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1. *Introduction: what is hiatus, and why does it matter?*

The aim of this study is to contextualize the fragments of the *The Wonders beyond Thule* in the set of lost novels that have come to us in papyri to gain a fuller understanding of this novel’s stylistic ambitions in comparison with its fragmentary fellow-texts.¹ To do this, I will devote special attention to a specific issue which offers valuable information about the style and literary level of the text: the treatment of hiatus.

Following Devine and Stephens: “Hiatus denotes a situation where a syllable ending in a vowel stands before a syllable beginning with a vowel, particularly if a word boundary intervenes between the two syllables; the result is a sequence of sounds both of which have the degree of sonority normally associated with a syllable nuclei. A sequence of two contiguous nuclei in fluent speech does not conform to the preferential structure of syllables sequences, in which nuclei are separated by margins”.²

I am not the first to acknowledge that the subject of hiatus is not – at first glance – very exciting. Reeve conceded as much in the opening remark of

---

¹ Occasionally, a same papyrus compresses several fragments – they could be even in different libraries –. It is clear that the papyri themselves are, in turn, fragments of a complete roll or codex.

his magisterial article of 1971: ‘Life offers various amusements, and anyone these days who can choose among them will come late to the study of hiatus in Greek prose.’ Nevertheless, paying attention to the presence (or absence) of hiatus yields valuable rewards for it helps us to determine the literary ambitions of an author or the literary register of a passage in a text. The liberty with which Greek prose writers permitted hiatus is one of the criteria that, since antiquity, has been used to measure the status of a literary author, with Isocrates as the most extreme example of the tendency to avoid it. Hiatus could be also linked with the type of discourse in each particular passage of the same work, in the sense that an author could not follow a consistent policy throughout the whole text because a great set piece might require more polish than a rapid narrative, for example. Hiatus relates too to the practice of the scribe and other material issues involved in the support and transmission of the text. Data relating to the practice of retaining or eliding final vowels in a text (scriptio plena / scriptio elisa respectively) and the appearance or not of the apostrophe are usually provided in the bibliography.

When studying hiatus, we are, therefore, facing a complex problem in which many factors are involved: spelling, pronunciation, rhythmical prose, type of clause, and emphasis for pronouncing the speech. In previous

---

3 Reeve 1971, 514.
4 Parsons 2016b, 16. Regarding the deliberate use of hiatus with stylistic purpose in Attic orators, see Pearson 1975 and 1978.
5 Almost all the editiones principes – that is named the first editions of these texts – of Greek papyri make specific reference to the work of the scribe regarding the hiatus. I will try to clarify the distinction between the practice of the author and the practice of the scribes although it will be not easy to distinguish because sometimes the role each one plays is not very clear. Of course, the ‘intellectual property’ over the text corresponds only to the author, but the scribe – as he is also a reader – could be more or less scrupulous speaking, reading and writing the text. At the end, he is able to introduce a number of additional changes – sometimes of not minor importance – regarding accent, pronunciation, spelling and/or punctuation. In this sense, we could say that the scribe has certain auctoritas over the text. If I may, it is comparable with the capacity of the actor with the text written by the dramatist.
6 Scriptio plena refers to an unelided vowel before another vowel (e.g., the last short vowel of δέ before another vowel). The opposite is scriptio elisa, (e.g., δ'). This elision can be indicated by apostrophe or not. Apostrophe is the mark ’ resembling a reversed letter C that is used by the scribe who copies the papyri to indicate the elision of a vowel. Regarding the conditioning of elision in Greek, Heding 2000. I take this opportunity to thank Francisca Pordomingo from the University of Salamanca for providing me with her contribution – Pordomingo 2016 – when it was still awaiting publication, and Antonio Stramaglia for informing me about Rohden 1875.
editions of Greek prose, the tendency was to elide the final vowels almost mechanically. This was done in the case of particles, conjunctions, prepositions (except περί and πρό), combinations like μᾶλ’ εὖ, μᾶ Δί and other sophistry contained in the manual by Lejeune. However, the validity of this editorial procedure is currently under review, and as a result, many final vowels have now been restored where the editorial tradition had previously elided them. This has happened in recent editions of the speeches of Demosthenes, for example.

So what tendencies do we see among the texts of the ancient novelists? All novelists allow hiatus freely after καὶ and δέ, between sentences and after the definite article. Hiatus is also quite common in the following positions: before ἀλλά, ἤ, οὐδέ, a second οὐτε, a second εἴτε; before μέν, δέ; before and after a vocative; before or after an adverbial clause or noun clause; before or after a participial phrase; before or after a parenthetic or epexegetic clause or phrase; before a relative clause; before asyndeton; before and after direct speech and the verb ἔφη(ν). In addition to Reeve’s classification, I include the positions in contact with ι and υ of the diphthong because both of them could be pronounced as a semivowel and could not be counted as hiatus. To illustrate some of these tendencies, I will begin with a brief survey of Chariton’s practice in his novel, Chaereas and Callirhoe, which is the benchmark for my comparative analysis of Diogenes’ text.

2. Case-study: Chariton

Of the novelists whose complete texts have been preserved, I have chosen Chariton for three fundamental reasons: firstly, because there are two recent editions of Greek prose, the tendency was to elide the final vowels almost mechanically. This was done in the case of particles, conjunctions, prepositions (except περί and πρό), combinations like μᾶλ’ εὖ, μᾶ Δί and other sophistry contained in the manual by Lejeune. However, the validity of this editorial procedure is currently under review, and as a result, many final vowels have now been restored where the editorial tradition had previously elided them. This has happened in recent editions of the speeches of Demosthenes, for example.

So what tendencies do we see among the texts of the ancient novelists? All novelists allow hiatus freely after καὶ and δέ, between sentences and after the definite article. Hiatus is also quite common in the following positions: before ἀλλά, ἤ, οὐδέ, a second οὐτε, a second εἴτε; before μέν, δέ; before and after a vocative; before or after an adverbial clause or noun clause; before or after a participial phrase; before or after a parenthetic or epexegetic clause or phrase; before a relative clause; before asyndeton; before and after direct speech and the verb ἔφη(ν). In addition to Reeve’s classification, I include the positions in contact with ι and υ of the diphthong because both of them could be pronounced as a semivowel and could not be counted as hiatus. To illustrate some of these tendencies, I will begin with a brief survey of Chariton’s practice in his novel, Chaereas and Callirhoe, which is the benchmark for my comparative analysis of Diogenes’ text.

2. Case-study: Chariton

Of the novelists whose complete texts have been preserved, I have chosen Chariton for three fundamental reasons: firstly, because there are two recent editions of Greek prose, the tendency was to elide the final vowels almost mechanically. This was done in the case of particles, conjunctions, prepositions (except περί and πρό), combinations like μᾶλ’ εὖ, μᾶ Δί and other sophistry contained in the manual by Lejeune. However, the validity of this editorial procedure is currently under review, and as a result, many final vowels have now been restored where the editorial tradition had previously elided them. This has happened in recent editions of the speeches of Demosthenes, for example.

So what tendencies do we see among the texts of the ancient novelists? All novelists allow hiatus freely after καὶ and δέ, between sentences and after the definite article. Hiatus is also quite common in the following positions: before ἀλλά, ἤ, οὐδέ, a second οὐτε, a second εἴτε; before μέν, δέ; before and after a vocative; before or after an adverbial clause or noun clause; before or after a participial phrase; before or after a parenthetic or epexegetic clause or phrase; before a relative clause; before asyndeton; before and after direct speech and the verb ἔφη(ν). In addition to Reeve’s classification, I include the positions in contact with ι and υ of the diphthong because both of them could be pronounced as a semivowel and could not be counted as hiatus. To illustrate some of these tendencies, I will begin with a brief survey of Chariton’s practice in his novel, Chaereas and Callirhoe, which is the benchmark for my comparative analysis of Diogenes’ text.
editions available;\(^\text{15}\) secondly, because four papyri fragments have been preserved, apart from a fragment of a codex that is now lost,\(^\text{16}\) and, finally, because it is likely that Chariton and Antonius Diogenes came from the same geographical region, Aphrodisias, and could even have been contemporaries.

The general opinion is that Chariton avoids hiatus. However, this is an over-simplification of his practice, as we shall see. However, we should not confuse greater permissiveness regarding hiatus with literary negligence, for sometimes the presence of hiatus may be an intentional feature. It could even be a conscious imitation of the archaic style before Isocrates who, as we have seen, stringently avoided it.\(^\text{17}\)

The positions where Chariton permits hiatus freely are: after \(\mu \acute{\eta}, \bar{\eta}, \epsilon i, \mu \omicron, \epsilon o, \delta i, \tau i, \pi e \rho i, \epsilon u, \mu \epsilon, \pi \rho o, \delta, \bar{o}, \omicron\); after short vowels: \(\pi o \lambda \acute{\upsilon}\) (3 times), \(\pi a \nu \upsilon (2), \mu e t a \xi o (2), \) dative singular (11); before a verbal prefix (8); before augment (5); before \(\sigma \dot{o} \nu\) (4) and after \(\epsilon \pi e \delta \eta\) (2). On the basis of Blake’s edition,\(^\text{18}\) Reeve detected a total of 40 cases of hiatus that do not fit into these positions. Of these 40 cases, only 6 remain in the editions by Reardon 2004 and 16 in the case of Sanz Morales 2020.

Reardon himself explains in his preface the reasons why, in many cases, he avoided hiatus by changing the order of words or slightly modifying the text: ‘Reeve de hiatus disputavit, in aliis prosae orationis generibus multum tractato sed in his fabulis ut diu parvi factis ab editoribus fere neglecto. ac-
currate autem perspicienti clarum fit Charitonem saepe precepta ab Isocrate
constituta re vera observare, sed librarioin incuriam vel ipsorum usum tex-
tum auctoris deformasse; quam ob causam frequentius in hac editione verba transposita vel similis generis emendationes invenies’.\(^\text{19}\)

When the earlier edition by Blake was published, the papyri of this novel were as yet unknown. We now have four papyrus fragments,\(^\text{20}\) all of which

---

\(^\text{15}\) Reardon 2004 and Sanz Morales 2020, that I have just received. Regarding the critical editions of Charito, cf. Sanz Morales 2020, xv.

\(^\text{16}\) \(P.\) \(Oxy.\) 1019 + \(P.\) \(Oxy.\) 2948, \(P.\) \(Michael.\) 1 and \(P.\) \(Fay.\) 1.


\(^\text{18}\) Blake 1938.

\(^\text{19}\) ‘Reeve discussed the hiatus, a topic very often treated by the editors with respect to other genres of discourse in prose but almost neglected regarding these novels, not so much appreciated for a long time. However, it is evident to those who analyze it in detail that Chariton often observes the precepts established by Isocrates, but the carelessness of the scholars or of the authors themselves has distorted the text used; for this reason, in this edition you can find frequently transposed words or corrections of a similar type’ in Reardon 2004: XIII-IV. See also Sanz 2006, 452-3.

\(^\text{20}\) Cf. n. 14.
are from approximately the same period: second-third century, the period to which most of the Greek papyri found in Egypt belong. The papyri present a text that is very similar to that of the manuscript tradition, but some divergence also occurs, as the following three examples will show:21

I) 2.4.7
οὐκ ὁπόθεν ἦλθεν Π: οἶδας F22

In this first text, both Reardon and Sanz Morales adopt the reading of the manuscript without hiatus, οἶδας. In the papyrus, however, οἶδα appears in hiatus position, which has been attributed to a scribal error.

II) 2.4.8
Τίνα εἶδες Π: Τίνας F23

In this second case, both Reardon and Sanz Morales accept the reading of the papyrus with the singular pronoun, which has hiatus. Τίνας εἶδες, with the plural pronoun, is the reading in the manuscript.

III) 2.11.6
ἡ Πλαγγὼν ὑπέλαβεν κἀγὼ περὶ τούτων Π: ὑπολαβοῦσα ἔγωγε F24

In this last example, the papyrus reading without hiatus has been adopted by Reardon. The manuscript, however, presents a text with hiatus adopted by Sanz Morales: ὑπολαβοῦσα ἔγωγε. There are, however, difficulties in this passage because neither of the variants can be explained satisfactorily.25

Thus, two of the three reported cases of hiatus are from papyri versus the manuscript tradition. In conclusion, we can say that, without reaching Isocrates’s level of obsession, Chariton conspicuously avoids hiatus, but that this practice is more conspicuous in the manuscript tradition than in the papyri, where hiatus seems to be allowed more freely. This discrepancy between the two traditions highlights the important role played by the mode of

21 The first one is the text accepted by Reardon; the second, following the colon, are other variants. The Roman letter in capital F represents the reading of the manuscript and the Greek letter Π indicates that of the papyrus.
22 ‘You do not even know where he came from’.
23 ‘Who did you see?’
24 ‘Plangon interrupted her, I about it’.
transmission in matters of hiatus. We need to bear this in mind as we move to examine the texts that are preserved in the papyrological tradition only.

3. Fragments of lost novels

The editions of papyri by Stephens and Winkler and López-Martínez were very useful in their day but have now been superseded, because from 1998 to 2021 new texts and/or new studies about the fragments have been published. After López-Martínez (1998) fourteen new papyri have been added to this corpus: a short fragment from *Parthenope* (*P. Mich.* inv. 3402v); a fragment where the protagonist is a woman named Panionis (*P. Oxy.* 4811); a new episode of the *Φοινικικά* by Lollianus (*P. Oxy.* 4945); the papyrus recounting the sexual encounter between a donkey and a woman (*P. Oxy.* 4762); a fragment about Semiramis or a queen and her pyramids (*P.Oxy.* 5264); two new fragments of *Sesonchosis* (*P. Oxy.* 5262 and *P. Oxy.* 5263); a new text from *Calligone* (*P. Oxy.* 5355); a new fragment about certain Eusyene...

---


30 Obbink 2009. See also: Cioffi and Trnka-Amrhein 2010, Casanova 2014a, 2014b and 2019. I wonder if the fact that four particularly cultivated people, three of them connected to Oxyrhynchus, (the sophist Hoerdonius Lollianus from Ephesos, a teacher – *P. Oxy.* 3366 – and a literated woman – *P. Oxy.* 1467 and *P. Oxy.* 1475 –) are called Lollianos, is only a simple coincidence.


32 Trnka-Amrhein 2016c and López Martínez 2017c.

33 Trnka-Amrhein 2016a and 2016b.

(P.Oxy. 5356);\textsuperscript{35} and, finally, the three new fragments from \textit{Tà ὑπὲρ ὸούλην ἀπίστα} (P.Oxy. 4760, 4761 and 5354).\textsuperscript{36}

Hereinafter the fragments will be referred to by the following numbers: 1 (P.Berol. 6926 + P.Gen. 85), 2 (PSI 1305), 3 (O.Edfu. 306), 4 (P.Berol. 9588 + P.Berol. 7927 + P.Berol. 21179), 5 (P.Oxy. 435), 6 (P.Mich. inv. 3402\nu), 7 (O.Bodl. 2722), 8 (P.Oxy. 2466), 9 (P.Oxy. 3319), 10 (P.Oxy. 1826), 11 (P.Oxy. 5262), 12 (P.Oxy. 5263), 13 (P.Oxy. 4943), 14 (P.Tebt. 268), 15 (P.Oxy. 2539), 16 (P.Oxy. 4944), 17 (P.Oxy. 5264), 18 (PSI 981), 19 (P.Oxy. 5355), 20 (PSI 151), 21 (P.Mil. Vogl. 260), 22 (P.Oxy. 5356), 23 (P.Oxy. 4811), 24 (PSI 1220), 25 (P.Colon. inv. 3328), 26 (P.Oxy. 1368), 27 (P.Oxy. 4945), 28 (P.Oxy. 4762), 29 (PSI 1177), 30 (P.Oxy. 3012), 31 (P.Oxy. 4760), 32 (P.Oxy. 4761), and 33 (P.Oxy. 5354).

What picture, then, emerges from the papyrus fragments of lost novels, especially, in those cases where we have several papyrological testimonies:\textsuperscript{37} Ninus, Parthenope, Sesonchosis, Bellum Trojanum, Apollonius, Panionis, Calligone, Phoiniká, Ass and Ἀπίστα?\textsuperscript{38} We begin with two novels which are similar in a number of ways: \textit{Ninus} and \textit{Parthenope}. Both correspond to the early stages of the development of the genre; both enjoyed the same success in the Imperial period; both protagonists are mentioned in several historical sources (Thucydides, Herodotus, Ctesias and Diodorus, among others); Lucian quotes Ninus, along with Metiochus and Achilles;\textsuperscript{39} Ninus and Metiochos and Parthenope are depicted in two different mosaics from the same \textit{villa} that is known as “The House of the Man of Letters” in Antioch;\textsuperscript{40} and, finally, it is possible that both novels are related to the texts that we can read in two \textit{ostraca} from first century A.D.\textsuperscript{41}

\hfill
\textsuperscript{35} Parsons 2018.
\textsuperscript{36} Parsons 2006a, 2006b and 2018. Nunzio Bianchi identified a scholium in \textit{Codex Marcianus gr.} 450 which could possibly be another new fragment from this novel. Regarding texts and all the materials about Antonius Diogenes, cf. n. 65.
\textsuperscript{37} The editions of papyri of lost novels which have served as a reference to date have been those by Stephens and Winkler and López-Martínez. Stephens and Winkler 1995 – hereinafter S&W –; López-Martínez 1998a – hereinafter LM –, who is preparing a new edition of all the fragments of lost novels for the \textit{Bibliotheca Teubneriana}. The editions of reference before 1998 are Lavagnini 1922 and Zimmermann 1936. Kussl 1991 is not a comprehensive edition.
\textsuperscript{38} I have focused my research on clear readings. Supplements in the lacunae are excluded from this study.
\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Pseudol.} 25. Cf. Stramaglia 1996a, 129.
\textsuperscript{40} Regarding these mosaics: Levi 1947, Quet 1992, and Newby 2007.
\textsuperscript{41} Stramaglia 1996a and b, 120-7 and 151-3, S&W, 93-4 and LM, 68-9 and 135.
3.1 Ninus:
1 (PBerol. 6926 + PGen. 85), 2 (PSI1305) and 3 (OEdu. 306)\[^{42}\]

*Ninus* is the most important chapter in any publication about ancient lost novels, as its fragments are the oldest testimonies of the genre. *Ninus* consists of two different papyri (fragments 1 and 2). From a material point of view, they are professional, standard products for habitual readers. The texts are quite extensive – 315 lines in fragment 1 and 51 lines in fragment 2 – and their literary level is very high.\[^{43}\]

Papyrus 1 comprises three smaller pieces (A, B and C): the two largest are in Berlin (AB); the third, a much shorter one, in Geneva (C). The text appears in the *recto* and it is dated to the end of the first century B.C.\[^{44}\] In the *verso* there are some accounts that correspond to 100-101 A.D. The scribe practises elision (fragment B, column I, line 20 ὀδός αὖ-; B,II,25 ἄπ’ ἀντων; B,III,15 καθ’ ἥκαστον; B,III,20 ἡ κατ’ ἐκ; B,III,37 ἐπ’ Αἰγυπτίουϲ; A,II,16 δ’ ἑλάττωνοϲ; A,III,1 παρ’ ἡμίν; 11 δύ’ ἔτη; 21 μ’ ἐκδέχονται and A,IV,13 ἐϕ’ ὑμίν), which can be indicated using the apostrophe.

The features of papyrus 2 are very similar, and it too is dated to the first century A.D.\[^{45}\] The last literary testimony of this novel, fragment 3, is an *ostraca* from Apollinopolis Magna from the end of the first or beginning of the second century, whose reading and attribution are uncertain.\[^{46}\]

Based on papyrus 1, we would say that the author tends to avoid hiatus but retains the inherent flexibility of novelists.\[^{47}\] There is only one exception in A,III,197-198: τετρακαίδεκα ἐτῶν κυοφοροῦϲιν γυναίκεϲ καὶ τινεϲ, νῆ Δία, καὶ τίκτουϲιν.\[^{48}\] This case could be justified easily as an echo of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* (1,4,16), where it is stated that Cyrus, when he

---

\[^{44}\] I appreciate the valuable help of Fabian Reiter of Trier Universität, who is not responsible for the errors that I can make.
\[^{45}\] The papyrus is now in the Egyptian Museum in Alexandria. Bastianini 2010 published a new edition of this text accompanied by a commentary.
\[^{46}\] The *ostraca* are generally potsherd.
\[^{47}\] Regarding hiatus in this novel: Vitelli 1894.
\[^{48}\] ‘At fourteen years, women can get pregnant, and some, Oh Zeus, bear children’. I appreciate the interesting remark of Ewen Bowie of Oxford University about the clause τεσσαρα καὶ δεκ’ ἐτῶν in verse epigram. Other similar examples are: Παυλῖναν φθίμνη ἐννέα καὶ δέκ’ ἐτῶν / Ἀνδρόνικος ἰητρὸς ἀνὴρ, μνήμην ἁγιάζων, Cougny 1890, 706.1-3, and ὅτε τεττάρων μὲν καὶ δέκ’ ἐτῶν γεγενημένων ἀφ’ οὗ τὸν πατέρ’ ἡμῶν ἀφεῖσαν D. 38, 6.
reached the age of fifteen, was looking forward to marrying: ἀμφὶ δὲ τὰ πέντε ἕκκαιδεκα ἔτη γενομένου αὐτοῦ ὁ νίος τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων βασιλέως γαμεῖν μέλλων ἐπεθύμησε. 49 It is clear that this work by Xenophon is one of the models by which Ninus is inspired. In the case of papyrus 2, the author also permits the hiatus in the positions that we find in Reeve’s classification. Despite the brevity of fragment 3, we see that the treatment of hiatus corresponds to that of the papyri (καὶ εὖ σύκ ἄγν[οεῖϲ τὴν] λέϲχην· οὔτε ν[υ-κτόϲ] γὰρ οὔτε ἡμ[έραϲ κα]βεύδω). 50

3.2 Parthenope:

4 (P.Berol. 9588 + P.Berol. 7927 + P.Berol. 21179), 5 (P.Oxy. 435), 6 (P.Mich. inv. 3402v) and 7 (O.Bodl. 2722) 51

Parthenope consists of three papyri with many lacunae and an ostracon. Papyrus number 4 comprises three smaller pieces (P.Berol. 9588 + P.Berol. 7927 + P.Berol. 21179), has been dated by Cavallo to the second century and combines two types of writing: one smaller and one larger module. 52 It seems to be a rather careless piece of professional work, with mistakes of all sorts and signs supra lineam. 53 Sometimes the scribe marks elision and sometimes neglects it. Parthenope is written in learned Greek, with echoes (both in content and in form) of Greek literature from the Archaic and Classical times, such as Homer, the Classical historians and Plato. 54 On the basis of papyrus 4, we would say that the tendency of this author is to avoid hiatus to the same extent as in Chariton and Ninus.

Papyri 5 (P.Oxy. 435) and 6 (P.Mich. inv. 3402v) are not particularly illustrative from this point of view and the ostracon neither.

49 ‘When he (Cyrus) was about fifteen or sixteen years old and was going to get married, the son of the Assyrian king, desired...’
50 ‘You do not ignore the rumor; I can not sleep at night or day’.
52 Cavallo 2005, 216 and 220.
53 They are written above the writing line.
54 Hom. Il. 9.447-451; Od. 7.238, 8.572-ff., 9.19; Hdt. 1.35.12 and Pl., Smp., amongst others.
3.3 Sesonchosis:
8 (P. Oxy. 2466), 9 (P. Oxy. 3319),
10 (P. Oxy. 1826), 11 (P. Oxy. 5262) and 12 (P. Oxy. 5263)\textsuperscript{55}

The papyri relating to this novel are dated later than the material of Ninus or Parthenope. Nowadays, Sesonchosis consists of four fragments from roll-format and one from a codex-format.\textsuperscript{56} Papyri 8 and 9 are made by two different scribes who worked in the early third century and possibly in the same scripторium, transcribing the same roll. This was a workshop where copies for pepaideumenoi – the literary elite – may have been produced. The handwriting corresponds to the early third century, although it is difficult to date them because they are professional, highly standardized and formal products. The texts are written in the recto, and the verso of the two papyri is blank. In the case of fragment 8, the scribe is systematic in elision (scriptio elisa), except in some specific cases involving proper names. However, in papyrus 9, the scribe consistently practises scriptio plena and adds paragogic νυ when the text demands it. In contrast, the scribe of fragment 10 is not systematic regarding the choice scriptio plena (δὲ ἐνα, line 8 verso) or scriptio elisa (ἀλλ᾽ ἔχου[, line 3 verso). From a material point of view, this fragment is a sheet from codex of medium-low quality. It marks the transition period between the roll-format and the codex-format. The text from number 11 is very short and difficult to read: it presents thirteen lines from the center of a column in a very poor state of conservation. The scribe is not consistent in the use of scriptio elisa or scriptio plena: [οὐ πολ... – lines 4-5 –, but ὁ δὲ ἀνθρώ[ποϲ – line 6 –. The scribe of fragment 12 practises scriptio plena in the case of ἐκάλεϲεν δὲ αὐτὸν – column II, line 31 –.

Based, therefore, on papyri 8 and 9, we would say that this author systematically avoids hiatus except in those positions where it is allowed by the other Greek novels (for instance: περὶ αὐτὸν – papyrus number 8, line 17 – is also allowed by Chariton and the slip in τὰϲ αὑτοῦ ἁ[μαρτίας – papyrus number 9, column III, lines 5-6 – can be explained by the semivowel).

Fragment number 11 is not particularly illustrative from the point of view of hiatus and the case of [c. 4 ]τω ἀπεμέριϲεν – line 9 – can be explained because of the preverb.

In contrast, papyrus 10 is baffling because the author appears not to take care to avoid hiatus. In addition to the positions where it is permitted by

\textsuperscript{55} S&W, 246-66 and LM, 357-75. See also the edition of two new papyri of the Oxyrhynchus collection by Trnka-Amrhein 2016a and 2016b.

\textsuperscript{56} Del Corso 2010, 260-1.
other novelists, in fragment number 10, we find cases that do not appear in the contexts listed by Reeve: ἐκεῖνα ἀδε̣η̣[ (6 verso) and τότε αὐτὸς (7 verso). Regarding papyrus 12, the author does not avoid hiatus, for instance: ἐλυπεῖτο ορων – column I, line 17 ; ἐγέ̣νετ̣ο ομη – column I, line 21 ; πλεῖϲτα ἔθνη – column I, line 30 ; and εἰϲ τὰ λεγόμενα ἄβατα – column II, line 25 –.

Can this discrepancy be explained by postulating the existence of different versions of the novel? Is it possible that more than one Greek text based on the same legend exists? It is necessary to bear in mind that the novel was inspired by a character who had a very ancient and rich native literary tradition. 57

3.4 Ephemeris Belli Troiani:
13 (P. Oxy. 4943), 14 (P. Tebt. 268), 15 (P. Oxy. 2539) and 16 (P. Oxy. 4944) 58

From the Greek original of the apocryphal Journal of the Trojan War by Dictys of Crete, we have four papyri of varying sizes. Important news about this novel was produced in the period (1998–2018). 59 We already knew fragments 14 and 15, a translation into Latin by Septimius and versions by Byzantine scholars. Two new fragments, 13 and 16, were published in 2009.

Fragment 13 appears in verso and has been dated by Hatzilambrou in the second century. In the recto there is a document. The script on the verso is sure and rapid and the style has a curvilinear character. The scribe sometimes practises scriptio plena (line 8: τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα αἴτιον and line 13) and sometimes, scriptio elisa (line 5: τὸν Ἀπόλλων’ ἐμφορηθῆναι is the text of

57 The story is inspired by an Egyptian Pharaoh of the Twelfth Dynasty. Literary texts inspired by this dynasty were written during the Middle Kingdom and we have a Demotic legend of Sesostris. The main Greek sources about this figure are Hdt 2,102-110; D.S. 1,53-58 and the Greek Alexander Romance. Σεσόγχωσις is also known as Σεσωστρις, Σεσόωσις and other variants of the name. “Diodorus Siculus (1,53) notes that both Greek writes than Egyptian priest told varying and conflicting histories about the legendary pharaoh... These variables are significant, since the possible interaction and influence between Greek and Egyptian Fiction has been a topic of growing interest as more attention is paid to Demotic literary texts”, Trnka-Amrhein 2016a: 20. Regarding the existence of different versions of Chariton’s novel, see Sanz 2009.


the *editio princeps*, although there are other possibilities). Fragment 16 comprises three fragments that probably correspond to the end of the roll. The writing is severe style ascribed to the third century. Here the more variable treatment of *scriptio plena / scriptio elisa* is found again: sometimes, elision (lines 18, 47 and 75); sometimes, *scriptio plena* (lines 27, 28, 70, 93 and 107). Fragment 14 is dated to the third century and it is in very poor condition. The text is quite long: we have two columns of 54 lines on the back of a papyrus in the *recto* of which there is a document with accounts. Here too we find a mixture of *scriptio plena / scriptio elisa* as in fragment 16.

In fragment 13, Ἀπόλλωνα αἴτιον – line 8 – is a proper name and λαοὶ οἱ εἶναι – line 9 –, a case of article and/or semivowel.


In conclusion: the author seems permit hiatus to a bit greater extent than other novelists. The critical question is whether this freedom is an indicator of literary neglect by the author or of a consciously archaizing style.

3.5 **Semiramis or another uncertain Queen and her pyramids:**

17 (*P. Oxy. 5264*)

Papyrus 17 comprises six fragments written along the fibres in an upright round bookhand. It should probably be dated to the late second / early third century. There is a *vacat* but no punctuation. Iota adscript and other signs have been added to facilitate the reading: a rough breathing and an acute accent to differentiate between αὖτη and αὐτή.

In the case of προκε[τετρέ]ψατο Ἀ[γνυπτο]ν – lines 1-2 – and ἐν Ἀ[γνυπτω]ν αὐτη – lines 6-8 –, we must bear in mind that the hiatus would be conditioned to the appearance of a proper name.

---

60 Trnka-Amrhein 2016c and 2018, regarding the possible connection of *P. Oxy. 5264* with Alexander, Sesonchosis and Ninus.

61 *Vacat* is the blank space to mark a pause.
3.6 Calligone:
18 (PSI981) and 19 (P. Oxy. 5355)62
Papyrus 18 is in Egyptian Museum in Cairo and dates to the end of II AD.63
The scribe of 18 is not consistent regarding scriptio plena/scriptio elisa – δὲ
αὐτὸ 18.28 and ἀλλ’ Ἑλληνὶς 18.37 –. Scriptio plena is the norm in papy-
rus 19.

Both papyri are comparable regarding the hiatus: the author avoids it to
the same extent as in Chariton. Nevertheless, the cases of ῥίψαϲα ἑαυτὴν –
18,II,3-4 – and ἐ̣φα̣ί̣νετο αὐτῆι – 19,1,III,26-27 – could be a bit difficult to
explain.

3.7 Apollonius:
20 (PSI 151) and 21 (P.Mil. Vogl. 260)64
These fragments date to the third century A.D. The scribe practises scriptio
plena and the author avoids hiatus to the same extent as we find in Reeve’s
classification.

3.8 Eusyene:
22 (P. Oxy. 5356)65
The author of this fragment seems avoid hiatus to the same extent as we find
in Reeve’s classification, but the papyrus is too fragmentary to allow reliable
conclusions on this matter.

3.9 Panionis:
23 (P. Oxy. 4811) and Staphylus: 24 (PSI1220)66
Papyrus 23 is known by the name “Panionis”. Several revisions to the text
have been published since its editio princeps in 2007. For paleographic rea-
sons, papyrus 24, known as “Staphylus”, has been attributed to this same
volume and/or novel. This identification is based on several similarities

62 S&W, 271-276 and LM, 145-148, nr. 16. See also Stramaglia 2000, 36 and 207, n. 8,
Braund 2005, 38-45 and Del Corso 2010, 260. Regarding P. Oxy. 5355, ed.pr. by Par-
sons 2018.
63 Cavallo 2005, 226 and 222.
Latin both fragments.
65 Parsons 2018.
307-16. Parsons 2007b is the edition princeps of 23. Regarding this fragment, see also:
interpretation of both fragments.
regarding the informal hand and the layout. 67 The scribe practises scriptio plena (δὲ ἐκόμιϲεν in line 1, ἡ δὲ ἔφ[η] in line 4 and δὲ οὐ̣χὶ in line 8) and sometimes scriptio elisa (καθ΄ ἡμέραν in line 6).

The style of the dialogue is simple, even colloquial, and the author seems permit hiatus to a greater extent than other novelists and in cases that do not fall within the categories established by Reeve (ἐνοχλοῖτο ἀκρωμένη lines 3-4 –). 68

3.10 Phoinikika by Lollianos:
25 (P. Colon. inv. 3328), 26 (P. Oxy. 1368) and 27 (P. Oxy. 4945) 69 Three papyri from the Phoinikika by Lollianos have been preserved. Number 25 is a papyrus codex dated to the middle of the second century, according to Cavallo. 70 Subscriptions with the author's name, the title of the work and the number of the book are written at the bottom of some pages. It is possible to identify two different styles of writing that could correspond to different hands. The scribe corrects his own mistakes, but some of them remained uncorrected. He practises both scriptio plena and scriptio elisa and is not systematic in his use of the apostrophe. Cavallo dated papyrus 26 to a period between the second and third century and Del Corso to the half of the third century A.D. 71 The novel is written on the papyrus verso; on the recto there is an account. The scribe tends to mark elision. Fragment 27 is dated to the third century and is written on the recto, while the back is blank. The handwriting is a variety of the severe style. The scribe does not very often elide final vowels.

The author, therefore, introduces hiatus freely in fragment 25, but there are a lot of lacunae in the text, so in some cases it is difficult to specify the type. In papyri 26 and 27 it is clear that the author allows hiatus. We can therefore cautiously conclude that the author of the Phoinikika exemplifies a very different practice from that of the other novelists. The critical question here is whether this freedom is an indication of actual low literary quality on Lollianos' part or if it is just a pose.

67 S. A. Stephens per litteras in Parsons 2007b, 48-9.
68 Parsons 2007, 47.
70 Cavallo 2005, 216 and 223.
3.11 The ass and the women:  
28 (P. Oxy. 4762)\textsuperscript{72}

Fragment 28 describes the sexual encounter between a woman and a donkey.\textsuperscript{73} The text appears on the verso of a small roll that is dated to the third century A.D.\textsuperscript{74} On the recto there is a register of accounts and the writing corresponds to a type known as formal mixed. The scribe practises scriptio plena and elision which can be indicated or not by using the apostrophe.

The author avoids hiatus with the flexibility of novelists.\textsuperscript{75} The text is rhythmical and its literary level is colloquial and simple.\textsuperscript{76}

Among the fragmentary novels, therefore, we find the full spectrum of practice regarding hiatus: from zealous avoidance of it altogether (the Herpyllis fragment), to the opposite, liberal extreme in Lollianus’ and Dictys’ work; in between, we find the flexible-but-conservative tendencies that seem to be typical of the Greek novelists more generally (Chariton). I now turn to the papyri that transmit the work by Antonius Diogenes, to see how these fit this overall picture.

3.12 Τὰ ὑπὲρ Ὑπάλην ἄπιστα by Antonius Diogenes:  
29 (PSI 1177), 30 (P. Oxy. 3012), 31 (P. Oxy. 4760),  
32 (P. Oxy. 4761) and 33 (P. Oxy. 5354)\textsuperscript{77}

Fragment 29 is a papyrus from the early third century. The text appears on the back, while there is a record of accounts from the second-third century on the recto. The text is written in a slightly tilted severe style with some punctuation marks. The scribe uses scriptio plena and sometimes elision. Some editors have identified an apostrophe in lines 9 and 14, but this is not very clear. Fragment 30 is dated to the beginning of the third century.\textsuperscript{78} The

\begin{footnotes}

\textsuperscript{73} Luc. Asin. 51-2 and Apul. 10.19-22. Cf. also Vita Aesopi W 75-6.

\textsuperscript{74} Obbink 2006, 22.

\textsuperscript{75} We have to bear in mind that the prosody of this fragment could require a special treatment regarding hiatus. Cf. West 2010, 37.

\textsuperscript{76} According Puglia 2013, the whole text is written in iambic trimeters. West 2010, 39 concludes: ‘our papyrus brings us another version in the script for a cabaret act’

\textsuperscript{77} S&W, 101-57. All the papyri and sources on this novel are available in the new edition by Schmedt 2020. Russo 2016 published a complete and systematic study about language and style in Antonius Diogenes with a specific section dedicated to the hiatus and K. ni Mheallaigh, C. R. Jackson and H. Schmedt prepare a volume of essays about Antonius Diogenes’ novel.

\textsuperscript{78} Del Corso 2010, 262.
\end{footnotes}
novel’s text is written on the recto in severe style. The back is blank. This is a good editorial product that has been made with care. The text preserved here is short. The scribe appears to have practised scriptio plena. Fragment 31 is written on the recto, like fragment 30, but this time in an expert semi-cursive handwriting from the second-third century A.D.\textsuperscript{79} The verso contains a document. If αλα (II,9) is admitted,\textsuperscript{80} this elision would not have been indicated. Although the attribution to the novel is not very clear, fragment 32 provides data that can improve our knowledge. Del Corso ascribes it to the second half of the third century\textsuperscript{81} but Parsons thinks it could be third or possibly early fourth century.\textsuperscript{82} It is a careless version of the severe style, also written on the recto, and the back is blank. It could be a copy made for or by an accustomed reader. The scribe practised both scriptio plena and elision. The novel text is on the back of the fragment 33 and it has been dated in II-III AD. Along the fibres, we find a long account. The scribe practised both scriptio plena and elision.

What can we observe with respect to the hiatus in these papyri? Many cases occur in fragment 29 but almost all of them could fit within Reeve’s classification.\textsuperscript{83} Tolerance of hiatus in fragment 30 occurs on the same terms as in fragment 29.\textsuperscript{84} In line 9, we have problems with the reading before ἦδη; as the text is not clear, the nature of hiatus is not either. Fragment 31 has little to contribute to our present study because it does not have groups of words in hiatus.\textsuperscript{85} In fragment 32, the author allows some level of hiatus, mostly in positions that are accepted by the other novelists:\textsuperscript{86} after the article (column II, line and line 17), the particle δη (II,11), at the end of clause (II,12) after semivowel or before the augment (μόνωι ἔϲται – line 3 –, παρθένοι οὐδ’ αὐταὶ ἀνίεϲαν – line 13 – and νύκτα ἐπόμεναι ἢνώχλουν – line 22 –). We have one instance which is not included in Reeve’s list: νύκτα ἐπόμεναι (line 22).

Parsons has the impression that there is no significant difference between papyri 31 and 32 and the other papyri of Antonius Diogenes,\textsuperscript{87} and the new

\textsuperscript{79} Second-third century A.D. – Parsons 2006a –, and early of second A.D. – Del Corso 2010 –.
\textsuperscript{80} Parsons 2006a, 14.
\textsuperscript{81} Del Corso 2010.
\textsuperscript{82} Parsons 2006b.
\textsuperscript{83} For specific data, cf. Schmedt 2020, 210-11.
\textsuperscript{84} For specific data, cf. Schmedt 2020, 274.
\textsuperscript{85} For specific data, cf. Schmedt 2020, 294.
\textsuperscript{86} For specific data, cf. Schmedt 2020, 213-315.
\textsuperscript{87} Parsons 2006b: 16.
fragment 33 is also very similar: the author seems avoid hiatus to the same extent as in Chariton, but there could be an exception with οὐπω ἄρα – I, 45 –.

In addition to the testimonia considered above, Antonius Diogenes’ novel has sometimes been linked to another two papyri, P. Dubl. C3. and P. Mich. inv. 5 + P. Palau Rib. inv. 152.89

P. Dubl. C3 is also known by the name of its possible female protagonist as Herpyllis.90 This text is, however, stricter regarding hiatus. The papyrus is dated to the second century. On the recto, there is a document and the novel-text is on the back. The scribe practised scriptio elisa regularly, although an example of scriptio plena also occurs. In this case, the author’s pattern is clear: hiatus is systematically avoided. He does not allow it even in places that are permitted by all other novelists.

The same applies to the other papyrus (P. Mich. inv. 5 + P. Palau Rib. inv. 152),91 which consists of two pieces of good quality. They are fragments corresponding to the same papyrus but they are kept in different libraries. Our text is written on the recto, and on the verso, there are remains of writing. According to Cavallo, it corresponds to the second century.92 Here hiatus is avoided as much as possible.93

Therefore, these two papyri have little in common with Antonius Diogenes, with the novel by Chariton or with the fragments of Ninus, Parthenope and the longest two fragments of Sesonchosis. The fact that there is no hiatus even after καί, after the article, between phrases or before δέ seems suspicious to me.94 Clearly, we must exercise caution and refrain from becoming mere hunters of hiatuses,95 but we should not ignore such an obvious discrepancy, either.

---

92 Cavallo 2005, 224.
93 For specific data, cf. Schmedt 2020, 360.
94 See also Stramaglia 2015, 164-166.
95 Reeve 1971, 515.
3.12.2 Antonius Diogenes on the banks of the Oxus River?
At this point, finally, I would like to introduce materials from a Hellenistic city on the Banks of the Oxus River in Afghanistan that might have inspired Diogenes’ novel. The modern name of the city is Ai Khanoum but it is not clear what it was called in Antiquity. Here papyri of great value have been found but my focus is rather on the archaeological site and the inscriptions which, I suggest, offer us tantalizing parallels for the fictional mise en scène of Diogenes’ novel.

The first detail to note is that, according to Photius, Antonius Diogenes writes two letters at the beginning of his work. One of these letters is addressed to his sister Isidora, to whom Antonius dedicates his book because she is eager to learn. The second detail to note is that the final episode of the Greek novel presents the very well known literary cliché of the ‘re-discovered manuscript’, which is used as an authenticating strategy by novelists. The details of this cliché in the novel by Antonius Diogenes are quite complex (as is the whole novel). The author tells us that the text, written on cypress tablets, was found in a crypt along with six mysteriously inscribed coffins. The crypt was discovered by Alexander the Great after he seized Tyre. A soldier led Alexander, Hephaistion and Parmenion to a place outside the town. There was a crypt with several stone graves where the names of their occupants and the years they had lived were inscribed. The names were Lysilla, Mnason, Aristion, Mantinias, Derkyllis and Deinias of Arkadia. In the first entry, for example, one could read: ‘Lysilla: lived 35 years’. They found a small cypress chest by the wall with a clear inscription: Ὡξένε, ὅστις εἶ, ἀνοιξόν, ἵνα μάθῃς ἃ θαυμάζεις, ‘Stranger, whoever you are, open, so that you may learn marvelous things’. When Alexander the Great’s companions opened the chest, they found the cypress tablets that contained the novel.

One of the first structures that was erected in the city of Oxus, Ai Khanoum, was a heroon in honor of a certain Kineas, who is considered as the probable founder of the city. It is one of the few structures at Ai Khanoum, whose earliest phases have been traced back to the late fourth

---

100 Regarding the heroon of Kineas, Merkelbach and Stauber 2005: 8-15 and Mairs 2014b.
The shrine of Kineas is decorated with an inscription written by a man named Klearchos. The first part of this text is an elegiac epigram that says:  

1 ἀνδρῶν τοι σοφὰ ταῦτα παλαιστέρων ἀνάκει[τα]ι
ῥήματα ἄρισκιωτων Πυθοί ἐν ἡγαθέαι
ἐνθεν ταῦτα] Κλέαρχος ἐπιφραδέως ἀναγράψας
εἵσατο τηλαυγὴ Κινέου ἐν τεμένει.

‘These maxims of renowned men of old are enshrined in the holy Pytho (Delphi). From there, Klearchos copied them carefully, and set them up here blazing them from afar, in the sanctuary of Kineas’.

The inscription is long and consists of 142 maxims.  

Κλέαρχος is a very common name in inscriptions from the third century B.C. and several documented characters in literary sources bear this name as well.  

This Klearchos could be the philosopher Klearchos of Soloi, who was a pupil of Aristotles’. He had Eastern interests, wrote extensively on Eastern philosophies and was a great connoisseur of Pythagorean tradition. Athenaeus says that Klearchos was an expert on anagrams, acrostics and other γρῖφοι.

Other burial places at Ai Khanoum are outside its walls. One of them is similar to the structure evoked by Diogenes: it consists of partially subterranean vaulted chambers with a solid brick superstructure. It contains two types of burial: in sarcophagi and jars. The jars bore the names of their occupants and a short legend: Λυσανίου Ἰσιδώρας, τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ τῆς μικρᾶς ‘Lysanias’s’, ‘Isidora’s’, ‘the little (male)’s one and the little (female)’s one’.
Additionally, in this area, at the site of Zhiga-tepe in the Bactra oasis, a fragmentary Greek funerary inscription on a ceramic plaque was found. It belongs to a man named Diogenes and contains a reference to Hades, if the restoration proposed is correct.\(^{108}\)

![Inscription Image]

**Perhaps it is a mere coincidence but I find curious similarities between the text by Antonius Diogenes and the archeological elements we find in the region of Bactria:**

1. **The names of Isidora, Diogenes and Kineas:** Isidora, Antonius Diogenes’s sister and Isidora the female occupant of sarcophagi in the jar in Ai Khanoum.\(^{109}\) Diogenes, the author of the novel and the man of Zhiga-tepe.\(^{110}\) Perhaps it is not going too far when thinking about a possible relationship between *Kineas* and *Deinias*.\(^{111}\)

2. **A set of catacombs:** The crypt that Alexander discovered outside of the city of Tyre and the subterranean vaulted tomb outside the walls in Ai Khanoum.

3. **Inscriptions:** The stone graves in the crypt and the cypress chest described by Antonius Diogenes; the inscriptions on the shrine of Kineas, on the tombs on jars and on the ceramic plaque in Bactria.\(^{112}\)

---

\(^{108}\) Was found in Bactria—Dilbarjin, Zhigaiga-tepe and it is dated to third-second century BC. Canali de Rossi 2004, 196, number 304. See also, Mairs 2014a, 75 and n. 67.

\(^{109}\) *Ἰσιδώρα*: 47 results in *LGPN* (clas-lgpn2.classics.ox.ac.uk/name/*Ἰσιδώρα*). Antonius Diogenes’s sister is named Isidora in Photius 111a3. Regarding Isidora from Ai Khanoum: Mairs 2015, 10-11.

\(^{110}\) *Διογένης*: 1209 results in *LGPN* (clas-lgpn2.classics.ox.ac.uk/name/*Διογένης*).


\(^{112}\) The inscription in the sanctuary of Kineas is dated to third century B.C. Regarding inscriptions and their use in Ancient novel: Sironen 2003, Slater 2009 and Liddel and Low 2013.
4. Bizarre epitaphs: in the case of Antonius Diogenes we have Ἄμμίλε, ὅστις εἶ, ἔνωξον, ἵνα μάθης ἃ θαυμάζεις. In the case of Kineas, we have the epigram cited above.  

5. References to the age of the occupants of the sarcophagi: to the old age of Lysilla, Mnason, Aristion, Mantinias, Derkyllis and Deinias of Arkadia in The Wonders beyond Thule, compared with the youth of the two little Lysanias and Isidora in the case of Ai Khanoum.  

6. Curiosity about the afterlife: The visits to Hades made by the characters of the novel by Antonius Diogenes and the reference Hades in the funerary inscription Zhiga-tepe.  

7. The presence of Pythagoreanism: Diogenes’ novel is mentioned in the Life of Pythagoras by Porphyry. If Klearchos from Ai Khanoum is Klearchos of Soloi, we know that he was interested in Pythagorean wisdom.  

8. Lovers of learning: Isidora, the sister of Diogenes the author of Wonders beyond Thule, is a woman φιλομαθῶϲ ἔχουσα. The interest in philosophy and literature among the population of Ai Khanoum is very clear because a fragment of a philosophical treatise was found in a room in the palace treasury next to the shrine of Kineas and near to the tomb of the little Isidora.

---


114 Photios 111a41.  


116 Photios 109a29-109b3 and papyrus number 23.  

117 Canali de Rossi 2004, 227, number 384, line 5 and Canali de Rossi 2004, 196, number 304.  


119 Mairs 2014b: ‘in fact, as it has more recently been stated with refreshing directness, we know nothing to support the view that he was the historical Kearchos of Soloi, or that the philosopher Kearchos even travelled in the east. The Kearchos of the inscription from the temenos of Kineas should be, until we gain evidence to the contrary, a citizen of Ai Khanoum, and his visit to Delphi fits within the growing body of evidence that third-century Bactria remained in constant interaction with the western Hellenistic world.’  

120 New edition of the fragments of Clearchos with commentary and translation into Modern Greek by Ioannis Taifacos 2008 and Dorandi (in preparation).  

121 Photius 111a34. ‘She is eager to learn’.  

9. The presence of Alexander the Great in the novel and the Hellenistic foundation of Ai Khanoum.

To be sure, Diogenes and Isidora are very common names. Nevertheless, these similarities – especially when considered cumulatively – open up the possibility that Diogenes could have been inspired by a real place or family saga.

4. Conclusions

Hiatus is a license that depends on the style of the author, but it can sometimes be attributed to an error by the scribe or the editor. It should be evaluated carefully from several perspectives (Phonetics, Syntax, Stylistics, History of the Language, Papyrology). It involves very different aspects: paleographic, linguistic and literary. What conclusions, then, can we draw from this comparative analysis of hiatus in Diogenes, Chariton and the fragmentary Greek novels?

1. The papyri of Antonius Diogenes avoid hiatus to the same extent as other novelists analysed here, i.e. Chariton and the authors of Ninus and Parthenope. On the other hand, the fragments of Sesonchosis, the Phoinikiká by Lollianos and, to a lesser extent, the Ephemeris belli Trojaní by Dictys of Crete are more permissive than Antonius Diogenes. We should not attribute this freedom too readily to low literary quality or literary ambition in these texts because it could be a deliberate choice by the author. In the case of Sesonchosis or Dictys, an archaizing style is very much in tune with the theme and fictional Trojan war date of the work, as well as with the literary genres that are its references: epic (Homer) and historiography (basically, Herodotus and Thucydides). In the case of Lollianos, hiatus may occur because the linguistic register of the novel is adapted to the social and cultural level of the characters. Something similar is suspected in the case of Xenophon of Ephesus.

Canali de Rossi 2004, 270-2, number 458 and Hollis 2011, 107-9. Cf. also Mairs 2015, 14: ‘Greek Drama was read and performed in Bactria. There was a theatre at the city of Ai Khanoum, and a fragmentary Greek dramatic work on parchment was found in the city’s treasury.’

123 Photius 111b4, 6, 22 and 112a4.
125 Cf. n. 132 and 133.
whose permissiveness regarding hiatus could mimic prose before Isocrates.
2. My analysis shows that *PDubl. C3.* and *P. Mich. inv. 5 + P. Palau Rib. inv. 152* probably do not belong to the novel by Antonios Diogenes because they do not allow hiatus in any case, even after *καί,* after the article, between phrases or before *δέ.*
3. The texts preserved in the fragments of *The wonders beyond Thule* are littered with references to the philosophical tradition, their literary level corresponds to an educated Greek, and the Diogenes’ literary ambition is similar to *Callirrhoe, Ninus* and *Parthenope.* In my opinion, the ‘implicit reader’ would have belonged to the educated elite known by the term of *pepaideumenoi* and *pepaideumenai.*

To finish it seems to me plausible to suggest that a remote Hellenistic city on the Banks of the Oxus River in Afghanistan might have served as a model for scenes, details and/or characters of Diogenes’ novel.
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