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**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.¹ Our purpose here is to present a new edition of the second column, ———

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 narrations, such as the collection of narratives Dārāb-nāmah, and, especially, the epic poem Vāmiq u Ἁdhrā by ʿUnṣurī, 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 ʿUnṣurī. 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. 


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. 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., 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 νίκη (l. 9) and on ἵκα (l. 25), here perhaps to indicate the beginning of a word. *Scriptio plena* in δέ ὡξίοντον P. Berol. I. 17, *elisa* in γέλωσ δέ ἄν (line 13) and καὶ ἀφ' ὕ (14) but unmarked in lines 13, 14, 20 and 32. The iota adscript is omitted in κομείτη l. 9, τῶ ωτῶ l. 10, τη ηλικία l. 17, and ἐθελη in l. 23.

We also find *vacat* (l. 12), and there is a possible case of haplography [*ἐβούλετο τὸν* (II. 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: καὶ after ἰσαν (l. 2); three letters have been deleted before αιωσει (l. 14); ω before α in γεννωμενωα (l. 16); αυτς before μενειν (l. 19); των (l. 23); χαξ before οὐθ (l. 23); διοργησευσατον after κακειν (l. 33) and τουερωτα before μηπω (l. 34).

The scribe confuses the vowels, using ει instead of ι- ἐπακολουθοῦσει (l. 8); Ἀφρο[δ][ε][τηϲ (perhaps, l. 9); κομείτη (l. 9); αιωσει (l. 14); απειθανο[ν (l. 20); κεινμα (l. 28); οο[ν (l. 34) and ἡμε[ι]ν instead of ἡμε[ι]ν (l. 37). The opposite appears as well: περινοστιν instead of περινοςτεύν (l. 21) and παιδιαϲ instead of παιδιαϲ (l. 37). The scribe also uses ai instead of ε: ναιοϲ instead of νέοϲ (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: ωμολογήϲαι instead of ὁμολογήϲαι 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 POxy. 435: δ' εὐθυνίαϲ -lines 3-4-, and δ' ειναι -line 7-.
7 In the first column the following two examples have been confirmed: ολεγωρια (I.6) and αυτωνομεια (I.29).
There is also some confusion between the voiceless and voiced consonants -τ/δ-: κομειτη instead of κομιδή (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-μένου 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

προτι-

Col. II

[θεὶϲ τ]ὴν φ[ελ]οφόφου ζήτηϲιν κατὰ τύχηϲ τ[c. 4].»

[καȋ c. 7]ηϲαν οί δύο τὰϲ ψυχὰϲ λαβ[όντεϲ]

[ c. 10]ούν πάθουϲ ἀνάμυϲιν ἐφο[ c. 4]

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

[ c. 8 εἰκότα ἡ μάθηϲιν πρέπουϲ[αν c. 2

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

[c. 3] οἰ τῆϲ ἀλ]ηθοῦϲ παιδεῖαϲ ἀμύϲτηϲ αρχ[αι]-]

---

[ἐντεκν]ωθὲν αἰῶϲι* καὶ ἀφ' οὗ [συ]νέϲτ[εκ c.2]
[α]ὸρ σύραμεν ἡ[λικίαϲ] προβαίνει* τον 15
[εἴη δ'] ἂν κἀκεῖνο παντελῶϲ ἄπιθαν̣[ν* εἰ] [βρέφοϲ εϲτὶν ὁ Ἐρωϲ, περινοϲτ⟨ε⟩ῖν* αὐτ̣]ὸν̣[ν̣ ὅ̣[λη]ν̣[τὴ]ν 25
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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: ζήτησιν.
In l. I.34 the initial verbal form from line 33 (προτί-), 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 (ζήτησιν) 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 Ὑστερ δὲ ἡ διήγησις κατὰ Νεοκλέα ἡ δικαιωματικὴ ἐκθεσις πραγμάτων εἰς τινα προκειμένην ζήτησιν ἀνηκόντων ἢ νὴ Δία περιστάσεως ἐκθεσις εἰς τινα ζήτησιν 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 Ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν περὶ τούτων λόγως ἀφείσθω, πρὸς δὲ τὸ προκειμένου ἐπιστρεπτέον τὴν ζήτησιν. Cf. also Cyrilus Commentarii in Joannem 1.444.31-2.
Line 1 κατὰ τύχην [κ. 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 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, without 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 ἔννοια / δημηγορήσει; {Πρ.} πολὺ μὲν οὖν ἄριστά που; / λέγουσι γὰρ τῶν νεανίσκων ὅσοι / πλείστα σποδοῦνται, δεινοτάτους εἶναι λέγειν. / ἦμιν δ’ ὑπάρχει τούτο κατὰ τύχην τινά; Pl. Leg. 702.b.4-6 Εγὼ τυχα, ὦ ἐξευ, μοι δοκῶ κατανοεῖν. ἐοικεν κατὰ τύχην τινά ἦμιν τά τῶν λόγων τούτων πάντων ὧν διεξῆλθομεν γεγονέναι: Dem. 48.24.1-3 καὶ κατὰ τύχην τινά καὶ δαίμονα ὡμεῖς ἐπείσθητε ὑπὸ τῶν ῥητόρων εἰς Ἀκαρνανιάν στρατιώτας ἐκπέμπειν. Maehler’s suggestion,10 κατὰ τύχην ταῦτην, 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 καὶ. 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 εἴ θεάστηται ἡ ὄψις, ἐταράχθη καὶ ἐτάραξε τὴν ψυχήν... and Char. 8.1.7 θεσάμενος... 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 καιν]οῦ πάθους.
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 καὶ διὰ τῶν τούτων καὶ ἔθην δεξιάς κινδύνους καὶ ταχύτατος ἐπιφέρου...; De anima libri mantissa 147.27-28; Basilius Homilia in illud: Νε dederis somnum oculis tuis 31.1500.23-25 Ἀρα τούτον ἀπαγορεύει τὸν ὑπνοῦ, τὸ κοινὸν 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 ἀδύνατον εἶναι; But we prefer the adjective καινοῦ, 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 ἀνενεργῶσι τὰ τῶν πολέμου, ἐν παραθύρῳ τὰ τῶν παρατέτας. ἀφελκέτω τις τα βέλη, καλυπτέτω τοὺς νεκροὺς. ἀπείρηκα βλέπουσα τὰ τραύματα.

Line 3: πάθους ἀνάμμηνων.
This is a frequent expression, including in medical contexts, such as: Galen. Pro puer. epileptico consilium, vol. 11, p. 360 Kühn: κεφάλαιον ἐστὶ σφόδρῳ κινῆσαι καὶ ταράξαι τὸ σῶμα καὶ τοῦ πάθους ἀναμμῆναι καὶ παρεξεφάμον γεννῆσαι, and De simplicium medicamentorum temperaments ac facultatibus libri xi, vol. 11, p. 639 Kühn: καὶ μὲν οἱ καὶ τὸ τῆς αἰσθήσεως ὁδιὸν ἐκατέρου πάθους ἀναμμηνθέντι σοι τοῖς αὐτοῖς μαρτυρήσει.

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

Line 3: ἐφοινίχθη 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 Nīnus’ novel, where the verb is linked to the κόρη, probably Semiramis: καὶ ἠρυθάνυντο μὲν αἱ παρειαὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀδιάφορο τῶν λόγων (P.Berol. 6926 A IV.35-36).

L. 4: ὑποτιμησάμενοι.[loc].
The meaning of the verb could be “by pleading”, like in Ps. Apollod. 2.5.3 ὁ δὲ ὑποτιμησάμενος τὴν ἀνάγκην, καὶ τοῦ αἵτινον εἰπὼν Εὐρυσθέα γεγονέαν, πραénergie τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς θεοῦ τὸ θηρίον ἐκόμισεν ἐμπνευσάς, see also Plut. Quaest. conv. 639C12 τὸν δ’ Ἀλκίνου 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 Ρωμαίων ἀναστάτους ἐς τῶν Νικοπόλεως συνοικισμόν ἐποίησεν Αἰτωλοῦς... (cf. 3.14.6-7.8 as well).
Line 7: οἱ τῆς ἄλθηος 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 λευτημένος κατὰ τὸν βίον, ὅψε παιδείας ἄλθηος ἁσθημένος, οὐ μὴν ἄλθηῃ γε οὐδὲ πρέπουται θεοῖς. Proclus In Platonis rem publicam commentarii 1, p. 200 Kroll: τίνας ἐπαίδευσεν Ὅμηρος εἰπερ μὴ μιμητὴς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δημιουργὸς παιδείας ἄλθηος, τίσι τῶν πόλεων ἐθετο γε ἐκεῖνοι ἐπράχθη καλῶς.

Texts where the same full expression appears are especially interesting, such as Athen.13.588a7 καὶ πρῶτον μὲν μνησθῆσομαι τοῦ φιλαληθεστάτου Ἐπικούρου· ὅστις ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ἀμύητος ὢν ἐμακάριζε καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν παρερχομένους. Aesopica, Fab. (dodecasyllab) 69: Ὁ μῦθος δηλοῖ ὅτι ὁ παιδείας ἀμύητος 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: 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 πρωτεύοντες τῆι δόξηι τῆς 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 ancients myths, such as Heracles' labors, in 4.8.1.1-6 (tàs παλαιὰς μυθολογίας); cf. 4.8.3.1-4, where ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαίαις μυθολογίαις is opposed to τοῖς πραττομένοις ἐν τοῖς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς χρόνοις...


This portrait of the young and beautiful Eros echoes well-known classical models. Quoting Hesiod and Parmenides, Phaedrus, in Plato’s 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 δέ Φαιδρῳ πολλὰ ἄλλα ὠμολογῶν τοῦτο σὺν ὠμολογῷ, ὡς Ἔρως Κρόνου καὶ Ἰαπετοῦ ἁργαίοτέρος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ φημι νεώτατον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεών καὶ αἰε 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 πτερὰ σοι προσέκειτο καὶ ἐν χερὶ τόξα καὶ ἵοι. / οὖν ᾧν Ἐρως ἔγραψε Κύπριδος, ἄλλα σὺ, παῖς. idem (p1) Εἰ καθύπεθε λάβοις χρύσεα πτερὰ καὶ σεν ἁπ’ ὤμου, / (1) τεῖνοντ’ ἄργυρεων ιδόκοι φαρέτρη. This portrait was still alive in much later times: Cf. Steph. Scholia in Hippocratis prognosticon 1.4 καὶ γὰρ θεῖόν τι χρῆμα ἐστίν ὁ Ἐρως, ὥς δηλοῦσι τὰ σύμβολα ἣ 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 ὑντα, πτερωτὸν.

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. Chariton (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 μ[ὲν c.2 ἐντεκ]φωθεν αἰῶϲι* καί.
The participle ἐντεκφωθεν, 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, Βύβλῳ συνοικούσαν καὶ πεποιημένην ἐκείνῳ δύο παῖδας, αὐτῷ πάλιν ὡς περ εὐγενὴ χώραν ἐντεκφωσθαι παράσχαι.

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 eternal, and whose reflections are alive in later authors such as Hippol. *Eccles.* Contra Eunomium 1.1.371.7 οὔτε αἰῶσι παραμετρουμένη οὔτε χρόνοις συμπαρά-


tréxoussa, ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς ἐστώσα καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῇ καθιδρυμένη, οὔτε τῷ παραφυσικῷ 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] οὐ χρονοῦν βρέφος.

Before the participle χρονοῦν, an adjective or another participle could be read under οὐ. An adjective like θείου could fit the context: see Athanas. *Homilia in occurrsum domini* 28.988 τὸ θείου 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 H τὸ γοῦν βρέφος δοκεῖ τελειοῦσθαι <ἐν ἑπτὰ ἑβδομᾶσιν>, 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 γεννηθέν ἄρτιως and opposed to other human ages: Herenn. Philo, *De diversis verborum significationibus* gamma 42.

**Line 16:** [εἰ] τὰ ἐπὶ 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 θείας], 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 *Sobr.* 53 τίνος σοὶ τῷ τῆς φύσεως τάγαθου μεμοιραμένον εἰχῆς ἀξίοι: *Det.* 138 τούτ’ ἐστίν, ἢ δεῖ τάληθες εἰπεῖν, ἢ μόνη κυρίως γένεσις ἀνθρώπων, ὡς τῶν μὴ ἑλπιζόντων ἐπὶ θεοῦ λογικῆς φύσεως οὗ μεμοιραμένων.
At the end of the line καθάπερ τοὺς ἄναπήρους 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 ἄν τις τίς ἡ κίνησις, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔχουσι δεξίου καὶ ἀριστερόν, πόθεν κυνοῦνται· φαίνονται δὲ κυνούμενα. ἡ ὑστερόπερ 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: ἐστὶν ὁ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα πεπηρωμένος, ὡς Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἀρεσαίχμου "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:


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: περινοστέιν.
This is another term used by comic authors since Aristophanes (Pax 762-3 Καὶ γὰρ πρότερον πράξας κατὰ νοῦν οὐχὶ παλαίστρας περινοστῶν/ παῖδας ἐπείρων, .... 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.

This word has poetic origins as well, according to the TLG data. It is linked to Eros in Eur. Tρ. 25 ἔρως ἑτόξεύεσ’ αὐτὸν 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 "Ερως ἀνταγωνίζεται καὶ πατήρ. ὦ μὲν ἐστηκεν αἰδοί κρατῶν, ὦ δὲ κάθηται πυρπολῶν. See also 4.15.1.

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 φρενομανής τις εἴ θεοφόρητος...) onwards, and it usually appears in a prophetic or extatic context. Interesting comparanda in the Imperial age include Plut. Them. 26.2 ἔκφων γενόμενος καὶ θεοφόρητος ἀνεφώνησεν ἐν μέτρῳ ταύτι, and Ps. Luc. Asin.37 ἐπ᾽ αὐτής ἐφύσα ὡμίλος ἐνθέον... (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 boy’s 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 Ἦρακλείδης δ᾽ ὁ Πουτικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱδονῆς τάδε λέγει οἱ τύραννοι καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς πάντων ἀγαθῶν όντες κύριοι καὶ πάντων εἰληφότες πεῖραν τὴν ἱδονὴν προκρίνουσιν; and Nicol. Fr. 12 εἰ δὲ ἀδίκως, σὺ τε τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάθους ἐμοὶ πεῖραν λάβοις (cf. Joh. Chrys. In Genesim 54.416).

Line 27: [δὲ γ᾽ οὐ]ποι, μηδὲ πειραθείν τὸ εὐσολοῦν.
“As for me, I (have not) yet experience -and may I never experience it- at all!” The adverbal construction τὸ εὐσολοῦν 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 ταύρον ὁ Τίμαιος ἐν ταῖς Ἰστορίαις διαβεβαιωσάμενος μὴ γεγονεῖ τὸ σύνολον, ὕπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τύχης ἥλεγχη; Ps. Clement. 165. 9-6 ὑπὲρ 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 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. 16

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

Line 29: ἀρδῆν ἔβουλετ’ ἀ’ν λόγον περαινεὶ.

We read ἀρτην, that is, ἀρδῆν, “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 ῥυτην or ῥυτην, and consequently proposed ῥύδην, a reading that was defended by Stramaglia and H&U. 17 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 ἀρδῆν 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 κατασκάπτουτες, τοὺς δ’ ἄρδην 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 Hld. 1. 1. 3 μεστὰ πάντα σωμάτων νεοσφαγῶν, τῶν μὲν ἄρδην ἀπολωλότων, τῶν δὲ ἡμιθνήτων καὶ μέρη τῶν σωμάτων ἐτι σπαιρότων...
such as in Aeschin. *Ctes. 143* ... τὴν (ἡγεμονίαν) δὲ κατὰ γῆν, εἰ μὴ δεῖ ληφεῖν, ἄρδην φέρων ἀνέθηκε Θηβαίως. Indeed Galenus used it in a metaphorical way in *Adversus eos qui de typis scripserunt vel de circuitibus 7. 501* ἐὰν δὲ ὑστερίζῃ, ἐννενηκοστοογδαῖοι πάλιν κδ, εἰ δ’ αὐτὰ δὴ ὑποτίθε-νται τινας ἡγεμονίαν προλαμβάνοντας καὶ ὑστερίζοντας, ἀναροῦσιν ἄρδην ἐαυ-
tῶν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν.

The reading ἐβου[λετ’]ἀν by S-W is more suitable than Maehler’s supplement ἐβούλετο 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 εῦνολον (l. 27) can be observed here.

**Lines 30-31: καὶ ὁ [Ἀ]ναξιμένης 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. 19 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 κα-
thódon, πολλὰ κατεπαγγελλόμενος χρήσιμος ἔσεσθαι τῇ πατρίδι, ὁμώοιο; D.Hal. *Antiq Rom* 4.70.2.5-3.1 καὶ περιλαβὼν τὴν νεκρὰν κατεφίλει καὶ ἀνεκαλεῖτο καὶ διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτὴν ὡσπερ ζῶσαν ἐξω τοῦ φρονεῖν γε-
gονῶσ 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..., ἦθη τῶν στρατιτέων ὅσον οὐ ἢπιόντω προσελθόντε Άγιδι διελεγέσθην μὴ ποιεῖν μάχην, and in D. Sic. 18.51. The construction seems to be a typical one for *koine*.

---

Lines 33-4: δὴ λέγει τῷ μὴ δομολογήσαι* μήπως οὐδεμίας* ἐρασθήναι (καὶ εὐξατο μηδὲ* 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 ἄι τινα — ὅτι Γοργίας ᾐσχύνθη σοι μὴ προσομολογήσαι τὸν ῥητορικὸν ἄνδρα μὴ σιχί 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 .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 εἶποι; δῆλον οὐ γ᾽ ἐμοί 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 κἀκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων ὁίοσ ἦν δοκεῖ δὲ, φησίν ὁ Θράσύλος, ζηλωτὴ γεγονέναι τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν. Here δῆλον appears next to δοκεῖ just like the seemingly possible δοκεῖ μῶι in the papyrus. Preceding this expression Maehler suggested including καθ ῶϲ or καὶ οὖ δοκεῖ μῶι), and we think both of them could be right, yet other possibilities such as κα[ίπερ], etc. must be mentioned as well.

Lines 70-71: ἐπὶ παιδ<ε>ια* θύραν .......... καὶ ποιηταί καὶ ζωγράφοι 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᾽ ἄν ἀνευ μανίας Μοῦσῶν ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται, πεισθεῖς ὡς ἄρα ἐκ τε-χθης ίκανος ποιητὴς ἐσόμενος.

Maehler proposed [συγγραφεῖς] καὶ ποιηταί. Alternatively, a comparative expression of the type ὡς καὶ before ποιηταί 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 καὶ πλάστας constitutes a literary topic.\(^{22}\) and, in this way, we read in Xen., Symp. 4.21. 5 οἵσθα ὅτι οὔτω σαφὲς ἔγραψε ζωγράφοι καὶ πλάστας ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ὡς εἰ πλαστικὸς ἢ ζωγραφικὸς ἦν.… We could also mention other later examples, such as DH Dem. 50.24 δεὶ δὲ αὐτὴ τριβὴς πολλῆς καὶ κατηχήσεως χρονίου· οὐ γὰρ δὴ πλάσται μὲν καὶ ζωγράφων παιδες, εἰ μὴ πολλῆν ἐμπειρίαν λάβοιες, χρόνῳ τρίψαντες τὰς ὀράσεις μακρῷ (cf. Din. 7. 38); Cf. Philo. De migratione Abrahimi 167. 3 ὥσπερ 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 ἱρτορες, 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 δὲ ἐπιθυμίαν <οἱ δὲ φιλίαν> οἱ δὲ μανίαν οἱ δὲ θείον τι κύρια τῇ ψυχῆς καὶ δαιμόνιον, οἱ δὲ ἀντικρούσι τὸν ἄναγγελους (…). διὸ καὶ πυρφόρου ἀυτῶν οἱ τε ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν οἱ τε πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς δημοτευχίτους. We read similar ideas in Charit. 1.1.3 …σοῦ Άχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἰππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς <ἀπό>δεικνύσι… And of special interest is ἐνεθυμεῖτο ὅτι φιλόκαινός ἐστιν ὁ Ἐρως· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ τόξο καὶ πῦρ ποιηταὶ 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 καὶ πλάσται (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 οἱ τε πλάσται καὶ κατα 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 καὶ οἱ ἀγαλματοποιοὶ Pl. Phaedr. 275. d4-5 ἰσον γὰρ ποι. ὥς Φαίδρε. τοῦτ ἔχει γραφῆ, καὶ ἦν ἀληθῶς ὄμοιον ζωγραφῆ. R. 597d11 Ἡ καὶ τὸν ζωγράφον δημοτικῶν καὶ ποιητῆς τοῦ τοιούτου; Arist. Po. 1460b8-9 ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐστι μιμητῆς ὡς ποιητῆς ὡς περενει ζωγράφος καὶ τις ἄλλος εἰκονοποιῶ. 
Conclusions

As we established in our previous study of the first column, the banquets offered to Odysseus by the Phaecians at *Odyssea* 7-8, together with Plato’s *Symposium*, are the main hypotexts 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 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 expression [εἴη δ'] ἂν 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 ὅ - II.30- and καὶ εὖξατο -II.35-), after δὲ (δὲ φίλοι -II.5-), after the definite article (ὁ ᾿Ερως -II.21-, [ὁι] ἴδη -II.26-, ὃ ᾿Αναξιμένης - II.30-; τῆι ἡλικίαι -II.17-). It is also quite common before ἦ (ἐκκόστα ἦ μάθης- -II.5-), before or after an adverbial clause or noun clause (ίνα καὶ μᾶλλον γένηται τῆι Παρθενοπη». «Ὁ μὲν πατήρ» -I.10-; ἐπακολουθοῦσι ὡς ἔκτων ὁ ᾿Ερως ᾿Αφροδίτης υἱὸς -II.8-9; τι οἷον θεόφρορητοις –II.25-). In addition, it is possible to include positions in contact with i because it could be pronounced as a semivowel (ἀμύητοι αρχαίαις –II.7-8; δοκεῖ μοι ὅτι – II.36). The case of ἵτα ἀπὸ Θρᾴκης –Ι.14- could be explained if τα 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 μη), as do Chariton, Achilles Tatius, Longus. On the contrary, μὴ ἰού νόλεμιας –II.34- lies outside Reeve’s classification.27

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.28 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 sports29, 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
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.  

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.  

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”, 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 Chariton 3. 2.16. Yet at the end of the plot, she meets her husband again, and both return to their country together. In Iamblichus’ Babyloniacca, the heroine Sinonis menaces her husband Rhodanes with a new marriage (Phot.  

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.
Parthenope seems to have been the model for a strong female character, comparable to that which we see in Calligone and in the Babyloniacca, and her influence could extend to the learned and brave Charikleia in Heliodorus. Indeed, Actiopicca’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.