



## PSI 726: *Antheia's* Novel

**María Paz López Martínez**

Universidad de Alicante, España.

maripaz.lopez@ua.es

**Consuelo Ruiz-Montero**

Universidad de Murcia, España.

consuelo@um.es

**Resumen:** Este artículo ofrece un estudio de PSI 726, el cual constituye un fragmento de una novela griega de amor. Tras realizar una revisión del papiro original, ofrecemos aquí una nueva edición, traducción y comentario del texto, centrándonos en su lenguaje y estilo. Concluimos con el estudio de los personajes del fragmento y proponemos que sea considerado como una novela histórica.

**Palabras clave:** papiro griego, novela griega antigua, novela de amor, novela histórica

**Abstract:** This paper offers a study of PSI 726, which constitutes a fragment of a Greek love novel. We reviewed the original papyrus, and provide here a new edition, translation and commentary of the text, focusing on its language and style. We conclude with the study of the characters of the fragment and propose to consider it a historical novel.

**Keywords:** Greek papyri, ancient Greek novel, love novel, historical novel

The papyrus PSI 726 (LDAB 5024) forms part of the collection held in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence and is of unknown provenance. It was acquired in 1915 by Guido Gentili and published by Medea Norsa in 1920.<sup>1</sup> Based on this *editio princeps*, the text has been edited and a commentary provided in four editions of the collected novelistic fragments: Lavagnini (1922), Zimmermann (1936), López Martínez (1998), Stephens and Winkler (1995), and Kaltsas (2020).<sup>2</sup>

The novelistic text appears on the verso of the roll. The recto contains another literary text, Demosthenes' *On the Crown* 7–10, preserving four columns from the total of twenty that the roll probably comprised. The verso retains the upper margin and the upper part of three columns (19 lines each) of a prose text that narrates the adventures of a female character called «Antheia», a name which coincides with that of the protagonist of the novel by Xenophon of Ephesus. The recto contains a fragment of Demosthenes' speech, *On the Crown*, preserving four columns from the total of twenty that the roll probably comprised.

Norsa assigned the fragment to the third to fourth centuries AD, whereas Cavallo has placed it in the late second or early third centuries AD and Degni at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.<sup>3</sup>

The fact that the papyrus has been reused, the type of writing and the frequent deletions all seem to indicate that this was not copied by a professional scribe but was a private copy written by a reader with

---

<sup>1</sup> Norsa (1920: 163–165).

<sup>2</sup> Lavagnini (1922: 29–31); Zimmermann (1936: 78–84, n.9); Stephens and Winkler (1995: 277–288); López Martínez (1998: 296–306), whose microfiche edition was published in 1994; Kaltsas (2020), with an excellent review and a good commentary of our papyrus.

<sup>3</sup> Norsa (1920: 163); Cavallo (1996: 15 and 34); Degni (1998: 94, n. 13), a reference gently given to us by our colleague Antonio López García.



some level of training. On some occasions, an erroneous letter has the correct one written over it; on others, it is annotated above the line of writing; and on still others, the text is copied again in the margin, in a smaller hand, as is the case of the first two lines. There are some punctuation signs, such as the upper dot, *diple stigma* and paragraph. Although *scriptio plena* predominates, *scriptio elisa* is also present, for example δ' ἦσαν (1.1), δ' ἠκόγ[τις]αν (1.3) and δ' ἐ[λ]θῶν (2.1).

It is a difficult fragment because the papyrus contains numerous gaps and stains, some of which are in a reddish colour. The ink has vanished on some lines, while on others the letters are virtually illegible. Here, we revise the original papyrus and provide a commentary on the text, focusing especially on some lexical and stylistic aspects. Our revision has prompted us to suggest new interpretations and nuances. In some respects, we agree with the work of earlier scholars on the text, and with colleagues who are currently studying the fragment, especially with professor Kaltsas.<sup>4</sup> In other cases, our readings diverge from previous interpretations.<sup>5</sup>

## 1. Edition of the text

### Col. 1

[c. 3]εἰς δ' ἦσαν [c. 11].. ν ἢ πρότε-	31
[ρο]ν, τοὺς μη [c. 11]ποὺς δ' ἠκόγ-	30
[τις]αν ὥσπερ ...[ c. 9]εχ. ις ἐρρω-	32
[μέ]νοι, μήτε c. [... ]εν [... ]ων διέμενο[ν]	29
[μήτ]ε ἀναστῆναι .... μοντας.. οἱ..	5 30
[c.3] ἀντεῖς τὸν νεῶν καὶ χειρ[α] ἀπέκο]ψαν	32
[καὶ] πόδας καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο ἦν ἄκρον, ἔνι-	30
[α τῶν δ]εσποτικῶν ἀναθημάτ[ων] κα-	26
[c.5 ] ηἰαν εἶπον προ[... ]ο... α	25
[c.5 ] ε βα... ρος ρου... ἐνερ[... ]	10 26
[c.6 ] τεῖς δὲ φρο[υ]ροὺς τῆς...	31
[c.6 ] ταῖς ἡλικίαις κ[αὶ] ταῖς ῥόμ[α]ις.	30
[c.5 ]ται ἐπ' [ο]ῖκου ἀνέστρεφον, ἐκ	26
[c.5 ] τοξαρην ὡς διὰ μιᾶς ταύτης πρᾶ-	29
[ξεως ὑ]πὲρ πολλῶν ἀπολογησαμενον	15 30
[τοῖς Ἑλλ]ησιν φόνων. ἡ δὲ ἐπεὶ κατα	27
[c.3 εἰς] τὴν πολίχνην ἔμελλεν, τὸ μὲν	29
[c.6] τοῖς κόλποις κατέθετο, μή τις αὐ-	32
[c.7] ται πάλιν, αὐτὴ δὲ ἀνατείνασα	31

...

1 [εὐθαρε]εἰς (vel [περιχαρ]εἰς vel [περιδε]εἰς) possis : Δ correctum in papyro : εἰς Norsa : τρεῖς Zimm. | [μᾶλ]λον possis | εἰςδεσαν in margine iterum scripta sunt || 1-2 πρότε[ρο]ν SW : ]ν· Π || 2 μήτ[ε] SW | [ἀφ]ίπποους (vel [λο]ιπῶους) possis | δ' edimus || 2-3 ἠκόγ[τις]αν supplimus || 3-4 ἐρρω[μέ]νοι Norsa : νοι· ex vai· Π || 4 . ]ων διέμενο[ν] edimus : τῶν δε[δε]μέν[ων] Zimm. || 5 [μήτ]ε Crön.-Lodi (ap. Zimm.) | τοὺς καμόντας possis | οἱ possis || 5-6 [ἐκβ]άντες (vel [ἀναβ]άντες) dubitanter : [cήρ]αντες Crön. (ap. Zimm.) || 6 χε[ί]ρα Lav. : χε[ί]ρων ed.pr. || 6-7 [ἀπέκο]ψαν supplimus : [νί]ψαντες Crön. (ap. Zimm.) || 7 κα[ι] Lav. || 7-8 ἔνι[α] supplimus : ἔνι (vel ἔνι[οι]) SW || 8 [τῶν] (vel [δὲ]) SW | [δ]εσποτικῶν Norsa | ἀναθημάτ[ων] Lav. || 8 κα[ι] Lav. || 9 εἶπον Lav. | πρό[να]ος SW || 10 ].. β.. δ [ ] φρο... τ[... ] SW : «poche lettere riconoscibili»

<sup>4</sup> We thank professor Demokritos Kaltsas, from the University of Cyprus, who has been kind enough to send us his unpublished study of the second column of this fragment before his definitive publication in 2020.

<sup>5</sup> We are grateful for the help with lines 1.9-14 and 2.8-9 provided by Guido Bastianini, Daniel Delattre, Rosario Pintaudi and Antonio López García. Any possible errors are ours alone. We would also like to thank the staff of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana for their hospitality.

Norsa | θεὰς possis || 11 καταλιπόντες Kaltsas : ἐς Lav. | δὲ φρουρούς τῆς Kaltsas | δίφρο[υ] SW : δίφρο[υ] Lav. || 12 ταῖς Lav. | κ[αί] ταῖς ῥώμ[αις] Kaltsas : π[ά]σαις Zimm. || 12–13 ῥώμ[αις] Kaltsas : ῥ[ύ]μ[αι] δὲ ἦσαν Zimm. || 13 [με]ταί Zimm. : ]ταν | ἐπ' [ο]ῖκου Kaltsas : ἐπ[ιν]ίκου Norsa | ἀνέτρεφον Kaltsas : ἀνέτρεφεν Norsa || 13–14 δ' ἐκεί[νος] SW || 14 [A]ρτοξάρην SW : τοξάρην Norsa : τοξάρ(χ)ην Zimm. : Τόξαρην\* LM || 14–15 διὰ μιᾶς ταύτης πράξεως ὑπὲρ Kaltsas : δια ac ταυτ... Norsa || 15 [ὑ]πὲρ (vel [καί]περ) Zimm. ) [καθά]περ (vel εἴ]περ) Lav. | ἀπολογησάμενον (vel ἀπολογησάμενην) SW : ἀπολογησάμενων Norsa || 16 [τὴν] Zimm. : [τοις] Kaltsas | Ἑλλ[λη]νιν Kaltsas : ἔγκλη[ν]ιν Wilck. (ap. Zimm.) | φόνων· Π || 16–17 κατα[λύειν] Lav. : κατα[λείπειν] Zimm. : κατά[γερθαι] SW | [εἰς] Lav. || 18 [φάρμακον] Lav. : [ξίφος] (vel [ποτόν] ) vel [βυβλίον]) possis | [ἐν] Lav. : «kein Raum für Lav's ἐν» Zimm. || 18–19 αὐ[τὴν] Lav. || 19 [ἀφαιρῆ]ται Lav. : [ἀφέλη]ται Zimm. | πάλιν· Π || 19–20 [τὰς χεῖρας] post ἀνατείνασα possis

## Col. 2

«ἐγγραψάτω»· «Λύσιππος δ' ἐ[λ]θὼν ἐπὶ θάλατ-	31
ταν σὺν Εὐξείνω(ι) πυνθάνεται τῶν γνω-	29
[ρί]μων τὴν κατάστασιν [π]ᾶσαν τ[ῆς] ἐν Σά-	29
[μωι] πολιτ[ε]ίας· Θρασέας μὲν ἄρχει μόνος	32
αὐτός, Θαλασσία δὲ ἀναρπάσασα τὸ πλοῖ-	5 32
[ο]ν Κλεάνδρου Θρασέαν περιέπει καὶ	28
κύνεισιν ἀλλήλοισι.... τις δὲ ἐξέ-	28
πλευσεν λαθοῦσα· οὐ γὰρ[ρ] ἦν αὐτῆ(ι) με-	28
[νειν] ἀσφαλὲς προδοῦ[σ]η(ι) μὲν τὰς Θάλασ-	29
σίας βουλάς, τὰ δὲ Ἀνθ[ε]ίας ἐλομένη(ι)·	10 28
καὶ γὰρ ἔσφραγεν Ἀνθείαν οὐ δοῦσα τὸ φάρ-	29
[μ]ακρον, καὶ κατακρύψασα ὡς μάλιστα ὑ-	32
περθεῖσιν περιεγένετο». «τὰ δὲ Ἀνθείας,	30
[π]ῶς ἔχ[ε]ι, λέγε, ὧ φίλτατε». «οὐκ οἶδα», ἔφη,	30
«σαφῶ[σ]. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Λύσανδρος αὐτὴν ὁ Σπ[α]ρ-	15 31
τιάτης παρέδωκεν δ' [...] καὶ Θρασέα[σ]	31
ἐξή(ι)τ[η]το ἐπ' αὐτῆι. δ[ῆ]λα ταῦτα ἅπασιν,	29
[τὰ δὲ] ἄλλα <ε>ϊκασία* καὶ λόγος μεμιγμένος	33
[c.6] ατι ἔχοντι τὸ ἄπιστον καὶ παράδο-	33
[ζον...].».	20

...

1 ἐνγραψάτω· Π | ἐ[λ]θὼν Zimm. : [πλ]έων Lav. || 2 Εὐξείνω Π || 2–3 γνω[ρί]μων – [π]ᾶσαν Norsa || 3–4 τ[ῆς] ἔ]ως ἄ]ρτι Zimm. : τ[ε] χ]ῶσα Lav. : τ[ῆς] ἐν Σά[μωι] Kaltsas || 4 πολιτ[ε]ί[α]ς Zimm. : [ἐ]πολιτ[ε]ύεσθαι ὁ Lav. : πολιτ[ε]ί[α]ς· Π | μόνος Zimm. || 5 αὐτός· Π || 5–6 πλοῖ[ο]ν Norsa || 7 κύνεισιν SW | [πάρ]εισιν Zimm. | ἀλλήλοισι SW | post ἀλλήλοισι punctum Kaltsas | τις δὲ Kaltsas qui ..... τις mulieris nomen censet : ὅτε SW || 7–8 ἐξέ[π]λευσεν Norsa || 8 post λαθοῦσα punctum Kaltsas edit | οὐ γὰρ[ρ] ἦν Kaltsas : αὐτ[ὸν] ]ν Lav. : αὐτ[ὰ] [c ὦ]ν Zimm. | αὐτῆ(ι) Zimm. : αὐτῆ Π || 8–9 μέ[νειν] Kaltsas et nos edimus : μέ[λει] Norsa : μέ[ν] οὐκ ἦν Lav. || 9 προδοῦ[σ]η(ι) Kaltsas : γὰρ δοῦ[ναι] Lav. : δ' οὐ[ν] ὄθ] εν Zimm. | μὲν τὰς Kaltsas : [ὄθ]εν Zimm. : γὺν (vel σοι) τὰς SW || 10 βουλάς Lav. : δούλας Norsa : ούλας· Π | τὰ δὲ Ἀνθ[ε]ίας SW : τὰ δε[π]ινῶ Zimm. | ἐλομένη(ι) Kaltsas : ἐλομένη SW : ἀφελομένη Lav. : νη· Π || 11 καὶ Zimm. | γὰρ ἔσφραγεν Kaltsas : τρέσ[α]σαν Zimm. | Ἀνθείαν Zimm. | [δ'] Lav. : οὐ Kaltsas | δοῦσα Kaltsas et nos edimus : ἰδοῦσα Lav. || 11–12 φάρ[μ]ακρον Norsa || 12–13 ἔσφραγισθαι Lav. : ὑπ Π || 13 περιεγένετο» SW : περιέπει Lav. : περιεπεῖν Norsa : . Π | «ἐ[άν] Lav. : ἐ[ἴ]α»· Zimm. | «τὰ δὲ SW || 14 [π] ὧς ἔχ[ε]ι, Kaltsas : [ἐπ]ιδέχ[ο]ν Norsa : [co]ιδέχ[ου] Lav. : [ο]ὐδ' ἔχ[ε]ι SW : [ο]ὐδ' ἔχ[ω] edimus | λέγε, ὧ Kaltsas : λέγειν, Norsa | φίλτατε· Π | «οὐκ Zimm. || 15 σαφῶ[σ] Norsa | [ὁ] Norsa | αὐτὴν SW : αὐτῆ Norsa : αὐτῆ Zimm. || 15–16 ὁ Σπ[α]ρτιάτης Kaltsas : ὑπ[ὸ] ἀρπαγῆς Crön. (ap. Zimm.) || 16 δὴ [ικ]α[ν]ά Lodi (ap. Zimm.): δη[μίωι] (vel δη[μοσίωι]) dub. conl. Kaltsas : ] ἄ· Π | Θρασέα [σ] Lav. | [καί] Lav. : [δ'] Zimm. || 17 ἐξή[ι]τ[η]το Kaltsas : ἐξ[ε]πτό]ητο Crön.–Lodi (ap. Zimm.): ἐξήρητο (vel

ἐξήρητο vel ξέριπτο) SW | δ[ῆλ]α Norsa | ἄπαιν· Π || 18 [τὰ δὲ] Lav. | εἰκακία Lav.: ἰκακία Π || 19 [διηγῆμ]ατι  
supplimus: μυθεύμ[ατι] Lav.: πλάσμ[ατι] Zimm. || 19–20 παράδο[ξον] Lav.

## Col. 3

ἐωζόμην [c.25	]	
ταύρων ορ[c.25	]	
ἐκείνοι γ[c.25	]	
ανο.. αυ[c.24	]	
ωρα α.. [c.26	]	5
θαι καὶ κτ [ c.25]		
Ἄρτεμιν ο[c.24	]	
ψευσάμεν[c.25]		
.. λ[. ]ενο[c.28	]	
μήτε αὐτὸς [c.24]		10
ἐκείνην ατ[c.24	]	
[c.4]καφη[c.25]		
[c.4]ηδε[c.26	]	
.[.....].[]		
[.....].[]		15
.[]		
.ο.[]		
τα[]		
ρας κακίς[τ-]		

2 ὄρ[γῆν] possis || 7 Ἄρτεμιν· Π || 7–8 [ἔ]ψευσά μεν Lav. || 18–19 [ἄνδ]ρας possis :  
[συμφο]ρᾶς Zimm. || 19–20 κακίς[της] Zimm..

## 2. Translation

## Column 1:

... They were (encouraged) and more... than before. They hurled javelins at those... (horse), just like... strengthened, they could not resist on their own, nor could they raise those lying on the ground... (After entering) in the temple, [they mutilated] the hands, the feet, and the remaining protruding parts, of some of the offerings of the tyrants (...) after garrisons of... their youth and strength... they came back home... after they had set free (Ar)toxares, since, through this only action, he had defended from the perpetration of many murders to the Greeks. She, for her part, when she went to (set out for) the fortress, placed the... beside her breast, lest someone take it away again; for her part, she herself lifted up...

## Column 2:

«... let it be written»: «Lysippus, after reaching the sea together with Euxeinus, finds out from those close to him about the entire political situation in Samos: Thraseas wields power, he alone in person. Thalassia, after wresting the ship from Cleander, lavishes care on Thraseas and both remain together. (Woman's name) –tis set sail in secret, as it was not safe for her to stay, because she had betrayed Thalassia's plans and had taken Antheia's side, not giving her the poison and, keeping it secret, at most she managed to escape. Antheia's situation, can you say how she is, my dear?». «I do not know for sure», he said, «because Lysander, the Spartan, handed her to... and Thraseas was summoned because of her». This was clear to all; the rest are conjectures and rumours mixed (with a tale) that contains incredible and portentous elements...».

## Column 3:

«... I escaped ... (from the fury?) of the Taurians ... they (...) ... to Artemis... after deceiving ... nor he... to her... of course (...) ... the worst (men?) ...».

### 3. Commentary

#### Column 1

The first column consists of 19 lines in very poor condition, some of which are illegible. The third person narrative has traditionally been interpreted as a scene of ritual purification in a temple, through comparison with Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, a work with which this papyrus may share certain thematic elements. This interpretation appears in the latest editions by López Martínez, Stephens and Winkler, and still persists in the studies by Morgan, who does not modify the text of the papyrus, and Kaltsas.<sup>6</sup> However, although the text is very mutilated, and therefore its interpretation is very hazardous, we offer another proposal, in the sense that it describes a revolt, a military incursion or an attack on a temple, as we shall attempt to demonstrate.

#### Line 1

The first four lines are heavily damaged. An adjective of the type *εὐθαρσεῖς* or *περιχαρεῖς* seems plausible for the beginning of the line. If the expression *μᾶλλον... ἢ...* could be read afterwards, we would be prompt to interpret the line like this: «They were encouraged and ...more... than before». We can compare with Plb. 18.45.1 *Τούτου δὲ τοῦ δόγματος διαδοθέντος εἰς τοὺς Ἑλληνας οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι πάντες εὐθαρσεῖς ἦσαν καὶ περιχαρεῖς*; D. Hal. *Antiq Rom.* 8.43.3 *αἱ μὲν δὴ περιχαρεῖς γενόμεναί καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπικαλεσάμενα...;* and Plut. *Ant.* 46.3.2 *ὥστε πάλιν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους εὐθαρσεῖς γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἀκούσαντα τῶν πεδίων ἐφίεσθαι μᾶλλον...* But the comparative adverb is not a sure reading.

Moreover, we are also aware that the opposite sentiment cannot be ruled out, and in fact both adjectives appear in combination in the text of D.S.13.45.10 *οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπιβάται θεωροῦντες πλαγίας τὰς ἑαυτῶν ναῦς συνεπιφερομένας ταῖς τῶν πολεμίων τριήρεσι, περιδεεῖς ἐγίνοντο, περὶ σφῶν ἀγωνιῶντες· ὁπότε δ' οἱ κυβερνήται ταῖς ἐμπειρίαις ἐκκρούσειαν τὰς ἐπιφοράς, πάλιν ἐγίνοντο περιχαρεῖς καὶ μετέωροι ταῖς ἐλπιδίαισι. (...)* ἄλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐκ πολλοῦ διαστήματος ἐφεστηκότες ἐτόξευον κατὰ τὸ συνεχές, καὶ ταχὺ ὁ τόπος ἦν βελῶν πλήρης· οἱ δ' αἰεὶ προσιόντες ἐγγυτέρω τὰς λόγχας ἠκόντιζον... The context of war in this passage is comparable to that of our text, and both also appear to share the verb *ἠκόντιζον*, as we shall see.

#### Line 2

If the initial letter of the form *-πους* were a *π*, it would give *-πιπους*, or a compound of the same noun, and in this respect the example of Iamblichus, *Babyloniaca* 21\*.1-2 *περιδεεῖς δὲ ἦσαν ὡς ἐν ἐρημίᾳ τά τε ἄλλα καὶ ἄφιπποι γενόμενοι* is interesting, although other possibilities cannot be dismissed, as can be seen in App. *Anñib.* 249.3 *τοὺς λοιποὺς κατηκόντισεν ἅπαντας, τοῦ μὴ τοιοῦσδε ἄνδρας ποτὲ Ῥωμαίοις γενέσθαι χρησίμους.*

#### Lines 2-3

We propose reading the aorist *ἠκόντισαν*: «...they hurled javelins at those.... they went... horse; just like.... Strengthened». Other comparable texts include: Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.15 *καὶ εὐθύς μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διώξει κατηκόντιζον ἐννέα ἢ δέκα αὐτῶν. ὡς δὲ τοῦτο ἐγένετο, πολὺ ἤδη θρασύτερον ἐπέκειντο*; cf. 6.2.20, Ctesias, *frg.3c*, 688, F.26.42-44, and the already cited D. S.13.45.10. Curiously, this same verb appears in Eur. *IT* 1369-1371: *καὶ κῶλ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν τοῖν νεανίαιν ἅμα / ἐς πλευρὰ καὶ πρὸς ἦπαρ ἠκοντιζετο, / ὥστε ξυναλγεῖν καὶ συναποκαμεῖν μέλη.* The passage corresponds to the fight between Orestes and Pylades and the Taurians.

#### Lines 3-4

There is a plural masculine subject in the participle *ἐρρω[μέν]νοι*, of the verb *ῥώννυμι*, «to give strength, be strong», and in the middle voice, «to be strengthened or strong». This participle may agree better with the subject of *ἠκόντισαν* than with the object of comparison introduced by *ὥσπερ*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Morgan (2018: 81-97).

<sup>7</sup> This same participle in middle voice appears on two occasions in the fragment entitled *Chrysis*: *ἐρρω[μένης]* (2.17-18) and *ἐρρωμένης* (2.20), which is in a very poor state of conservation: cf. López Martínez (1989: 156-162, n.18), and «¿Existió también una Críside nov-lesca?» (forthcoming).

## Line 4

The negative conjunction μήτε is an indication of two parallel negative constructions, in turn indicating two corresponding infinitives, although only the infinitive ἀνατῆναι appears in 1.5. Both infinitives would depend on a main verb, which could be διέμενο[ν], the imperfect of διαμένω, «to stay» or «to resist». This construction appears in D. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.23.2 ἐπὶ τοῖς δένδρεσι καρπὸς οὐδεὶς ὠραῖος γενέσθαι διέμεινεν. However, there are other possibilities: cf. Plb. 1.18.6 πέντε μὲν οὖν ἴσως μῆνας ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν διέμενον; D. Hal. Ant. Rom. 8.86.5 μέχρι πολλοῦ διέμενον ἐκθύμως ἀγωνιζόμενοι.

## Line 5–6

The direct object of the verb ἀνατῆναι could be τοὺς καμόντας, a participle of Homeric origin frequently used by imperial historians and prose writers, as can be seen in Nicolaos, frg. 66.384–388 Ἐνθα δὴ καμόντες ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους οἱ Πέρσαι ἔφευγον ἐπὶ ἄκρον τὸ ὄρος, ἵνα αὐτοῖς αἱ γυναῖκες ἦσαν; Ps. Call. 2.2.8–16 ἀδύναμοι γὰρ ἦσαν. Θηβαίους κατέσκαψεν οὐκ ὄντας οὕτως ἀδυνάμους, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ πολλῶν πολέμων καμόντας; and Luc. Merc Cond. 6.8–10...μὴ πονήσαντα μηδὲ καμόντα ἔτοιμον ἀργύριον λαβεῖν. In these texts, the participle has the sense of «to suffer hardship, to be exhausted». On other occasions, it has the meaning of «the fallen», as can be seen in Artemid. 5.43.8–10 ὥσπερ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἄνθρωποι τῶν καμόντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπαλλαγείας τῶν σωμάτων ἐν ἄλλαις γίνεσθαι διατριβαῖς. This meaning is also possible in our text.

Thus, the two lines could be understood as follows: «they could not resist on their own, nor could they raise those lying on the ground». Nevertheless, we are aware of the difficulty of these readings.

What follows on line 5 is illegible. From a syntactic point of view, there should be a nominative subject here of the participle deduced in 1.6, which could be [ἐπὶ]β]άντες, [ἐβ]άντες, «after entering the temple...», or [ἀναβ]άντες, as in Xenophon, who describes thus the attack on the inhabitants of Mantinea sheltering in the temple of Artemis: Xen. Hell. 6.5.8... καὶ φθάνουσι πρὶν καταληφθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν διωκόντων εἰς τὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος νεῶν καταφυγόντες, καὶ ἐγκλεισάμενοι ἠσυχίαν εἶχον. οἱ δὲ μεταδιωξαντες ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸν νεῶν καὶ τὴν ὀροφὴν διελόντες ἔπαιον ταῖς κεραμίσι. The Attic form νεῶν is also used here, and it also appears in the following passage in Plato's Critias, which mentions statues inside the temple of Poseidon, including a chariot with a god as charioteer, as well as others outside the temple, as offerings made by kings and by individuals: Criti. 116d2–8 χρυσᾶ δὲ ἀγάλματα ἐνέστησαν, τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἐφ' ἄρματος ἐστῶτα ἐξ ὑποπτέρων ἵππων ἠνίοχον (...) πολλὰ δ' ἐντὸς ἄλλα ἀγάλματα ἰδιωτῶν ἀναθήματα ἐνῆν. περὶ δὲ τὸν νεῶν ἔξωθεν εἰκόνες ἀπάντων ἔστασαν ἐκ χρυσοῦ. (...) καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα ἀναθήματα μεγάλα τῶν τε βασιλέων καὶ ἰδιωτῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς τε τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ὄσων ἐπήρχον. This text and others that we cite below shed light on the possible context of the event described in our papyrus and on its literary tradition, which is also present in the iconography.<sup>8</sup>

In fact, the form –ψαν at the end of line 6 has been interpreted by earlier editors as the nominative plural of an aorist participle of νίπτω, «to sprinkle, wash», a plausible conjecture since this verb appears in the scene of the false cleansing of the temple of Artemis in *Iphigenia among the Taurians*: IT 1191 ἀγνοῖς καθαρμοῖς πρῶτὰ νιν νίψαι θέλω. However, in the context that we are proposing, we think that –ψαν could also correspond to the third person plural of the aorist of ἀποκόπτω, in other words, to ἀπέκοψαν. In addition, notices of the ritual bathing of statues concern processions when statues were carried from their temples to the sea, a river or a nearby source, whereas here it seems to refer to the inside of the temple.<sup>9</sup>

Consequently, the translation of these lines would be: «after entering the temple, they mutilated the hands, the feet, and the remaining protruding parts». We believe that these «protruding parts» are clarified by texts such as Galen. *In Hippocratis aphorismos commentarii* vii 18a.125.6–7 οὐ μόνον τὰ ἀκρωτήρια τοῦ σώματος, οἷον πόδας καὶ χεῖρας καὶ κεφαλὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σύμπαν τὸ δέρμα. Cf. also Arist. GA 772b16–18; *Phgn.* 806b31–34.

Of particular interest is the following text by Lysias, the end of which also refers to a possible mutilation of statues in a desecrated temple: Lys. 6.15 ἐὰν μὲν τις ἀνδρὸς σῶμα τρώση, κεφαλὴν ἢ πρόσωπον ἢ

<sup>8</sup> A statue of Apollo inside a temple is depicted on a crater held in the University of Amsterdam Museum (inv. APM02579). The piece comes from the south of Taranto and is dated to the early fourth century AD. Cf. LIMC, vols. II.1, p. 239 and II.2, p. 216, 428.

<sup>9</sup> Scheer (2000: 58, n. 327) for the quotation from IT 1040 ff.; Bettinetti (2001:143–60); see pp. 158–159 for the quotation from IT 1039–41 and 1109. In both cases, it is clear that Iphigenia takes the statue out of the temple for a supposedly ritual bath.

χειρας ἢ πόδας, οὗτος...φεύζεται τὴν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος πόλιν (...) · ἐὰν δέ τις τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ἀδικήσῃ τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν, οὐδ' αὐτῶν κωλύσετε τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιβαίνειν ἢ εἰσιόντα <οὐ> τιμωρήσασθε;

The context of an attack in a temple and a cruel sacrilege could also be comparable to that of historical Asiatic Vespers, when the king of Pontus, Mithridates VI organized a massacre of Roman and Italian in several cities from Asia Minor during 88 BC: Ἐφέσιοι τοὺς ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμῖσιον καταφυγόντας, συμπλεκόμενους τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν, ἐξέλκοντες ἔκτεινον. Περγαμηνοὶ τοὺς ἐς τὸ Ἀσκληπιεῖον συμφυγόντας, οὐκ ἀφισταμένους, ἐτόξευον τοῖς ξοάνοις συμπλεκόμενους. Ἀδραμυτηνοὶ τοὺς ἐκνέοντας ἐσβαίνοντες ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν ἀνήρουν, καὶ τὰ βρέφη κατεπόντου. Καύνιοι Ῥοδίοις ὑποτελεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀντιόχου πολέμῳ γενόμενοι, καὶ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀφεθέντες οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ, τοὺς Ἴταλοὺς ἐς τὴν βουλαίαν Ἔστιαν καταφυγόντας ἔλκοντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἔστιας, τὰ βρέφη σφῶν πρῶτα ἔκτεινον ἐν ὄψει τῶν μητέρων, αὐτὰς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπ' ἐκείνοισ. Τραλλιανοὶ δ' αὐθένται τοῦ κακοῦ φυλαζάμενοι γενέσθαι, Παφλαγόνα Θεόφιλον, ἄγριον ἄνδρα, ἐς τὸ ἔργον ἐμισθώσαντο, καὶ ὁ Θεόφιλος αὐτοὺς συναγαγὼν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς ὁμοιοίας νεῶν ἦπτετο τοῦ φόνου, καὶ τινῶν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι συμπλεκόμενων τὰς χεῖρας ἀπέκοπτεν.

#### Line 7

At the beginning of the line, it seems that πόδας should be preceded by καί, which would give a list of three syntactically identical members.

Stephens and Winkler (1995: 284) also thought that our papyrus was referring to statues in a temple, and the next line seems to corroborate this because it mentions ἀναθημάτ[ων], «offerings». The question now is to determine to whom this act is attributed. Ever since the famous mutilation of the Herms recounted by Andocides, the ancients interpreted the profanation of sacred statues as a barbaric act:<sup>10</sup> Myst. 34 Ἐπειδὴ Τεῦκρος ἦλθε Μεγαρόθεν, ἄδειαν εὐρόμενος μηνύει περὶ τε τῶν μυστηρίων ἃ ἦδει καὶ τῶν περικοψάντων τὰ ἀναθήματα [καί] ἀπογράφει δυοῖν δέοντας εἴκοσιν ἄνδρας... It was also viewed in this light in Arrian's *Anabasis*: Ana. 4.7.4 καὶ ἐγὼ οὔτε τὴν ἄγαν ταύτην τιμωρίαν Βήσσου ἐπαινῶ, ἀλλὰ βαρβαρικὴν εἶναι τίθεμαι τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων τὴν λῶβην.

The offerings mentioned in our text could have been cast down or damaged in some way, as is described in numerous texts, a few of which include: Plb. 4.67.3 παραγενόμενος δὲ πρὸς τὸ περὶ Δωδώνην ἱερὸν τὰς τε στοὰς ἐνέπρησε καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἀναθημάτων διέφθειρε, κατέσκαψε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν οἰκίαν; cf. 7.13.3; D. S.13.90.2 λέγεται δὲ τὸν Τελλίαν τὸν πρωτεύοντα τῶν πολιτῶν πλούτῳ καὶ καλοκάγαθῶ συναναχῆσαι τῇ πατρίδι, βουλευθέντα καταφυγεῖν σὺν τισιν ἐτέροις εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν, νομίζοντα τῆς εἰς θεοὺς παρανομίας ἀφέξεσθαι τοὺς Καρχηδονίους· θεωροῦντα δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν ἀσέβειαν, ἐμπρῆσαι τὸν νεῶν καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐν τούτῳ ἀναθημάτων ἑαυτὸν συγκατακαῦσαι.

It seems unlikely that the agents of this fact are the novel's «good guys», in other words, the protagonist himself or his supporters, although the character who burns the temple in D. S. 13.90.2 is an honourable citizen who immolates himself in the fire. As regards our text, we cannot be certain that these actions are undertaken by the same subjects of the verbs in the previous lines: is it the attackers who, now strengthened, hurl javelins and enter the temple? What is certain is that what follows seems to be a desecration of the temple.

After ἄκρον, the paragraph refers to «some of the offerings of the local ruler». The adjective [δ]εσποτικῶν refers to the «masters» in Char. 1.12.10 τὴν δὲ περὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αἵρεσιν ἢ ὄψις κρινεῖ, πότερον δεσποτικόν ἐστὶ τὸ κτῆμα ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς», and X. *Ephes*. 5.9.12 Ἡ δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἀντέλεγεν αὐτῷ, ἀναξία εἶναι λέγουσα εὐνῆς δεσποτικῆς.<sup>11</sup> Once again, we can cite Eur. IT 1420–21 ὦ τλήμον Ἰφιγένεια, συγγόνου μέτα / θανῆι πάλιν μολοῦσα δεσποτῶν χέρας, a text that refers to Thoas.

The adjective δεσποτικός never appears in the tragedies, but does appear in Plato and Xenophon, who would have been the sources for imperial prose writers.

Based on the foregoing information, we could envisage that the syllable κα– that concludes line 8 could correspond to a verb such as καταφθεῖρω, κατακαίω, κατασκάπτω or καταβάλλω.

<sup>10</sup> Th. 6.27.1 and 28.1 also uses the verb περικόπτω to refer to the mutilation of the Herms.

<sup>11</sup> Morgan (2018: 85) admits both possibilities, but leans toward the second. Stephens and Winkler (1995: 281) also interpret it in a political sense, «of the despot's dedications».

## Lines 9–14

The papyrus here is in a very poor condition and it is very hazardous to reconstruct the vocabulary or syntax of a phrase to give it complete meaning, but Kaltsas' recent review of them allows to venture some proposals.

According to Stephens and Winkler, lines 10 and 11 might be referring to a chariot, a term repeated on both lines, δῖφρου... δῖφρου τοῦ τῆς.... But Kaltsas' reading, καταλιπόντες δὲ φρουρούς..., based on Xen. Cyr. 7.4.7 καὶ ἅμα ταῦτα λέγων ἀπήγε τὸ στράτευμα, φρουρούς ἐν ταῖς ἄκραϊς καταλιπών, seems to fit better a military context. And the same can be true for the next lines.

## Line 12

The possible reading, proposed by Zimmerman, ταῖς ἡλικίαις π[ά]σαις, considering the first term as an article, nor does appear in the TLG, and nor does ἡλικίαις π[ά]σαις, although πάσαις ἡλικίαις does appear in Arist. Pol.1340a4. Nevertheless, we prefer Kaltsas' reading... ταῖς ἡλικίαις καὶ ταῖς ῥώμαις, «...their youth and strength...». He quotes Plut. Per. 12.5 τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἡλικίαν ἔχουσι καὶ ῥώμην αἱ στρατεῖαι τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν εὐπορίας παρῆχον and D.S.17.108.1. We could add Plut. Aem. 10. 2 οὗτος ἦν Παῦλος Αἰμίλιος, ἡλικίας μὲν ἤδη πρόσω καὶ περὶ ἐξήκοντα γεγονῶς ἔτη, ῥώμη δὲ σώματος ἀκμάζων, πεφραγμένος δὲ κηδεσταῖς καὶ παισὶ νεανίας καὶ φίλων πλήθει καὶ συγγενῶν μέγα δυναμένων.

## Line 13

We could read the verbal form ἀνέστρεφεν, with Stephens and Winkler and previous editors, but we could consider the pluriel ἀνέστρεφον as well, as Kaltsas (2020: 42) does: ται ἐπ' οἴκου ἀνέστρεφον. In this way the meaning of the verb would be «to come back home», better than «to turn around or overturn something», or «to change a situation». Kaltsas quotes Str. 15.1.61, and Ach. Tat. 6.3.1, and thinks the subject of this verb would be the same than that of the participle καταλιπόντες, which is a logical supposition. The desinence -ται opening the line would correspond to a nominative of a substantive such as πολῖται, ὀπλίται, or an ethnical name, as the most suitable possibilities, according to Kaltsas.

## Line 14

It is possible to relate τοξάρην to a Persian name, such as that of the eunuch Artoxares, the most powerful of the three eunuchs who served Artaxerxes, according to Ctesias, whose *Persica* testifies to their power and capacity for court intrigue:<sup>12</sup> frg. 3c, 688, F.15.35–37 εὐνοῦχοι δὲ τρεῖς ἡδύνατο παρ' αὐτῶι, μέγιστον μὲν Ἀρτοξάρης, δεύτερος δὲ Ἀρτιβαρζάνης, καὶ τρίτος Ἀθῶος. ἐχρήτο δὲ συμβούλωι...; frg. 3c, 688, F.15.75–78 Ἀρτοξάρης ὁ εὐνοῦχος, ὃς μέγα ἡδύνατο παρὰ βασιλεῖ, ἐπιβουλεύει βασιλέα. θέλων αὐτὸς βασιλεῦσαι. Chariton also introduces Artaxates' powerful and scheming eunuch (Charit. 5.2.2 Ἀρταξάτην δὲ τὸν εὐνοῦχον ὃς μέγιστος ἦν παρὰ βασιλεῖ καὶ δυνατώτατος; cf. 6.4.10). Here, the name seems to be the direct object of a verb, perhaps made explicit between lines 13 and 14. Before this proper name Kaltsas (2020: 42) is able to see the tracks of the participle ἀφέντες with a temporal sense, «after they had set free Artoxares, since he...». Cf. Plut. Sol. 16.4 ταχὺ μέντοι τοῦ συμφέροντος αἰσθόμενοι καὶ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν μέμψεις ἀφέντες, ἔθυσάν τε κοινῆι.

What follows, ὡς δια..αἰαυτ...ρα, is very difficult to read. Stephens and Winkler (1995: 284–285) ventured ὡς διαστάσι (=διαστάσει with an itacism), or διὰ στάσι(ν) αὐτα πεπρα[χ]ότα (Stephens and Winkler 1995: 285). The last expression could fit the context well because of its meaning, and the expression is correct from a linguistic point of view, cf. D. S.38/39.8.1 ὁ δὲ τὴν πᾶσαν αἰτίαν ἐπὶ τοῦς στρατιώτας ἀνέπεμπεν, ὡς ἄνευ τῆς αὐτοῦ γνώμης πάντα πεπραχότας; Char. 2.7.6 καὶ οὐδεὶς <ἄν> ἀνθρώπων ἐρρύσατο μὴ ἀπολέσθαι Φωκῶν καὶ τὴν Πλαγγόνα τοιαῦτα πεπραχότας. But, for palaeographical reasons, we again accept Kaltsas' reading, διὰ μᾶς ταύτης πρά-ξεως, «through this only action...».

<sup>12</sup> This possibility has also been suggested by Stephens and Winkler (1995: 284). Kaltsas (2020: 44) mentions the powerful eunuch Artoxares, who acted under Artaxerxes I and Darius II. López Martínez (1998) considers the possibility of Τοξάρην as an itacism of Τόξαρης, the Scythian name that forms the title of a famous work by Lucian, which contains names that appear in other novels. This is also based on other two examples of itacism that appear in the same fragment: ἰκακία for εἰκακία, given in 2.18 and περιεγένητο (1.13) for περιεγένετο (following Kaltsas). A Scythian context for our novel is possible, as we shall discuss later.



## Line 15

The participle of the aorist ἀπολογησάμενον probably refers to the above mentioned «Artoxaren»: «who had defended from the machination or perpetration of many murders», if we interpret the form [c.6]ησιν in l.16 as an accusative of the noun of action, such as ποίησιν, «action, execution», or βούλησιν, «plan». Stephens and Winkler (1995: 285) have interpreted it as «charge» or «complaint». Kaltsas (2020: 43) proposes the dative, [τοῖς Ἑλλ]ησιν, «to the Greeks», and quotes some examples of the verb ἀπολογέω with a dative, such as Long. 4.29.5; D, Chrys. 32.21, Char. 8.1.3). We think it is a good proposal as well. Kaltsas (2020: 43) also observes the hyperbaton of lines 15–16, whose purpose is to create an intended rhythm of the prose.

Ἴπερ seems to correspond to ὑπέρ better than to καίπερ. This verb is frequently constructed with this preposition, as can be seen in the following examples: Lys. 21.20 οὐκ ἂν δυνάμενοι δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν σφετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπολογήσασθαι ἑτέρων κατηγορεῖν τολμῶσι; Xen. Hell.1.7.19 ἀλλὰ μίαν ἡμέραν δόντες αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀπολογήσασθαι; cf. Isocr. Antid. 6.3–4. Obviously Artaxares changed his previous hostile behaviour helping the Greeks in any way.

## Line 16

It is interesting that a singular feminine subject appears in l.16, who initiates an action in another scene and which may be parallel to that we have discussed up until now: «she, for her part, as she went to set out for the fortress, placed the... beside her breast, lest someone capture take it away again». Cf. D.S.15.46.5 οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ καταφυγόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν...; 18.70.1 ἐψηφίσαντο τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας κατάγειν εἰς τὴν πόλιν. This subject could be Antheia, but there are other possibilities, as we shall see.<sup>13</sup> The author probably had mentioned this character before the last military action in such a way that this new scene could remain clear for the reader.

## Line 17

What it is that the woman in question places beside her breast, we do not know. Previous editors have interpreted the missing noun as the φάρ[μ]ακον mentioned in column 2.11–12. This is a plausible conjecture. In the novel by Xenophon of Ephesus, the protagonist, also called Antheia, attempts to avoid an unwanted wedding by taking a hypnotic potion she believes to be deadly, in the solitude of her marriage bed: 3.6.1 ἡ δὲ ἄκουσα μὲν καὶ δεδακρυμένη ἐξῆει, ἐν τῇ χειρὶ κρύπτουσα τὸ φάρμακον. This gives rise to an episode of apparent death which is characteristic of the genre. In our text a synonymous such as the substantive ποτόν, already known from Homer and from the classical prose, as it appears in LSJ II, where we read that also E. Hipp. 516. used this term as an adjective referred to φάρμακον. It also appears in the magical papyri: λαβὼν σφηκαλέοντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀράχῃ, λειώσας ἐπὶ ποτόν δὸς πειν P XIII 320 βάλε ἄλατος [καὶ οἶνο]μέλιτος δύο [χοίνικας ποι]ῶν πο[τ]όν P LXIII 4 (LMPG).

Evidently, a φάρμακον of whatever type would be possible here, but one should not rule out the other possibility that the neuter article precedes a noun such as ξίφος, «dagger». Women who conceal daggers to commit suicide appear in D. Hal. A.R. 4.82.1.5–2.2 αὕτη μέντοι σωφρονεῖν βουλομένη καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἑαυτῆς φιλοῦσα, ὥσπερ ἀγαθῆ προσήκει γυναικί, τὴν ἀκόλαστον ὕβριν τῆς τυραννίδος οὐκ ἐδυνήθη διαφυγεῖν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ αἰχμάλωτος ὑπ' ἀνάγκης κρατηθεῖσα ὑπέμεινεν ὅσα μὴ θέμις ἐλευθέρα γυναικὶ παθεῖν... ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους συγγενεῖς τὰς κατασχούσας αὐτὴν ἀνάγκας διεξήλαθε πολλὰς ποιησαμένη δεήσεις καὶ ἀράς, ἵνα τιμωροὶ τοῖς κακοῖς αὐτῆς γένοιτο καὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον ὑπὸ τοῖς κόλποις ξίφος σπασαμένη... But bandits may also conceal daggers (Fl.Jos. BJ 2.425–426.1 οὕτως γὰρ ἐκάλουν τοὺς ληστὰς ἔχοντας ὑπὸ τοῖς κόλποις ξίφη...), as can wives helping to further their husbands' stratagems (Polyaen. Strateg. 7.48.1 αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν τοῖς κόλποις κρύπτουσαι ξίφη τοῖς ἀνδράσι συνεξήλαθον).

A frenzied novelistic heroine, Calligone (PSI 981), demands the return of her dagger, which has been stolen, in order to commit suicide or to kill someone. In Iamblichus' *Babyloniaka*, the female protagonist

<sup>13</sup> Morgan (2018: 86) thinks that the subject of these verbs would not be Antheia but Thalassia, cited in column 2.9–10. Kaltsas (2020, 39, n. 33; 42, n. 36) expresses the possibility of considering Polichne as the name of a city.

spends half the novel with a dagger at the ready to end the life of a rival, and again in this case, the hero takes it away from her.<sup>14</sup>

From the standpoint of palaeography, the reading φάρμακον would not allow an article preceding τοῖς κόλποις because there is not enough space on the papyrus; however, an article would be allowed by the reading ζίφος. Although use of prepositions is more frequent with this type of dative, the preposition can also be omitted in this construction, which would thus emulate a poetic model: Ael. Arist. *Romes en-comion* 214 ὡςπερ δὲ οἱ τοῖς κόλποις δεχόμενοι πάντα οὕτως κρύψασα ἔχει ἐξιόντων καὶ εἰσιόντων.

She could take the possible poison herself in the case of need, as occurs in an episode of the *Babylonian Tales*, where the heroes carry it hidden for a while until using it for a suicide attempt. In Antonius Diogenes' *Incredible Things beyond Thule*, the wicked priest Paapis' magical potions are stolen from him and then used to heal characters harmed by his spells.

Although a poison or a dagger seem the most appropriate objects in this context, it should be noted that there are other possibilities: Callirhoe carries a letter hidden in her breast in Charit. 8.4.7 Σφραγίσασα δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπέκρυψε ἐν τοῖς κόλποις, and curiously, Iphigenia dictates a letter to Orestes on tablets in IT 583 ff. Letters are central to the plot in Callirhoe, and we do not know if this is also the case in *Antheia*, which may have an underlying political plot. The woman in question could be acting as a go-between, providing information to one or other of the two sides in the conflict.<sup>15</sup>

It should also be noted that Eur. IA 34–39 and 98–112 also refers to the tablet, δέλτον, that Clytemnestra writes to Agamemnon, the content of which is recounted later in direct speech by Agamemnon himself in vv.113–123. This procedure was used earlier by Hdt. 3.128 (βυβλία), and can subsequently be seen in administrative documents (P. Oxy. 76 5100, ca. 136 AD, τὸ ἐπιστόλιον; P. Oxy. 1481.3, second century AD, ἐπιστόλιον) and literary texts (Plut. *Ages*. 13: φέρεται γοῦν ἐπιστόλιον αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰδριέα τὸν Κἄρα τοιοῦτο: Ἕνικίας εἰ μὲν μὴ ἀδικεῖ, ἄφες; εἰ δὲ ἀδικεῖ, ἡμῖν ἄφες; πάντως δὲ ἄφες'. Furthermore, line 19 contains the verb ἀνατείνω, which can be used with a diminutive direct object, such as βυβλίδιον (Latin libellus), in Plb. 23.2.5 τοῦ δὲ Δημητρίου φήσαντος ἔχειν καὶ προτείναντός τι βυβλίδιον οὐ μέγα, λέγειν αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσεν ἦνπερ τὰ ὑπομνήματα περιεῖχε πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν κατηγορουμένων ἀπόφασιν κεφαλαιώδη..., or βιβλίδιον in papyri such as P. Mich. 11 616. 13–15 (second century AD) ἄπερ μαθῶν εὐ[θέ]ως τὰ δικάιά μου βιβλιδίω ἐνγράψας ἀνέτεινα τ[ῶ] Νεμεσιανῶ ὅπως \τ/αὐτα διαπέμψηται [τῶ ἐ]πιτρόπῳ, [α]ὐτὸς τότε οὐ δυνάμενος διὰ νόσον καταπλεῦσαι... In our text, a noun such as βυβλίον in the sense of «letter» would be palaeographically possible.

#### Lines 18–19

Whatever the hidden object, the adverb πάλιν indicates that this is not the first time this action has happened: αὐ– can be understood either as αὐτό, the direct object of a verb in middle voice, of the type ἀφέληται, «lest someone take it away again», or as the feminine αὐτήν, the direct object of a verb such as ἀπάγηται or ἐπάγηται: «lest someone capture her again».<sup>16</sup>

#### Line 19

In the last line, the same woman probably extends her arms to say a prayer, as is usual, according to Aristotle (*Mu.* 400a.16 καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἀνατείνομεν τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐχὰς ποιούμενοι), and in many other texts (Hecateus, frg. 3a, 264, F. 25.693–694 ὁ δὲ Σεσόωσις ἀμφοτέρως τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείνας καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν τε παίδων καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς τοῖς θεοῖς εὐξάμενος...). In fragment B of *Ninus*, the protagonist extends his arms before a military speech: προτείνων τὰς [χεῖρας] «τὸ θεμέλιον», ἔφη (3.31–32), while in PSI 151, what is extended is a goblet in the context of a banquet.<sup>17</sup> This woman, perhaps the heroine, would do something similar before undertaking a crucial action. Iphigenia also says

<sup>14</sup> On this type of character, see the study by Ruiz–Montero (2011: 381–402). Among the novelistic fragments, we have already cited Calligone (PSI 981): Stephens and Winkler (1995: 271–276) and López Martínez (1998: 145–148, n. 16), to which a new fragment has been added (POxy. 5355) edited by Parsons (2018: 63–72).

<sup>15</sup> The next column could give an account of the dictation that forms the reply, informing on the situation of the other members of the faction who have infiltrated the other side, although it seems more likely that the imperative ἐγγραψάτω reflects information on all the events in the novel, by way of a recapitulation.

<sup>16</sup> Examples with these verbs can be seen in X. *Ephes.* 3.5.5 and 5.5.4 (ἀπάγω); 3.2.11 and 5.15.1 (ἐπάγω).

<sup>17</sup> Line 8, cf. S Stephens and Winkler (1995: 394) and López Martínez (1998: 330, n. 35)

two prayers to Artemis, one before executing her plan to deceive Thoas (1.1230–33) and another when, having carried the deception out, she hopes to escape from danger (1.1398–1402).

Shortly before, we mentioned the other possibility that the missing object of the verb ἀνατείνω was a letter, which would link this column to the next one.

The papyrus ends here, in order to continue in the second column, which may be a direct continuation of the scene depicted in the first column, although we do not know how many lines are missing.

#### Column 2

The situation is now clearer, although questions remain. This column contains a dialogue between two good friends (see φίλτατε in l.14), who may be two men, such as Chaereas and his friend Polycharmus in the novel by Chariton (Charit. 7.1.7 Πολύχαρμος δὲ ἰδὼν ἀπαρηγόρητον αὐτῷ τὴν συμφορὰν καὶ ἀδύνατο σωθῆναι Χαίρειαν «πάλαι μὲν» ἔφη «παρεμυθούμην σε, φίλτατε, καὶ πολλακίς ἀποθανεῖν ἐκώλυσα...»), or a man and a woman, which is more frequent in these novels and also seems to be somewhat more plausible here. In our case, the vocative is masculine. The feminine vocative is especially frequent in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus; in the fragment of Panionis,<sup>18</sup> the vocative is preceded by the interjection ὦ φίλτατε, and Kaltsas also introduces it here.

This dialogue chronicles or relates the fate of the main characters of the novel, by way of a recapitulation of the vicissitudes of each. Nevertheless, this second column begins with the verb ἐγγραψάτω, which has been interpreted by most of previous editors as preceeding a letter containing the next sentences, in direct speech, as its content. We have already mentioned Iphigenia's letter in the tragedies of Euripides (IA 113 and IT 760), on both occasions using the same verb as in our papyrus, ἐγγράφω. We have also referred to the importance of letters in the plot of the novel by Chariton: see in particular the episode in which Callirhoe writes a letter to Dionysius via the Persian queen, Stateira, in a climate of friendship and reconciliation (Char. 8.4.9). But the verb ἐγγράφω could refer to a previous content, lost in our text: Kaltsas (2020: 31) supposes that the verb ends a previous scene. In fact, the verb means «to engrave» or «inscribe», on a stele, like, for example, in Hdt. 4.91.2 Τεάρου ποταμοῦ κεφαλαὶ ὕδωρ ἄριστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον παρέχονται πάντων ποταμῶν· καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἀπίκετο ἐλαύνων ἐπὶ Σκύθας στρατὸν ἀνὴρ ἄριστός τε καὶ κάλλιστος πάντων ἀνθρώπων, Δαρεῖος ὁ Ὑστάσπεος, Περσέων τε καὶ πάσης τῆς ἠπείρου βασιλεύς. And LSJ, II, also quotes the meaning of «to enter in the public register», and «to indict», which are frequent in classical orators, such as Iseus 7.16 εἰς τὸ κοινὸν γραμματίον ἐγγράφειν; 2.14.6 καὶ εἰς τοὺς δημότας με ἐγγράφει καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας, and this meaning continues during the Empire: Dio Cassius 44.11 ἐς τὰ ὑπομνήματα ἐγγραφῆναι ἐποίησεν.

The imperative mood of this verb is also found in a direct speech in Aesch. Tim. 35 καὶ ἐὰν καταγνωσθῇ αὐτοῦ κρύβδην ψηφίζομένων, ἐγγραψάτωσαν οἱ πρόεδροι τοῖς πράκτορσιν.

In our fragment the verb could refer to a similar public registration of some people or event important for the plot. In this way we recall Char. 7.5.14–15 where king Artaxerxes, after the final battle against the Aegyptians, in which Dionysius has been successful, says that he lists Dionysius as a «benefactor» of his house, and eventually gives him Callirhoe, the most pleasing of gifts, in order to be his wife: ὁ δὲ πεντακισχιλίους λαβῶν συνῆψε σταθμοὺς δύο ἡμέρα μᾶ, καὶ νυκτὸς ἐπιπεσὼν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἀπροσδόκητος πολλοὺς μὲν ἐζώγησε, πλείονας δὲ ἀπέκτεινε. ὁ δὲ Αἰγύπτιος ζῶν καταλαμβανόμενος ἀπέσφαξεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ Διονύσιος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκόμισε πρὸς βασιλέα. θεασάμενος δὲ ἐκεῖνος «ἀναγράφω σε» εἶπεν «εὐεργέτην εἰς τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ ἤδη σοὶ δίδωμι δῶρον τὸ ἡδιστόν, οὗ μάλιστα πάντων αὐτὸς ἐπιθυμεῖς, Καλλιρόην γυναῖκα. κέκρικε τὴν δίκην ὁ πόλεμος. ἔχεις τὸ κάλλιστον ἄθλον τῆς ἀριστείας.» Διονύσιος δὲ προσεκύνησε καὶ ισόθεον ἔδοξεν ἑαυτὸν, πεπεισμένος ὅτι βεβαίως ἤδη Καλλιρόης ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ. Could our fragment be referring to a comparable fact? In any case our verb pertains to a direct speech. Therefore, it is more likely that the following text could belong to a new scene.

#### Lines 3–4

At the end of l.3, earlier editors have read –ωσα, but Kaltsas (2020: 38) reconstructs τ[ῆς] ἐν Σά[μω], which is consistent with πολιτείας in the following line and apt for both the maritime context of this text and the rest of the novelistic genre. Furthermore, Samos is the homeland of the heroine of another

<sup>18</sup> Ed.pr. by Parsons (2007: 47–53).

fragmentary novel, *Parthenope*, which is set in the historic past, since she is the daughter of the famous tyrant Polycrates, and her sweetheart, Metiochus, is the son of Miltiades, the hero of Marathon.<sup>19</sup> As we shall see, our fragment may also correspond to a historical novel.

Some interesting texts comparable with these two lines include Pl. R. 552.e.5-7 Ἄρ' οὖν οὐ δι' ἀπαιδευσίαν καὶ κακὴν τροφήν καὶ κατάστασιν τῆς πολιτείας φήσομεν τοὺς τοιούτους αὐτόθι ἐγγίγνεσθαι; Arist. Ath. 42.1.1 Ἔχει δ' ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας τόνδε τὸν τρόπον; Plb.6.15.1 Τίνα μὲν οὖν τρόπον διήρηται τὰ τῆς πολιτείας εἰς ἕκαστον εἶδος εἴρηται; Crysip. *Fragmenta logica et physica* 1010.11 Παρελθὼν δέ τις εἰς πόλιν εὖνομον, ἐν ἧ τὰ τῆς πολιτείας σφόδρα καλῶς διακεκόσμηται; Plut. *Arat.* 2.2.1 ἤδη δέ τινα τῆς πολιτείας κατάστασιν ἔχειν δοκούσης, Τιμοκλείδας μὲν ἀπέθανεν; and App. B.C. 1.11.99 τοσόνδε μέντοι προσέθεσαν εἰς εὐπρέπειαν τοῦ ῥήματος, ὅτι αὐτὸν αἰροῖντο δικτάτορα ἐπὶ θέσει νόμων... καὶ καταστάσει τῆς πολιτείας.

We can mention as well Lysander's Life by Plutarch (1-15), where Samos and Athens are hostile to Lysander, whereas Ephesus is favourable to him. Allusions to Athens' πολιτεία are mentioned in 13.5, to Lysander's own πολιτεία in 24.30.3.

#### Lines 4-5

This may read μόνος αὐτός, a construction documented in other texts, as can be seen in Xen. *Mem.* 3.2.2 οὐκ εἰ μόνος αὐτός εὖ ἀγωνίζοιτο πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους; and D. Chrys. 80.2.2 ἐκκλησιάζων δὲ μόνος αὐτός.

#### Line 6

The name Κλέανδρος is mentioned in Xen. *Hell.* 7.1, together with Lysander: οἱ δ' αἰροῦνται αὐτὸν τε τὸν Εὐφρονα καὶ Ἰππόδαμον καὶ Κλέανδρον καὶ Ἀκρίσιον καὶ Λύσανδρον. ὡς δὲ ταῦτα ἐπέπρακτο, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ξενικὸν καθίστησιν Ἀδέαν τὸν αὐτοῦ υἱόν, Λυσιμένην τὸν πρόσθεν ἄρχοντα ἀποστήσας. Θρασέας does not correspond to any historical character in the classical period, although it does appear as a proper name in the empire, in the time of Nero, in Plut. *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 810A5-9 ὡσπερ ὁ Νέρων ἐκεῖνος ὀλίγον ἔμπροσθεν ἢ κτεῖναι τὸν Θρασέαν μάλιστα μισῶν καὶ φοβούμενος, ὁμως ἐγκαλοῦντός τινος ὡς κακῶς κεκριμένου καὶ ἀδίκως, «ἐβουλόμην ἄν», ἔφη, «Θρασέαν οὕτως ἐμὲ φιλεῖν, ὡς δικαστῆς ἄριστός ἐστιν». A historian with this name appears in *CatMi* 25.2.2, and a philosopher in Epict. *Dissertationes* 1.1.26. Stephens and Winkler (1995: 286) cite Thrasudaios from *Hell.* 3.2.27-30. In any case, in our novel it seems to be a fictitious name.

#### Line 7

We propose σύνεισιν ἀλλήλοις, which can be seen in X. *Ephes.* 2.3.6 καὶ συνῆσαν ἀλλήλοις ἔτι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. The same construction appears in Plut. *Pyrrh.* 5.6.2. Similarly, a very fragmentary part of the novel *Ninus* reads: δὲ πανήμε[ροι c. 8] ἀλλήλοις, ὅσα μὴ [c. 4 τῶν στρατ]ιωτικῶν ἀφειλ[ c. 8 ἐλ]λιπῶς ὄρω B. I.25-28, where Wilcken has proposed [συνῆσαν] to complete the first gap. Kaltsas has inserted an upper dot after ἀλλήλοις, and we have followed his example.

Along the same lines, rather than the temporal conjunction ὅτε before the final verb, as given in the edition by Stephens and Winkler, Kaltsas proposes the reading -τις as an inflectional suffix of the name of the feminine subject of the verb ἐξέπλευσεν. The suffix -τις could recall an oriental name. Perhaps she is a political supporter of Antheia, and could play an active role in the intrigue; she seems to be an independent woman, another possible warrior, since she flees by sea and has disobeyed Thalassia. We propose to see the ending -τις as a possible eastern name, like the daughter of Mithridates, Μιθραδάτις cited in App. *Mith.* 11. The ending is also used for names of eastern cities, such as Ὀροβάτις in India (Arr. *Ana.* 4.28.5), or those quoted by the grammarian Herodian in Egypt, Ἄβοτις, Κράμβοτις (*De prosodia catholica* 3,1). But we also find this ending in Greek place names, such as ἡ Κασσοτις καλουμένη πηγή; and in gentilial, as we read in Luc., *D. Deor.* 2.2.3 Πηνελόπη ἡ Σπαρτιάτις; and even as a Greek feminine name, as in Alciph. 3.12.3 τὸ ἐκ Κεραμεικοῦ πορνίδιον, ἢ μέτοικος ἢ Φεναῆτις, Ἰακινθίς. It is curious that this type of nominal ending is considered Attic by Moeris 192 βατίς θηλυκῶς τὸ θαλάττιον Ἀττικοί, βάτος Ἑλληνες.

<sup>19</sup> On this novel, see the fundamental study by Hägg & Utas (2003).

Stephens and Winkler (1995: 286) reject the possibility of another feminine name, but from a syntactic standpoint, a nominative is a good option; furthermore, from a palaeographic point of view, an adverb such as αὐτίκ seems too short.

#### Line 8

We agree with Kaltsas's reading, οὐ γὰρ[ρ] ἦν, which completes line 8, together with the complement μέ[νειν], which coincides with our proposal and would make sense of the phrase: «as it was not safe for her to stay».

#### Line 9

The particle γάρ followed by the infinitive δοῦναι proposed by Lavagnini and maintained by Stephens and Winkler, would no longer make sense here, but the participle προδοῦ[ς]η would; this would agree with αὐτῆι and would be followed by the particle μὲν, as suggested by Kaltsas.

The same is the case with βουλάς, «designs, plans», according to Lavagnini's reading, maintained by Stephens and Winkler as well as Kaltsas, and it fits better with the narrative context of these lines than the reading δούλας, «slaves», proposed by Norsa. The papyrus then presents an upper dot.

#### Lines 11–12

The reading of some of the letters is unclear in l.11, but Kaltsas ventures καὶ γὰρ ἔσωσεν Ἄνθειαν οὐ δοῦσα τὸ φάρμακον καὶ κατακρύψασα..., «because she (the woman in l.7) has saved Antheia by not giving her the poison and hiding...». Kaltsas himself admits the syntactic difficulty involved in reading these lines.

In *Calligone* (PSI 981.II.28–31), Eubiotus, fearing that the Pontic princess may commit some folly, has hidden her weapon ἐτύγχανεν δὲ αὐτὸ (τὸ ἐγχειρίδιον) [ὁ] Εὐβίοτος εἰ[ύθ]υ κατὰ τὴν [ἔφ]οδον σπαράμενος ἐκ [το]ῦ κολοῦ καὶ λαθῶν.

#### Lines 12–13

In lines 12–13, ὡς μάλιτα may refer to what follows. Kaltsas (2020: 33) can read περιεγίνεται (l.13), with iotacism, instead of the regular form περιεγένητο.

The meaning of the verb περιγινομαι has been glossed by the grammarians, as can be seen in Timaeus Soph. Grammaticus *Lexicon Platonicum* pi. 1000a.30 'Περιεγένετο' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνίκησε γενικῆ, ὅπερ καὶ 'Περιγένονεν' εὐρηται. Πλάτων ἐν τῇ τοῦ Σωκράτους ἀπολογία· «τῷ αὐτῷ οἰόμενος περιγεγονέναι, ὥπερ καὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν». Other examples of this verb are given in D.S.11.81.6 καὶ κατὰ κράτος περιεγένετο τῶν ἀντιπαθόντων; and Plut. *Parallela minora* 309D4 ὁ δὲ τρίτος τοῦνομα Κριτόλαος στρατηγῆματι περιεγένετο τῶν Δημοστράτου.

The indirect narration of the previous facts by the interlocutors would end on this line. Next, we return to their direct speech.

#### Line 14

This can be read as [ο]ὔδ' ἔχ[ω] λέγειν, φίλτατε, or, according to Kaltsas, [π]ῶς ἔχ[ε]ι, λέγε, ὦ φίλτατε. Stephens and Winkler (1995: 286) provide a reading of the papyrus, which has an upper dot after φίλτατε, leading us to conclude that Kaltsas's proposal is better.

#### Line 15

In l.15, previous editors have given the expression ὑπὸ ἀρπαγῆς, which is consistent with novelistic plots and appears in fourth century AD authors such as Ioannes Chrys. *De eleemosyna* 60 Καὶ ἐνίστε ἔχεις τὸν οἶκον ἀπὸ ἀρπαγῆς, ἀπὸ πλεονεξίας. However, Kaltsas proposes a completely different reading, ὁ Σπ[αρ]τιάτης, which would refer to the Lysander mentioned in the same line, who Kaltsas identifies with the famous Spartan general of Xen. *Hell.* 1–3, to whom we referred earlier (l.3–4). Kaltsas's reading seems opportune. Although the order of the words in the text might appear unusual, it should be noted that this is not new in this papyrus, particularly for example in column l.15–16 (πολλῶν ἀπολογησαμένων ἡμεῶν φόνων), and may be comparable with D.S.14.3.4 ἀντιλογίας δὲ γενομένης περὶ τούτων ἐπί τινας ἡμέρας, οἱ τὰς ὀλιγαρχίας αἰρούμενοι πρὸς Λύσανδρον διεπρεσβεύσαντο τὸν Σπαρτιάτην– οὗτος γὰρ καταλυθέντος τοῦ πολέμου τὰ κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ἀπέσταλτο διοικῆσαι... (cf. 14.13.1 Λύσανδρος δὲ ὁ Σπαρτιάτης ἐπειδὴ πάσας τὰς ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίους πόλεις δῶκε...). In addition, Kaltsas refers to the Cleander who appears in Xen. *Ana.* 6.6.29 Εκ τούτου οἱ μὲν ἀμφὶ Κλέανδρον ἠρίστων..., a text that also cites a Δρακόντιον τὸν Σπαρτιάτην,

one of the four characters with this ethnic adjective in Xenophon, according to the TLG. We think that the fact that both Cleander (above, 1.6) and Lysander are mentioned together in Hell. 7.1 is more telling.

#### Line 17

We favour the reading ἐξή[τ]ητο proposed by Kaltsas over the options ἐξήρητο, ἐξήρητο or ἐξέριπτο proposed by Stephens and Winkler.

#### Lines 18–19

Lastly, we propose the following reading for 1.19: διηγήματι ἔχοντι τὸ ἄπιστον καὶ παράδο[ξον]. These latter adjectives also appear in Chariton (Charit. 2.8.3 φιλόνηκος γὰρ ἡ δαίμων, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀνέπιστον παρ' αὐτῆ· καὶ τότε οὖν πρᾶγμα παράδοξον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄπιστον κατώρθωκεν), an author who usually insists on his novel as διήγημα: as is well known, these adjectives are characteristic of paradoxography, which includes novels such as the one by Antonius Diogenes and authors such as Aelianus (cf. Ael., NA 3.1.30 καὶ ἐκ τούτων καὶ φωνῆς τῆς προειρημένης ἀκούειν τοὺς θῆρας, οὐδὲν οὔτε ἄπιστον οὔτε παράδοξον).<sup>20</sup>

The scene in the second column seems to correspond to a previous moment in the plot and its dénouement. Morgan's proposal (2018: 88) that the narrator in this column is the main character, and therefore cannot be Antheia, is plausible, but another interpretation of the scene is also possible. In effect, a final recapitulation of the plot, in the form of a *diegema*, can be seen in Char. 8.7–8, while the final dialogue between the two lovers in X. Ephes. 5.14 recapitulates the various twists and turns of the plot. In our papyrus, some loose ends remain at the end of the action: the narrator says that he does not know Antheia's fate and therefore the novel cannot end here, whether Antheia is the protagonist or not. The interlocutors may be faithful friends of the heroes, as is usual in the genre. Therefore, this end may correspond to the end of a book in the novel rather than to the end of the novel itself; in addition, the papyrus continues in the third column. In contrast, it seems clear that the narrator of this column, which we shall quote, is indeed one of the protagonists.

#### Column 3

##### Line 1

The third column is barely preserved, but nevertheless contains some significant terms. This column concerns another account related in the first person, no doubt by one of the main characters, who has escaped (ἐσωζόμεν, 1.1) from a great danger, perhaps from several vicissitudes, as it is typical of these love novels.

#### Lines 1–8

In 3.2, ταύρων may refer to «bulls» or to the «Taurians». Mention of the goddess Artemis, Ἄρτεμιν (3.7), and of guile on someone's part, in the participle ψευσαμεν- (1.8), fits with a genre in which divine help and female cunning are customary, and again suggests the possibility that *Iphigenia among the Taurians* is one of this novel's fundamental hypotexts, as it seems to be for Ach. Tat. 8.2.3, where reference is made to the Taurians and to the Artemis of the Scythians. Consequently, we incline towards the «Taurians».<sup>21</sup> In this respect, it should be noted that the name of the goddess appears in PSI 981, 20 (second century AD), where she is bitterly reproached by the protagonist, Calligone, and in another papyrus (PMed. Inv.36, third century AD) describing a war scene and presenting some novelistic characteristics, which uses the noun θαλάττης.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> It should be noted that of all Euripides' plays, *Iphigenia among the Taurians* presents the highest use of the adjective ἄπιστον and the noun θαῦμα, according to the TLG. The adjective παράδοξον does not appear in the tragedies. Of course, Euripides, the most «tragic» author according to Arist. Po. 1453a 29–30, was particularly fond of using vocabulary with this semantics.

<sup>21</sup> It is less probable that Ταύρων is a name, although it is attested in LGPN III A. We compare our papyrus with historical sources in a forthcoming paper: «Warrior women in papyrological fragments».

<sup>22</sup> For the former, see Stephens and Winkler (1995: 267–76), López Martínez (1998: 145–55) and (forthcoming), Ruiz-Montero (forthcoming); for the latter, see López Martínez (1998: 353–356, n.39), catalogued as *valde incertum*, and López Martínez and Ruiz-Montero («P. Med. inv. 36: novel or historiography?»).

## Line 19

The adjective *κακίς* (1.19) appears in Char.7.3.4, used by the hero to refer to the Persian king Artaxerxes, and also by the protagonist of *Calligone* (PSI 981, 32–33), who exclaims: «ὦ πάντων ἀνθρώπων κάκιστε», using a cliché that dates back to *Medea*.<sup>23</sup> It is interesting that Char. 2.9.3 depicts *Medea* as «Scythian» and an example of cruelty.

Euripides' tragic heroines, so active and so cunning, are paradigms of the fearless and passionate female protagonists of the novels. As is well known and attested in the papyri, Euripides was the most popular author in the empire after Homer.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, we believe that this fragment may shed light on one of the main sources for the novelistic genre besides sensationalist historiography, one of whose principal exponents was Ctesias. In addition, the phraseology of the text is comparable to that of the imperial historians.

## Conclusions

We shall now discuss some linguistic aspects that may shed more light on the date of the novel. The first of these is the existence of some Attic traits, such as the accusative *νεῶν*, «temple», in col. 1.6. Use of the double *τ* in *θάλατ-ταν* (col 2.1–2) is typical of the historian Xenophon and was common in the second century AD among imperial prose writers. It was especially frequent in Appian and Arrian and was a conscious Atticism. The same is the case of the suffix *-ικός* (col. 1.13), which appears regularly in Aristophanes' comedies as well as being popular among classic Attic prose writers.<sup>25</sup>

The text reflects a tendency to avoid the hiatus while maintaining a certain degree of flexibility, as is the case in other novels, especially in Chariton: it appears after *καί* and *δέ* (*δέ ἐπει*, 1.6; *δέ ἀνατείνασα*, 1.6; *δέ ἀναράπασα*, 2.5; *καί εἴ*, 2.7; *δέ ἐξέπλεγευεν*, 2.7–8; *δέ Ἀνθ[ε]ί[α]*, 2.10; and *δέ Ἀνθείας*, 2.13), after the definite article (*τὸ ἄριςτον*, 2.19), after *μήτε* (*[μήτ]ε ἀνακτῆναι*, 1.5), between two sentences (*-λαθοῦσα· οὐ*, 2.8 and *περιεγένετο· τὰ δὲ Ἀνθείας*, 2.13), after the vocative (*φίλιτατε, οὐκ οἶδα, ἔφη*, 2.14), next to *ι*, which would not count as a hiatus because of the semivowel (*ἰατι ἔχοντι*, 2.19) and, in the same example as above, before and after *ἔφη(ν)* in direct speech. As in Chariton, it also appears before a verb prefix in *:ἰκου ἀνέκτρεφεν*, (1.13). However, on some occasions, usage differs from that in Chariton, for example *δ[ῆλ]α ταῦτα ἄσασιν* in 2.7 and *ωρα α-* in 3.19. These instances are difficult to explain,<sup>26</sup> but may be conscious archaisms, as in the case of Xenophon of Ephesus.<sup>27</sup>

The absence of the article in proper names is a notable feature of this novel, being rare in other novelistic papyri, and according to Schmid,<sup>28</sup> who discussed it in relation to Philostratus, it is an Atticism. We consider it a conscious archaism. We would also like to draw attention to use of the historical present in column 2, which is characteristic of Ionian logography and typical of Xenophon of Athens, and was subsequently imitated by the novelist of the same name. It is no coincidence that the *Suda* cites three Xenophons as *historikoi*, one of them Xenophon of Ephesus, who used a very illustrative pseudonym and whose sources included Ionian logography and Euripides' tragedies.<sup>29</sup>

Nine characters appear in the 20 lines of the second column, of whom at least six are named, leaving two interlocutors unnamed (one of whom is definitely male, as we have explained), and the possible scribe. The names «Antheia» and «Euxinus» also appear in the novel by Xenophon of Ephesus, she as the protagonist, with the form Ἀνθία, and he as a pirate, which may or may not be the same role he plays here. If we accept that it is possible to have speaking names based on the physical description, social status or role in the novel of a character, as occurs in Xenophon of Ephesus and other novels, the following can be deduced: «Lysippus», «Euxinus», «Thraseas», «Cleander» and «Lysander» (Λύσιππος, Εὐξείνος, Θρασεάς,

<sup>23</sup> See López Martínez (1998: 152–153) and Ruiz–Montero (2011: 14, n. 35).

<sup>24</sup> For the papyri, see Criboire (2001: 197ff), and for Euripides' «novelistic» tragedies, see Wright (2009).

<sup>25</sup> Chantraine (1979: 384–393).

<sup>26</sup> On the hiatus in novelistic fragments, cf. Reeve (1971), and López Martínez: «Yawning matters. What can hiatus tell us about the Wonders beyond Thule?» (forthcoming).

<sup>27</sup> See Ruiz–Montero (1994: 1117–1118).

<sup>28</sup> Schmid (1964: 4.64).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Ruiz–Montero (1994: 1088–1138), and Tagliabue (2017).

Κλεάνδρος, Λύκανδρος) are names associated with aristocracy and power; in the case of Thraseas, the name might indicate a strong, valient man like the «Thersander» of Achilles Tatius. «Euxinus» may be related to the sea (he is a pirate in Xenophon) or he may have been hospitable to the heroes in some way: the *Ephesian Tale* features Hippothous, another brigand who first captures and then helps the heroes. «Lysander», another possible speaking name, according to the text, has abducted her, but in fact has released her and delivered her to Thraseas. We have already seen that Cleander and Lysander may be characters with some historical basis. All of these names appear in imperial inscriptions.<sup>30</sup>

Of particular interest is the name Θαλασσία, which would be translated as «Marina», which in this novel corresponds to a valient woman, perhaps a warrior, like the Calligone of P.Oxy 5355, who recalls the Artemisia of Halicarnassus cited in Hdt 7.99: her courage, he says, was equal to or greater than that of a man, and she actively participated in the Battle of Salamis. In this case, Thalassia, who would be equivalent to a pirate in modern fantasy, appears to form a couple with the also brave Thraseas, a local king or magnate, and perhaps at first she didn't support the cause of Antheia, who may be the heroine. We shall return to this point. Nonetheless, the novel's setting is presented as historical, and in this case one might think that Antheia has been stripped of her power, which she would recover at the end of the novel, in the style of heroines such as Parthenope or Charicleia; however, the autobiographical tale in column 2 calls this hypothesis into question.<sup>31</sup> The name «Thalassia» is documented in Greek inscriptions in Asia Minor from the Hellenistic period onwards.<sup>32</sup> We shall return later to this character.

«Antheia», «flower», that is, «Fleur» is the kind of romantic name typical of the novelistic genre that would become a tradition, as can be seen in the first Spanish «Byzantine» novel from the 16th century, *Los amores de Clareo y Florisea y los trabajos de la sin ventura Isea*. The name has a long tradition and was widely used throughout the empire. This feminine form rarely appears in inscriptions, but is common in other feminine and masculine forms with the same root. The form Ἄνθεια appears in inscriptions from Chios (Ἄνθε[ια], first century BC) and Messene (first century AD);<sup>33</sup> Ἀνθία is the name of the protagonist of Xenophon's novel, as mentioned above, and it also appears in this form in an inscription from Magnesia, dated to around 298–310 AD.<sup>34</sup> It is an apt name for the protagonist of a romance, comparable to Parthenope, Calligone, Callirhoe and Chione. However, Rhode is the name of a female slave of the main characters in the novel by Xenophon of Ephesus.

As mentioned earlier, we do not know the name of the male protagonist nor that of the interlocutors in the dialogue. The narrator lists the possible characters that the heroes will meet on their travels. Earlier, we mentioned the dénouements of the novels by Chariton and Xenophon; this procedure also occurs in the novel by Antonius Diogenes and in later ones by Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus. The characters report what has happened, thus recapitulating the plot using an epic technique.

In our novel, as in that by Diogenes, there is evidence of considerable narrative complexity, probably with intercalated secondary plots using a Chinese box structure. The *Antheia* novel would therefore contain the typical elements of the genre: journeys, abductions, love stories, possible suicides, poison, captivity, fighting and letters. The protagonism of the female characters recalls that of *Parthenope*, *Calligone*, *Ephesian Tales*, *Babylonian Tales* and *Aethiopian Tales*, the last in the genre. We do not know the extent to which this novel presented two parallel narrative threads such as those observed in Xenophon of Ephesus.

López Martínez (1998: 305) has placed the novel in the Crimean Peninsula, on the basis, among other reasons, of the possible mention of the Taurians and the goddess Artemis. Similarly, she (1998: 306) has suggested a connection between the author of our fragment and Xenophon of Ephesus, in the sense that *Antheia* may have been a model for *Ephesian Tales* or vice versa. Recently, Morgan (2018: 89–90) has delved

<sup>30</sup> Morgan (2018: 87–88) also refers to the speakers' possible names in the fragment, and gives figures taken from the LGPN. Lysippus, Lysander, and Cleander are labelled «warriors» (ibid., 88).

<sup>31</sup> Morgan (2018: 89) does not believe that she is the protagonist.

<sup>32</sup> A «Thalassia» is mentioned between 140–124 BC in Tylos, who was a queen, the wife of King Hyspoasines. There are other examples from the imperial period (LGPN V A) and in Rome (IGUR II 577). Morgan (2018: 87, n.11) only mentions CIL VI 10112, which refers to a female mime artist.

<sup>33</sup> BSA 61 (1966: 199 n. 3.25) and IG V (1) 1482, according to the online version of the LGPN [accessed on 16 January 2020].

<sup>34</sup> IMM 122 a, 7 and Chiron 37 (2007: 442, n. 30) Ἀνθιαρή (estate), according to the online version of the LGPN (accessed on 16 January 2020).



further into this question, suggesting that the fragment corresponds to an intercultural story located beyond Greece, in Scythia, whose protagonist may have been an Amazon in love with a Greek.

Morgan (2018: 89–90) has also associated *Antheia* with the fragments of *Calligone* and *Chione*, arguing that Amazons play a prominent role in all of them and correspond to the stereotype of fictional characters that embody an ideal of independent women who are mistresses of their fate, along the lines of Heliodorus' *Charicleia* or *Arsake*. In addition, Morgan (2018: 96) sees a connection between *Antheia* and Xenophon because the Amazons were closely associated with Ephesus and played an important role in the foundation of the Artemision and perhaps even of the city itself. Although Morgan (2018: 89–90) takes the connection between Ephesus and the Amazons too far, we believe that *Thalassia* did indeed look like an «Amazon admiral», but we do not know if *Antheia* did so as well. Morgan also suggests that a penchant for the Scythian landscape was typical of the Second Sophistic. However, Colchis is mentioned in fragment C of *Ninus*, a novel that was written before the Second Sophistic, and in addition, a taste for «barbarian» exoticism is already evident in Euripides, above all in *Helen* and *Iphigenia among the Taurians*.<sup>35</sup>

In the case of that the reading *Artoxares* were correct, a historical context related to the Persians would be plausible, and this would lead us back to the first novels, comparable with *Parthenope* and *Callirhoe*, both from the first century AD. *Ninus*, *Parthenope*, *Sesonchosis*, the *History of Apollonius King of Tyre*, only preserved in Latin, and the *Aethiopian Tales* all have characters who are dispossessed of their thrones or power and regain them at the end. There are probably other instances, although restoration of the initial *eutychia* (Po. 1451a13ff.) is mandatory in all Greek novels. This also appears to be the case in *Antheia*. Nevertheless, a similar historical context also appears in the *Babylonian Tales*, written by Iamblichus ca. 180 AD, but does not appear in the *Ephesian Tales*, which may be earlier, and this point should also be taken into account. We should clarify that we do not think our papyrus corresponds to this latter novel, although it seems logical to assume that one may have informed the other. Although it is difficult to establish which of them is earlier, we would be inclined to give precedence to our papyrus because of the historical–legendary setting and the aspiration to historicity, as we have discussed earlier. For all the above reasons, we propose a date between the first and second centuries AD for the novel.

Kaltsas places the novel's plot at the end of the Peloponnesian War, on the island of Samos, and the violent desecration of the temple, τὸν νεῶν, described in the first column (I.6) would have taken place in the island's famous Heraion. Samos is one of the settings of another lost historical novel, *Parthenope*, daughter of the tyrant Polycrates. We agree with Kaltsas in that the start of the second column would thus refer to the battles incited by the Spartan Lysander on the island, τὴν κατάστασιν [π]ᾶσαν τ[ῆς] ἐν Σά[μω] πολιτ[ε]ίας (II.3–4), «the entire political situation in Samos». According to Kaltsas, the novel's other setting could be the nearby city of Ephesus, with the protagonists' first encounter taking place in that city's Heraion. Kaltsas suggests that *Thalassia* is a villain who attempts to poison the protagonist, *Antheia*, whom she has abducted. However, a third woman, probably the one referred to as ἡ δὲ (I.16), whose name may end in -τις (II.7–8), rescues her from death by poisoning by not administering the poison *Thalassia* had intended for her.

Our opinion is that *Thalassia* is not necessarily a negative character or the protagonist's enemy, but might instead be a mercenary working for either of the opposing two sides in the war. Herodotus was a fundamental hypotext for the novel featuring *Parthenope*, and may also have served the same function for this lost novel featuring *Antheia*. The character of the brave, seafaring queen *Artemisia* may be a model, as may the circumstances of the period itself, because there is evidence of the existence of *navicularii*, women who owned ships and fleets and even served as ship's captains, as documented in D. 14.1.1.15 Ulpian, D. 14.1.1.16 and 19.2.19 (21).7.

Lastly, we should mention the material on which the manuscript is written. The material was reused, since the novel was copied onto the verso of a papyrus, the recto of which contains a passage from Demosthenes' speech, *On the Crown*. From this one can deduce that its owner was interested in refined literature, which further supports our hypothesis that the Greek novel represented «light reading» for

<sup>35</sup> We refer to Wright (2009: 177–202): there are 27 instances of the adjective *barbaros* in the former tragedy and 15 in the latter (2009: 178, n. 69), a higher figure than in any of his other works.

educated people and was not therefore a «plebeian» or «minor» genre but rather another expression of the *paideia* of the Second Sophistic.<sup>36</sup>

## References

- Bettinetti, Simona (2001). *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca*. Levante Editore.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo (1996). Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere. In Pecere, Oronzo and Stramaglia, Antonio (Eds.). *La Letteratura di Consumo nel Mondo Greco-Latino* (pp. 11–46). Università degli Studi di Cassino.
- Chantraine, Pierre (1979) [1933]. *La formation des noms en Grec ancien*. Klincksieck.
- Criboire, Raffaella (2001). *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton University Press.
- Degni, Paola (1998). 13.6.726. In Cavallo, Guglielmo, Crisci, Edoardo, Messeri, Gabriela and Pintaudi, Rosario (Eds.) *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico*. Mostra di Papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana 25 agosto–25 settembre 1998. Gonelli, p. 94, tav. XII.
- Devambez, Pierre (1981). Amazones. LIMC 1.
- Hägg, Tomas & Utas, Bo (2003). *The Virgin and her Lover. Fragments of an Ancient Greek Novel*. Brill.
- Kaltsas, Demokritos (2020). Antheia–Fragment: PSI VI 726. ZPE 216.
- Lavagnini, Bruno (1922). *Eroticorum Scriptorum Fragmenta Papyracea*. Teubner.
- LGPN (1987). *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, I, III.A, III.B, IV and V.A*. (Ed. by Fraser, Peter and Matthews, Elaine). Clarendon Press.
- LIMC (1984). *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (8 vols.). Artemis Verlag.
- López Martínez, María Paz (1998). *Fragmentos papiráceos de novela griega*. Universidad de Alicante.
- (2021). Calígone y su aventura con las amazonas (POxy. 5355 y PSI 981). In Rodríguez López, Rosalía. *Mujeres de la Hispania Romana. Una Mirada al patrimonio arqueológico* (pp. 165–189).
- ¿Existió también una Crísida novelesca? Erat Olim. Forthcoming.
- Yawning matters. What can hiatus tell us about the Wonders beyond Thule? In: Jackson, Claire Rachel and ní Mheallaigh, Karen (Eds.). *The Thulean zone: new frontiers in fiction with Antonius Diogenes*. Cambridge University Publishing. Forthcoming.
- López Martínez, María Paz and Ruiz–Montero, Consuelo (2019). Magia y erotismo en la novela griega: P. Oxy. 4945 de las Feniciacas de Loliano. In Martos Montiel, Juan Francisco et alii (Eds.). *Plutarco entre dioses y astros. Homenaje al Profesor Aurelio Pérez Jiménez* (pp. 1223–1249). Libros Pórtico, vol. II.
- *PMEd.inv.36: novel or historiography?* (forthcoming).
- Warrior women in papyrological fragments of Greek Novels, The Reality of Women in the Universe of Ancient Fiction (forthcoming).
- Morgan, John (2018). A Cast of Thousands': The Riddle of the Antheia Romance solved (?). In Chew, Kathryn, Morgan, John and Trzaskoma, Stephen (Eds.). *Literary Currents and Romantic Forms: Essays in Memory of Bryan Reardon* (pp. 81–98) Barkhuis.
- Norsa, Medea (1920). Frammento di romanzo. PSI 6, 163–165.

---

<sup>36</sup> We hope to go further into all these questions in the chapter we are preparing regarding Women warriors in the fragments of Greek novels for the volume in preparation *The Reality of Women in the Universe of Ancient Fiction*.

- Parsons, Peter John (2007). 4811. Novel (Panionis). *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 76, 47–53.
- (2018). 5355. Novel (Calligone), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 83, 63–72.
- Reeve, Michael David (1971). Hiatus in the Greek Novelists. *CQ*, 21, 514–539.
- Ruiz–Montero, Consuelo (1994). Xenophon von Ephesos: ein Überblick. *ANRW*, I (34.2), 1117–1138.
- (2011). Mujeres desesperadas: tipología de la «enamorada asesina» en la novela griega. In de Martino, Francesco & Morenilla, Carmen (Eds.). *La mirada de las mujeres* (pp. 381–402). Levante Editore.
- (2020) La novela de *Calígone*: el texto y su contexto literario. in: L. Conti et alii (eds.) *Homenaje a Emilio Crespo*, Madrid, 499–508.
- Scheer, Tanja Sussane (2000). *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild. Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik*. Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Schmid, Wilhem (1964) [1897]. *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*. Georg Olms, 5 vols.
- Stephens, Susan and Winkler, John (1995). *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Princeton University Press.
- Tagliabue, Aldo (2017). *Xenophon´s Ephesiaca. A paraliterary love–story from the Ancient World*. Barkhuis.
- Wright, Matthew (2009). *Euripides´Escape–Tragedies. A study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians*. Oxford University Press.