

Joanne Vera Stolk

**INAIKTION IN EDITIONS OF PAPYRI:
A SOCIOLINGUIST'S COMMENT
ON THE SPELLING AND DECLENSION OF THE TERM**

THIS ARTICLE IS A RESPONSE to the previous text, Jerzy Danielewicz's 'INAIKTION in editions of papyri and inscriptions: A philologist's comment on the spelling and declension of the term' published in this journal. While Danielewicz takes a prescriptivist's approach to determine the correct spelling of this word using ancient grammarians and other authoritative sources, the current article will take a descriptive approach to the same question. It provides an overview of the variant spellings of the genitive of the word *INAIKTION* as it is supplemented by editors and written by ancient writers in documentary papyri in order to determine the conventional spelling of the term. This will help the modern editor to make a more informed choice about the spelling of this word in papyrus editions.

In the previous article, the author argues that the only correct spelling of the genitive of the word *ἰνδικτιῶν* is *ἰνδικτιῶνος* based on Greek literary sources. As far as the argumentation about the correct placement of the accent is concerned, this may be justifiable: accentuation is not generally provided in papyri and accentuation rules can therefore only be determined based on literary sources and/or linguistic reconstruction. Regarding the spelling of the genitive with the *omega* or the *omicron*, however, I believe the documentary sources can and should be taken into account.

In recent years, increasing attention has been given to a sociolinguistic approach to the variation found in documentary papyri. This approach

focuses on the language as used in original sources to determine the (social) factors governing the attested variation.¹ Trevor Evans already concluded in 2010 that ‘we should be building our understanding of an emerging standard language in non-literary papyri from this internal evidence much more than from the practices of classical literature’.² This also applies to orthography. As Hanna Rutkowska and Paul Rössler explain in the *Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*: ‘Orthography depends on the practices of a community of writers within a certain period and has to be established and accepted by this community’.³ When Greek orthography is approached in this way, also referred to as the ‘bottom-up’ approach, contemporary spelling conventions as applied by a local community of writers can be shown to diverge from literary practices and may also change over time. An example of such an orthographic innovation is the uniform change of the spelling of *τρεῖσκαιδέκατος* to *τρῖσκαιδέκατος* at the start of Roman rule in Egypt.⁴

Danielewicz remarks about regularization that ‘the editors (plausibly) do not correct mistakes of the original, nevertheless are expected to give the standard spelling in the apparatus’ (p. 212). But how does one determine this standard spelling? The new *Guidelines for Editing Papyri*, recently presented by Jean-Luc Fournet at the *30th International Congress of Papyrology* (Paris, 30 July 2022), propose the following: ‘The editor will take care to correct, not according to the norms of classical Greek, but according to those of the contemporary Greek of the document being edited’.⁵ In order to decide on those contemporary spelling norms, one first needs to examine the contem-

¹ E.g. M. LEIWO, ‘Introduction: Variation with multiple faces’, [in:] M. LEIWO, H. HALLA-AHO, & M. VIERROS (eds.), *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin*, Helsinki 2012, pp. 1–11; K. BENTEIN, ‘Historical sociolinguistics: how and why? Some observations from Greek documentary papyri’, *AION* 41 (2019), pp. 145–154.

² T. V. EVANS, ‘Standard *koine* Greek in third century BC papyri’, [in:] *PapCongr.* XXV, pp. 197–206, at 205.

³ H. RUTKOWSKA & P. RÖSSLER, ‘Orthographic variables’, [in:] J. M. HERNÁNDEZ-CAMPOY & J. C. CONDE-SILVESTRE (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*, Malden, Ma. – Chichester 2012, pp. 213–236, at 214.

⁴ J. V. STOLK, ‘Post-classical Greek from a scribal perspective: Variation and change in contemporary orthographic norms in documentary papyri’, *Mnemosyne* 73/5 (2020), pp. 750–774.

⁵ To be published in a forthcoming volume of *Chronique d’Égypte*.

porary parallels. There are thus two methods to determine the ‘correct’ spelling of a word in a certain document: following (1) a prescriptive approach based on comparison with ‘external’ sources, such as the rules for correct spelling prescribed in (ancient) dictionaries and grammars, or (2) a descriptive approach based on comparison with ‘internal’ sources, primarily other documents that provide parallels as close as possible in time, place and genre to the document at hand. In some cases, these two approaches may give different results.⁶

Different ideas on how to determine the standard spelling of a word have resulted in varying practices in editorial regularization and supplementation in papyrus editions, as also observed by the author of the previous article for the spelling of *INAIKTΩN*. This is not only an impression that one can get by looking at a handful of older and more recent editions. The extent to which this applies to the spelling and regularization of *ἰνδικτιών* can be quantified more precisely with the help of modern tools, namely TM Words, compiled by Alek Keersmaekers, and TM Text Irregularities, compiled by Mark Depauw and myself.⁷ These quantitative results are presented in table 1.

The results immediately show the large scale of this practice. In fact, the majority of the editors choose the spelling with the *omicron* instead of the one with the *omega* for supplementation of abbreviations or in lacunae. Unsurprisingly perhaps, given the editorial choices presented in

⁶ See J. V. STOLK, ‘Encoding linguistic variation in Greek documentary papyri: The past, present and future of editorial regularization’, [in:] N. REGGIANI (ed.), *Digital Papyrology II: Case Studies on the Digital Edition of Ancient Greek Papyri*, Berlin – Boston 2018, pp. 119–138; N. REGGIANI, ‘Linguistic and philological variants in the papyri: A reconsideration in the light of the digitization of the Greek medical papyri’, [in:] IDEM (ed.), *Greek Medical Papyri: Text, Context, Hypertext* [= *Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft* 40], Berlin – Boston 2019, pp. 237–256.

⁷ For TM Words, see <www.trismegistos.org/words> and A. KEERSMAEKERS, *A Computational Approach to the Greek Papyri: Developing a Corpus to Study Variation and Change in the Post-Classical Greek Complementation System*, PhD dissertation, KU Leuven 2022. For TM Text Irregularities, see <www.trismegistos.org/textirregularities> and M. DEPAUW & J. V. STOLK, ‘Linguistic variation in Greek papyri. Towards a new tool for quantitative study’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 55/1 (2015), pp. 196–220. Inevitably, these results are based on the data found in digital editions of documentary papyri, which have occasionally been adapted during digitalization; for more on this issue see STOLK, ‘Encoding linguistic variation’ (cit n. 6).

Table 1. Supplementation of *omega* or *omicron*
in the oblique⁸ cases of *INΔIKTΙΩN*⁹

	<i>omega</i>	<i>omicron</i>
abbreviations ¹⁰	2,073 (= 29%)	5,098 (= 71%)
lacunae	131 (= 39%)	206 (= 61%)

Table 1, regularization of the spelling of *omicron* to *omega* is not that common either. The Trismegistos Text Irregularities database contains nineteen examples (in only eight different publications) where the spelling *INΔIKTΙONOΣ* has been regularized in the apparatus to *INΔIKTΙΩNOΣ*. There are even four instances in which the spelling with the *omega* has been regularized towards the *omicron*.¹¹

The ‘problem’ thus seems to be much more fundamental than Danielewicz suggests by referring to the inconsistencies in some editions. The spelling *INΔIKTΙONOΣ* is not just an occasional slip, but seems to be common practice among editors of papyrus documents. All the more

⁸ The far majority of those, of course, being the genitive singular of the noun, but occasional attestations of other cases, like the dative and accusative singular and the genitive plural, showing the same vowel pattern, are found as well.

⁹ Based on an export of the attestations of the lemma *ἰνδικτιών* from TM Words (31 October 2022), selecting ‘only abbreviated’ and ‘only with lacuna’, respectively. Both have been manually annotated for the use of *omicron* or *omega* in the abbreviation or lacuna (abbreviation in lacuna is counted as lacuna), omitting all instances where the *omicron* or *omega* are not in a supplemented part of the abbreviation or lacuna (those have been added to the results in Table 2, see note 12 below).

¹⁰ In some abbreviated examples, it seems that the *omicron* is in fact written, e.g. *ἰνδ(κτῖ)ο(ν)ος* in *P. Oxy.* XVI 2034, ll. 13–15, but it is probably best to still regard these cases as an editorial supplement, since in other editions, the suprascribed *omicron* is interpreted as a part of the ending, see, e.g., *ἰ(ν)δ(κτῖων)ο(ς)* in *P. Oxy.* LXXII 4930, ll. 3 and 20.

¹¹ *P. Col.* VII 162, ll. 3 and 12 read *ἰνδικτίωνως* regularized to *ἰνδικτίονος* in the apparatus of the original edition; the edition of *SB XIV* 11496, 2, l. 5 reads *ἰνδικτιώνων*, l. *ἰνδικτιόνων*, but the editor of the first edition in *SB X* 10264 read *ἰνδικτιόνων* without regularization; the regularization *ἰνδικτεῖωνος*, l. *ἰνδικτίονος* in *P. NYU* I 11a, 3, l. 53 was not in the original edition, but added during digitalization (but *ἰνδικτίωνος* in 3, l. 57 was not regularized).

important it is, therefore, to compare these results to what the ancient writers of the documents produced under the same circumstances before we can judge these editorial decisions. Even though the word is abbreviated most of the time, enough attestations where the *omega* or *omicron* are written out survive to get an idea of contemporary practice.

The chronological specification in Table 2 shows clearly that at all times the spelling with the *omicron* would have been more common than the spelling with the *omega*. During the fourth century, when the term first starts to become regularly used, the percentages are closer together, but soon after, the spelling with the *omicron* is far more common than with the *omega*.

Table 2. Percentage of attestations of *omega* and *omicron* in the oblique cases of *INAIKTION*¹²

%	4th cent.	5th cent.	6th cent.	7th cent.	8th cent.	total (%)	total (N)
<i>omega</i>	41	18	9	17	14	29	267
<i>omicron</i>	59	82	91	83	86	71	654

Regularization and supplementation based on comparison with contemporary documents could move beyond the general statistics of a particular century, although this requires more detailed comparison and observation of local practices. Especially regarding documents from the fourth century, careful judgement of the local and chronological differences would be justified in order to determine the most likely conventional spelling. For example, in the Hermopolite nome there seems to have been a preference for the spelling with the *omega* during the first half of the fourth century (49 *omega*

¹² Based on an export of the attestations of the lemma *ἰνδικτιών* from TM Words (31 October 2022), selecting ‘only non-abbreviated’ and ‘only without lacuna’, supplemented with the ones from ‘only abbreviated’ and ‘only with lacuna’ where the *omicron* or *omega* was in fact not supplemented but in the written part of the word (see n. 10 above). All have been manually annotated for the use of the *omicron* or *omega*. The chronological results are calculated using the weighed dates method, see B. VAN BEEK & M. DEPAUW, ‘Quantifying imprecisely dated sources: A new inclusive method for charting diachronic change in Graeco-Roman Egypt’, *Ancient Society* 43 (2013), pp. 101–114.

vs. 7 *omicron*), but this pattern is changing in the second half of the fourth century (17 *omega* vs. 11 *omicron*). A similar change from *omega* to *omicron* may have been even more advanced in the Oxyrhynchite nome, where the attestations from the second half of the fourth century show already a clear preference for the spelling with *omicron* (9 *omega* vs. 29 *omicron*).

This quantitative overview (table 2) explains the clear editorial preferences for the supplement with the *omicron* (table 1). The previous author may still not be impressed by these results, as ‘this fact should not influence the editor’s decision who (...) is responsible for providing the correct form of the words not fully verbalised in the text’ (p. 213), but, together with many other papyrus editors, I would therefore question ignoring the practices of the writers themselves in favour of a more authoritative literary source. Why would one regularize towards or supplement *INΔIKTI-ΩNOΣ* in the sixth century, when 91% of the attestations of that time in fact write *INΔIKTIONOΣ*? A more plausible conclusion would be that the actual conventions among scribes of that time seem to have been different from what we find prescribed in the literature.

Based on this information, I would not recommend changing the editorial practice of regularization and supplementation of the genitive form spelled with the *omicron* unless compelling reasons can be found in the document itself or its close contemporary parallels.

Joanne Vera Stolk

Leiden University
Centre for the Arts in Society
P.O. Box 9515
2300 RA Leiden
THE NETHERLANDS

Ghent University
Department of Linguistics
Blandijnberg 2
9000 Gent
BELGIUM

e-mail: joanne.stolk@ugent.be