

Notes on the use of the iota adscript in the third century B.C.

THE treatment of the long diphthongs $αι$, $ηι$ and $ωι$ is typical of the secular tendency of the Greek language to model itself upon its classical past.

Up to the end of the classical period $αι$ and $ωι$ ⁽¹⁾ are true diphthongs, but in the course of the Hellenistic age the *iota* is dropped in the spoken language both in the *koinê* and in the dialects ⁽²⁾. In inscriptions and papyri it is regularly written until the end of the third cent. B.C. ⁽³⁾, but from about 200 B.C. irregular spellings ($ω$ for $ωι$, $ωι$ for $ω$) become increasingly frequent, attesting that the *iota* was no longer pronounced in that period ⁽⁴⁾. During the first centuries before and after Christ there exists a general confusion between $ωι$ ($αι$) and $ω$ ($αι$) ⁽⁵⁾. In the second-century papyri, however, the historical orthography rapidly disappears; where it still occurs, the *iota mutum* is mostly written irregularly, but more often it is dropped altogether ⁽⁶⁾. In the third

(1) In inscriptions and papyri of the pre-Christian era $ηι$ developed differently from $αι$ and $ωι$. Cf. E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik I*, München, 1939, pp. 200-202.

(2) Cf. F. BLASS, *Ueber die Aussprache des griechischen*, Berlin, 1882, pp. 39-44; E. LADEMANN, *De titulis Atticis quaestiones orthographicae et grammaticae*, Kirchheim, 1915, pp. 41-44; E. MAYSER - H. SCHMOLL, *Grammatik I²*, Berlin, 1970, pp. 95-98, 108-114; K. MEISTERHANS, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1900, pp. 64-68; E. NACHMANSON, *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften*, Uppsala, 1904, pp. 49-59; E. RUESCH, *Grammatik der Delphischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1914, pp. 117-136; E. SCHWEIZER, *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1898, pp. 86-91.

(3) In some dialects (Lesbian, Cypriot, Thessalian) the *iota* disappears as early as the beginning of the third century. Cf. E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, pp. 201-202.

(4) The earliest literary evidence is probably in the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax (1st cent. B.C.) (= *Grammatici Graeci I*, 1, Leipzig, 1883, p. 58): $τῆς α διφθόρου, προσγραφομένου τοῦ ι, μὴ συνεκφωνημένου δέ.$

(5) This was nicely put by W. GROENERT, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, Leipzig, 1903, pp. 45-46: « magna vero perturbatio est si primi p.C. librariorum contemplantur; redundant acta et epistulae huius aetatis pravis scripturis - - . »

(6) Cf. Strabo's famous statement (XIV, 1, 41): « Πολλοὶ γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ ι γράφουσι τὰς δοτικὰς καὶ ἐκβάλλουσι δὲ τὸ ἔθος φωνικῆν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἔχον. »

and fourth-century papyri the use of the *iota* is confined to the dative singular in the heading or the address of letters, petitions etc., where it occurs with increasing rarity (1). A similar tendency is noticeable in the inscriptions where the historical orthography practically disappears after Septimius Severus (2). From the fifth century onwards the documents nearly always display the phonetic spelling (3).

The *iota mutum*, however, is maintained in the literary papyri up to the 7th century. It is not found everywhere; moreover, it is quite often written irregularly within one and the same text or it has been added afterwards by a second hand, but the tradition was clearly kept alive by some scholars.

A thorough investigation of the use of the *iota mutum* in late Classical and Byzantine manuscripts is still inexistant (4). The grammarian Theodosius (4th-5th cent. A.D.) seems to have been the first to put τὸ ἰ τὸ ἀνεκφώνητον under the preceding vowel (προσγραφομένον κάτωθεν) (5). His practice, however, was hardly followed in Antiquity (6). In the early Byzantine period (up to the 11th cent.) the *iota*, if written at all, was usually *adscriptum*, although sometimes smaller in size. In addition, a *iota superscriptum* (7), *subscriptum* and even *inscriptum* are

(1) An interesting exception is the correspondence of Theophanes (early 4th cent.) where the *iota* is regularly written. Cf. E. G. TURNER, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford, 1971, p. 118.

(2) Cf. W. LARFELD, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* I, Leipzig, 1907, p. 305. [see addendum 1]

(3) Exceptions are very rare, e.g. P. Grenf. I 63, l. 8 (VI-VII; χωρις) and WILCKEN, *Chrestom.* 134, l. 10 (VI-VII; ἀγνωτάτοι πατρί).

(4) The following survey is based mainly on V. GARDTHAUSEN, *Griechische Palaeographie* II, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 241-244.

(5) *Theodosii Alexandrini Grammatica*, edid. C. G. GOETLING, Leipzig, 1822, p. 158, 27.

(6) A very exceptional example of *iota subscriptum* is attested in a funerary inscription from Claudiopolis (Cilicia; probably 3th or 4th cent A.D.). Both the copies of Sterett (Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 3, 1885, p. 9, nr. 6) and A. C. Headlam (*Ecclesiastical Sites in Isauria*, The Society for Promotion of Hellenic Studies, Supplementary Papers nr. 2, 1892, p. 23, nr. 3) clearly note the *iota* under the *o-mega* of Δομνείω and τῷ ταμείω (whereas ἄλλω on l. 5 is written without). The revised text printed by G. E. Bean and T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964-68*, Wien, 1970, p. 234, nr. 53 suppresses the main point of interest of the inscription by not marking the peculiar use of the *iota subscriptum*.

(7) An early example (papyrus of the 7th cent.) is discussed by F. BLASS, *ZÄS* 18, 1880, p. 35.

met with. In the 12th cent. the *iota adscriptum* is gradually written lower until it coincides with the *subscriptum*.

Even in the earliest printed books (late 15th - early 16th cent.) the *iota* is usually, though not always, omitted (1). Apparently the French royal type, created by H. Estienne for Francis I, definitively and universally spread the use of the subscribed *iota* (2).

In Modern Greek the *iota subscriptum* is still written regularly in the *kathareuoussa*, whereas it has disappeared in normal language together with the dative and the subjunctive.

The present article deals only with the use of the *iota adscriptum* after $\bar{\alpha}$ and ω in Greek papyri from the third cent. B.C. According to the traditional view the disappearance of the *iota* in the Egyptian *koine* can be traced back to this period.

The examples of aberrant use of the *iota* after $\bar{\alpha}$ and ω are conveniently listed by H. Schmoll in his recent reedition of vol. I of Mayser's *Grammatik* (3). These instances will now be scrutinized one by one in order to see how many of them are acceptable.

* * *

1.a. *Spelling α for $\alpha\iota$* . (*Grammatik*, pp. 96-97)

— OGIS I 69, 1 *(247-221 B.C.): $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\Sigma\alpha\mu\theta\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota$ (4).

The date of this inscription is perhaps not as certain as would seem at first glance. It is based on palaeographical grounds only (5). The plate in E. BRECCIA, *Iscrizioni greche e latine*, tav. XXIV 60, does rather favour a date in the late third or even early second century.

(1) See on this topic R. PROCTOR, *The Printing of Greek in the fifteenth century* (Illustrated Monographs issued by the Bibliographical Society 8), Oxford, 1900, e.g. pp. 17-18 (« the *iota* subscript, usually omitted in early types »), p. 58 (in the oldest Greek printed book, A.D. 1476, the *iota* adscript is used, in contrast with the majority of the early types), p. 97 (*iota* subscript used by Aldus Manutius), p. 134 (casual occurrence of the *iota* adscript), etc.

(2) Cf. R. PROCTOR, *The Printing of Greek*, p. 145.

(3) E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I, 1, Berlin-Leipzig, 1923²; zweite Auflage bearbeitet von H. SCHMOLL, Berlin, 1970.

(4) According to the established custom among editors of papyri and inscriptions the spellings α and ω indicate that the *iota* is *not* written in the original.

(5) Cf. W. DITTENBERGER, OGIS I 69, comm. « Sane hunc titulum Euergetae potissimum aetatis esse non constat, nam etiam inferiore aetate Theram in fide Ptolemaeorum fuisse probant n. 102, 110 ».

— **P. Col. Zen.* II 80, 8 (246 B.C.): ἀπεστειλα/[με]ν τὸν λόγον τοῦ ἀν/[δρὸς] Θρακὸς

I need only repeat here T. Reekmans' convincing correction, listed in *Berichtigungsliste* III (1958), p. 45: λόγον τοῦ ἀν/θρακος (1).

— *P. Ent.* 28, 6 (218 B.C.): τῶι Ἰππώιτα.

The reading has been checked by M. Muszynski.

— **SB V* 7782 (221-204 B.C.): Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία

Here H. Schmoll was deceived by a misprint in the *Sammelbuch*. The *editio princeps* of this foundation-plaque by E. BRECCIA, *BSAA* 26, 1931, p. 276 has the regular spelling with *iota adscriptum*: Ἀφροδίτη Οὐρανία (2).

— *SB IV* 7270, 5 *(III-II B.C.): Διὶ καὶ Ἀθηναῖ.

On the evidence of Arrhenidês' aulic titulature the text is dated by L. MOOREN, *Prosopography*, n° 0281, to the second, or perhaps even the first cent. B.C. (3).

1.b. Spelling *ai* for *a*. (*Grammatik*, pp. 97-98).

— *P. Lille I* 23, 3 *(221 B.C.): ἀρτάβαις διακοσίας (accus.).

This text has wrongly been dated to the third century, cf. *infra*, pp. 156-160.

— The other examples, given on p. 98, are rightly explained by H. Schmoll as writing errors, often due to the vicinity of a diphthong or a *iota*: ξυλοκοπία καὶ σησαμείαι (sic) καὶ ἐμπουρισμός (*PSI V* 500, 3; 257 B.C.), καλῶς ἀν ποιήσαις γράφαις (for γράφας) (*PCZ III* 59496, 6), σεμιδάλιος for σεμιδάλιος (*P. Col. Zen.* II 77, 28). The form *ἰερατίας* in *SB I* 3975, 6 is a faulty reading by U. Wilcken: the tablet in fact has κρότωνος (4).

(1) T. REEKMANS, *Parerga Papyrologica*, *Chron. Ég.* 27, 1952, p. 405.

(2) Three new copies of the same text have since been recovered; cf. P. M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria II*, p. 332, n. 50.

(3) Cf. *Pros. Ptol.* VIII 4338 add.

(4) Cf. my note in *Chron. Ég.* 48, 1973, p. 328.

2.a. Spelling ω for $\omega\iota$ (*Grammatik*, pp. 109-111).

2.a.1. In the middle of a word.

— *P. Hib.* II 198, 166 (mid 3rd cent. B.C.): ἀθώος.

The unsteady spelling of $\theta\omega\eta$ - $\theta\omega\iota\eta$, ἀθῶος - ἀθῶιος is not caused by the omission of the *iota*, but by the use of different suffixes: - $\bar{\alpha}$ - η , -ος (Attic) (1) and - $\iota\bar{\alpha}$ (- $\iota\eta$, - $\iota\sigma$) (Ionic) (2).

— *P. Lille* I 27, 10 (III B.C.): ἐν τῶι Ἡρῳίωι.

The reading was checked on the original by M. Muszynski. The text is dated before 234 B.C. by F. UEBEL, *Die Kleruchen*, p. 77, n. 5.

— **P. Mich. Zen.* 69, 1 (240 B.C.): Ἡρῳίδης.

H. C. Youtie, who has kindly checked the papyrus on my request, confirms that « the papyrus has most clearly Ἡρῳίδης. » (letter of 29 June 1975).

— *SB* I 4528 *(III B.C.): Ἡρῳίδης.

The photograph of this text in E. BRECCIA, *Iscrizioni greche e latine*, tav. XXXV, no 117 suggests a much later date than that proposed by the editors. The ligature of T and H on l. 5 (ΑΣΤΗ), for instance, is hardly possible in the Ptolemaic period (3).

— **P. Lille* I 23, 7-8: Ἡρῳίδης.

This text is to be dated in the second cent.; see below pp. 156-160.

— *PSI* VII 869, 2 (III B.C.; Zenon archive): ἐπὶ ζῳωτῶι χίτωνι.

The photograph of this papyrus, provided by prof. M. Manfredi, confirms the textual corrections proposed by T. Reekmans (*Chron. Eg.*, 43, 1968, pp. 170-171). The spelling of ζῳιωτῶς, used three times in the text, is not consistent:

(1) Already found in early fifth century inscriptions; cf. K. MEISTERHANS - E. SCHWYZER, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, p. 66 with n. 581.

(2) See the discussion of both groups by E. RUESCH, *Grammatik der Delphischen Inschriften*, pp. 130-131.

(3) We thank Prof. J. Bingen who has backed our opinion with his palaeographical experience.

1. 2: ἐπὶ ζωωτῶι χίτωνι
 1. 7: [ξ]ωιωτῶν ἀποίσειν
 1. 11: ζωιωτὸν δτε τόκος (legit T. Reekmans)

The text will be reedited by Prof. T. Reekmans as *P. L. Bat.* XX 62.

2.a.2. *Dative singular, 2nd declension.*

— **P. Mich. Zen.* 2, 3 (259 B.C.): συνθεῖναι ἀτῶ.

In a letter dated 21-9-74 H. C. Youtie informed me that the papyrus in fact has ἀτῶι.

— **PCZ* III 59439, 4 (mid. 3rd cent.)

περὶ τοῦ | προσαγγέλματος οὗ δέδωκά σοι περὶ τῶν Θοτέως |
 ἱερῶν · καλῶς ἂν οἶν ποιήσαις συναποστείλας | τινὰ μετ' ἔμοῦ,
 ἵνα καταγάγω ἀτῶ προ τοῦ ἀτῶν πωλῆσαι.

I have written out the whole passage here in order to show that the problematical form ἀτῶ does not fit the context very well. As the editor (C. C. Edgar) pointed out, one would rather expect ἀτά (= τὰ ἱερεῖα). Edgar leaves room for two interpretations: ἀτῶ = ἀτῶ = the messenger, or ἀτῶ = slip of the pen for ἀτά. He prints ἀτῶ but in his introduction to the text he seems to prefer ἀτά: « He had given Zenon a report about the pigs of Thoteus and now asks him to send someone to help him to bring *them* (= ἀτά) down before Thoteus sells them ».

— **P. Col. Zen.* 7, 4 (257 B.C.): χαρίζοι' ἂν ἔμοι καὶ τῶ θεῶ[ι].

The text was reedited by C. C. Edgar in *JEA* 21, 1935, p. 123 on the basis of a photograph. The corrected version gives τῶι θεῶ[ι], the aberrant τῶ in the editio princeps being merely a printing error.

— **PSI* IV 393, 7 (241 B.C.) = *C.P.Jud.* 14: ἐπεδείξαμέν σοι τῆι ις
 καὶ [. . . .]ι τῶ τῶν | παρὰ Ἀγήγορος --- συναποσταλέντι καὶ
 Θεοπόμπωι τῶι φυλακίτηι.

We could check this doubtful passage on a photograph which prof. M. Manfredi kindly put at our disposal, but we were unable to reach a satisfactory solution. The name of the official looks like Λαμποχρότῶι, but this would be a new name; it is moreover followed by some doubtful signs which cannot be reconciled with τῶι, although this is what can be expected. Perhaps a new scrutiny of the original will

solve the problem, but I consider it preferable not to use this passage as evidence for an early omission of the *iota*.

— *P. Lille* I 21, 23-24: μέτρῳ δοχεικῶι | τῷ συμβεβ<λ>ημένῳ |
 προ<ς> τὸ χαλκοῦν | καὶ σχυτάλη δεικαία

P. Lille I 23, 23-24: μέτρῳ τῷ συν|βε[β]λημένῳ πρὸς τὸ | χαλκοῦν
 καὶ [σ]κ[υ]τά|[λ]η [δι]καία

The naukleros receipts *P. Lille* I 21-22-23 are dated in the 26th year of a king whom the editors identify with Ptolemy III on palaeographical grounds. The papyri, now in the Cairo Museum (1), seem to be inaccessible for the moment. Luckily three unpublished fragments from the same source are still in the Sorbonne and prof. J. Scherer kindly allowed me to use them as evidence here.

P. Sorb. inv. 110 a

12 cm × 6,5 cm ; upper part, bottom missing ; writing along the fibres.

(Ἔτους) λδ Χοίαχ ιβ̄
 προῦ [(ἀρτάβας)] Ἀχ

Ἔτους τ[ε]τάρτου
 καὶ τριακόστου

5 [[ἔτους]] Χοίαχ ιβ̄
 ὁμολογεῖ Πετόσει-
 ρις ναύκληρος τοῦ
 τῆς βασιλίσσης
 κερκουροσκάφης
 ἀχαράκτου οὔ

10 [μισθωτής - - -]

ll. 3-11. « The thirty-fourth year, Choiach 12. Petosiris, naukleros of the Queen's ship, without emblem, [the mishthôtês] of which [is - - -], acknowledges [that he has embarked - - -] »

(1) Cf. *P. Lille* I, Préface, p. 2 : « Les papyrus — d'El-Lahoun appartiennent au musée du Caire et doivent y revenir ». This has been confirmed by Prof. J. Scherer.

1-2. Exactly the same kind of summary (date + cargo) is met with in *P. Lille* I 22; the amount on l. 2 is rather doubtful.

6-7. *Πετόσειρις*: *Pros. Ptol.* V 14037.

7-9. *τοῦ τῆς βασιλίσσης κερκουροσκάφης*: The use of the article before *βασιλίσσης* is ample proof of the correctness of Wilcken's view that this word does not indicate the name of the ship but that of its owner (1). Notable is the masculine gender of *κερκουροσκάφη*, not only here, but also in *P. Lille* I 22, ll. 5-7 (*ὁ μισθωτής* for *οὗ μισθωτής*) and in *P. Lille* I 23, ll. 5-7 (*οὗ μισθωτής*). In *P. RyI.* IV 576, ll. 13-15, however, the word is feminine (*ἐφ' ἧς*).

10-11. *οὗ [μισθωτής]*: the restoration is based on the formula in *P. Lille* I 22, ll. 7-9 (*ὁ (for οὗ) μισθωτής ὁ αὐτο[ς II]άρεμφις*) and 23, ll. 7-8 (*οὗ μ[ισθωτής Ἡρώδ[ης] ὁ αὐτός*). Probably Petosiris, like Paremphis and Herodes, was simultaneously *naukleros* and *misthotes* of the boat (2). It is remarkable that in all three cases the ship belongs to the queen.

P. Sorb. inv. 110 b

7,5 cm × 7,5 cm; top and bottom missing, but certainly from the conclusion of the document; writing along the fibres.

[παρὰ τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ ἀντιγραφομένου παρὰ βασιλικῶν γραμ-
ματῆος τὸ περὶ Φυρέ-
αν ἐργαστήριον πυ-
ροῦ φορικοῦ ἀρτάβα[ς]
{βας} τετρακοσίας | υ
5 μέτρῳ τῷ σ[υν-]
βεβλημένῳ π[ρὸς]
τὸ χαλκοῦν
Ἐγραψεν Θεόδοτος[ς]
Θεοδ[---]
10 η.]

1 l. [γραμ]/ματέως

(1) U. WILCKEN, *Urkundenreferat*, Archiv 5, 1913, p. 226.

(2) For the difference between *naukleros* and *misthotes*, see M. ROSTOVITZEFF, Archiv 5, 1913, p. 298.

Translation : « [- - x - - acknowledges that he has embarked to Alexandria, having received from Herakleodoros (?), the antigrapheus of the basilikos gram]mateus [to check] the store at Phurea, four hundred (400) artabae of wheat, paid as rent, by measure tested with the bronze measure. Theodoros, son of Theod[- -] has written [for him - -] ».

1. The title can be safely restored on the basis of *P. Lille* I 21-22-23 and *P. Sorb.* inv. 111, where the same official is mentioned. Since the date of *P. Sorb.* inv. 110 b is not preserved, we cannot be sure that Herakleodoros also held this post here.

1-2. τὸ περὶ Φυρέαν ἐργαστήριον : the same place-name can doubtless be restored in *P. Lille* I 23, l. 19, where the editors read τὸ περὶ Φυ ... ἐργαστήριον. It seems likely that *P. Sorb.* Inv. 110b and *P. Lille* I 23 were written by the same person and that Φυρέα is only an orthographical variant of Πυρρεία, the well-known village in the meris of Themistos (1).

3. πυροῦ φορικοῦ : the same expression in *P. Lille* I 23, 21 and in *P. Tebt.* III 823, 11 (δλόρας φορικῆς). Cf. Claire PRÉAUX, *L'Économie Royale des Lagides*, Bruxelles, 1939, pp. 411-412.

P. Sorb. inv. 111

15 cm × 7,5 cm ; lower part with large margin at the bottom ; lacuna of 4 to 6 letters on the right ; writing along the fibres.

- πυρ[.]ε [
 ἀπὸ τῶν γεννημ[άτων]
 τοῦ κθ (ἔτους) π . . . [Ἡρακλε-]
 οδώρου τοῦ ἀντιγ[ραφο-]
 5 μένον παρὰ [βασιλικῶ] γρα(μματέως)]
 πυροῦ ἀρτάβας ἐ[κατόν]
 (γίνονται) ρ μέτρο δοχικῶ [τῶ συν-]
 βεβλημένῳ πρὸς τὸ χ[αλκοῦν]
 καὶ σχυτάλη δικαί<αι> καὶ [οὔ-]
 10 θὲν ἐγκαλῶ.

4. I. /οδώρου 7. I. μέτρο

(1) Cf. *P. Tebt.* II, Appendix, p. 400.

Translation: « [- -] out of the produce of the 29th year from (?) [Hêrakle]odôros the antigrapheus of the royal scribe, hundred (100) artabae of wheat by measure tested with the bronze measure and with a just smoothing-rod; and I make no [complaint]. »

1. This line deviates from the usual pattern and could not be restored.

2. The text is dated in the 29th year: $\kappa\theta$ and $\kappa\varepsilon$ both seem possible on the photograph, but the papyrus clearly favours the first reading (checked by M. Muszynski).

The antigrapheus [- -]odoros is most probably identical with Hera-leodoros, who was in office during the 26th year (*P. Lille* I 21-23; *Pros. Ptol.* II 1788). The syllabical word-division practically excludes such names as *Μη-τροδόωρος*, *Ἀθη-ροδόωρος*. The name of the antigrapheus is usually introduced by *παρά* or *διά*, but neither of those fits the remaining traces.

5. The traces are hardly recognizable.

10. The end of the line is indecipherable.

The new fragments clearly belong to the same dossier as *P. Lille* I 21-23; not only do they come from the same find-spot (El-Lahoun), but they also mention the same places (Phurea) and persons (Herakleodoros), contain the same formulae, and were written by the same kind of uneducated people.

There can therefore be no doubt that they also belong together chronologically and that the 26th year mentioned in *P. Lille* I 21-22-23 belongs to the same reign as the 29th in *P. Sorb. inv.* 111 and the 34th in *P. Sorb. inv.* 110a. Since Euergetes reigned for 26 years at most⁽¹⁾, he no longer enters into consideration. One has the choice between Philadelphos (260/59 - 252/51), and a date in the second century under Philometor (156/55 - 148/47) or Euergetes II (145/44 - 137/36).

According to *Pros. Ptol.* V 14037 A. Bataille dated *P. Sorb. inv.* 110a in 252/51; this would imply a date in the first half of the third century for the whole archive. Although it seems rather daring to contradict an authority in the field of palaeography such as A. Bataille, especially

(1) The attribution of the receipts to the 26th year of Euergetes I was just possible by assuming that the financial calendar was used here. Cf. H. HAUBEN, *An annotated list of Ptolemaic naukleroi*, ZPE 8, 1971, p. 263, n. 16; J. BINGEN, *Chron. Ég.* 50, 1975, p. 243.

since the barely literate handwritings of the Sorbonne texts do not lend themselves very well to palaeographical dating, I am convinced that a date in the second century is in this case preferable.

Neither of the three fragments presents any of the letter-forms typical of the third century: no wedge-shaped *alpha*, no *nu* with final upright stroke carried up above the line, no *tau* without right-hand portion of the cross-bar, no *o-mega* with flattened second curve. On the contrary, some second-century characteristics will be found in the loop of the *alpha*, the large *bêta* (*P. Sorb. inv. 110 a, l. 8*), the cursive *êta* (*P. Sorb. inv. 111, l. 8*), the *tau* of which the second part of the cross-bar is added separately and attached to the following letter (esp. in *P. Sorb. inv. 111, ll. 3 and 9*), and the *o-mega* of the ordinary minuscule type ⁽¹⁾.

All this would not perhaps in itself be sufficient proof for a date in the second century; but confirmation is provided, in my opinion, by the uncertainty in the use of the *iota adscriptum* and by the fact that in three instances (*P. Lille I 22, 23* and *P. Sorb. Inv. 110a*) the queen is mentioned as owner of the ship. If the texts indeed belong to the reign of Philadelphos, this would be rather surprising, considering, as H. Hauben rightly remarks « that Arsinoe II had died nearly twenty years before » ⁽²⁾. There is no difficulty in the second century, when either Kleopatra II or III could be the owner of the boat.

If a date in the second century is accepted, *P. Lille I 21* and *23* no longer testify to an early omission of the *iota adscriptum* in the dative.

— *P. Lille I 18, 4* (233/32 or 208/07): Σώσω

This passage is not mentioned by Mayser-Schmoll, although it contains a certain example of a dative in *-ω* on l. 4: μέ[τ]ρ(ησοῦ)
Σώσω κτλ.

According to the editors the text belongs to the period of Euergetes or Philopator. In view of the spelling (l. 4: Σώσω; l. 8: κατόσχης) a date towards the end of the third century (208-207) seems preferable.

(1) For a survey of the characteristics of 3rd and 2nd century Ptolemaic hands, see F. C. KENYON, *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, Oxford, 1899, pp. 35-41 and W. SCHUBART, *Griechische Palaeographie* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft I, 4, 1925), pp. 23-41. Cf. also *P. Lille I 22* (plate XII in the *ed. pr.*).

(2) H. HAUBEN, *ZPE* 8, 1971, p. 261, n. 9.

— **P. Tebt.* III 823, 14 (185 B.C.): μέτρον τῷ συνβεβλημένῳ

This text was included by mistake among the third century examples.

— *BGU VI* 1289, 12 *(III B.C.): Θεοφίλω

This private account is wrongly dated by the editors to the third cent. B.C. The large amounts indicate that the copper standard is used here. This gives as *terminus post quem* the 12th year of Philopator (210 B.C.) (4). The 10th year, mentioned on l. 14 of the text, can therefore be no earlier than that of Epiphanes (196/95 B.C.).

— *SB I* 4302, 11 *(III B.C.): Ἀριστομάχῳ τῷ [- - -]τρατηγῷ

The papyrus is not dated. The first editor, G. Botti (2) attributed it to the third century on palaeographical grounds. He was followed by Preisigke (*SB I* 4302, with question mark) and by Anna Swiderek (*P. Alex.* 549, description p. 10), but the date should be checked carefully before this text can be used as evidence. It is at least remarkable that in petitions of this kind the formula ἐάν [σοι φαίνεται] (l. 25) seems more characteristic of the second and first centuries, whereas in the third εἰ σοι δοκεῖ is more usual (3).

— **BGU VI* 1470, 10 (III-II B.C.):

[πολλά] δ' ὄ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἀλ[γεια] (*Odyss.* I, 4)

Dr. W. Müller, who kindly checked the ostrakon in the Berlin Museum at my request, sent me the following comments: « An der fraglichen Stelle steht entgegen der Lesung von E. Kühn - - - πωντωι (l. πόντωι); das ω ist deutlich und klar unterschieden vom o derselben Hand, und das Iota adscriptum am Schluss des Wortes unterliegt keinem Zweifel. Uebrigens gehört die Schrift eher in das 3. als in das 2. Jh.a.» The strategos [So]krates, mentioned on l. 1 of the ostrakon is perhaps identical with the homonymous strategos *Pros. Ptol.* I 332 (170 B.C.) (4).

— *PSI VII* 860 l. 6 (III B.C.; Zenon archive): [. . .] ληνω β

This document, not listed in Mayser-Schmoll, was brought to my notice by prof. T. Reekmans, who (on the basis of a photograph kindly

(1) Cf. T. REEKMANS, *Monetary History and the dating of Ptolemaic Papyri*, *Studia Hellenistica* 5, 1948, pp. 15-23.

(2) G. BOTTI, *Bull. Soc. Arch. Alex.* 2, 1899, p. 66, nr. 1.

(3) Cf. ANNA DI BITONTO, *Le petizioni al re*, *Aegyptus* 47, 1967, pp. 17-18.

(4) Cf. *Pros. Ptol.* VIII 2137 add.

provided by prof. M. Manfredi) made several improvements on the editio princeps. He now reads line 2 and line 6 as follows :

l. 2 : ἐν τῆι ἰδίαι λη(γῶι)

l. 6 : [ἐν τῆι ἰδί]α ληνῶ

Be it noted that ll. 1-4 are in a fluent cursive hand, whereas ll. 5-12 were written by a different person in rather clumsy capitals. The personal name on l. 1 is not *Κλεοδότης* but *Κλεόβουλος*.

2.a.3. Subjunctive forms of *δίδωμι*, 3rd pers. sing.

The two passages cited by Maysen-Schmoll for a subjunctive 3rd pers. sing. ἀποδῶ are due to a faulty interpretation of the texts. Both in *P. Hib.* I 86, 10 and 102, 9 ἀποδῶ is a *first* person sing. and is regularly written without *iota* : ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδῶ, ἀποτείσω σοι. (Grenfell-Hunt rightly translate : if I fail to repay it, I will forfeit to you).

In *BGU X 1946* (213-12 B.C.) (not in Maysen-Schmoll) the editor reads on l. 11 : ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδῶ --- ἀπ[ο]τει[σ]άτω. On the accompanying photograph (Tafel XII), however, are visible some faint traces after the *o-mega*, which I thought could be the remains of a *iota*. In his letter of 12-6-75 Dr. Müller points out that in this case the papyrus really has ἀποδῶ : « ἀποδῶ ist korrekt ; was Sie nach der Tafel als Iota adscriptum zu erkennen glauben, ist in Wahrheit eine Papyrusfaser in dunkelbrauner Färbung, die auf dem Foto schwarz wirkt und den Gedanken an ein *ι* suggeriert, fälschlich ».

2.b. Spelling ωι for ω (Grammatik, pp. 112-113)

2.b.1. The three cited examples for -ωι- instead of -ω- in the middle of a word are apparently all authentic.

PSI IV 403, 4 (Zenon archive) : ἀναγνῶναι

P. Gurob 7, 9 (ca. 212 B.C.) : παράσχοιμαι (reading checked on the original in Trinity College Dublin).

BGU VI 1266, 9 (203 B.C.) : Σωιστράτης

2.b.2. At the end of the word.

— **P. Petrie II 13, 6, 20* (mid 3rd cent.) : δοκῶι (Konj.)

The correct reading Ἀμαδόκωι is given in *P. Petrie III 42 G 4* and in the *Berichtigungsliste I*, p. 354.

— WILCKEN, *Ostraca* 1490, 2: $\xi\chi\omega\iota$

The text is dated by B. P. Grenfell (*Berichtigungsliste* II A, p. 114) to the second century (174 or 163 B.C.).

— *P. Petrie I 15, l. 19 (237 B.C.): $\xi\omega\varsigma \dot{\alpha}\nu \zeta\tilde{\omega}\iota$

This text will shortly be reedited as *P. Petrie. Wills* 3. With the aid of a new fragment, $\xi\omega\varsigma \dot{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\gamma\tilde{\omega} \zeta\tilde{\omega} \upsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\omicron\sigma[\iota \delta\tilde{\eta}][\tau\epsilon\varsigma]$ can now be read with certainty (1).

— *O. Mich. 1. 10 (*235 B.C.): $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\tilde{\omega}\iota$

The ostracon was not written in 235 B.C. (so the editor and Mayserschmoll), but in 211/10 B.C. as was pointed out by H. I. Bell (2).

A careful examination of the photograph which Amundsen appended to the original publication (plate I) necessitates a few textual corrections on ll. 8-10, read as follows in *O. Mich.* 1 :

$\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\epsilon\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \eta\pi\eta\tau\omicron\alpha \text{ } ^\circ B\mu$
 $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\grave{\alpha} \lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha \epsilon\kappa\alpha[\tau\omicron\nu]$
 $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\tilde{\omega}\iota (\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu.) \text{ } ^\circ B\xi.[$

On ll. 8 and 10 I recognize, instead of $^\circ B\mu$ and $^\circ B\xi.[$, $\Sigma\mu$ (= 240) and $^\circ B\Sigma.[$ (= 2200), respectively. The doubtful *hapax legomenon* $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$ (3) conceals the personal names Glaukias and Ask[lēpiadēs]. I therefore propose the following reading of the passage :

$\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\epsilon\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \eta\pi\eta\tau\omicron\alpha \Sigma\mu$
 $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\varsigma \Gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota \text{ } ^\circ A\sigma\kappa\lambda[\eta\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta.]$
 $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\iota (\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma) \text{ } ^\circ B\Sigma.[$ (4)

However, I have no solution for the form $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\iota$. The verb $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is not attested elsewhere in Ptolemaic papyri; moreover, the whole passage, from l. 3 up to and including l. 12, apparently depends on $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota \Gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ (l. 3). The first pers. sing. $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\tilde{\omega} <\iota>$ seems therefore rather out of place here. But I do not see a plausible alterna-

(1) For the expression $\upsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\omicron\sigma \dot{\omega}\nu$ in a paramone-contract, see P. Fouad II 37, ll. 4-5 with the correction of H. C. Youtie, *Scriptiunculae* I, pp. 192-195. A full account of my new reading in *P. Petrie* I 15 will be given in the forthcoming reedition of the text (*P. Petrie. Wills* 3, ll. 21-22 comm.).

(2) H. I. BELL, *JEA* 24, 1938, p. 137; see also T. REEKMANS, *Chron. Ég.* 27, 1952, pp. 409-410.

(3) The word has been included in the recent Supplement on Liddell-Scott-Jones.

(4) For $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ + dative + ($\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$) cf. verso l. 1: $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \delta\tilde{\eta}$ (= $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$) $\mu\omicron\iota (\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma) \text{ } ^\circ A$

tive. Just possible, although not very convincing, is [γεν]εαλόγωι as a professional qualification of Glaukias.

— *PSI V 534, 8 (III B.C.)*: ἕως ἀν τοῦς λοιποῦς ἀποστείλωι
The reading is certain (checked by prof. Manfredi).

— *PSI IV 352, 2 (254 B.C.)*: ὠφεληθῶι

The papyrus is seriously damaged. The first editors read ὠφεληθῶι[[ι]] (with a superfluous iota deleted afterwards). Later Viereck recognized ὠφελήθωσι but this was doubted by Medea Norsa who only read: ὠφεληθω.. (*PSI VIII, Add. et corr.*, p. xvī; not included in the *Berichtigungsliste*). It seems preferable not to take this doubtful passage into consideration.

— **P. Petrie II 13, 14, 2. (258-253 B.C.)*: δεδότηι

Wilcken's correction δέδοται (*P. Petrie III, p. xv*) was duly registered in the *Berichtigungsliste I, p. 354*.

— **P. Petrie II 38b, 6 (242 B.C.)*: τιθέσθωι

This form was corrected to γνέσθω in *P. Petrie III, p. xi* (sub LIII). The photograph in *P. Petrie II, plate XII* clearly shows that γνέσθω is not followed by a superfluous *iota*.

— **P. Petrie II 8 (1A) 3 (246-45 B.C.)*: ἔστωι

In her revised edition of this text (*C. Ord. Ptol. 7*), Marie-Thérèse Lenger only reads] . . τωι. This fragmentary passage can therefore no longer be used as evidence in the matter at hand.

— **P. Hal. 11, 11 (238 B.C.)*: κάτωι

P. Hal. 11 will be republished shortly in the first volume of the revised Petrie Papyri (*P. Petrie. Wills 1, 85-99*). Dr. F. Uebel provided an excellent photograph of the papyrus after chemical cleaning, which enabled me to correct the reading [τ]ραχήλωι κάτωι to [τ]ραχήλωι δεξιῶι. The base (*limen*) of the *xi* has almost entirely disappeared, but some faint traces are still visible. The use of κάτω would have been rather surprising here, since this adverb only occurs in personal descriptions in connection with lips and teeth, whereas for other parts of the body the specifications « left » and « right » are used.

— PCZ III 59742, 26 (III B.C.): $\tilde{\omega}$ ι πλει ω ι

The irregular *iota* after πλει ω ι has probably crept in under the influence of the dative $\tilde{\omega}$ ι.

— *C.P.Jud. I 33, 11 (III B.C.): [$\dot{\rho}$ Απολ]λ ω ν $\dot{\omega}$ ι<ι>

This severely damaged text was not taken into account by Mayser-Schmoll. Having checked the original in the Bodleian Library Oxford (Ms. Gr. class 43 P) I prefer to read: [$\dot{\rho}$ Απολ]λ ω ν $\dot{\omega}$ ι[ι]

— In *P. Lond.* VII 2024, 15 T. C. Skeat reads the form μισθ ω σ ω ι. He notes, however, that the connection of this letter with the Zenon archive is not assured: « On the whole the hand would appear to be later than the age of Zenon ».

— In the very fragmentary *P. Lond.* VII 2098 seems to appear a form μεταβ α λ ω ι.

* *

The main purpose of this paper was to prove that disappearance of the *iota adscriptum* remained very exceptional in Egypt until the end of the third cent. B.C. Nearly all the examples given by Mayser-Schmoll are based on erroneous readings, false datings and/or wrong interpretations.

The remaining passages are often fragmentary or dubious (*OGIS* I 69; *P. Hib.* II 198; *SB* I 4528; *PCZ* III 59439; *PSI* IV 393; *O. Mich.* 1; *P. Petrie* II 8 1A; *P. Loná.* VII 2098). Hardly relevant are the examples which can be explained by graphic anticipation or repetition of a neighbouring *iota* (*PSI* IV 403: ἀναγνω ω ιαι; *P. Gurob* 7: παρασχ ω ιμαι; *PSI* V 534: ἀποστει ω ι; *PCZ* 59742: $\tilde{\omega}$ ι πλει ω ι).

The instances of unquestionable confusion between $\tilde{\alpha}$ ι - $\tilde{\alpha}$ and ω ι - ω are in fact very rare. I have noted only *PSI* VII 860 ([$\dot{\epsilon}$ ν τῇ ἰδί]α λην ω ; Zenon archive), *PSI* VII 869 (ζω ω τος), *P. Ent.* 28 (τ $\tilde{\omega}$ ι Ἰππωίτα 218 B.C.) and *P. Lille* I 27, 10 (τ $\tilde{\omega}$ ι Ἡρώ ω ι - III B.C.). To the last decade of the third century belong *P. Lille* I 18 (Σώσ ω - 208/207 B.C.), *BGU* X 1946 (ἀποδ $\tilde{\omega}$ - 213 B.C.) and *BGU* VI 1266 (Σωιστρ α της - 203 B.C.).

The examples are so few indeed that in undated texts aberrations in the use of the *iota adscriptum* after $\tilde{\alpha}$ and ω can be considered a useful indication for a date in the second rather than in the third

cent. (e.g. *P. Lille* I 21-23 ; *BGU* VI 1470 ; WILCKEN, *Ostraca* 1490 ; perhaps also *P. Lond.* VII 2024 and *SB* I 4302).

That the *iota* was really pronounced in the third cent. can be positively proved by the letters of uneducated people, whose orthography quite often reflects their pronunciation (phonetic writing). In the third cent. letters of that kind there is not a single example of confusion between $\omega\iota$ and ω , $\bar{\alpha}\iota$ and $\bar{\alpha}$, on the contrary there is a good deal of evidence that $\omega\iota$ and $\sigma\iota$ were closely akin ⁽¹⁾.

This critical survey of two paragraphs in the new edition of Mayser's *Grammatik* has brought to light a serious imperfection in Schmoll's recent « mise à jour ». It is not possible, of course, for the author of a general work to make a thorough inquiry into every exceptional case. But anyone who deals with papyri ought to know that palaeographical datings are but approximative and are easily shifted from one century to another if there is convincing evidence ; on the other hand, fragmentary or dubious passages presenting orthographical or grammatical discrepancies are to be distrusted. But the most serious fault of Schmoll's reedition is not systematically having taken into account the corrections of papyrologists, even though these were readily accessible in the *Berichtigungsliste*.

Leuven

Willy CLARYSSE

Aangesteld Navorscr N.F.W.O.

(1) Cf. E. MAYSER - H. SCHMOLL, *Grammatik* I², pp. 114-115.

ADDENDA :

1. (*ad pag. 151*) This is not true for official inscriptions, where *iota mutum* appears throughout in several third-century texts. See, ex. gr., F. F. ABBOTT - A. C. JOHNSON, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, New York 1968 (Part II : *Municipal Documents*), nos. 130, 132, 133, 134, 145, 147, 148 etc. (all of the third cent.)

2. When this paper was already in print, I noticed the strange form $\epsilon\pi\iota\delta\omega\eta\iota$ in *P. Lille* I 3, 39 : $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\chi\sigma\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\ \delta\iota[\sigma\alpha]\zeta\ \bar{\alpha}\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\eta\iota\ \text{Κτήσεων}$, which the editors take for an optative. E. MAYSER, *Grammatik* II, 1, p. 292 (cf. also I 2, p. 88 n. 1) objects : « man erwartet im allgemeinem Relativsatz mit einen Konjunktiv, und das ι adscr. nach η ist verdächtig, während es nach dem ω fehlt. » With the help of the photograph in the editio princeps it is possible to read : $\delta\iota[\sigma\alpha]\zeta\ \bar{\alpha}\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\eta\iota\ \text{Κτήσεων}$, which fits the sense and the grammar.