), New Testament (56), Plato (54), Callimachus (50), Old Testament (39), Aeschylus (29), Herodotus (26), Isocrates (23), Alcaeus (22), Sophocles (20), Archilochus (18), and Xenophon (16). A few authors common at Oxyrhynchus but not found in the villages are Aeschines (38), Apollonius Rhodes (34) and Theocritus (17). See P. van Minnen, *JJP* 28 (1998) 99-124 and LDAB (above, n. 23).

²⁹ A comparison can be made between the list of texts found at Karanis and the list of texts written by school children or school masters compiled by Criboire, *op. cit.* [above, n. 25], Appendix 1; some of the texts and many of the authors found in Karanis were considered suitable for instructional purposes. The existence of an elementary school is proved at Karanis both by a letter (P.Mich. VIII 464 [Karanis, 99 AD]) explicitly referring to the children of a Roman soldier attending school, and by the alphabets and tables of syllables found at the site (*O. Mich.* I 661, 662, 672, an alphabet, P. Mich. inv. no. 2816, a syllabic table for learning Coptic?). See Appendix for a complete list.

³⁰ T. Gagos suggests from the placement of the house in the street and its odd shape that the house of the Nilometer might actually be an Egyptian shrine (*per litteras*).

³¹ This may well be the case for the Cairo fragments of the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia; that Greek text has Demotic on the verso. See L. Koenen, *Stud. Pap.* 15 (1976) 38-79. Norsa (*PSI* X 1129-1142 introduction) suggests that some of the Tebtunis texts found in the priest's cell were kept or acquired to be reused. Remarkably the Demotic texts from the Tebtunis find had been reused to write in Greek on the verso.

³² The Theramenes papyrus was found in the street designated CS 190, in sector H-11-12 of the excavation grid. This sector sits on the eastern side of the tell, a short distance from where the sabakh digging stopped in 1924 (plate 1). Half of this street was paved, marking the approach to the so-called Mithraeum (C 178), and there is evidence of mastabas on the north side. The "Mithraeum" also has a font much like those found in temples of Isis. Published texts:

inv. 5791	<i>P. Mich.</i> IX.532	expenses concerning orphans
inv. 5795	<i>TAPA</i> 87 (1956), 51ff., ed. O.M. Pearl	measurements of the Nile-flood's recession
inv. 5984	SB VI 9245	expenses for the Samesia, a festival connected with the arrival of the Nile flood
inv. 5982	Theramenes papyrus (<i>ZPE</i> 2 [1968] 161ff., ed. Youtie – Merkelbach; and this article	Hellenika anonyma
inv. 5794	circumcision request (in preparation, T. Gagos)	
inv. 5796		Hieratic lexicon of gods

There is also an unpublished legal agreement in which the primary party is another Egyptian priest, Sto[toetis] (?), of the (?) phyle of priests of the twice great god Soknopaios. For further discussion see T. Gagos and P. Van Minnen, "Is there a Nilometer in the House?" (delivered at the annual meeting of the APA in Washington, DC, 1993). T. Renner ("Towards Plato in Context: A Papyrus containing Phaedo 99A-100B from CS 190 [B224] at Karanis", *Akten des 21. Intern. Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*, Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 5 [1997] 827-834) has suggested that the house was occupied by Egyptian priests who read Plato and the other Greek literature found in the house. For more elaboration of the suggestion that Egyptian priests read Greek literature and may have been schoolteacher see P. van Minnen, *JJP* 28 (1998) 99-184.

Egyptian society, might also have taken an interest in Greek literature;³³ in Socnopaïou Nesos the priests used the text of Homer for divination, and may have owned other Greek literary works.³⁴ Moreover, priests of Secnebtuni at Tebtunis appear to have owned Greek literature; the excavators at Tebtunis reported finding in the storage cellar of a priest's cell within the temenos of temple of Secnebtuni a mixed cache of Greek, hieratic, hieroglyphic, and demotic papyri, also dating to the second century and including a fragment of Homer and some Greek medical texts.³⁵ The excavators, Bagnani and Anti, concluded from finds of jars that the priests had practiced medicine. This supposition was born out by the Egyptian texts, dated to the second century; these included medical recipes and a hymn placing the various parts of the body under the protection of the god Souchos. Agreeing with Bagnani's view, Norsa, who published the Greek texts from this find, concluded that the Greek medical texts could well have been of interest to these doctor-priests and that many of the Greek documents were directly connected with the functioning of the temple in the second century.³⁶ If literate Egyptians did occupy house B224 in Karanis, the Egyptian context may further limit the possibilities for authorship of the Theramenes papyrus; the other Greek literary texts found in the House of the Nilometer alongside the Theramenes papyrus, Plato's *Phaedo*, Herodotus, Book 7 and Demosthenes' *Philippics*, also suggest that the Theramenes papyrus can only be whatever fourth century historian was most widely read and widely available in the second century AD.

Other fragments of historical works identified among the Karanis papyri from elsewhere in the site, Herodotus, Xenophon's *Hellenica*, and the *Acta Alexandrinorum* are also fairly common texts in second century Egypt (see the LDAB [above, n. 23]). Although a papyrus fragment of the *Letter of Alexander to his Mother Olympias* (Alexander novel III 27-29) has been found only at Karanis, other letters of this sort have also been found in Egypt in this period (*PSI* XXII.1285 [2nd cent., Oxy.]), and the general topic would seem to have had a wide appeal.³⁷ Historical texts, although less common in school contexts, might also have been useful for a schoolmaster; more advanced students were expected to compose themes on historical topics.³⁸

³³ E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1964). For the view that Egyptian priests commonly used Greek see D. Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt* (Princeton 1998) 250. Also D.J. Thompson, "Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt", in A. Bowman, *Literacy and Power* (Cambridge 1994) 77-79. For the continued importance of Demotic see W. Tait, "Demotic Literature and Egyptian Society", in J. Johnson, ed., *Life in a Multicultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond* (Chicago 1995) 303-310.

³⁴ The Greek literature found at Soknopaïou Nesos, includes Homer, Plato, astrology, medicine and mathematics. According to D. Hobson, the inhabitants of this village were entirely Egyptian. See G. Schwendner, "Divination by Homer" presented to the University of Michigan Summer Ancient History Seminar, 1994 (publication in preparation). For the earlier period, D. Thompson, *Memphis Under the Ptolemies* (1987) 252ff. For Philae, see L. Koenen, "Die Adaption ägyptischer Königsideologie an Ptolemäerhof", in E. Van 't Dack, P. Van Dessel and W. Van Gucht (edd.), *Egypt in the Hellenistic World*, in *Stud. Hell.* 27 (Louvain 1983) 143-190.

³⁵ D.J.I. Begg, *BASP* 35 (1998) 185-210. The Egyptian and Greek texts were published separately. Norsa published one of the medical texts from this find as *PSI* X 1180 and the documents as *PSI* X 1129-1132, 1134, 1135, 1143-1149 and 1150-1158; The Egyptian texts are very similar to the texts published in *P. Tebtunis Tait*, 1-23 (Demotic), 24-34 (Hieratic), 35-37 (Hieroglyphic), and also Greek texts including Homer, perhaps from an illicit excavation at the same findspot, as the editor suggests. C. Anti in *ILN*, May 30, 1931, 908-10 published a photo of the temple including the medical equipment. A similar find of papyri stored in a priest's cell was described by T. Derda, "Polish Excavations at Deir El Naqlun 1986-1991. Interdependence of Archaeology and Papyrology", A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists at Copenhagen* (1992) 124-131.

³⁶ For further discussion of the Egyptian priests at Tebtunis see P. van Minnen *JJP* 28 (1998) 99-184.

³⁷ R. Merkelbach, *Der Alexanderroman*² (1997); see also S.M. Burstein, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 275. Alexanderbiography: *P. Oxy.* LVI.3823 and 3824 (LDAB 4372 and 4495 respectively).

³⁸ Criboire (*op. cit.* [above n. 25]) lists student compositions on the topic of Alexander's death and divinity (348, 349) and his conversations with the gymnosophists (380). An epistolary autobiography of Hadrian found at Bacchias is in a schoolhand (van Minnen, *JJP* 28 [1998] 118 mit references). The *Life of Alcibiades* is also sometimes considered a student composition drawn from history. One other anonymous fragmentary text of an Historian of the fourth century dealing with Athenian Admiral Chares (*P. Ryl.* III.490; *FGrHist* 2F 505; Pack² 2192 and LDAB 7007) might have been found at Karanis

To judge from both the other Greek texts found with it, and the kind of Greek literature generally found at Karanis, the author of the Theramenes papyrus might be expected to have appealed to an audience whose tastes for Greek literature were formed and perhaps limited to those texts still considered canonical. It seems unlikely that the author of the Theramenes papyrus found at the village of Karanis was less well known than the major fourth century historians found at the metropolis of Oxyrhynchus: Ephorus (*P. Oxy.* 1610)³⁹ and the Oxyrhynchite Historian have both been found there.⁴⁰

Argument from the Content of the Unplaced Fragment: Ephorus?

The relationship of the unplaced fragment to Diodorus' and Xenophon's accounts of the Corinthian War might help to identify the author of the Theramenes papyrus. The author treats a period covered by both Diodorus and Xenophon. Because the episode appears to be after Cnidus, the author cannot be Theopompus since Theopompus ended his *Hellenica* with the battle of Cnidus (Diodorus, XIV.84.6). Furthermore the author appears to describe in greater detail than Xenophon a naval encounter that is either described or at least alluded to by Xenophon, but not mentioned by Diodorus.⁴¹ So the author, not Theopompus, is probably independent of both Diodorus and Xenophon.

Diodorus' main source for Books XIII-XVI, Ephorus has been suggested as the author on the basis of the main fragment.⁴² Polybius (XII.25) praised Ephorus' treatment of naval battles and singled out his descriptions of Cnidus and the Persian campaign against Evagoras of Salamis as reflecting Ephorus' own experience of battle.⁴³ Did Diodorus use the earlier passages from Ephorus about Iphicrates' activities around Corinth but simply omit the activities of the Corinthian fleet from his text? Diodorus certainly was capable of this sort of editing; his versions of the battle of Cnidus and of the main battle between the Persian fleet and Evagoras are extremely abbreviated and certainly bear no resemblance to the description of an eyewitness. In fact Diodorus ignores Spartan naval adventures until after 391 BC; he states that the Spartans threw away their command of the sea directly after Cnidus and did not aim at naval supremacy again until they sent help to the revolt of Rhodes in 391 BC (Diodorus XIV, 84 and 97.4).⁴⁴

On the other hand, Diodorus' narrative of the Corinthian War seems to support suggestions that Ephorus also had an Athenian point of view.⁴⁵ Diodorus' narrative focuses on the activities of the Athenian generals and admirals, Iphicrates in Corinth and Thrasybulus in Asia at the expense of the leaders of other cities, who are never named, and his simplified account produces the impression that the Corinthian War was simply a continuation of the Peloponnesian War. He centers his narrative on Sparta and Athens, focusses on a few major individuals, and depicts Sparta as land power until the revolt of

or another Fayum village. This piece is not physically related to the Theramenes papyrus, but is also a source for Diodorus (XVI.22.1,2 and 34.1,20); see U. Powell, *New Chapters in Greek Literature*, First Series (Oxford 1921) 68-69.

³⁹ For Theon, the *grammatikos*, who may have lived in Oxyrhynchus and his quotes from Ephorus, see Turner, *op. cit.* (above, n. 33) 92-93. Turner, 88-91, suggested that the London fragments of the Oxyrhynchus Historian which are written on the other side of a land survey from the Arsinoite nome might have been the personal copy made for Sarapion *alias* Apollonianos who had been strategos in the Arsinoite nome and had retained his official papers for his private use.

⁴⁰ *P. Oxy.* 842 and *PSI* 1304 both from Oxyrhynchus, and *P. Cairo* temp. inv. no. 26/6/27/1-41 from Karanis or Socnopaïou Nesos or Oxyrhynchus. See G. Pesely, *Ancient History Bulletin* 8.2 (1994) 38-44.

⁴¹ This is the case for the contents of the main fragment as well.

⁴² For the arguments based on the contents of the main fragment see H.R. Breitenbach, *op. cit.* (above, n. 21).

⁴³ Either of naval matters in general or of these particular campaigns; *FGrHist* 70 T 20 θαυμάζειν τὸν συγγραφέα καὶ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν <εἰκός>. For a favorable assessment of Ephorus' description of Arginousai see P. Krentz, ed., Xenophon *Hellenika I-II.3.10* (Warminster 1989) *ad loc.*

⁴⁴ This omission is an oddity in Diodorus' account: at XIV.79.4, the Spartans acquire 100 triremes from Egypt, Pharaoh besieges Conon at Caunus, sails to Rhodes; the fleet is expelled from Rhodes in the rebellion, and vanishes from Diodorus' account, not to reappear until Rhodes returns to the Spartan side.

⁴⁵ G. Westlake, "Abydos and Byzantium: the Sources for the two episodes in the Ionian War", in *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History* (Cambridge 1976) 224-235, n. 19 cites Polybius (12.25, *FGrHist* 70 T 20). For the Athenian sources of Diodorus note 5 and S. Accame, *Rend. Class. Sc. mor., stor. e fil. Accad. dei Lincei*, series 6, 14 (1938) 335.

Rhodes and then active in Asia when Athens takes a renewed interest in the area, and this consistent point of view could well be due to Ephorus.⁴⁶ If Ephorus did focus on the Athenian leaders, Iphicrates and Thrasybulus, would he have been as interested in the details of naval maneuvers in the gulf of Corinth mostly involving lesser known Spartan commanders and Corinthian admirals?⁴⁷

In conclusion we can now eliminate two arguments about authorship on the basis of the new fragment. Arguments that the Theramenes papyrus was part of a biography or a political pamphlet about Theramenes cannot be maintained; he was long dead by the Corinthian War.⁴⁸ The find spot in Karanis suggests that the author is a major historian who continued Thucydides. If, as we have suggested, the narrative focuses on a naval encounter in the Corinthian War after the battle of Cnidus, this author cannot be Theopompus, but, to judge from the findspot, seems more likely to have been Ephorus.

**Appendix: Comparison between Literary Texts found at Karanis
and Literary Texts Written in School Hands Identified by R. Criore (above, n. 25)**

Criore's school texts	Literary papyri from Karanis:
260 Ninos Romance	Pack ² 2616; LDAB (above, n. 23) 4272
283 Funeral Oration of Hyperides	Pack ² 2501; LDAB 2422
290 Menander Misoumenos	P. Mich. inv. no 4733 (LDAB 2643), 4801 and 4807 (prepubl. in A. Martina, <i>Epitrepontes Menandri</i> [Rome 1997]): Menander <i>Epitrepontes</i>
301 Hypotheses of Euripides' plays	P. Mich. inv. no. 6222a: Hypotheses of Euripides' plays (LDAB 949).
303 Callimachus <i>Hecale</i>	P. Mich. inedita: Callimachus <i>Aitia</i> (LDAB 477).
306 Isocrates Ad Nicoclem	Pack ² 1256; LDAB 2506
293, 308 & 395 Isocrates, Ad Demonicum	Pack ² 1246; LDAB 2477
314 & 271 Aesopic fable	<i>P. Mich. Koenen 765: Aesop's Fables and a Life of Aesop</i> (LDAB 134, 135);
275 Letter of Alexander to the Carthaginians	<i>P. Mich. Koenen 761: Letter of Alexander to his mother Olympias</i>
284 narrative about King Adrastus and his daughters	<i>P. Mich. Koenen 762: mythological fragment</i>
325 Scolia Minora	LDAB 1462 (same text as Criore 325)
359 grammar books	LDAB 4477 (same text as Criore 359) LDAB 4764; P. Mich. inv. no. 4693 + 4711a; unpubl.: Grammatical papyri.
Homer texts in school hands	Homer texts from Karanis
183 Iliad	Pack ² 832; LDAB 1411
201 Iliad	Pack ² 596; LDAB 1436
216 Homeric formulae	LDAB 1464
225 Iliad	LDAB 1466
226 Iliad	Pack ² 853; LDAB 1487
227 Iliad	Pack ² 818; LDAB 1561
259 Iliad	Pack ² 599; LDAB 1644
264 Odyssey	LDAB 1651
289 Iliad	Pack ² 624; LDAB 1719
291 Odyssey	Pack ² 565b; LDAB 1810
292 Iliad	LDAB 1812
294 Iliad	Pack ² 1024.1; LDAB 1813

⁴⁶ For Ephorus' Athenian point of view also H.R. Breitenbach, *op. cit.* (above n. 21).

⁴⁷ It may be noted that detailed description of the Corinthian war might also fit the Oxyrhynchus Historian. For a favorable analysis of the Oxyrhynchus Historian's description of naval encounters see A. Andrewes, *JHS* CII (1982) 15-25. For a summary of arguments that the Theramenes papyrus was written by the Oxyrhynchus Historian see M. Chambers, *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (Leipzig 1989).

⁴⁸ Sealey (above n. 4) made the same point in restoring the unplaced fragment to 403 BC. The argument that the Theramenes papyrus was a political pamphlet was made by A. Andrewes, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 35-38. Andrewes' conclusion has been widely accepted.

299 Iliad	<i>LDAB 1816</i>
300 Iliad	<i>Pack² 625; LDAB 1978</i>
313 Iliad	<i>LDAB 2359</i>