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\textit{Introduction}

Maehler noted in his excellent edition that \textit{P. Berol. 9588} belonged to the same papyrus as \textit{P. Berol. 7927} and \textit{P. Berol. 21179}, and that all three fragments formed two consecutive columns of the same papyrus. Stephens-Winkler, López Martínez, and Hägg-Utas have also edited the text, though practically all of the editors have maintained Maehler’s readings in their editions.\textsuperscript{1} Our purpose here is to present a new edition of the second column,

\textsuperscript{1} The papyri of this novel are as follows:


accompanied by a translation and commentary of the main literary traits of the text. We have followed Hägg’s translation with some minor changes. The papyri date from the first half of the 2nd century A.D. to the 3rd century A.D. Moreover, an ostrakon has survived from the 1st century A.D.

Several references to the characters also remain in other literary and iconographic sources from the Empire, along with quotes in Persian narratives, such as the collection of narratives Dārāb-nāmah, and, especially, the epic poem Vāmiq u Ἁdhrā by ‘Unṣūrī, from the XIth century. Nearly 400 verses of this poem have been kept, which is very useful when it comes to reconstructing the plot of this novel. We express our gratitude to our colleague Haila Manteghi, at the University of Alicante, for her review of the Persian text by ‘Unṣūrī. In her opinion, the Persian poem was composed in Pre-Islamic times, starting from a Pahlavi Persian text—probably in prose, from the 5th century—which was versified by the poet. \(^2\)

---


The first column has 33 preserved lines, whereas the second one has 38 between 30 and 42 letters. The first column is the worst preserved; in our 2016 study we offered an edition, translation and commentary of it.4

The novel is written on the papyrus verso. An account register can be seen on the recto. Our text, ascribed by Cavallo to the first half of the 2nd century A.D.,5 combines two types of writing: a small-module and one that is larger. It is perhaps a rather careless piece of professional work with mistakes of all sorts.

Regarding this column, the scribe does not use lectional signs, except *tremata* on ἴδη (l. 9) and on ἴκα[λεί] (l. 25), here perhaps to indicate the beginning of a word. *Scriptio plena* in δὲ ὀχλ[όης]ν *P. Berol.* I. 17, *elisa* in γέλωϲ δ’ ἄν (line 13) and καὶ ἀφ’ οὗ (14) but unmarked in lines 13, 14, 20 and 32.6 The iota adscript is omitted in κομειτη l. 9, τω ωτω l. 10, τη ηλικια l. 17, and εθελη in l. 23.

We also find *vacat* (l. 12), and there is a possible case of haplography [ἐβού[λετο τ ὸ]ν (ll. 29-30)] and writing *supra lineam*, such as the ν in κρατῶν (l. 11).

The following letters or groups of letters have been deleted or corrected in the papyrus: και after ἰςαν (l.2); three letters have been deleted before αιωϲει (l. 14); ω before α in γεννωμενωα (l. 16); αιτις before μενειν (l. 19); των (l. 23); χαι before ουϲ (l. 23); διοργυγουατων after κακεινη (l. 33) and τονερωτα before μήπω (l. 34).

The scribe confuses the vowels, using ει instead of ι - ἐπακολουθοῦϲει (l. 8); Ἀφρο[δ]εῖτηϲ (perhaps, l. 9); κομειτη (l. 9); αιωϲει (l. 14); απειθανο[ν] (l. 20); κεινημα (l. 28); οιδεμειαι (l. 34) and ἣμε[ίϲ]ν instead of ἡμε[ίϲ]ν (l. 37). The opposite appears as well: περινοϲτιν instead of περινοϲτεῖν (l. 21) and παδιαϲ instead of παδιαϲεας (l. 37). The scribe also uses αι instead of ε: νέοϲ instead of ναιο ς (l. 9). We also find the opposite: ε instead of αι in l. 17 (προβενει instead of προβα ⟨ί⟩νει). Furthermore, there is a possible εα instead of α in l. 23 (εαν instead of ἀν). Finally the scribe uses ω instead of ο: ὡμολογῆϲαι instead of ὁμολογῆϲαι in l. 33-34.

---

3 There is a line with 15 letters because of a *vacat* at the beginning.
4 Cf. López Martínez - Ruiz-Montero 2013 (n. 1).
5 Cavallo 1996.
6 In the first column of this papyrus, we have the following: ει δ’ ἐπηλ[θεσ] -line 5-, and ἀλλ’ ἐμ -line 19-. In *P.Oxy.* 435: δ’ εὑθο[μιας] -lines 3-4-, and δ’ εἰναι -line 7-.
7 In the first column the following two examples have been confirmed: ολειγωρια (l.6) and αὐτωνομεια (l.29).
There is also some confusion between the voiceless and voiced consonants -τ/δ-: κομειτη instead of κομιδη (l. 9), αρτην instead of ἄρδην (l. 29) and μητε instead of μηδὲ (l. 35) but δοξον instead of τόξον (l. 10).

In another example of a consonant mistake, the scribe uses παρηρκτη-μένον instead of παρηρτημένον in l. 10.

The papyrus we studied in Berlin’s Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung was so badly damaged that the assistance offered by Dr. Fabian Reiter, to whom we want to again express our warmest gratitude, was essential.

Metiochus and Parthenope are mentioned by Herodotus, the former as the son of Miltiades of Thracian Chersonese, and Parthenope as the daughter of Polycrates of Samos. This means that this is a historical novel similar to that of Ninus and also that it belongs to the earliest stage of the Greek love novels.

P. Berol. 7927 + 9588 + 21179 belong to the beginning of the plot, as it is evident if we compare our text with the Persian version. The beginning of the verbal form προτι- is continued in the second column, where the philosopher Anaximenes offers an inquiry about love. A rhetorical controversy about love follows. In almost 30 lines Metiochus explains his critical view of the traditional image assigned to Eros as a child with a bow and arrows. When Parthenope is encouraged to join the discussion and begins to give her own opinion, the papyrus is interrupted shortly thereafter.

Text and apparatus

\[ \text{προτι-} \]

Col. II

[θεὶϲ τ]ὴν ϕ[ιλ]οϲόφου ζήτηϲιν κατὰ τύχην τ[ι[c. 4].»
[καὶ c. 7]ηϲαν οἱ δύο τὰϲ ψυχὰϲ λαβ[όντεϲ]
[ c. 10]ου πάθουϲ ανάμμηϲιν ἑφο[c. 4]
[ c. 10]Μητίοϲχοϲ υποτιμηϲάμενοϲ c. 2]
[ c. 8 εἰκότα η mktimeϲις πρε僭ουϲ[αν c. 2] 5
[c. 3] [c. 3] ἕει. «βωμολόχοι μέν,» ἐπεν, «α[ c. 4]
[c. 3] ὁι τῇϲ ἄλ]ηθοϲ παιδείαϲ ἀμύητοϲ αρχ[λαι-]

μυθολογίαις ἐπακολουθοῦσι* ὡς ἔστιν c. 2

ὁ Ἔρως Ἀφροδίτης* υἱὸς κομιδῆς* νέος* ἔχων c. 3

τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γεννώμενα* [ c. 7]

τοῖς ἐρώμενοι* τόξον καὶ τῆι χείρι κρατῶν λαμπάδα τῶν τε τῶν ὡμῶν vacat τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν νέων

τοῖς γέλωσ δ' ἂν εἶ ὡς τοιοῦτο πρῶτον μὲν c. 2

ἐντεκὼθὲν αἰῶν* καὶ αφ' οὗ συνέκεκεν c. 2

εἰτα τὸ ἔρωταν ὑπάντών ψυχαῖς εἰληφότεραν πεῖραν. ἐγὼ δέ γ' οὔ πω, μηδὲ πειραθείην τὸ σύνολον. Ἐρως δ' ἔστιν κίνημα* διάνοιας υπὸ καλλος* γενομένας* μήπω οὐδεμίας* ἐραθῆναι, καὶ εὔξατο μηδὲ* μέλλειν· «δῆλον, ἔφη, κενὸ ὁ τοῦ ξένου λῆρος καὶ δοκεῖ μοι ὅτι ημιν* ἐπὶ παιδείας* ἐθορυβήθην εἰς εἰς ἑαυτάμου* καὶ χρόνου βρέφος* μὴ τελειωθῆναι, καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις τῆι αὐτῆς καθάπερ τοὺς πολλοὺς φύσεως κατακλεῖν τοὺς πολλοὺς.» ἄρδην ἐβουλετέρων περαίνειν καὶ ὁ Ἀναξιμένης διελέγετο πρὸ τῆν Παρθενόπην ἀντιλαβέσθαι τῆς ἦς ἐπὶ παιδείας καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ ζωγράφοι καὶ πλάστα τοῦτον καὶ...
Translation

“…proposing the philosopher’s inquiry by some chance”. [And] the two (got confused) in their souls, recalling their (novel) experience. Metiochus (flushed red)… professing (to not have a)… reasonable or proper knowledge (for such a discussion). “They are fools”, he said, “indeed, (all those) who, uninitiated in the true education, adhere to old tales that [Eros] is Aphrodite’s son and quite young, having [wings] and a bow hung on his back, and holding a torch [in his hand], and that with these weapons he (cruelly)… wounds the souls of the [young]. Such a thing would be ridiculous: firstly, that a baby generated in primeval times and […] ageing ever since he took form, should not reach maturity, [and] (that), [if those] born of men [ ] with time reach adulthood, the (child) who shared a (divine) nature, should (always) remain at the same (age for the future), like the (stunted…). It would also (be) completely incredible, [if] Eros is a [baby], that he should go around the [whole] world hitting with his arrow whomever he wishes of those that he encounters, and inflame them, [so that] in the souls of lovers a kind of holy breath arises, as in the inspired. [They] who have already experienced the passion know. As for me, I [have not] yet experienced, and may I never experience it at all! Eros [is rather] an agitation of the mind occasioned by beauty and increased with familiarity”. He would have liked to have rounded off his speech fully, when Anaximenes invited Parthenope to join [the] inquiry. And she, who was angry with Metiochus for not admitting that he had ever fallen in love with any woman, and he prayed that he never would, said:
“Evidently, our guest’s speech is idle nonsense, and I think... that we, at the door of education [....] poets and painters and [sculptors]... this...”.

**Commentary**

**Line 1: ζήτησων.**
In l. 1.34 the initial verbal form from line 33 (προτι-), can be understood as a participle, as described by Maehler and Hägg & Utas, which could be either the last sentence of this period, or the beginning of a new sentence. If this is the case, the present tense, followed by a particle such as δὲ, could also be possible. In any case, the meaning is clear: “I propose as a topic the philosopher’s inquiry by (some) chance”.

In this same sentence, the article τὴν seems to be a sound reading, which could refer to an investigation (ζήτησων) previously proposed by the philosopher Anaximenes, who is mentioned above (col. I 30) and seems to already be known by the audience. It is worth noting that in the Persian version the “sage” is introduced in v. 145 for the first time, which has no parallel in the Greek text. In the Persian version the characters who will take part in the symposium are introduced around vv. 140-142, but, since the manuscript is damaged at this point, nothing can be taken for granted. Moreover, the sage has realized the sights between the two protagonists and tries to discover Vamiq’s opinion on Love and its external shape. A similar scene could precede our text. Here, the sage Anaximenes has seemingly proposed an inquiry on love, a most suitable topic for the symposium, and he tries to help the lovers, as Calasiris did in Heliodorus’ Aethiopica 3.5.5; 10.4; and 17.2.

Hägg already observed that this zetesis constituted a rhetorical progymnasma of refutation and confirmation (H&U, 28, n. 14), which could be compared with texts such as Anon. Seguer. Rhetorica 46.1-4 Ἐστι δὲ ἡ διήγησις κατὰ Νεοκλέα ἡ δικανικὴ ἡ ἐκθεσις πραγμάτων εἰς τινά προκειμένην ζήτησιν ἀνηκόντων ἢ νὴ Δία περιστάσεως ἐκθεσις εἰς τινά ζήτησιν ἀνηκούσης. In this last example we find the passive form of the verb προτιθημα, which our papyrus seems to refer to. For the verb also see Gregorius Nyssenus, De opificio hominis 181.1-2 Ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν περὶ τούτων λόγος ἀφείσθω, πρὸς δὲ τὸ προκειμένου ἐπιστρεπτέων τὴν ζήτησιν Cf. also Cyrilus Commentarii in Joannem 1.444.31-2.
Line 1 κατὰ τύχην τινά.
The last word of this line could begin with a τ-, followed by four or five letters. The easiest reading would be κατὰ τύχην τινά, already proposed by ed. pr. and accepted by S-W and H&U. S-W translated the sentence as follows: “in proposing the philosopher’s inquiry as chance would have it.” This last sentence was understood by H&U (28, n. 15.) as “something like “(proceeding) by chance (round the table)”. Yet, we interpret it as “by some chance” only, whitout necessarily referring to the order at the table. The expression would constitute the end of the sentence and of the direct speech. Maehler linked it to next sentence, which seems less probable to us.

The following are other examples of this: Ar. Eccl. 157-61 καὶ πῶς γυναικῶν θηλύφρων ἔναντις / δημηγορήσει; {Πρ.} πολὺ μὲν ὧν ἄριστα του. / λέγουσι γὰρ τῶν νεανίσκων ὅσοι / πλείστα σποδοῦνται, δεινώτατον εἶναι λέγειν. / ἢμιν δ’ ὑπάρχει τούτο κατὰ τύχην τινά; Pl. Leg. 702.b.4-6 ἔγω τινα, ὦ ξένε, μοι δοκῶ κατανοεῖν. ἐοικεν κατὰ τύχην τινά ἢμιν τα τῶν λόγων τούτων πάντων ὅν διεξήλθομεν γεγονέναι: Dem. 48.24.1-3 καὶ κατὰ τύχην τινά καὶ δαίμονα ὑμεῖς ἐρωτεύουσα ὑπὸ τῶν ῥητόρων εἰς Ἀκαρνανίαν στρατιῶτας ἐκπέμπειν. Maehler’s suggestion. 9 κατὰ τύχην ταύτην, doesn’t appear in TLG (nor does κατὰ ταύτην τύχην).

Line 2: ἐταράχθησαν.
This verb was proposed by Maehler, and S-W added an initial καί. Both terms fit the context very well, and a compound form with συν-, δια-, etc. could even be suitable here. Here we will only quote Gorgias, Frag. 11.101 εἰ θεάσεται ἡ ὑψής, ἐταράχθη καὶ ἐτάραξε τὴν ψυχήν... and Char. 8.1.7 θεασάμενος... ἐταράχθη τὴν ψυχήν καὶ μετέωρος ἐγένετο. See Ach. Tat. 2.37.10; Longus 1.21.3, both from an erotic context as well.

Line 3: τοῦ καυνοῦ πάθους.
Both καυνοῦ and κουνοῦ are suitable readings in this context. The latter is well documented in Greek (cf. Galenus Definit. med. 19.391.16-392.2 λοιμός ἐστι καυνὸν πάθος πλείστων ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν καυρὸν κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἐθνή δεξίων κυνδύνων καὶ θανάτους ἐπιφέρον...; De anima libri mantissa 147.27-28; Basilius Homilia in illud: Ne dederis somnum oculis tuis 31.1500.23-25 Ἀρα τούτον ἀπαγορεύει τὸν ὑπνον, τὸ κουνὸν πάθος τῆς

9 Maehler 1976, 16 “die durch einen Zufall in ihrer Seele beunruhigt oder verwirrt werden”.
10 Maehler 1976, 9.
φύσεως, καὶ βούλεται ἡμᾶς ἀΰπνους εἶναι:. But we prefer the adjective [καιν]οῦ, which was already proposed by Maehler and followed by subsequent editors. It appears in strong rhetorical contexts, such as in Liban. Prog. 11.8.4 ὡ καινοῦ πάθους, ἐν ἀνδρῶσι τὰ τῶν πολέμου, ἐν παρθενῶσι τὰ τῶν παρατάξεων. ἀφελκέτω τις τὰ βέλη, καλυπτέτω τοὺς νεκρούς. ἀπείρηκα βλέπουσα τὰ τραύματα.

**Line 3: πάθους ἀνάμμηνιν.**
This is a frequent expression, including in medical contexts, such as: Galen, Pro puerō epileptico consilium, vol. 11, p. 360 Kühn: κεφάλαιον ἐστι σφόδρως κινῆσαι καὶ ταράξαι τὸ σῶμα καὶ τοῦ πάθους ἀναμνῆσαι καὶ πα- ροξυσμὸν γεννῆσαι, and De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus libri xi, vol. 11, p. 639 Kühn: καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸ τῆς αἰσθή- σεως ἵδιον ἐκατέρου πάθους ἀναμμησθέντι σοι τοῖς αὐτοῖς μαρτυρήσει. Hld. 4.4.25-27 echoes these ideas, as Maehler observed (p. 16, n. 34).

**Line 3: ἐφο[ινίθη δὲ].**
H&U (28, n.17) observe that “blushes indicating emotional turmoil” are common in the novels, and quote Ach. Tat. 2.6.1; Hld. 1.21.3; 10. 24. 2 with the same verb. Galen uses the verb many times, but we consider especially telling the following text, from Ninus’ novel, where the verb is linked to the κόρη, probably Semiramis: καὶ ἤρυθαίνοτο μὲν αἱ παρεἰαὶ πρὸ τὴν αἰδῶ τῶν λόγων (P.Berol. 6926 Α IV.35-36).

**L. 4: ὑποτιμησάμεν[οι].**
The meaning of the verb could be “by pleading”, like in Ps. Apollod. 2.5.3 ὁ δὲ ὑποτιμησάμενος τὴν ἀνάγκην, καὶ τῶν αἰτίων εἰπὼν Εὐρυσθέα γεγονέα, πραύνας τὴν ὄργην τῆς θεοῦ τὸ θηρίον ἐκόμισεν ἐμπνεύσει μὲν αἱ παρειαὶ πρὸ τὴν αἰδῶ τῶν λόγων (P. Berol. 6926 Α IV.35-36).

**Line 5: [τὸ μὴ ἔχειν λόγον εἰκότα.**
Maehler’s proposal seems to be sound and fits very well here. For comparanda, see Paus. 10.38.4-7 καὶ δῆ καὶ ἔχει λόγον εἰκότα, ὅτε βασιλεὺς ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἀναστάτους ἐς τὸν Νικοπόλεως συνοικισμόν ἐποίησεν Αἰτω- λοὺς... (cf. 3.14.6-7.8 as well).
Line 7: οἱ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παιδείας ἀμύητοι.
The adjective ἀμύητοι recalls Platonic models (see LSJ s.v.). For this type of παιδεία see D.Chr. 30. 25.2 καὶ πολλὰ λελυπημένος κατὰ τοὺς βίους, ὡς παιδείας ἀληθοῦς ἡσθημένος, οὐ μὴν ἀληθή γε οὐδέ πρέπουσι θεοῖς. Proclus In Platonis rem publicam commentarii 1, p. 200 Kroll: τίνας ἐπαίδευσεν Ὁμήρος, εἴπερ μὴ μιμητὴς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δημιουργὸς παιδείας ἀληθοῦς, τις τῶν πόλεων ἐθέτο νόμους, τίς πόλεος δὲ ἐκεῖνον ἐπράχθη καλὼς.

Texts where the same full expression appears are especially interesting, such as Athen.13.588a7 καὶ πρῶτον μὲν μνησθήσομαι τοῦ φιλαληθεστάτου Ἐπικούρου· ὃστις ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ἀμύητος ὢν ἐμακάριζε καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν παρερχομένους. Aesopica, Fab. (dodecasylabì) 69: Ὁ μῦθος δηλοῖ ὅτι ὁ παιδείας ἀμύητος ὑπάρχων πῶς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους παιδεύσει. Cf. Philo, Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat 77.l.5; Theodoretus, Graecarum affectionum curatio 1.53.3.

Lines 7-8: ἀρχαίας μυθολογίαις ἐπακολουθοῦσι.
Diodorus of Sicily frequently mentions ἀρχαίας μυθολογίας to refer to historiographical writers such as Ephorus, Callisthenes and Theopompus, who distanced themselves from ancient mythology: D.S.4.1.2-3 διόπερ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων ἱστοριογράφων οἱ προτεύοντες τῇ δόξῃ τῆς μὲν ἀρχαίας μυθολογίας ἀπέστησαν διὰ τὴν δυσχέρειαν, τὰς δὲ νεωτέρας πράξεις ἀναγράφειν ἐπεχείρησαν. Ἐφορος ... ὀμοίως δὲ τούτωι Ἀρχαίωι καὶ Θεόπομπος ... κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ήλικίαν γεγονότες, ἀπέστησαν τῶν παλαιῶν μῦθων. He refers to proper ancients myths, such as Heralcs’ labors, in 4.8.1.1-6 (τὰς παλαιὰς μυθολογίας); cf. 4.8.3.1-4, where ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαίαις μυθολογίαις is opposed to τοῖς πραττομέοις ἐν τοῖς καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνοις...

This portrait of the young and beautiful Eros echoes well-known classical models. Quoting Hesiod and Parmenides, Phaedrus, in Platos’ Symp 178c, asserts that Eros is the πρεσβύτατος of the gods. Yet Agathon’s speech expresses his criticisms in the sense that Eros is the youngest of the gods and always remains young: ἐγὼ δὲ Φαιδρῳ πολλὰ ἄλλα ὀμολογῶν τούτῳ ὑμολογῶ, ὃς Ἐρως Κρόνου καὶ Ἰαπετοῦ ἀρχαιότερός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ φημὶ νεώτατον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεῶν καὶ ἀεὶ νέον (Symp.195b6-c1).

11 Cf. Hes. Th. 120-122.
The portrait of Eros is usually completed by wings, a bow, and torch, which are Eros’ arms, as we see both in iconographical sources and in literary texts such as Asclep. Epigr. 12.75.2 Εἰ πτερά σοι προσέκειτο καὶ ἐν χερὶ τόξα καὶ ίοί, / οὖν ἂν Ἔρως ἐγράφη Κύπριδος, ἀλλὰ σὺ, παῖς. idem (p1) Εἰ καθύπερθε λάβοις χρύσεα πτερά καὶ σευ ἂν ὤμων/ (1) τείνουτ’ ἀργυρέων ιοδόκος φαρέτρη. This portrait was still alive in much later times: Cf. Steph. Scholia in Hippocratis prognosticon 1.4 καὶ γὰρ θεῖόν τι χρῆμα ἂστιν ὁ Ἔρως, ὡς δηλοῦσι τὰ σύμβολα ὅ ὁ γραφεῖς γράφουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφοντο ἔρως ἔχοντα καὶ λαμπάδα κατέχουτα. καὶ παιδίον μὲν ὡς νέον καὶ ἀγήρατον καὶ ὡς ἀφθαρτον αὐτὸν ὄντα, πτερώτον.

The Platonic tradition is also echoed in Longus’ novel, where Eros introduces himself by saying that he is older than Cronos and Time (Οὔ τοι παῖς ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ δοκῶ παῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου πρεσβύτερος καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ παντὸς χρόνου, 2.5.2). Yet later we heard old Philetas informing the heroes about Eros as a child with wings and a bow (Εἶδον αὐτοῦ καὶ πτέρυγας ἐκ τῶν ὦμων καὶ τοξάρια μεταξὺ τῶν πτερύγων, 2.6.1).

A similar portrait of Eros can be found in Moschus, Eros fugitivus 21, including the verb τιτρώκει (cf. Asclep. Epigram. 5.189.3), which is well-known in battle descriptions. Charito (1.1.7; 6.3.2) and Achilles Tatius (1.4.4; 2.7.6; 13.1) also use the verb in a metaphorical, erotic context.

Line 13: γέλως δ’ ἂν εἶ ὁ τοιοῦτο. This expression can be found from Dem. 22.28 onwards.

Lines 13-14: πρῶτον μὲν c.2 ἐντεκαὶωθέν αἰώνι* καί. The participle ἐντεκαὶωθέν, proposed by Bowie and accepted by S-W, seems to be a sound reading, if we compare it with Plut. CatMi. 25.4.3-5.1 ἐπεχείρησε συμπείθειν, ὡς τὴν θυγατέρα Πορκίαν, Βύβλῳ συνοικοῦσαν καὶ πεποιημένην ἐκείνην ὡς παίδας, αὐτῷ πάλιν ἔσπερ εὐγενὴς ἣραν ἐντεκαὶωθέσθαι, παράσχῃ. As for the dative αἰῶϲι, the noun is well-known to mean “long space of time”, either in the past or in the future (see LSJ, II). The meaning of

“eternity” is already apparent in Pl. *Tim.* 37c6-38a, where αἰῶν and χρόνος have a similar meaning. Our text seems to echo ideas comparable to those we read in *Timeus* on the nature of the world, which is one and etern, and whose reflections are alive in later authors such as Hippol. *Eccles.* Contra Eunomium 1.1.371.7 οὔτε αἰῶνι ρυθμούμενη οὔτε χρόνως συμπαρατρέχουσα, ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ έαυτής ἐστώσα καὶ ἐν ἕαυτή καθιδρυμένη, οὔτε τῷ παρωχηκτί οὔτε τῷ μέλλοντι συνδιαιρομένῃ. In this item an opposition between the passing of time and things that remain unaltered is noticeable as well, in a way comparable with our text.

**Line 15:** [ c. 3] οὐ χρονοθύν βρέφος.
Before the participle χρονοθύν, an adjective or another participle could be read under οὖν. An adjective like θεῖον could fit the context: see Athanas. *Homilia in occursum domini* 28.988 τὸ θεῖον βρέφος (cf. also 989).

Βρέφος is originally a poetic word and is very frequent in later *koine*. The following quotation about Empedocles could provide a useful example: fr.153a.1-2 Theo Smyr. 104. 1 Η τὸ γον βρέφος δοκεί τελειώσθαι <ἐν ἐπτὰ ἐβδομάσιν>, ὡς Ἶ. αἰνίτεται <ἐν τοῖς Καθαρμοί>. On the meaning of the word, we can mention a telling passage in which βρέφος is described as τὸ γεννηθὲν ἅρτιως and opposed to other human ages: Herenn. Philo, *De diversis verborum significationibus* gamma 42.

**Line 16:** [εἰ τὰ] πό τῶν ἀνθρώπων γεννώμενα [ ].
Most likely ἀπὸ must be read before the genitive. As for the last lacuna, Merkelbach’s proposal, τέκνα, fits the context very well. Both γεννώμενα and τέκνα are connected in Arist. *EE*1241b.4.

**Line 17:**
On τοῖϲ χρόνοιϲ, see above, 1.14.
At the end of the line the expression [δὲ θείαις], proposed by Krebs, makes sense here.

**Line 18:** [μεμοιραμένων,]
The reading is supported by examples from Philo, who especially likes this participle and exhibits ten matches of it, according to the *TLG* data. It also appears in connection with φύσεως in *Sобр.* 53 τίνος οὖν τῷ τῆς φύσεως τάγαθον μεμοιραμένοι έιχής άξιοί; *Det.* 138 τούτ’ ἐστίν, ἐι δεὶ τάληθες εἰπεῖν, ἡ μόνη κυρίως γένεσις ἄνθρωπων, ὡς τῶν μη ἐλπιζόντων ἐπὶ θεοῦ λογικῆς φύσεως οὐ μεμοιραμένων.
At the end of the line καθάπερ τοὺς ἀναπήρους c.7], as proposed by Merkelbach, seems to be right since the term is very frequent in classical comedy and oratory, according the TLG data. See, for example, Arist. IA 714b.8-11 Περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀστρακοδέρμων ἀπορήσειν ἂν τις τίς ἡ κίνησις, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔχουσι δεξίῳ καὶ ἀριστερόν, πόθεν κυνοῦνται· φαίνεται δὲ κινούμενα. Ἡ ὀσπερ πανάπηρον δεῖ τιθέναι πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον γένος...

The word continued to be used during the Empire. Pollux in his Onomasticon 2.60.8-61.2 provides an explanation of the word ἀνάπηρος, quoting classical sources as well: ἐστὶν ὁ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα πεπηρωμένος, ὡς Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἀρεσάκχου "κατέλιπεν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ γέροντας καὶ ἀνα-πήρους...."

**Line 20: παντελῶς ἀπίθανον[ν].**
The adverb παντελῶς, evident from Aeschylus onwards, is frequent in Plato (43 items) and Aristotle (106 times) and reached its peak with Diodorus (209). Here we are only quoting three classical items:

Gorgias, fr. 3.14-15 παντελῶς δὲ ἀτόπον τὸ εἶναι τι ἁμα καὶ μὴ εἶναι.
Arist. Cael. 269b.7 ἡμιμετατοῦ καὶ παντελῶς ἀλογοῦ; cf. Top. 150a.7-11 παντελῶς ἀτοπον ἄν δοξειεν εἶναι.

In the Roman Empire, Plutarch offers 76 items with this adverb, including παντελῶς ἀπιθάνον in Sol. 24.2.-6. The adverb appears in Calligone (PSI 8.981) with the same word order: παντελῶς τὴν γνώμην διασεσεισμένη. This order is changed below, l. 27.

**Line 21: περινοστεῖν.**
This is another term used by comic authors since Aristophanes (Pax 762-3 Καὶ γὰρ πρότερον πράξας κατὰ νοῦν οὐχὶ παλαιοστρας περινοστίων/ παῖδας ἐπεῖρον, .... The word is frequent in prose writers belonging to both the classical and imperial ages. In this later period, Lucian exhibits the highest range of items.

**Line 22: τοξεύειν.**
This word has poetic origins as well, according to the TLG data. It is linked to Eros in Eur. Tro. 25 ἔρως ἠτόξευσ' αὐτόν ἐνθέου κόρης, whose echoes reach Ach Tat. 5.26.3. Yet the word is very frequent among Imperial prose writers.13

13 For the topos Eros as a child with these attributes see Maehler 1976, 16, n.35.
This verb appears already in Homer Od.10.30, and, like τοξεύειν, becomes a typical verb for sieges, here in a metaphorical sense. Achilles Tatius uses the term in an erotic context as well: 1.11.3 "Ἐρως ἀνταγωνίζεται καὶ πατήρ. ὁ μὲν ἐστηκεν αἰδοὶ κρατῶν, ὁ δὲ κάθηται πυρτολῶν. See also 4.15.1.

We read the nominative here, not the dative θ[ε]οφορήτοι proposed by Maehler, whose proposal was, however, the best. The word is evident from Aeschylus (Ag. 1140-2 φρενομανής τις εἰ θεοφόρητος...) onwards, and it usually appears in a prophetic or extatic context. Interesting comparanda in the Imperial age include Plut. Them. 26.2 ἔκφρων γενόμενος καὶ θεοφόρητος ἀνεφώνησεν ἐν μέτρῳ ταυτί, and Ps. Luc. Asin.37 ἐπὰν δ’ εἰς κώμην τινὰ εἰσέλθοιμεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ θεοφόρητος ἱστάμην, ὁ δὲ αὐλητὴς ἐφύσα ὅμιλος ἐνθεόν... (cf. also 38.29), a quotation that belongs to the episode of the priests of the Syrian goddess. We know that θεοφόρητοι was the title of a comedy by Alexis as well.14

In the same line, the expression ἰερὸν πνεῦμα, as Hägg already observed referred to the pneuma of Love, is a topic from Plato Symp. 179b; Phaidr. 255c onwards.15

“(They) know (who) have already experienced the boys’ passion”. We have similar periphrasis with πεῖραν from the 5th century B.C. onwards. Interesting items include Her. Pont. Fr. 55, according to Athen. 12.512a Ἡρακλείδης δ’ ὁ Ποντικός ἐν τῷ πείρη ἧδουν τάδε λέγει οἱ τύραννοι καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς πάντων ἀγαθῶν ὤντες κύριοι καὶ πάντων εἰληφότες πεῖραν τὴν ἡδονὴν προκρίνουσιν; and Nicol. Fr. 12 εἰ δὲ ἄδικως, σὺ τε τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάθους ἐμοὶ πεῖραν λάβοις (cf. Joh. Chrys. In Genesim 54.416).

Line 27: [δὲ γ’ οὐ]πῶ, μηδὲ πειραθεῖν τὸ εὐνολον.
“As for me, I (have not) yet experience -and may I never experience it- at all!” The adverbal construction τὸ εὐνολον is well documented in Greek (24 items in Aristotle, 55 in Diodorus Siculus, according to TLG). We offer two

15 See H&U 2003, 29, n. 20. They refer to S-W 1995, 72 ss, who interpret it as “an oblique reference” to Anaximenes’ doctrine of “air” as first principle.
examples in which the expression appears in a negative phrase, like in our fragment:

Timaeus Fr. 3b, 566. F. 28a*-4-6 τοῦτον δὲ τὸν ταῦρον ὁ Τίμαιος ἐν ταῖς Ἰστορίαις διαβεβαιωσάμενος μὴ γεγόνειν τὸ σύνολον, ὅτι αὐτὴς τῆς τύχης ἠλέγχθη. Ps. Clement. 165.9-6 ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ σύνολον ἀκούειν δύναμαι. Here the word order is different from that which we saw in l.20.


The expression κίνημα διανοίας echoes passages such as Arist. LI 968a 26 ταχίστη δ’ ἡ τῆς διανοίας κίνησις and Rh. 1369b. 33-34 ὑποκείσθω δὴ ἡμῖν εἶναι τὴν ἡδονῆς κίνησιν τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς. κίνημα does not appear in Plato, but both κίνησις (35 items) and διανοία (167 ones) are frequent in his works. See especially Leg. 966ε1; Epin. 988ε2. We have read διάνοια in an erotic context in Phaedr. 234.β7-c as well.16

The combination of love and familiarity becomes traditional: see Xen. Ephes. 1. 14. 7 ἐρὰ ὁ Κόρυμβος τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου καὶ σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα, καὶ αὐτὸν ἡ πρὸς τὸ μειράκιον συνήθεια ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξέκαιε. Add Char. 5. 9. 8; Plut. Pol. 19. 1. 5; Sull. 2. 4. 3, etc.

Line 29: ἀρδην ἐβου[λετ]’ ἂν λόγον περαίνειν.

We read ἀρτην, that is, ἀρδην, “utterly, wholly” (LSJ II, sv). The scribe wrote ἀρτην because of the confusion of the voiceless and voiced consonants -τ/-δ-, examples of which can be read in col. II.9; II. 10 and II. 35. In fact, Maehler read ρωτην or ρυτην, and consequently proposed ρῦδην, a reading that was defended by Stramaglia and H&U,17 but can not be supported by the papyrus, because traces of a previous αλφα before ρ could be read. A phrase with τρόπον, as suggested by S-W (p. 72f.), “most likely a haplography of some sort” is not necessary. According to the TLG data, the adverb ἀρδην is already evident in Archilochus fragments, and it continued to be used by poets in the classical age. Yet it is very frequent in prose writers as well, usually in military contexts to mean “to destroy wholly”, like in Isocr. Plat. 19 ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν τὰ τείχη κατασκάπτοντες, τῶν δ’ ἀρδην ἀπολλύοντες.18 Nevertheless, the adverb can also refer to other, non-military verbs,

16 For other parallels in Plutarch (see below, l. 38) and Chariton we refer to Maehler 1976, 1, n. 37.
17 Maehler 1976. 10. For a full discussion about this term see H&U 2003, 29, n.23.
18 In military contexts a topos is created with this adverb which survived in later times, in such a way that we still read it in Hlst. 1. 1. 3 μεστὰ πάντα σωμάτων νεοσφαγῶν, τῶν μὲν ἀρδην ἀπολωλότων, τῶν δὲ ἡμιθνήτων καὶ μέρει τῶν σωμάτων ἔτι σπαιρόντων...
such as in Aeschin. Ctes. 143 ... τήν (ηγεμονίαν) δὲ κατὰ γῆν, εἰ μὴ δεῖ ληφεῖν, ἄρδην φέρων ἀνέθηκε Θηβαίοις. Indeed Galenus used it in a metaphorical way in Adversus eos qui de typis scripsersunt vel de circuitibus 7. 501 ἐὰν δὲ υστερίζῃ, ἐννενηκοστοογδαῖο πάλιν κδ, εἰ δ᾽ αὐτὰ δὴ υποτίθενται τώρα ἢ ἡ προλαμβάνοντας καὶ υστερίζοντας, ἀναιροῦσιν ἄρδην ἐαν-τῶν τῆν ὑπόθεσιν.

The reading ἐβουλεύετ’ ἀν by S-W is more suitable than Maehler’s supplement ἐβουλεύετο τὸν because of the space in the papyrus.

According to LSI, the meaning of περαίνειν could be either “to proceed with”, -in this case referring to Metiochus’ speech-, or “to finish”. Taking into account the meaning of the adverb ἄρδην, we think that the second translation is the best here. Consequently, we think that both S-W and H&U are right: “He wanted to finish his remarks...” / “He would have liked to round off his speech...”. Yet we have added “fully”.

A certain echo sound between λόγον περαίνειν and the previous πειραθείην τὸ εὐπολοῦ (l. 27) can be observed here.

**Lines 30-31: καὶ ὁ Ἀναξιμένης διελέγετο πρὸς τὴν Παρθενόπην.**

The καὶ (l.30) that begins the next sentence can have an adversativum value, as we read in Hägg’s translation, but it is also possible to interpret it as an example of “καὶ style”. We recall that this type of style is typical for Xenophon of Ephesus. Therefore, the translation would be: “he would have liked to have rounded off his speech fully, when Anaximenes...”.

The construction of the verb διελέγετο with an accusative preposition is highly frequent: see D.S.13.41.5.1-4 διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτῶν περὶ τῆς καθοδοὺ, πολλὰ κατεπαγγελλόμενοσ χρήσιμοσ ἐσεθαι τῇ πατρίδι, ὦμοίωσ; D.Hal. Antiq Rom 4.70.2.5-3.1 καὶ περιλαβὼν τὴν νεκρὰν κατεκλεῖ καὶ ἀνεκάλετο καὶ διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτὴν ὡσπερ ζῶσαν ἔξω τοῦ φρονεῖν γεγονός υπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ (cf. Ἐπικτ. Dissertat.4.1.116.4-117.1 as well). Yet, the construction with both the preposition and an infinitive does not occur in *TLG*. Nevertheless, Maehler quoted two examples of this verb with a dative and an infinitive in Thuc. 5.59. Θράσυλός... καὶ Ἀλκίφρων..., ἣδη τῶν στρατοπέδων ὃσον οὐ ἐξινότως προσελθόντε Ἁγίδι διελεγέσθην μὴ ποιεῖν máχην, and in D. Sic. 18.51. The construction seems to be a typical one for koiné.

---

Lines 33-4: διά τὸ μὴ ὀμολογήσαι* μὴπω σφεδμίας* ἐρασθηναι (καὶ εὑξατο μυθὰ* μέλλειν.

The meaning of the text must be that Parthenope is angry because Metiochus did not admit that he was in love with her, and, moreover, “he prayed that he would not either.” S-W’s translation in the sense that she got angry at Metiochus “for not admitting that he had not yet loved a woman” (S-W, p. 87) does not take into account that here the two negative adverbs are equivalent to an affirmation and, consequently, a translation in this affirmative sense is preferable. For a parallel construction see Pl. Gorg. 461b4-6 ἃ οἴει—ὁτι Γοργίας ᾐσχύνθη σοι μὴ προσομολογῆσαι τὸν ῥητορικὸν ἄνδρα μὴ σφέχι καὶ τὰ δίκαια εἰδέναι καὶ τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά... 

Line 35:
The exclamation “Μὰ τὸν” proposed by M. Maehler and accepted by H&U is difficult to maintain. In the papyrus we read ἐνι..ν. Although the locus is desperatus, we dare to propose the form δῆλον, based on texts such as Eur. Phoen. 962 τί δ᾽ ἀν τις εἴποι; δῆλον οὐ γ᾽ ἐμοὶ λόγοι. The translation would thus be, “evidently, our guest’s speech is idle nonsense...” Democritus, Testim. 1.38 offers a good testimony in δῆλον δὲ κάκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων οἰος ἄν. δοκεῖ δὲ, φησίν ὁ Θρασύλος, ζηλωτὴ γεγονέναι τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν. Here δῆλον appears next to δοκεῖ just like the seemingly possible δοκεῖ μιοί in the papyrus. Preceding this expression Maehler suggested including καθὼς or καὶ οὐ δοκεῖ μιοί), and we think both of them could be right, yet other possibilities such as καὶ ὅπερ, etc. must be mentioned as well.

Lines 70-71: ἐπὶ παίδ<ε>ίας θύραν .......... καὶ ποιητὰ καὶ ζωγράφου καὶ πλάστακ τοῦτον.

After θύραν, a participle like ἀφιγμένοις, or another one with a similar meaning, could fit the context very well, just like Pl. Phaedr. 245a: ὃς δ᾽ ἀν ἄνευ μανίας Μούσών ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται, πεισθεὶς ὡς ἄρα ἐκ τέχνης ἱκανὸς ποιητὴς ἐσόμενος.

Maehler proposed [συγγραφεῖς] καὶ ποιηταὶ. Alternatively, a comparative expression of the type ὡς καὶ before ποιηταὶ is also possible.

20 See E. Crespo, L. Conti, y H. Maquieira, Sintaxis del griego clásico. Madrid 2003, 224-5. We are grateful to Elena Redondo for this reference.
21 See the data in H&U 2003, 30, n. 25.
The union of ζωγράφοι και πιλάστας constitutes a literary topic.\(^{22}\) and, in this way, we read in Xen., *Symp.* 4.21. 5 οὕτω γὰρ καὶ σαφὲς ἐστι ζωγράφοι ἃν τῇ ψυχῇ ὡς καὶ πλάσταις ἃν ζωγραφικὸς ἢ... We could also mention other later examples, such as DH Dem. 50.24 δὲ ἔτσι γὰρ καὶ πλάσταις καὶ κατηχήσεως χρόνιοι· οὐ γὰρ δὲ πλάσταις καὶ ζωγράφοις παῖδες, εἰ μὴ πολλῆς ἐμπειρίας ἢ μίας τριπτείς πολλῆς καὶ κατηχήσεως χρονίων, ἐφεξήγησεν τὸ τὸν ὑπότοναν τριπτέον τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔρωταν ἡμῖν ὡς εἰς ἡμᾶς... We could also mention other later examples, such as *De Judentum* 2.252 καὶ ζωγράφοι και πλάσται; Plut. *Aemil.* 6. 9.2 οὐ γάρ μόνον γραμματικοὶ καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ ρήτορες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλάσται καὶ ζωγράφοι (Cf. also *Sulla* 27.2).

Plut. *Fr.* 135*.3-10 is especially interesting for our fragment Οἱ γὰρ νόσουν τὸν ἔρωτα οἱ δὲ ἔπιθυμιάν ήταν ἀλλὰ ρήτορες καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ βουλευταὶ, εἰ μὴ πολλὰ ἐμπειρίας λάβοιεν, καὶ πλάσταις καὶ ζωγράφοις δημιουργοῦσιν. We read similar ideas in *Charit.* 1.1.3 οἷον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἰππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς <ἀπο>δεικνύουσι... And of special interest is ἔνεθυμεν ὅτι φιλόκαινός ἐστιν ὁ Ἐρως· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τόξα καὶ πῦρ ποιηταί τε καὶ πλάσται περιτεθείκασιν αὐτῷ... (4.7.6).

Because of these quotations, we consider it more plausible to read an enumeration with only three members here, such as ποιηταὶ καὶ ζωγράφοι και πιλάστας (l. 38). To suppose a verbal form in the previous line, as we mentioned above, thus seems a logical inference.

The final pronoun τοῦτον seems to refer to Eros, which would be the object of a verb like ἐποίουν or another verb with a similar meaning: cf. Paus. 9. 35. 6 οἷς τε πλάσται καὶ κατὰ ταύτα ἐποίουν οἱ ζωγράφοι.

Parthenope is probably emphasizing the traditional portrait of Eros presented by writers and artists.

\(^{22}\) See the precedents in Hdt.2.46 γράφουσι τε δὴ καὶ γλύφουσι οἱ ζωγράφοι και οἱ ἀγαλματιστοί τοι διά τῆς γλυπτοῦσιν καὶ τοῦ τοιούτου; Arist. *Po.* 1460b-8 ἐπεὶ γάρ ἐστι μιμητής ὁ ποιητής ὡσπεραινεί ζωγράφος καὶ τὸν θεάν εἰκονοποιεῖ.
Conclusions

As we established in our previous study of the first column, the banquets offered to Odysseus by the Phaecians at *Odysseia* 7-8, together with Plató’s *Symposium*, are the main hipotexts here. A blend of the topics and characters of these texts emerges from our second column. Both a traditional picture of Eros and a typical subject for school exercises are presented here. We have provided contemporary texts on the same topics, which usually have old roots. The language and style of the fragment is highly elaborated, as is evident in our commentary. Moreover, the subtleties of its arguments recall classical models, and certain linguistic and stylistic devices must be highlighted: poetisms such as περινοστέω (l.54), τοξεύω (l.55), πυρπολέω (l.56); gorgianic repetitions (l.26-7 and 28-9); and the use of the optative mood, expressing a wish in l.27, and used inside a formula in l. 13 and 20, where the same expresion [εἴη δὲ] ἄν appears, yet with a different word order. These features give the text an intended patina of classicism.

In our previous paper on this fragment, we observed the high literary level of the fragment and its connections with the *Ninus* papyri both from a stylistic point of view and due to their “theatrical character” of both texts. With respect to the term “theatrical”, we want to highlight the fact that both novels were included in pantomime programs, so successful, according to Lucian, *De saltatione*.

---

23 See n. 1.

24 We could add the data from col. I: cf. López Martínez and Ruiz-Montero 2013, p.1, n.1.


Regarding the hiatus, the tendency in this novel is the same we see in other ancient novels: it is frequently found after καὶ (καὶ ὑπὸ -II.29-, καὶ ὁ - II.30- and καὶ εὔξατο -II.35-), after δέ (ἐμοι δέ ὁχλ -I.17) and after the definite article (ὁ Ἐρως -II.21-, ὁὶ ἤδη -II.26-, ὁ Ὄναξιμενης - II.30-; τῆι ἡλικίαι -II.17-). It is also quite common before ἡ (εἰκότα ἡ μάθησιν -II.5-), before or after an adverbial clause or noun clause (ἰνα καὶ μᾶλλον γένηται τῆι Παρθενόπη». «Ὁ μὲν πατήρ» -I.10-; ἐπακολουθοῦσι ὡς εἰς[ν ὁ Ἐρως Ἄφρος[δ]ίτης νίος -II.8-9; τι ὀδον θε[ο]φορήτος -II.25-). In addition, it is possible to include positions in contact with ι because it could be pronounced as a semivowel (ἀμύητοι α[ρχαῖαις] –II.7-8; δοκεὶ μ[οι] ὅτι –II.36). The case of τα ἀπὸ Θρ[ακ]ης –I.14- could be explained if τα were an article. Regarding Διὰ τὸ μὴ ὀμολογήσαι -II.33-, it may be noted that Heliodorus, whose novel is the longest of all preserved, uses this position (after μη), as do Chariton, Achilles Tatius, Longus. On the contrary, μήπω συδεμίας –II.34- lies outside Reeve’s classification.

According to the Persian version, after the banquet the lovers meet at night, but the girl’s tutor makes Vamiq promise that he will respect the girl.

The last verses of the Persian version have been interpreted as the depiction of a battle in which both heroes would have a very important role. Accordingly, the scene could be the beginning of the war that leads to Fuluqrat’s death and the subsequent forced separation of the lovers. This interpretation is very plausible, yet, it could also recall the games Odysseus is invited to join in Odyssey 8. 133-233: since we can read that Parthenope was well trained in sports, could it be the case for this episode in our novel?

The Persian text ends here. Nevertheless, we know from other Persian sources that Metiochus married a Persian woman. Moreover, Luc., de salt. 54 says that Parthenope wandered as far as Persia, searching for her

---


28 H&U 2003, 143.

29 See H&U 2003, 85, vv. 31-32. We find in the same text (vv. 39-40) that she was well trained in war. A parallel portrait of Metiochus is plausible, but there is a lacuna in the Persian text.
husband, and a scholion on Dionysius Periegetas v. 358 adds that she preserved her virginity in spite of falling into the hands of many men.30

We have another text inspired by this novel, the Martyrdom of Saint Parthenope, in which the young and beautiful protagonist committed suicide to avoid a marriage and preserve her virginity. The Martyrdom survives in its entire form in Arabic only, and fragmentarily in Coptic, but it is likely that it was first composed in Greek, in the 4th century A.D.31

How was the end of the novel? Would the romantic expectations of a happy ending be fulfilled? Hägg and Utas admit this possibility, but they have also indicated three factors that could point towards a different conclusion to the story: 1-) the fact that the name "Parthenope" predicts permanent virginity; 2-) the fact that no Greek or Persian testimonia explicitly point to a happy ending; and 3-) the fact that Saint Parthenope commits suicide to preserve her chastity, and other late Persian testimonies refer to miraculous deaths of the heroine, or even the hero. For these reasons, these scholars conclude that “Parthenope may have found her death in a similar way”,32 although they admit that nothing about the end of this novel can be taken for granted.

The study by Hägg & Utas is brilliant, but an “unhappy end” seems quite improbable to us in a Greek love novel. The name of the female protagonist is not a proof of perpetual virginity. Moreover, all the Persian poems on this topic have an “unhappy ending” because of their characteristic religious ideology: the protagonists can never enjoy their love. Thirdly, the Martyrdom has its generic conventions, and, accordingly, the heroine must die, but this is not the case with the Greek sentimental novels.

Moreover, Metiochus’ marriage in Persia is not an obstacle for the final reunion with her beloved, because Callirhoe also marries another man in Charito 3. 2.16. Yet at the end of the plot, she meets her husband again, and both return to their country together. In Iamblichus’ Babylonica, the heroine Sinonis menaces her husband Rhodanes with a new marriage (Phot. 32)

30 See the texts in H&U 2003, 46-47.
32 H&U 2003, 249-50. They follow previous studies by Hägg on this novel. At the Historia Apollonii regis Tyri it is the hero who recovers the kingdom of his father.
Bibl. 94. 77b22-23; cf. 78a.4), but the lovers meet again at the end of the plot (78a39-40).

Parthenope seems to have been the model for a strong female character, comparable to that which we see in Calligone and in the Babylonica,\(^{33}\) and her influence could extend to the learned and brave Charikleia in Heliodorus. Indeed, Acethiopica’s heroine returns to her country with Theagenes, who marries her and shares her power as well. We think that Parthenope would have returned to Samos with Metiochus in the same way, and that she would have recovered her father’s throne with the help of her lover. They could marry either at the beginning of the plot, as occurs in earlier novels, or at the end, like in Heliodorus’ novel, following in this case a pattern already offered by the story of Jason and Medea in Apollonius’ Argonautica 4. 1128-1220.

The success of this novel was superior to that of other love novels and it achieved “multimedia” transmission, i.e., literary, theatrical, and iconographical. Other Persian texts seem to be inspired by Greek novels, so the research must be continued.