

## II.—A New Historical Fragment

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

No. 4913 in the inventory of papyri belonging to the University of Michigan is a much damaged fragment, roughly oblong in contour, now broken into several pieces by both horizontal and vertical cracks.<sup>1</sup> Its greatest height is 9.3 cm., its width 13 cm. It belonged to a roll of papyrus of a medium brown color and fair quality. The ink is a good black. The upper parts of three columns are preserved, the middle column in its full width for the first twelve lines with the beginnings of four more; the first column has the ends of nine lines, the third the beginnings of eleven and a few letters from the middle of a twelfth. At one place the upper margin has been preserved in what was probably its original height, 1.9 cm. The second column is 4.5 cm. wide, and the lines contain from 19 to 23 letters. The intercolumnar space is about 1.8 cm.

The hand is a small uncial, neat yet not quite regular. Some of the letters are slightly inclined, but the writing is clearly earlier than the well-marked sloping hands of the third century. The omicron is small in proportion to the other letters, and the omega has in its base only a slight wave, which disappears in a few of the examples. These characteristics are often found in third-century texts, yet they begin earlier; and a certain squareness in the writing of this papyrus might be thought to favor a date in the second century. One can scarcely say more than that the text might have been written in the late second or early third century of our era. The orthography is correct except for the use of *ε* for *ι* in Col. III, 11. The iota adscript is used in Col. II, 8–10, but is omitted in line 1. A diaeresis is placed over iota in Col. II, 6 (*ῑμῆριος*) and space fillers stand at the ends of Col. I, 9 and Col. II, 7. A short stroke under line 8 of Col. III may be a paragraphos.

<sup>1</sup> Plate I. The papyrus is slightly warped, with the result that it could not be mounted and still allow the broken letters of Column II, 5 to be placed in their proper positions; the bottoms of several of the letters are slightly to the right of the upper parts that correspond to them. Although it seemed desirable to show the form and the hand of the fragment by means of a photograph, it will give little aid, if any, in the reading of injured letters.

There are no other marks of punctuation, although a slight space before  $\delta\delta\epsilon$  (Col. III, 7) may indicate a minor pause.

The numerous fractures of the papyrus, and occasional blurrings of the ink, make the reading difficult in several places. Where there was serious doubt, I have submitted the text to the judgment of my colleagues H. C. Youtie, O. M. Pearl, and Elinor M. Husselman, all of whom have contributed useful suggestions. I am also under obligation to Herbert Bloch, who examined a transcript of the text, confirmed my impression of its character, and offered several helpful observations. For this preliminary publication it seemed convenient to print the greater part of the text with the words divided and the usual reading signs and marks of punctuation added; absence of these signs shows that it was deemed imprudent to confuse the reader by suggesting one restoration when several others might be not only possible but also preferable. I am aware that other interpretations might be proposed in some places where I have ventured a suggestion; as, for example, in Col. I, 5, where  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$  might be the end of a word.

After the text individual readings are discussed in detail, and these comments are followed by a discussion of the relations and possible authorship of the fragment.

#### TEXT

##### Column I

$\quad\quad\quad ] . \alpha \epsilon \alpha \nu$   
 $\quad\quad\quad ] \alpha \xi \delta \iota \alpha \pi \upsilon -$   
 $\quad\quad\quad ] . s \theta \epsilon \rho \mu \omicron \tau \epsilon -$   
 $\quad\quad\quad \quad ] \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$   
5  $\quad\quad\quad ] \epsilon \iota \omicron \upsilon \delta \epsilon \alpha . .$   
 $\quad\quad\quad \quad ] \delta \upsilon \nu \alpha \mu \iota \nu$   
 $\quad\quad\quad ] \omicron \nu \gamma \upsilon \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \iota$   
 $\quad\quad\quad \quad \epsilon ] \xi \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$   
 $\quad\quad\quad \quad ] \kappa \eta \nu \omicron -$

##### Column II

$\tau \eta \text{ Νώτου κώμη κατοικοῦν-}$   
 $\text{τας ὀκτῶ μῆνας πολιορκή-}$   
 $\text{σαντας ἐλόντες ἀπελύτρω-}$   
 $\text{σαν τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους, τοὺς}$

- 5 δὲ περὶ τὴν ε.θεφιλην ἀ-  
φῆκεν ἐν ἱματίοις δυσὶν  
καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας. ὁ δὲ Νικο-  
κράτης ἐν τῷ περὶ Βοιωτίας·  
ἔστιν δ' ἐν τῇ Ταναγρικῇ  
10 χώραι καὶ ὁ Σ[αλγα]γεὺς καὶ  
ἡ Αὐλὶς· ἐντεῦ[θέν] ἔστιν εἰς  
'Ανθηδόνα στά[διοι] μὲν ἀμ-  
φὶ τοὺς κα τὰ με[  
τὴν ὁδὸν κεί[  
15 τῶνι πρότερον .[  
[. .].[. .]νδερ.[

## Column III

- δοια[. .].[  
τρικαισ.[  
καμενε. . .[  
ἀγῶνι φησι δυ[. . . . . 'Ερε-]  
5 τριέων κτίσ[μα εἶναι τὸν 'Ω-]  
ρωπόν· ἀμφισβητ[ήσιμος]  
γάρ ἐστιν Βοιωτοῖς ['Ερετρι-]  
εὔσιν 'Αθηναίοις .[  
δὲ δι' 'Ακραϊφνίαν . .[  
10 λοντες .ελαινην .[  
κραϊφνείαν ημε. .[  
[. . . . .]διὰ. .[

## COMMENTARY

*Column I.* Little can be made of these scanty remains. In lines 2-3 διὰ πυ[ρός] is fairly likely in view of the occurrence of some form of θερμότερος in 3-4; and before διὰ πυρός, either ἀπαξ or παραλλάξ would make sense. ἄνθραξ διάπυρος is also a possible combination. If something was said about passing through a fire, it might refer to a magical ceremony or some ordeal or superhuman feat of daring, and would suggest a myth or heroic legend rather than an historical incident; yet a dramatic happening during the burning of a captured town is not to be excluded from consideration. The letters κηνο in line 9 probably belong to a compound of σκηνή, such as σκηνοποιεῖν or σκηνοφύλαξ. If this is true, the matter of the column might well have been an account of the burning of some encampment in a military operation.

*Column II.* 1-4. The readings are certain, but if the text is sound the sentence to which these words belong must have been extremely



awkward, because both *κατοικοῦντας* and *πολιορκήσαντας* require articles, which must have been forced into undesirable juxtaposition in the earlier part of the sentence. The sense seems to have been "after capturing [those who] had for eight months laid siege to the inhabitants of the village of Notos, they allowed their captives to be ransomed"; but with this meaning, it would have been hard to avoid so ugly an arrangement as *τοὺς* (e.g., *πολεμίους*) *τοὺς τοὺς ἐν τῇ Νώτου κώμῃ κατοικοῦντας* . . . *πολιορκήσαντας ἐλόντες*, κτλ. Surely *πολιορκήσαντας* is an error for *πολιορκήσαντες*, and is due to the influence of the neighboring accusatives. In that case one may translate "after besieging the inhabitants of the village of Notos for eight months, they captured them and released the prisoners for ransom."

There are still difficulties. No village of Notos or Noton is known, and even if one were to read *τηνωτον* as one word, the resulting name is unknown. Furthermore a siege of eight months against a mere village population is surprisingly long.

5. The reading here was difficult because a horizontal crack runs through the line and has destroyed the lower parts of several letters. My provisional reading was corrected by Professor H. C. Youtie, who recovered several letters by a skilful adjustment of the fragments. The noun following *περὶ τήν* seems to be either *εὐθεφίλην* or *ερθεφίλην*, neither of which is known as a place-name; in fact the second part of the word looks more like a component of a personal name. Since no woman bearing such a name is known, this suggests a remote possibility which should perhaps be mentioned in the hope that further investigation may throw light on the passage. The name *Ἐτηφίλαι* occurs in several inscriptions of Mitylene, where it is a name for Demeter and Kore, and it has been plausibly conjectured in Hesychius for the gloss *εταί . . . φίλη Περσεφόνη*.<sup>2</sup> The Thessalian-Aeolic element in Boeotian civilization might perhaps account for the occurrence of a similar name or epithet in Boeotian surroundings, and the latter part of this column shows that the writer is dealing with Boeotian localities. Can *Εἰθεφίλη* be a local Boeotian name for Demeter or Persephone? If so, it is conceivable that *περὶ τήν Εἰθεφίλην* means "round (the sanctuary of) one of these goddesses"; or even if it were originally a name of Demeter or Kore, Eithephile may have come to be regarded merely as a heroine. Pausanias remarks (9.1.1) that most of the Boeotian towns are named from women. But the whole combination is extremely doubtful.

*ἀφῆκεν*: either an error for *ἀφῆκαν* or a sudden change from the army to its commander as subject of the verb.

6. The phrase *ἐν ἱματίους δυσίν*, taken in connection with the later mention of Boeotian towns, reminds one of the terms on which the Plataeans surrendered at the time of the second capture of their town, in 373 B.C. according to Pausanias (9.1.8); Diodorus (15.46) says 374. Pausanias (9.1.7) says: *πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐγκαταληφθέντας ἐποιήσαντο οἱ Θηβαῖοι*

<sup>2</sup> The references to the sources will be found in A. B. Cook, *Zeus* 3.167, note 8, 10; Hiller von Gaertringen, *RE* s.v. "Etephila."

σπονδάς, ἀπελθεῖν σφᾶς πρὸ ἡλίου δύντος ἄνδρας μὲν σὺν ἐνί, γυναῖκας δὲ δύο ἱμάτια ἐκάστην ἔχουσιν.<sup>3</sup> Yet there is nothing in our text to connect the incident with Plataea, and it must be remembered that stipulations about the amount of clothing allowed a conquered people entered into the terms of surrender on other occasions, and may have been usual articles of a capitulation. At the surrender of Potidaea (Th. 2.70.3), the men were allowed to depart accompanied by their wives and children and by their allies, the women taking two *himatia*, the men one and a specified sum of money in addition. When Lysander captured Samos (X. *HG* 2.3.6) the free men were allowed to go with a single *himation*; everything else was to be turned over to the captors, and nothing is said about the women and children, though they were probably included in the word ἐλευθέρους.

7. καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας seems to be added awkwardly as if it were an afterthought. Perhaps the sentence has been confused, and the terms were originally like those accepted by the Plataeans: τοὺς δὲ . . . ἀφήκεν ἐν ἐνί ἱματίῳ καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἐν δυσίν.

7-13. ὁ δὲ Νικοκράτης: the following words, certainly as far as τὰ in 13 and perhaps to the end of what is preserved in this column, are a new fragment of the historian Nicocrates; and they also attest a hitherto unknown work of his, *περὶ Βοιωτίας*.

10. The lacuna is almost certainly to be filled out as Σ[αλγα]νεύς, although it is surprising to find Salganeus counted along with Aulis as belonging to the territory of Tanagra. It lay some miles to the west of Chalcis on the north slope of Mount Messapius, overlooking the Euripus where it broadens northwestward; while Aulis lies to the south of Chalcis and the narrows. In a passage where Strabo cites Ephorus almost verbatim, Salganeus is clearly not included in the land of Tanagra: ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πρὸς Εὐβοίαν μερῶν ἐφ' ἐκάτερα τοῦ Εὐρίπου σχιζομένης τῆς παραλίας, τῇ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν Αὐλίδα καὶ τὴν Ταναγρικὴν, τῇ δ' ἐπὶ τὸν Σαλγαλέα καὶ τὴν Ἀνθηδόνα (9.2.2, p. 400 C).

11-13. στά[διοι] seems to be required, but μὲν is awkward and does not seem to have been followed by δέ. In 13 I have taken κα as a numeral, although there is no trace left of a stroke above it, because otherwise ἀμφὶ τοὺς would be left hanging without any connection. But 21 stades is much too short for the distance between Aulis and Anthedon, and even falls short of that between Salganeus and Anthedon—two and two-fifths miles as against about four, which one may infer from Frazer's account of the journey from Chalcis to Anthedon.<sup>4</sup> Heraclides Criticus (Ps.-Dicaearchus) says (fr. 1.26) that the distance from Anthedon to Chalcis is 70 stades, and Salganeus is not far from midway.<sup>5</sup> Dr. Naphtali

<sup>3</sup> Diodorus (15.46.5), referring to the same incident, says: ἔδει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τὰ ἐπιπλα λαβόντες ἀπελθεῖν.—Polyaenus (7.48), describing the capture of a Spanish town by Hannibal, says the people begged to be allowed to depart ἐν ἱματίῳ, leaving their weapons and their property behind. One might suspect that ἐν ἱματίῳ was the original text; but the phrase probably means in civil as opposed to military costume.

<sup>4</sup> Frazer, *Pausanias*, 5.91-92.

<sup>5</sup> Müller, *FHG* 2.260. The numeral has been questioned; Müller thought that the original text had οβ' or οή. See his note.

Lewis has suggested that in line 13 the actual numeral may have dropped out; in that case the latter part of the line should be written *κατὰ με[* or *καταμε[* . Nicocrates might then be acquitted of inaccuracy about distances, or rather, might be given the benefit of a doubt; but his placing Salganeus in the territory of Tanagra must count against him.

13-14. The remaining words suggest something like *τὰ μὲν χωρία τὰ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κείμενα*, or *τὰ μὲν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κείμενα χωρία*; but the former gives line 13 too many letters (24), the latter too few (17).

15. Perhaps *βελλῆτιον*.

*Column III.* 1. *δοι* might represent the dative *αἰδοῖ* or an optative such as *ἴδοι*, *σπεῖδοι*, and others. If the four letters belong to the same word *αἰδοῖα* is an obvious suggestion.

2. Here we probably have the end of an adjective like *Ἑρετρικαί* or else *καί* is preceded by the dative singular ending of one of a limited group of words—*πατήρ*, *μήτηρ* (with *Δημήτηρ*), *θυγάτηρ*, *γαστήρ*. After *σ* the remaining trace most resembles *κ*.

2-4. In view of the quotation from Nicocrates in the previous column it is natural to supply *εἰρή]καμεν ἐν τῷ [ἐν Ἑλικῶνι] ἀγῶνι*, since *περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἑλικῶνι ἀγῶνος* is the title of this author's only other known work. We should then expect *φησὶ δέ*, citing another authority, or *φησὶ δὲ καί*, introducing another quotation from the same author. But *δέ* is apparently impossible, because the trace following *δ* is in such a position as to fit no vowel except *υ*. Hence it seems necessary to set a period after *εἰρή]καμεν* in line 3, and begin a new sentence, which seems to have dispensed with a conjunction, since the traces in the seventh and eighth spaces of this line can scarcely represent *δέ*, while they can be easily interpreted as parts of *τω*.

The restoration of the latter part of line 4 must be considered in connection with 5-7. In 5 *κτίσμα* agrees excellently with the remaining vestiges; *τ* is certain, though broken, and *ω* is satisfactory, though a blot or false start at the bottom is somewhat confusing. *κτῆμα* would not fit so well. The clause beginning *ἀμφισβητήσιμος γάρ* seems to require in the earlier part of the sentence some word which the clause with *γάρ* serves to explain; and since that would probably be an adjective denoting something disadvantageous or troublesome about the *κτίσμα*, *δυστυχές* may be tentatively suggested as the word following *φησὶ*. Others may prefer *δυσχερές* or *δύσκολον*. The statement that Oropus was an Eretrian foundation will be discussed later.

6. Cf. Strabo 9.1.22 (p. 399 C): *᾽Ωρωπὸς δ' ἐν ἀμφισβητήσιμῳ γεγένηται πολλάκις· ἴδρυται γὰρ ἐν μεθορίῳ τῆς τε Ἀττικῆς καὶ τῆς Βοιωτίας*.

9. The name of the town mentioned here and in line 11 appears in inscriptions as (τὰ) *Ἀκραΐφια*, or in the Boeotian dialect as *Ἀκρήφια* (Frazer, *Pausanias* 5.99). Various other forms were used: Pausanias (9.23.5) and the Oxyrhynchus historian (11.3) wrote *Ἀκραΐφνιον*, Strabo *Ἀκραΐφια* and *Ἀκραΐφιον* (9.2.27, p. 410 C; 9.2.34, p. 413 C). Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. has *Ἀκραΐφια* . . . *οἱ δὲ Ἀκραΐφιον*. He adds that the ethnic adjective is *Ἀκραΐφιαῖος* or *Ἀκραΐφιος*, though Ephorus wrote

'Ακραϊφνίους and 'Ακραϊφνεῶτας, and that Theopompus has it (τὰ) 'Ακραϊφνία, with the ethnic 'Ακραϊφνιεύς. Our text seems to indicate 'Ακραϊφνία as the name of the town unless 'Ακραϊφνίαν is the adjective form, in which case the name itself might be either feminine or neuter. In line 11 a blot following the first ν might suggest that there was an iota before the epsilon; but it is more likely to be accidental; the ει there apparently represents iota.

10. We have found it impossible to determine the original writing here. The sixth letter should be sigma, but its form is not quite satisfactory, and while ἐλαῖνῆν, from ἐλαῖνός, might make sense if the context were preserved, the trace before it indicates some other word. On the broken edge of the papyrus before ελ there is a vertical stroke. Iota makes no sense, and the trace could not have been part of τ (τ') or γ. There is scarcely room for μ or π, of which the vertical might be the last stroke, and neither of those letters would give a satisfactory reading. It occurred independently both to Mr. Bloch and to me that there was an Athenian deme on the Boeotian border called Melainai, and consequently Μελαινή might be considered here.<sup>6</sup> But apart from the fact that the space appears to be rather narrow for μ, there are other difficulties: the deme-name is not known to occur in the singular number, and there is no evidence of an eponym Μελαινή, who might conceivably be mentioned here. Further, although such a border-deme might at one time or another have been claimed by Boeotia and hence might appear in a context dealing with that country, the mention of Akraiphnia seems to show that the narrator is here concerned with a region remote from the Attic border.

11. The trace after ημε is apparently the bottom of ι; ρ is perhaps possible.

Almost nothing is known about the Nicocrates who is quoted in Column II. Because he is once cited in the older scholia on Apollonius of Rhodes, Susemihl thought that he must be assigned to the Alexandrian age; about his personal circumstances we have no information whatever.<sup>7</sup> In the Townley Scholia on *Il.* 13.21, Nicocrates is mentioned as the author of a work called *περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἑλικῶνι ἀγῶνος*, in which he maintained that the Αἰγαί mentioned in *Il.* 13.21 was an island in the Aegaeen known for strange tales of supernatural dangers that beset visitors. C. Wendel has shown that this is the same work that is referred to as *De Musio* in a fragment of Censorinus.<sup>8</sup> Now this papyrus attests a book called *περὶ*

<sup>6</sup> W. M. Leake, *The Topography of Athens and the Demes* 2.132. St. Byz. s.v. Μελαινεῖς cites Callimachus as authority for Μελαίναί as the deme-name. Strabo says that Μελανηῖς was an older name of Eretria (10.1.10, p. 447 C).

<sup>7</sup> Sch. A.R. 1.831; Susemihl, *Gesch. der griech. Litt. der Alexandrinerzeit* 2.53; Müller, *FHG* 4.465f.; Wendel, *RE* s.v. "Nikokrates" (3) 357.

<sup>8</sup> Cens. fr. 1, § 10; Wendel, *H* 69 (1934) 346f.



*Βοιωτίας*, which must have been a work of wider range than that on the contest in Helicon; and we may confidently assign to it a fragment that is attributed to Nicocrates without mention of any book. This is a sentence in Stephanus of Byzantium *s.v.* *Βοιωτία*, *Νικοκράτης δὲ φησιν ὅτι Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀρνης ἦν παῖς* (sc. ὁ Βοιωτός). There is also good reason to think that another fragment is concealed under a different name in the scholium on Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1010, where, treating of the death of Menoeceus, the scholiast says: *Σωσιφάνης ὁ τραγικὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ Λαίου φησὶ τεθνηκέναι τὸν Μενουκέα· Νικόστρατος δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς Σφιγγός*. The last words, relating to a Boeotian legend, might well belong to Nicocrates' book on Boeotia, while there is no other fragment undoubtedly belonging to Nicostratus that deals with Boeotia. In fact the only fragment that is referred to Nicostratus with certainty has to do with a different part of the world; in Stephanus of Byzantium *s.v.* *Γάγγρα* he is given as authority for the foundation legend of that town in remote Paphlagonia. It is known that the names Nicocrates and Nicostratus were confused, for Eustathius on *Il.* 13.21 (p. 917, 38) attributes to Nicostratus the previously mentioned fragment about Aegae, and there are variant readings in Stephanus *s.v.* *Βοιωτία*.

Attention has been called to an apparent inaccuracy of Nicocrates with regard to certain distances,<sup>9</sup> and also to his inclusion of Salgameus in Tanagraean territory, which must be set down to lack of personal knowledge of the region; unless, indeed, some temporary political convulsion, not known to us from other sources, had given Tanagra power beyond her usually recognized boundaries. These faults suggest that the work was not one of great merit; and yet, if we had more of it, we might find valuable material here and there. Dr. Bloch remarks upon the resemblance of the passage from the *περὶ Βοιωτίας* to Heraclides Criticus' *περὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλεων*; he has in mind Heraclides' methodical manner of recording distances, as in fr. 1.8: *ἐντέθεν εἰς Τάναγραν στάδια λ'*, or fr. 1.23: *ἐντέθεν εἰς Ἀθηδόνα στάδια ρξ'*, etc. But this is after all merely a part of periegetic style. There are phrases in Pausanias that are similar to Col. II, 9–12; for example Paus. 9.20.1: *ἔστι δὲ τῆς Ταναγραίας ἐπὶ θαλάσση καλούμενον Δήλιον*; 9.23.3: *ἐντέθεν ἐς Ἀκραϊφνίον ἔστιν ὁδὸς τὰ πλείω πεδιάς*.

<sup>9</sup> Pausanias was sometimes equally careless. He represents the sanctuary of Amphiaras as 12 stades from Oropus (about 1½ miles), whereas Frazer estimates the distance as four miles. See Paus. 1.34.1, and Frazer, *Pausanias* 2.466.

The fragment of Nicocrates that begins in Col. II, 9 may have continued not only through the remainder of the column, but even to Col. III, 3 where *καμεν* suggests *εἰρήκαμεν* or some other perfect referring to the author's exposition of his subject. A note above has set forth the reasons why it seems necessary to let the sentence end with this word; and it will be observed that with that punctuation the following words as far as *Ἀθηναίοις* (8) constitute a new fragment of the book *περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἑλικῶνι ἀγῶνος*.

No other ancient authority represents Eretria as the founder of Oropus or as asserting a claim to its territory, and yet the statement is not without support, at least of an indirect sort. It may be related to the story told by Pausanias that the men of Eretria once invaded the territory of Tanagra, but were repulsed through the aid of Hermes Promachus, who appeared in person to aid the Tanagraeans, fighting with a *silengis*, the appurtenance of young athletes.<sup>10</sup> The intervention of Hermes might seem to place this event in the legendary past; but stories of divine and heroic helpers were told about the battle of Marathon.<sup>11</sup> It is probable that the invasion by the Eretrians may have been an attempt to win back territory that had formerly belonged to them, after the Boeotians had taken it at some time in the course of the sixth century. Various bits of evidence, in addition to the story just given, were gathered together by Wilamowitz in support of his view that there was an ancient connection between Eretria and Oropus and the other districts belonging to the valley of the Asopus.<sup>12</sup> Among the arguments advanced are the following:

1. Certain resemblances between the dialects of Eretria and Oropus, particularly in the matter of rhotacism.<sup>13</sup>

2. The occurrence of Eretrian names containing Oropus as an element in composition, as *ᾠρωποκλής*; also the fact that a *κώμη* of Eretria was called Oropus.<sup>14</sup>

3. Evidence from Stephanus of Byzantium indirectly suggesting that the Graian territory, including Oropus, was once Eretrian.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>10</sup> 9.22.2.

<sup>11</sup> Paus. 1.15.3; 1.32.5; Plu. *Thes.* 35.

<sup>12</sup> Wilamowitz, "Oropos und die Graer," *H* 21 (1886) 105ff.; F. Dürnbach, *De Oropo* 22ff.; F. Geyer, *Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euböia* (Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie, Heft 6) 64-66.

<sup>13</sup> Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 97-100.

<sup>14</sup> Geyer, *op. cit.* 66, note 1; 78.

<sup>15</sup> St. Byz. s.v. *Γραία*, *Τάναγρα*.

4. The tradition of the Gephyraioi, the family to which Harmodius and Aristogeiton belonged, that they were of Eretrian origin, taken in conjunction with the equation Γεφυραῖοι = Ταναγραῖοι, which is attested by Hecataeus and Strabo.<sup>16</sup>

5. The fact that Stephanus of Byzantium cites Theopompus as authority for the statement that Eleutheris, in the territory of Oropus, was founded by two Euboean heroes, Aeclus and Cothus.<sup>17</sup>

The last point, suggesting as it does that Theopompus recognized an ancient connection between Eretria and Oropus, might be thought to point to him as a source used by Nicocrates. But one can scarcely venture such an assertion. The circumstance that Photius, *s.v.* ἀμφισβητήσιμον, cites Theopompus along with Plato as using the word (cf. Col. III, 6) may be no more than a coincidence. Xenophon used it also (*HG* 3.5.3), and so did the Oxyrhynchus historian (13.3).

We should probably gain little by conjectures about the identity of the writer in whose work these fragments of Nicocrates are embedded. Everything in this papyrus is of a kind that might have found a place in Apollodorus' work *On the Catalogue of Ships*, and we know not only that that work was Strabo's principal source in his account of Boeotia (9.2), but also that it mentioned Oropus, Plataea, Aulis, and Anthedon.<sup>18</sup> Yet there are no verbal coincidences between this text and the fragments of Apollodorus' work, and in the absence of any positive evidence for Nicocrates' date, one hesitates to attribute a work that quotes him to Apollodorus, whose period is known (ca. 180–110 B.C.).

<sup>16</sup> Hdt. 5.57; St. Byz. *s.v.* Γέφυρα; Str. 9.2.10, p. 404 C.

<sup>17</sup> St. Byz. *s.v.* Ἐλευθερίς.

<sup>18</sup> Jacoby, *FGH* 2 B. 244, fr. 155–157, 168.