

Parthenope's novel:  
*P. Berol. 7927 + 9588 + 21179*, II column revisited

MARÍA PAZ LÓPEZ MARTÍNEZ  
University of Alicante

CONSUELO RUIZ-MONTERO  
University of Murcia

*Introduction*

Maehler noted in his excellent edition that *P. Berol. 9588* belonged to the same papyrus as *P. Berol. 7927* and *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.<sup>1</sup> Our purpose here is to present a new edition of the second column,

---

<sup>1</sup> The papyri of this novel are as follows:

- 1) *P. Berol. 9588 + P. Berol. 7927 + P. Berol. 21179*: TM63381, LDAB 4588, MP3 2622. Edition and commentary by: F. Krebs, "Metiochos und Parthenope", *Hermes* 30, 1895, 144–150 (P. 7927); F. Zimmermann, "Ein unveröffentlichtes Bruchstück des Metiochos-Parthenope-Romans, Pap. Berol. 9588", *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, 53–61 (P. 9588); H. Maehler, "Der Metiochos-Parthenope-Roman", *ZPE* 23, 1976, 1–20 (Maehler); S. A. Stephens–J. J. Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Princeton 1995, pp. 81–89 (S-W); M. P. López Martínez, *Fragmentos papiáceos de novela griega*, Universidad de Alicante, Alicante 1998, pp. 121–132 [microfiche edition: Alicante 1994] (López); M. P. López Martínez – C. Ruiz-Montero, "The Parthenope's Novel: P. Berol. 7927 + 9588 + 21179 Revisited", *Pap. Kongr. XXVII*, Warschau 2013, 235–250 –regarding Col. I- (LM-RM). The readings before Maehler (ed. pr., Zimmerman, etc.) are quoted in López. Photo (PBerol. 9588) available in: <http://ww2.smb.museum/berlpap/index.php/02329/>.
- 2) *P. Oxy. 435* (inv. number P. CtYBR 45): TM 63938, LDAB 5153, MP32623// TM 63938, LDAB 63938, MP 2623. Stephens-Winkler, pp. 97–99, López, pp. 133–134; R. Kussl, *Papyrusfragmente griechischer Romane*, Tübingen 1991, pp. 165–167

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 2<sup>nd</sup>. century A. D. to the 3<sup>rd</sup>. century A. D. Moreover, an *ostrakon* has survived from the 1<sup>st</sup>. century A. D.

Several references to the characters also remain in other literary and iconographic sources from the Empire, along with quotes in Persian narrations, such as the collection of narratives *Dārāb-nāmah*, and, especially, the epic poem *Vāmiq u Adhrā* by 'Unṣurī, 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 'Unṣurī. 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.<sup>2</sup>

---

(Kussl), and M. P. López Martínez - C. Ruiz-Montero, "Parthenope's Novel: P. Oxy. 435 Revisited", in: J. G. Montes Cala, R. J. Gallé Cejudo, M. Sánchez Ortiz de Landaluze, T. Silva Sánchez (eds.), *Fronteras entre el verso y la prosa en la literatura helenística y helenístico-romana*, Bari, Levante Ed. 2016, 479-489.

3) *PMich. Inv. 3402v*: TM 67622, LDAB 8891, MP 2622. 11. Edition by J. Alvares - T. Renner, "A new fragment of the Metiochos and Parthenope romance?", in: I. Andorlini et al. (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Firenze 23-29 agosto 1998)*, Vol. I, Florence 1998, pp. 35-40, plate I.

4) *OBodl. 2722*: TM 65585, LDAB 6836, MP3 2622. 1 (= Pack 2782). J.G. Tait - C. Préaux, *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, London 1955, vol. 2, number 2175, Stephens-Winkler, p. 94 and López, p. 135.

Other studies on this novel are the following: A. Dihle, "Zur Datierung des Metiochos-Romans", *WJA*, n. f. 4(1978)47-55; H. Harrauer - K. A. Worp, "Literarische Papyri aus Soknopaiu Nesos. Eine Übersicht", *Tyche* 8, 1993, 38; J. R. Morgan, "On the Fringes of the Canon: Work on the Fragments of Ancient Greek Fiction 1936-1994", *ANRWII* 34. 4, 1998, 3341-3347 and C. Vasallo, "Towards a Comprehensive Edition of the Evidence for Presocratic Philosophy in the Herculaneum Papyri", *Pap. Kongr. XXVII* (Warschau 2013), 336, Appendix. Photos and papyrological descriptions of these papyri available in G. Cavallo, 'Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere', in: O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia, *La Letteratura di Consumo nel Mondo Greco-Latino*, Cassino 1996.

<sup>2</sup> All the sources on this novel are available in T. Hägg & B. Utas, *The Virgin and Her Lover. Fragments of an Ancient Greek Novel and a Persian Epic Poem*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2003, pp. 21-22 who edit and translate all the texts (H&U). For more about this novel also see: D. Davis, *Panthea's Children: Hellenistic Novels and Medieval Persian Romances*, New York 2002; T. Hägg, *Parthenope*, Copenhagen 2004, and T. Hägg and B. Utas, 'Eros Goes East: Parthenope the Virgin Meets Vāmiq the Ardent Lover', in: I. Nilsson (ed.), *Plotting with Eros: Essays on the Poetics of Love and the Erotics of Reading*, Museum Tusulanum Press, Copenhagen 2009, pp. 153-186.

The first column has 33 preserved lines, whereas the second one has 38 between 30 and 42 letters.<sup>3</sup> The first column is the worst preserved; in our 2016 study we offered an edition, translation and commentary of it.<sup>4</sup>

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 2<sup>nd</sup> century A. D.,<sup>5</sup> 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 *υῖος* (l. 9) and on *ἵκα[αι]* (l. 25), here perhaps to indicate the beginning of a word. *Scriptio plena* in *δὲ ὀχλ[οπ]όησι* *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.<sup>6</sup> 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 [*ἔβου[λετο τὸ]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 *ἦσαν* (l. 2); three letters have been deleted before *αιωσει* (l. 14); *ω* before *α* in *γεννωμενωα* (l. 16); *αυτης* before *μενειν* (l. 19); *των* (l. 23); *χας* before *οὔς* (l. 23); *διοργησεχουσατον* after *κακεινη* (l. 33) and *τουερωτα* before *μήπω* (l. 34).

The scribe confuses the vowels, using *ει* instead of *ι* -*ἐπακολουθοῦσει* (l. 8); *Ἄφροδ[ι]εῖτης* (perhaps, l. 9); *κομειτη* (l. 9); *αιωσει* (l. 14); *απειθανο[ν]* (l. 20); *κεινημα* (l. 28); *οὔδεμειας* (l. 34) and *ἡμε[ί]ν* instead of *ἡμ[ί]ν* (l. 37).<sup>7</sup> The opposite appears as well: *περινοστιν* instead of *περινοστεῖν* (l. 21) and *παιδίας* instead of *παιδείας* (l. 37). The scribe also uses *αι* instead of *ε*: *νέος* instead of *ναιος* (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 *ἄν*). Finally the scribe uses *ω* instead of *ο*: *ὠμολογήσαι* instead of *ὀμολογήσαι* in l. 33-34.

<sup>3</sup> There is a line with 15 letters because of a *vacat* at the beginning.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. López Martínez - Ruiz-Montero 2013 (n. 1).

<sup>5</sup> Cavallo 1996.

<sup>6</sup> In the first column of this papyrus, we have the following: *εἰ δ' ἐπῆλ[θεσ]* -line 5-, and *ἀλλ' ἐμὲ* -line 19-. In *POxy.* 435: *δι' εὐθυ[μίας]* -lines 3-4-, and *δ' εἶναι* -line 7-.

<sup>7</sup> In the first column the following two examples have been confirmed: *ολειγωρια* (l. 6) and *αυτωνομεια* (l. 29).

There is also some confusion between the voiceless and voiced consonants -τ/δ-: κομειτη instead of κομιδήι (l. 9), αρτην instead of ἄρδην (l. 29) and μητε instead of μηδέ (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 Papyrus-sammlung* 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,<sup>8</sup> 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

προτι-

#### Col. II

[θεῖς τ]ῆν φ[ιλ]οσόφου ζήτησιν κατὰ τύχην τ[. c. 4].»

[καὶ c. 7]ησαν οἱ δύο τὰς ψυχὰς λαβ[όντες]

[ c. 10]ου πάθους ἀνάμνησιν ἔφο[ c. 4]

[ c. 10] Μητίοχος ὑποτιμηκάμεν[ος c. 2]

[ c. 8 εἰ]κότα ἢ μάθηςιν πρέπουσ[αν c. 2]

[c. 3] [c. 3] ξει. «βωμολόχοι μέν,» εἶπεν, «α[ c. 4]

[c. 3] οἱ τῆ[ c. ἀλ]ηθοῦς παιδείας ἀμύητοι ἀρχ[αί-]

5

<sup>8</sup> Hdt. 3.124 (Polycrates' daughter, here unnamed); 6.39-41. See the commentaries *ad locum* by W. W. How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, vol. I (I-IV), Oxford 1979 (1928) and D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus. Books I-IV*, edited by O. Murray and A. Moreno, Oxford 2007.

[αις] μυθ[ολο]γίαις ἐπακολουθοῦσι* ὡς ἔστ[ιν] c. 2]	
[ὁ Ἑρ]ῶς Ἀφρο[δί]της* υἱὸς κομιδῆ[ι]* νέος* ἔχω[ν] c. 3]	
[πτερ]ὰ καὶ τῶ[ι] [ν]ώτω[ι] παρηρητημένον* τόξον* καὶ τῆ[ι]	10
[χειρὶ] κρατῶν λαμπάδα τούτοις τε τοῖς ὄπλοις ὤ[μ]ως vacat τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν [νέων]	
[τιτρ]ώσκει· γέλωσ δ' ἂν εἴη τὸ τοιοῦτο· πρῶτον μ[έν] c. 2]	
[έντεκ]νωθέν αἰῶσι* καὶ ἀφ' οὗ συνέστηκε[ν] c. 2]	
[ c. 3] ον χρόνον βρέφος μὴ τελειώθῃναι, κ[αὶ] c. 2]	15
[εἰ τὰ ]πὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γεννώμενα* [ c. 7]	
[τοῖς] χρόνοις τῆ[ι] ἡλικία[ι] προβαίνει* του [ c. 7]	
[μμοι]ραμένον φύσεως καθάπερ τοὺς ἀναπ[ι] [ c. 7]	
[ c. 4] ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μένειν τὰ πο[ι] c. 7]	
[εἴη δ'] ἂν κάκεινο παντελῶς ἀπίθανο[ν]*, c. 3 εἰ]	20
[βρέφ]ος ἐστὶν ὁ Ἑρως, περινοστ(ε)ῖν* αὐτ[ὸ]ν ὄ[λ]η[ν] τῆ[ν]	
[οἰκου]μένην, τοξεύειν μὲν τῶν ὑπαν[τ]ῶν- των, οὐκ ἂν* αὐτὸς ἐθέλη[ι], καὶ πυρπ[ο]λεῖν	
[ῶστ' ἐ]ν μὲν ταῖς τῶν ἐρώντων ψυχαῖς ἐγγίγνε- [σθαι] ἱερὸν πνεῦμά τι οἶον θε[ο]φορήτοι· ἴσα-	25
[σι δ' οἶ] ἤδη τοῦ πάθους εἰληφότες πείραν. ἐγὼ [δέ γ' οὐ]πω, μηδὲ πειραθείην τὸ σύνολον. Ἑρως [δ' ἔστ]ιν κίνημα* διανοίας ὑπὸ κάλλους γινόμε-	
[νου] καὶ ὑπὸ συνθηείας ἀξόμενον. » ἄρδην ἐβου- [λετ' ἄ]ν λόγον περαίνειν καὶ ὁ [Ἀ]ν[α]ξίμένης δι-	30
[ελέγε]το πρὸς τὴν Παρθενόπην ἀντιλαβέσθαι [τῆς ζ]ητήσεως· κάκεινη δ[ι'] ὀργῆς ἔχουσα τὸν Μητίοχον δι[ὰ] τὸ μὴ ὁμο-	
λογῆσαι* μήπω οὐδεμίας* ἐρασ- θῆναι, καὶ εὗξατο μηδὲ* μέλλειν· «δῆλον, ἔφη,	35
κενδ[ο] ὁ τοῦ ξένου λῆρος κα ... δοκεῖ μοι] ὅτι ἡμ[ῶ]ν* ἐπὶ παιδ<ε>ίας* θύραν ..... καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ ζωγράφοι καὶ π[λάστα]ι τοῦτου	

I. 33-II. 1 προτι[θεῖς] Maehler || 1 [δὲ] Wilcken | [τ]ὴν φιλοσόφου Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 1-2 ταύτην Maehler : τίνα Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs : τινὰ Merk. (ap. Maehler) || 2 [καὶ] SW | litterae kai post ησαν in papyro deletae sunt | [ἐ]θορυβήθησαν Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs : [ἐ]ταράχθησαν Zimm. | λαβ[όντες] Maehler || 3 [τοῦ καινο]ῦ Merk. || 3-4 ἐφο[βήθησαν] (vel ἐφο[βούντο]) Maehler : ἐφο[βεῖτο] SW :

ἐφο[υίχθη] Hägg || 4 [μὲν] SW : [δὲ] Hägg : [δ'] Stram. (ap. Hägg) | [γὰρ] Maehler : [αὐτίκα] Stram. | [ὁ] Maehler | ὑποτιμησάμεν[ος] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 4-5 [τὸ μὴ ἔχειν λόγον] Maehler || 5 [εἰκότα] Maehler | πρέπου[σαν τῆι] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 6 [τοιαύτη διαλ]έξει Merk. (ap. Maehler) | ἀ[ληθῶς] Merk. (ap. Maehler) || 7 τῆ[ς ἀλ]ηθοῦς Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 7-8 ἀρχ[αίαις] Maehler || 8 μυθ[ολο]γίαις Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | ἐπακολουθοῦσαι Π | ἔστ[ιν] Maehler : ἔστ[ι] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | [δὴ] Zimm. || 9 [ὁ Ἔρ]ως Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | Ἀφροδ[ι]έτης Π | υἱὸς Π | κομειτη Π | ναιος Π | ἔχω[ν] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 10 [πτερ]ᾶ Maehler | τω [ν]ωτω Π | παρηρκτημένον Π | δοξον Π | κα[ὶ] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 10-11 [τῆι χειρὶ] Maehler : [ταῖς χερσὶ] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 11 ὠ[μῶς] ] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 12 initium lineae non scriptum est, «The scribe has left the initial two-thirds of this line blank, probably because he could not read his exemplar» SW pos. | [νέω] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 13 [τιτρ]ώσκει Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 14 [ἐντεκ]λυθὲν Bowie (ap. SW) | ante αιωσει tres litterae in papyro deletae sunt | αιωσει Π | συνέστηκ[εν] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 14-15 [τὸ πρωτ]ον M. Maehler (ap. Maehler) || 15 κ[αὶ, εἰ] M. Maehler (ap. Maehler) || 16 [τὰ] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | [γε] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs : [γ'] Merk. (ap. Maehler) | [ὕ]πὸ Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs : [ἀ]πὸ Dihle | γεννωμενωα Π ubi ω deletum est | [ἄμα] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs : [τέκνα] Merk. (ap. Maehler) || 17 [τοῖς] Merk. (ap. Maehler) | τη ηλικια Π | προβενει Π | «one expects τὸ, not τὸν» SW pos. || 17-18 [δὲ θείας μεμοι]ραμένον Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | ἀναπ[ή]ρους Merk. (ap. Maehler) : ἀναπ[λάστους] Dilhe || 19 [αἰεὶ] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | alterum αὐτης ante μένειν in papyro deletum est | πό[ρρω] M. Maehler (ap. Maehler) || 20 [εἴη] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | [δ'] Zimm. : [δὲ] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | απειθανο Π | [εἰ] Maehler || 21 [βρέφ]ος Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | περινοστι Π | αὐτ[ὸ]ν Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | ὄ[λη]ν Maehler | τῆ[ν] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 22 [οἰκου]μένην Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 22-23 ὑπαν[τ]ώντων Maehler || 23 χας ante οὖς in papyro deletum est | των supra lineam scriptum est | ξαν Π | εθελη Π | πυρπ[ο]λείν Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 24 [ῶστ' ἐ]ν Maehler || 24-25 ἐγγίγνε[σθαι] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 25 θε[ο]φ[ό]ρο[ι]ς Maehler : θε[ο]φ[ό]ρο[ι]ς SW || 25-26 ἴκα[σι] SW qui «Maehler's supplement is surely right on sense, but too long for space. Also, 'tremata' stand above the iota of ἴκα at the end of line 58, which tend to indicate the beginning of a word» pos. : ατ Maehler : ἴκα Π || 26 [δ'] SW | [οἰ] Maehler | εἰληφ[ό]τ[ε]ς Maehler || 27 [δέ γ'] Maehler | [οὔ]πω Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 28 [δ'] Maehler | [ἔστ]ιν Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | κεινημα Π || 28-29 γινόμενον] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 29 ἄρδην edimus : τρόπον S-W qui «Most likely a haplography of some sort occurred here also, perhaps of a phrase with τρόπον; e.g., “[In such a way] he desired to finish his speech» pos. : ῥύδην Stramaglia (ap. Hägg) || 29-30 ἐβού[λετ]’ Stramaglia (ap. Hägg) : ἐβού[λετο] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs || 30

[ἄ]ν Stramaglia (ap. Hägg) | [τὸ]ν Maehler : «There is insufficient space for ἐβούλετο τὸν, which sense demands, probably because a τὸ was omitted through haplography» SW pos. | [A]ν[α]ξιμένης Maehler || 30-31 δι[ελέγ]ετο Zimm. || 32 [τῆς] Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs | [ζ]ητήσεως Maehler | διοργησεχουσατου post κακεινη fortasse ob haplographiam in papyro deletum est || 33 δι[ὲ] ῥογῆς Maehler || 33-34 ὠμολογῆσαι Π || 34 τονερωτα ante μήπω in papyro deletum est | οὐδεμιας Π || 35 μητε in papyro ubi δ supra τ scriptum est | δῆλον edimus ubi η .. ν (vel .. ν) legimus : μὰ τὸν Maehler qui «statt μελλε könnte indessen auch μαλλ gelesen werden. Danach sind nur sehr geringe Spuren zu sehen; möglich erscheint μελ[ι]νματων d.h. “Μὰ τὸν”, ἔφη... » (M. Maehler) pos. || 69 κενὸς Maehler | κα[θῶς] (vel κα[ὶ οὐ]) Maehler | μ[οι] Maehler || 37 ημειν Π | παιδιας Π || 38 π[λάστα]ι Kaibel-Roberts-Krebs

### *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 guests speech is idle nonsense, and I think... that we, at the door of education [...] poets and painters and [sculptors]... this...”.

### *Commentary*

#### **Line 1: ζήτησιw.**

In l. I. 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 (*ζήτησιw*) 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 ἔκθεσις πραγμάτων εἰς τινα προκειμένην ζήτησιw ἀνηκόντων ἢ νῆ Δία περιστάσεως ἔκθεσις εἰς τινα ζήτησιw ἀνηκούσης. In this last example we find the passive form of the verb *προτίθημι*, which our papyrus seems to refer to. For the verb also see Gregorius Nyssenus, *De opificio hominis* 181.1-2 Ἄλλ’ ὁ μὲν περὶ τούτων λόγος ἀφείσθω, πρὸς δὲ τὸ προκειμένον ἐπιστρεπτέου τὴν ζήτησιw. Cf. also Cyrillus *Commentarii in Joannem* 1.444.31-2.



**Line 1** *κατὰ τύχην* τ[ c. 4].

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 philosophers 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.<sup>9</sup> which seems less probable to us.

The following are oher examples of this: Ar. *Ecccl.* 157-61 *καὶ πῶς γυναικῶν θηλύφρων ξυνουσία / δημηγορήσει; {Πρ.} πολὺ μὲν οὖν ἄριστα πού. / λέγουσι γὰρ καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων ὅσοι / πλείστα σποδοῦνται, δεινότητας εἶναι λέγειν. / ἡμῖν δ' ὑπάρχει τοῦτο κατὰ τύχην τινά;* Pl. *Leg.* 702. b. 4-6 *Εγὼ τινα, ὧ ξένε, μοι δοκῶ κατανοεῖν. ἔοικεν κατὰ τύχην τινὰ ἡμῖν τὰ τῶν λόγων τούτων πάντων ὧν διεξήλθομεν γεγονέναι.* Dem. 48.24.1-3 *καὶ κατὰ τύχην τινὰ καὶ δαίμονα ὑμεῖς ἐπίεσθητε ὑπὸ τῶν ῥητόρων εἰς Ἀκαρνανίαν στρατιώτας ἐκπέμπειν.* Maehler's suggestion.<sup>10</sup> *κατὰ τύχην ταύτην*, doesn't appear in *TLG* (nor does *κατὰ ταύτην τύχην*).

**Line 2:** *ἔταράχθησαν.*

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 ἢ ὄψις, ἔταράχθη καὶ ἔτάραξε τὴν ψυχὴν...* and Char. 8.1.7 *θεασάμενος... ἔταράχθη τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μετέωρος ἐγένετο.* See Ach. Tat. 2.37.10; Longus 1.21.3, both from an erotic context as well.

**Line 3:** *[τοῦ καινοῦ] πάθος.*

Both *καινοῦ* and *κοινοῦ* are suitable readings in this context. The latter is well documented in Greek (cf. Galenus *Definit. med.* 19.391.16-392.2 *λοιμός ἐστι κοινὸν πάθος πλείστων ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη ὄξεις κινδύνους καὶ θανάτους ἐπιφέρων...*; *De anima libri mantissa* 147.27-28; Basilii *Homilia in illud: Ne dederis somnum oculis tuis* 31.1500.23-25 *Ἄρα τοῦτον ἀπαγορεύει τὸν ὕπνον, τὸ κοινὸν πάθος τῆς*

<sup>9</sup> Maehler 1976, 16 “die durch einen Zufall in ihrer Seele beunruhigt oder verwirrt werden”.

<sup>10</sup> Maehler 1976, 9.

φύσεως, καὶ βούλεται ἡμᾶς ἀύπνους 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 ἀνδρώσι τὰ τοῦ πολέμου, ἐν παρθενώσι τὰ τῶν παρατάξεων. ἀφελκέτω τις τὰ βέλη, καλυπτέτω τοὺς νεκρούς. ἀπείρηκα βλέπουσα τὰ τραύματα.

**Line 3: πάθους ἀνάμνησιν.**

This is a frequent expression, including in medical contexts, such as: Galenus, *Pro puero epileptico consilium*, vol. 11, p. 360 Kühn: κεφάλαιόν ἐστι σφοδρῶς κινήσαι καὶ ταραξάει τὸ σῶμα καὶ τοῦ πάθους ἀναμνήσαι καὶ παροξυσμὸν γεννήσαι, and *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus libri xi*, vol. 11, p. 639 Kühn: καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸ τῆς αἰσθήσεως ἴδιον ἐκατέρου πάθους ἀναμνησθέντι σοι τοῖς αὐτοῖς μαρτυρήσει.

Hld. 4.4.25-27 echoes these ideas, as Maehler observed (p. 16, n. 34).

**Line 3: ἐφο[ινίχθη δέ].**

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 ἤρυ[θαίνο]ντο μὲν αἰ παρειαὶ πρό[ς] τὴν αἰδῶ τῶν λόγων (*P. Berol.* 6926 A IV.35-36).

**L. 4: ὑποτιμησάμεν[ος].**

The meaning of the verb could be “by pleading”, like in Ps. Apollod. 2.5.3 ὁ δὲ ὑποτιμησάμενος τὴν ἀνάγκην, καὶ τὸν αἴτιον εἰπὼν Εὐρυσθέα γεγονέναι, πρᾶϊνας τὴν ὀργὴν τῆς θεοῦ τὸ θηρίον ἐκόμισεν ἔμπνουσιν εἰς Μυκῆνας, see also Plut. *Quaest. conp.* 639C12 τὸν δ’ Ἀλκίονον ὑποτιμώμενον (θ 246).

**Line 5: [τὸ μὴ ἔχειν λόγον εἰκότα.**

Maehler’s proposal seems to be sound and fits very well here. For *comparanda*, see Paus. 10.38.4.4-7 καὶ δὴ καὶ ἔχει λόγον εἰκότα, ὅτε βασιλεὺς ὁ Ὑρωμαίων ἀναστάτους ἐς τὸν Νικοπόλεως συνοικισμὸν ἐποίησεν Αἰτωλοῦς... (cf. 3.14.6-7.8 as well).

**Line 7: οἱ τῆ[ς ἀληθοῦς παιδείας ἀμήτοι.**

The adjective ἀμήτοι recalls Platonic models (see *LSJ* s. v.). For this type of παιδεία see D. Chr. 30.25.2 καὶ πολλὰ λελυπημένους κατὰ τὸν βίον, ὄψε παιδείας ἀληθοῦς ἤσθημένους, οὐ μὴν ἀληθῆ γε οὐδὲ πρέποντα θεοῖς. Proclus *In Platonis rem publicam commentarii* 1, p. 200 Kroll: τίνας ἐπαίδευσεν Ὀμηρος, εἴπερ μὴ μιμητῆς μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ δημιουργὸς παιδείας ἀληθοῦς, τίσι τῶν πόλεων ἔθετο νόμους, τίς πόλεμος δι' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη καλῶς.

Texts where the same full expression appears are especially interesting, such as Athen. 13.588a7 καὶ πρῶτον μὲν μνησθήσομαι τοῦ φιλαληθεστάτου Ἐπικούρου· ὅστις ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ἀμήτος ὢν ἐμακάριζε καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν παρερχομένους. *Aesopica, Fab.* (dodecasyllabi) 69: Ὁ μῦθος δηλοῖ ὅτι ὁ παιδείας ἀμήτος ὑπάρχων πῶς / ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους παιδεύσει. Cf. Philo, *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 77.1.5; Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio* 1.53.3.

**Lines 7-8: ἀρχ[αίαις] μυθ[ολογίαις] 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 ιστοριογράφων οἱ πρωτεύοντες τῇ δόξῃ τῆς μὲν ἀρχαίας μυθολογίας ἀπέστησαν διὰ τὴν δυσχέρειαν, τὰς δὲ νεωτέρας πράξεις ἀναγράφειν ἐπεχείρησαν. Ἐφορος ... ὁμοίως δὲ τούτῳ Καλλισθένης καὶ Θεόπομπος... κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν γεγονότες, ἀπέστησαν τῶν παλαιῶν μύθων. He refers to proper ancient myths, such as Heracles' 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 πραττομένοις ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις...

**Lines 9-13: [ὁ Ἔρως Ἀφροδίτης υἱὸς κομιδῆι\* νέος\* ἔχων c.3] / [πτερὰ καὶ τῷ νύκτωι παρηρητημένον\* τόξον\* καὶ τῆι] / [χειρὶ] κρατῶν λαμπάδα τούτοις τε τοῖς ὄπλοις ὠμῶς] / τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν [νέων] / [τίτρ]ύσκει.**

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.<sup>11</sup> Yet Agathon's speech expresses his criticisms in the sense that Eros is the youngest of the gods and always remains young: ἐγὼ δὲ Φαίδρω πολλά ἄλλα ὁμολογῶν τοῦτο οὐχ ὁμολογῶ, ὡς Ἔρως Κρόνου καὶ Ἰαπετοῦ ἀρχαιότερός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ φημι νεώτατον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεῶν καὶ ἀεὶ νέον (*Symp.* 195b6-c1).

<sup>11</sup> 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<sup>12</sup> and in literary texts such as Asclep. *Epigr.* 12.75.2 Εἰ πτερὰ σοι προσέκειτο καὶ ἐν χερσὶ τόξα καὶ ἰοί, / οὐκ ἂν Ἔρως ἐγράφη Κῦπριδος, ἀλλὰ σύ, παῖς. *idem* (p1) Εἰ καθύπερθε λάβοις χρύσεια πτερὰ καὶ σεῦ ἀπ' ὤμων/ (1) τείνοιτ' ἀργυρέων ἰοδόκος φαρέτρη. This portrait was still alive in much later times: Cf. Steph. *Scholía in Hippocratis prognosticon* 1.4 καὶ γὰρ θεῖόν τι χρῆμά ἐστιν ὁ ἔρως, ὡς δηλοῦσι τὰ σύμβολα ἃ οἱ γραφεῖς γράφουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ· γράφουσι γὰρ αὐτὸν παιδίον πτερὰ ἔχοντα καὶ λαμπάδα κατέχοντα. καὶ παιδίον μὲν ὡς νέον καὶ ἀγήρατον καὶ ὡς ἀφθαρτον αὐτὸν ὄντα, πτερωτὸν.

The Platonic tradition is also echoed in Longus' novel, where Eros introduces himself by saying that he is older than Cronos and Time (Οὐ 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 ὤμων καὶ τοξάρια μεταξὺ τῶν πτερύγων, 2.6.1).

A similar portrait of Eros can be found in Moschus, *Eros fugitivus* 21, including the verb *τιτρώσκει* (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 εἶη τὸ τοιοῦτο.

This expression can be found from Dem. 22.28 onwards.

### Lines 13-14: πρῶτον μὲν c.2 ἐντεκ|νωθὲν αἰῶσι\* καί.

The participle [ἐντεκ|νωθὲν, 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, ὅπως τὴν θυγατέρα Πορκίαν, Βύβλω συνοικοῦσαν καὶ πεπονημένην ἐκείνῳ δύο παιδας, αὐτῷ πάλιν ὡσπερ εὐγενῆ χώραν ἐντεκνωσασθαι παράσχη.

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

<sup>12</sup> See *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zurich and Munich 1986, vols. II.1 and 2, s. v.: “Eros enfant”, 48-49, 65-70; “Eros bébé”, 51-52 and “Eros archer”, 332-361. Belonging to the same tradition we find Meleagrus, (p1) Εἰ μὴ τόξον Ἔρως μὴδὲ πτερὰ μὴδὲ φαρέτραν/ μὴδὲ πυριβλήτους εἶχε πόθων ἀκίδας..., and Themist. *Περὶ φιλικίας* 281ξ.5 Downey, Norman, and Schenkl: ὁ δὲ παιδίον ἐκείνο τὸ σεμνότερον τῆς ἡλικίας, ὃ τὰ χρυσεὰ φέρει δεσμὰ ταῖν χερσῶν, Ἔρως Φιλίας ἐστὶν ὑπουργός. οὐκ ἔχει δὲ οὐδὲ πτερὰ οὐδὲ βέλη. οὔτε γὰρ πέτεσθαι βούλεται καὶ ἀναίμακτον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.

“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 αἰῶσι παραμετρομένη οὔτε χρόνοις συμπαρατρέχουσα, ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς ἐστῶσα καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῇ καθιδρυμένη, οὔτε τῷ παρωχηκότι οὔτε τῷ μέλλοντι συνδιαιρουμένη. 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] *ον χρονοῦν βρέφος.*

Before the participle *χρονοῦν*, an adjective or another participle could be read under *ον*. 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 γοῦν βρέφος δοκεῖ τελειοῦσθαι <ἐν ἐπτὰ ἑβδομάσιν>, ὡς Ἐ. αἰνίττεται <ἐν τοῖς Καθαρμοῖς>.

On the meaning of the word, we can mention a telling passage in which *βρέφος* is described as τὸ γεννηθὲν ἀρτίως and opposed to other human ages: Herenn. Philo, *De diversis verborum significationibus gamma* 42.

**Line 16:** [εἰ τὰ ]πὸ 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, l. 14.

At the end of the line the expression [δὲ *θείας*], proposed by Krebs, makes sense here.

**Line 18:** [*μμοι*]ραμένον.

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 *Sobr.* 53 τίνος οὖν τὸν τῆς φύσεως τὰ γαθοῦ μμοιραμένον εὐχῆς ἀξιοῖ; *Det.* 138 τοῦτ’ ἐστίν, εἰ δεῖ τὰ ληθές εἰπεῖν, ἢ μόνη κυρίως γένεσις ἀνθρώπων, ὡς τῶν μὴ ἐλπιζόντων ἐπὶ θεὸν λογικῆς φύσεως οὐ μμοιραμένων.

At the end of the line *καθάπερ τοὺς ἀναπ[ήρους 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 ἀπορήσειεν ἂν τις τίς ἢ κίνησις, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔχουσι δεξιὸν καὶ ἀριστερόν, πόθεν κινούνται· φαίνονται δὲ κινούμενα. ἢ ὡς περ ἀνάπηρον 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: *ἔστιν ὁ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα πεπηρωμένος, ὡς Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἄρεσαίχμου "κατέλιπεν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ γέροντας καὶ ἀναπήρους...."*

### Line 20: *παντελῶς ἀπίθανο[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 ἄτοπον τὸ εἶναί τι ἅμα καὶ μὴ εἶναι*. Arist. *Cael.* 269b. 7 *θαυμαστὸν καὶ παντελῶς ἄλογον*; cf. *Top.* 150a. 7-11 *παντελῶς ἄτοπον ἂν δόξειεν εἶναι*.

In the Roman Empire, Plutarch offers 76 items with this adverb, including *παντελῶς ἀπιθάνους* 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: *περινοστῆν*.

This is another term used by comic authors since Aristophanes (*Pax* 762-3 *Καὶ γὰρ πρότερον πράξας κατὰ νοῦν οὐχὶ παλαίστρας περινοστῶν/παῖδας ἐπέιρων, ...*). 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 ἐτόξευσ' αὐτὸν ἐνθέου κόρης*, whose echoes reach Ach Tat. 5. 26. 3. Yet the word is very frequent among Imperial prose writers.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> For the *topos* Eros as a child with these attributes see Maehler 1976, 16, n. 35.

**Line 23: πυρπολῶν.**

This verb appears already in Homer *Od.* 10.30, and, like *τοξέειν*, 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 ἔστηκεν αἰδοῖ κρατῶν, ὁ δὲ κάθηται πυρπολῶν. See also 4.15.1.

**Line 25: οἶον θε[ο]φορήτοι.**

We read the nominative here, not the dative θε[ο]φορήτοις proposed by Maehler, whose proposal was, however, the best. The word is evident from Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1140-2 φρενομανῆς τις εἶ 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 ἐπὶ δ' εἰς κώμην τινα εἰσέλθοιμεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ θεοφόρητος ἰστάμην, ὁ δὲ ἀυλητῆς ἐφύσα ὄμιλος ἔνθεον... (cf. also 38.29), a quotation that belongs to the episode of the priests of the Syrian goddess. We know that θεοφορήτοι was the title of a comedy by Alexis as well.<sup>14</sup>

In the same line, the expression *ἱερὸν πνεῦμά*, as Hägg already observed referred to the *pneuma* of Love, is a topic from Plato *Symp.* 179b; *Phaidr.* 255c onwards.<sup>15</sup>

**Lines 25-26: ἴσα[σι δ' οἱ] ἤδη τοῦ παιδὸς πάθους εἰληφότες πείραν.**

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

**Line 27: [δέ γ' οὐ]πω, μηδὲ πειραθείην τὸ κύνολον.**

“As for me, I (have not) yet experience -and may I never experience it- at all!” The adverbial construction τὸ κύνολον is well documented in Greek (24 items in Aristotle, 55 in Diodorus Siculus, according to *TLG*). We offer two

<sup>14</sup> See *Poetae Comici Graeci (PCG)* ed. R. Kassel et C. Austin, Berlin 1991, vol. II, p. 68.

<sup>15</sup> 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 *τούτον δὲ τὸν ταῦρον ὁ Τίμαιος ἐν ταῖς Ἱστορίαις διαβεβαιωσάμενος μὴ γεγόνεναι τὸ σύνολον, ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τύχης ἠλέγχθη; Ps. Clement.* 165.9-ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ σύνολον ἀκούειν δύναμαι.

Here the word order is different from that which we saw in l. 20.

**Lines 28-9:** [δ' ἔστ]ιν κίνημα διανοίας ὑπὸ κάλλους γινόμενον] καὶ ὑπὸ συνηθείας αὐξόμενον.»

The expression *κίνημα διανοίας* echoes passages such as Arist. *LI*968a 26 *ταχίστη δ' ἢ τῆς διανοίας κινήσις* and *Rh.* 1369b. 33-34 Ἵποκείσθω δὴ ἡμῖν εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν κινήσιον τινα τῆς ψυχῆς. *κίνημα* does not appear in Plato, but both *κινήσις* (35 items) and *διάνοια* (167 ones) are frequent in his works. See especially *Leg.* 966e1; *Epin.* 988e2. We have read *διάνοια* in an erotic context in *Phaedr.* 234. b7-c as well.<sup>16</sup>

The combination of love and familiarity becomes traditional: see Xen. *Ephes.* 1. 14.7 ἐρεῖ ὁ Κόρυμβος τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου καὶ σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα, καὶ αὐτὸν ἢ πρὸς τὸ μειράκιον *συνήθεια* ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξέκαιε. Add Char. 5.9.8; Plut. *Pel.* 19.1.5; *Sull.* 2.4.3, etc.

**Line 29:** ἄρδην ἐβου[λετ' ἄ]ν λόγον περαίνειν.

We read *αρτην*, that is, *ἄρδην*, “utterly, wholly” (*LSJ* II, *sv*). The scribe wrote *αρτην* 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 *ρυτιν* or *ρυτην*, and consequently proposed *ρύδην*, a reading that was defended by Stramaglia and H&U.<sup>17</sup> but can not be supported by the papyrus, because traces of a previous alfa 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 *ἄρδην* 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 τεῖχη κατασκάπτουτες, τοὺς δ' ἄρδην ἀπολλύουτες.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, the adverb can also refer to other, non-military verbs,

<sup>16</sup> For other parallels in Plutarch (see below, l. 38) and Chariton we refer to Maehler 1976, 1, n. 37.

<sup>17</sup> Maehler 1976, 10. For a full discussion about this term see H&U 2003, 29, n. 23.

<sup>18</sup> 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 Hld. 1.1.3 μεστὰ πάντα σωμαίων νεοσφαγῶν, τῶν μὲν ἄρδην ἀπολωλότων, τῶν δὲ ἡμιθνήτων καὶ μέρεσι τῶν σωμαίων ἔτι σπαιρόντων...



such as in Aeschin. *Ctes.* 143 ... τὴν (ἡγεμονίαν) δὲ κατὰ γῆν, εἰ μὴ δεῖ ληρεῖν, ἄρδην φέρων ἀνέθηκε Θηβαίοις. Indeed Galenus used it in a metaphorical way in *Adversus eos qui de typis scripserunt vel de circuitibus* 7. 501 εἰ δὲ ὑστερίζῃ, ἐννενηκοστοογδαίοι πάλιν κδ, εἰ δ' αὐτὰ δὴ ὑποτίθενται τινὰς ἤδη προλαμβάνοντας καὶ ὑστερίζοντας, ἀναιροῦσιν ἄρδην ἐαυτῶν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν.

The reading ἐβουλετ' ἄλ by S-W is more suitable than Maehler's supplement ἐβούλετο τὸν because of the space in the papyrus.

According to *LSJ*, 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 σύνολον (l. 27) can be observed here.

**Lines 30-31: καὶ ὁ [A]ν[α]ξιμένης 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.<sup>19</sup> 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 αὐτοὺς περὶ τῆς καθόδου, πολλὰ κατεπαγγελόμενος χρήσιμος ἔσεσθαι τῇ πατρίδι, ὁμοίως; D. Hal. *Antiq Rom* 4. 70. 2. 5-3. 1 καὶ περιλαβὼν τὴν νεκρὰν κατεφίλει καὶ ἀνεκαλείτο καὶ διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτὴν ὥσπερ ζῶσαν ἔξω τοῦ φρονεῖν γεγυῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ (cf. Epict. *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. 5 Θράσυλος... καὶ Ἀλκίφρων..., ἤδη τῶν στρατοπέδων ὅσον οὐ ξυνιόντων προσελθόντε Ἄγιδι διελεγέσθην μὴ ποιεῖν μάχην, and in D. Sic. 18. 51. The construction seems to be a typical one for *κοινέ*.

<sup>19</sup> See the data in C. Ruiz-Montero, “Una interpretación del “estilo KAI” de Jenofonte de Éfeso”, *Emerita* 50, 1982, 305-23.

**Lines 33-4:** δὲ λὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογήσαι\* μήπω οὐδέ μία\* ἔρασθῆναι (καὶ εὕξατο μηδέ\* 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<sup>20</sup> and, consequently, a translation in this affirmative sense is preferable. For a parallel construction see Pl. *Gorg.* 461b4-6 ἢ οἶε—ὄτι Γοργίας ἤσχύνθη σοι μὴ προσομολογήσαι τὸν ῥητορικὸν ἄνδρα μὴ οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ δίκαια εἰδέναι καὶ τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ...

**Line 35:**

The exclamation “Μὰ τὸν” proposed by M. Maehler and accepted by H&U<sup>21</sup> is difficult to maintain. In the papyrus we read .η/ι ..ν. Although the locus is *desperatus*, we dare to propose the form δῆλον, based on texts such as Eur. *Phoen.* 962 τί δ’ ἄν τις εἴποι; δῆλον οἷ 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 κακ τῶν συγγραμμάτων οἶος ἦν. δοκεῖ δέ, φησὶν ὁ Θρασύλος, ζηλωτῆς γεγόνεσθαι τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν. Here δῆλον appears next to δοκεῖ just like the seemingly possible δοκεῖ μ[οι] in the papyrus. Preceding this expression Maehler suggested including καθῶς or κα[ὶ οὐ] δοκεῖ μ[οι], and we think both of them could be right, yet other possibilities such as κα[ὶ περ], etc. must be mentioned as well.

**Lines 70-71:** ἐπὶ παιδ<ε>ίας\* θύραν ..... καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ ζωγράφοι καὶ π[λάστα]ι 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: ὅς δ’ ἄν ἄνευ μανίας Μουσῶν ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται, πεισθεὶς ὡς ἄρα ἐκ τέχνης ἱκανὸς ποιητῆς ἐσόμενος.

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

<sup>20</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> See the data in H&U 2003, 30, n. 25.

The union of ζωγράφοι καὶ π[λάστα] constitutes a literary topic.<sup>22</sup> and, in this way, we read in Xen., *Symp.* 4.21. 5 οἶσθα ὅτι οὕτω σαφὲς ἔχω εἶδωλον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ὡς εἰ πλαστικὸς ἢ ζωγραφικὸς ἦν.... We could also mention other later examples, such as DH *Dem.* 50.24 δεῖ δὲ αὐτῇ τριβῆς πολλῆς καὶ κατηχήσεως χρόνιου: οὐ γὰρ δὴ πλάσται μὲν καὶ ζωγράφων παῖδες, εἰ μὴ πολλὴν ἐμπειρίαν λάβοιεν, χρόνῳ τρίψαντες τὰς ὀράσεις μακρῶ (cf. *Din.* 7 .38); Cf. Philo. *De migratione Abrahami* 167. 3 ὡσπερ ἂν εἰ ζωγραφία καὶ πλαστική; Fl. Joseph. *Contra Apionem* (= *De Judaeorum vetustate*) 2.252 καὶ ζωγράφοι καὶ πλάσται; Plut. *Aemil.* 6. 9.2 οὐ γὰρ μόνον γραμματικοὶ καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ ῥήτορες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλάσται καὶ ζωγράφοι (Cf. also *Sulla* 27.2).

Plut. Fr. 135\*. 3-10 is especially interesting for our fragment Οἱ μὲν γὰρ νόσον τὸν ἔρωτα οἱ δ' ἐπιθυμίαν <οἱ δὲ φιλίαν> οἱ δὲ μανίαν οἱ δὲ θεῖόν τι κίνημα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ δαιμόνιον, οἱ δ' ἄντικρυς θεὸν ἀναγορεύουσιν (...). διὸ καὶ πυρφόρον αὐτὸν οἱ τε ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν οἱ τε πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς δημιουργοῦσιν. We read similar ideas in Charit. 1. 1.3 ...οἶον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἰππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς <ἀπο>δεικνύουσι... And of special interest is ἐνεθυμείτο ὅτι φιλόκαινός ἐστιν ὁ Ἔρως· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τόξα καὶ πῦρ ποιηταὶ τε καὶ πλάσται περιτεθείκασιν αὐτῶ... (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 καὶ π[λάστα] (1. 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 οἱ τε πλάσται καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα ἐποίουν οἱ ζωγράφοι.

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

<sup>22</sup> See the precedents in Hdt. 2.46 γράφουσί τε δὴ καὶ γλύφουσι οἱ ζωγράφοι καὶ οἱ ἀγαλματοποιοὶ Pl. *Phaedr.* 275. d4-5 Δεινὸν γάρ πον, ὦ Φαῖδρε, τοῦτ' ἔχει γραφή, καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁμοιον ζωγραφία; R. 597d11 Ἡ καὶ τὸν ζωγράφον δημιουργὸν καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ τοιούτου; Arist. *Po.* 1460b8-9 ἐπεὶ γάρ ἐστι μιμητὴς ὁ ποιητὴς ὡσπερ ἀνὲι ζωγράφος ἢ τις ἄλλος εἰκονοποιός.

### Conclusions

As we established in our previous study of the first column.<sup>23</sup> the banquets offered to Odysseus by the Phaeacians at *Odysseia* 7-8, together with Plátos *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 argumentations recall classical models, and certain linguistic and stylistic devices must be highlighted: poeticisms such as περιουστέω (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 expression [εἴη δ'] ἄν appears, yet with a different word order. These features give the text an intended patina of classicism.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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*.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See n. 1.

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

<sup>25</sup> Regarding stylistic aspects in *Ninus*, R. Kussl, “Ninos-Roman”, *Papyrologica Lupiensis* 5, 1997, 141-204; and M.P. López Martínez, “La paideia del príncipe Nino”, in: A. López Eire, J. M. Labiano Ilundain y A. Seoane Pardo (eds.), *Retórica, Política e Ideología desde la Antigüedad hasta nuestros días. Actas del II Congreso Internacional. Salamanca*, Noviembre 1997, Vol. I, Salamanca 1998, 51-56 and “New contributions to some papyri labelled as ‘incerta’ in a corpus of novel fragments”, in: G. Bastianini - A. Casanova (eds.), *I papiri del romanzo antico. Convegno internazionale di studi*, Florence 2010, 95-119. Recent studies about this novel: M.P. López Martínez, “El asirio Nino, personaje de leyenda y de novela”, in: M.J. Albarrán Martínez/R. Martín Hernández/I. Pajón Leyra, *Estudios Papirológicos. Textos literarios y documentales del siglo IV a. C. al IV d. C.*, Madrid 2017, 99-115; “La representación del cuerpo como reflejo de intereses nacionalistas en la cultura griega antigua: a propósito de la leyenda de Nino y Semíramis”, *Respublica* 20(3), 2017, 581-602 and “The *Ninus* Romance: New Textual and Contextual Studies”, *AFP* 65/1, 2019, 1-25.

<sup>26</sup> The connections between *Ninus* and *Parthenope* and pantomime are significative: see C. Ruiz-Montero, “Novela griega y pantomimo: vidas paralelas”, in: A. Martínez Fernández, B. Ortega Villaro, H. Velasco López, and H. Zamora Salamanca (eds.), *Agalma*.

Regarding the hiatus, the tendency in this novel is the same we see in other ancient novels: it is frequently found after *καί* (*καὶ ὑπὸ* -II. 29-, *καὶ ὁ* - II. 30- and *καὶ εὐξάτο* -II. 35-), after *δέ* (*ἐμοὶ δὲ ὀχλοπρόησι* -I. 17) and after the definite article (*ὁ Ἔρω* -II. 21-, *[οἰ] ἦδη* -II. 26-, *ὁ [Ἀ]ν[α]ξιμένης* - II. 30-; *τῆ ἡλικίαι* -II. 17-. It is also quite common before *ἦ* (*εἰκότα ἦ μάθηςιν* -II. 5-), before or after an adverbial clause or noun clause (*ἵνα καὶ μᾶλλον γένηται τῆ Παρθενόπῃ*). «*Ὁ μὲν πατήρ*» -I. 10-; *ἐπακολουθοῦσι ὡς ἔστ[ιν] ὁ Ἐρῶς Ἀφροδίτης υἱὸς* -II. 8-9; *τι οἶον θεοφορήτοις* -II. 25-). In addition, it is possible to include positions in contact with *i* because it could be pronounced as a semivowel (*ἀμύητοι αρχ[αίαις]* -II. 7-8; *δοκεῖ μ[οι] ὅτι* - II. 36). The case of *τα ἀπὸ Θράκης* -I. 14- could be explained if *τά* were an article. Regarding *Διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογῆσαι* -II. 33-, it may be noted that Heliodorus, whose novel is the longest of all preserved, uses this position (after *μή*), as do Chariton, Achilles Tatius, Longus. On the contrary, *μήπω οὐδέμιας* -II. 34- lies outside Reeve's classification.<sup>27</sup>

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.<sup>28</sup> 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<sup>29</sup>, 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

---

*Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica al Prof. Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid 2014, 609-621. Both novels appear in mosaics of ca. 200 A.D: see M. H. Quet, "Romans grecs, mosaïques romaines", in: M.-F. Baslez, Hoffmann, Ph. and Trédé M. (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec*, Paris 1992, 125-162.

<sup>27</sup> M. D. Reeve, 'Hiatus in the Greek Novelists', *CQ* 21, 1971, 514-39 and M. P. López Martínez, "Yawning matters. What can hiatus tell us about *The wonders beyond Thule?*" in: C. R. Jackson and K. ní Mheallaigh (edd.), *The Thulean zone: new frontiers in fiction with Antonius Diogenes*, Cambridge (volume in preparation).

<sup>28</sup> H&U 2003, 143.

<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup>

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.<sup>31</sup>

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",<sup>32</sup> 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' *Babyloniaca*, the heroine Sinonis menaces her husband Rhodanes with a new marriage (Phot.

<sup>30</sup> See the texts in H&U 2003, 46-47.

<sup>31</sup> A comparison between this *Martyrdom* and the Greek love novels in C. Downer, "Parthenope Revisited: Coptic Hagiography and the Hellenistic Novel" in: N. Bosson, A. Boud'Hors (edd.), *Actes du huitième Congrès international d'études coptes (Paris, 28 juin- 3juillet 2004)*, Leuven, Paris, Dudley, MA 2007, pp. 439-452 and C. Ruiz-Montero: "El martirio de Santa Parténope y sus modelos griegos", in: P. de Paz Amé-rigo, I. Sanz Extremeño (eds.), *Eulogía. Estudios sobre cristianismo primitivo. Homenaje a Mercedes López Salvá*, Madrid 2018, 611-28.

<sup>32</sup> 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 *Babyloniaca*,<sup>33</sup> and her influence could extend to the learned and brave Charikleia in Heliodorus. Indeed, *Aethiopica*'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.

---

<sup>33</sup> For this type of woman in the fragmentary novels see C. Ruiz-Montero: "Mujeres desesperadas: tipología de la "enamorada asesina" en la novela griega", in: F. de Martino & C. Morenilla (eds.), *La mirada de las mujeres*, Bari 2011, 381-402. Nowadays *Calligone*'s novel consists of two different papyri (*PSI*981 and *POxy.* 5356) the editions of reference are: Stephens-Winkler, 271-276 and López: 145-148, nr. 16. On the *Calligone*'s new fragments see P. Parsons, "5355. Novel (CALLIGONE)", *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 83, 2018, 63-72.