

Jerzy Danielewicz

**INAIKTION IN EDITIONS OF PYPYRI
AND INSCRIPTIONS:
A PHILOLOGIST'S COMMENT ON THE SPELLING
AND DECLENSION OF THE TERM***

THIS ARTICLE POINTS OUT MISSPELLINGS of the word *INAIKTION* occurring in papyrological and epigraphic publications, especially committed when supplementing the genitive of this word after the abbreviation *IN/INΔ/INΔIK*. Determining the correct spelling of the term entails conclusions regarding, more generally, the issue of transcription of documents.

Anyone who consults books and articles from recent decades on the chronological systems of Roman and Byzantine periods, as well as editions of papyrus and epigraphic texts in which the indiction appears as an element of dating, may be surprised by the orthographic inconsistencies that reveal themselves there at every turn. Strangely enough, the reader is confronted with different versions of supposedly identical forms. Some of these inconsistencies on the part of modern scholars and editors are due to an insufficiently rigorous approach to the rules of Greek accentuation

* This publication is the result of research work carried out within the project *Late Greek Poetry: A Selection (Edition, Translation, Commentary)* financed from the state budget under the programme implemented by the Minister of Education and Science (Poland) called the National Programme for the Development of the Humanities (grant no. 0082/NPRH9/H22/88/2021). I would like to thank the anonymous referee of this article for their comments, which prompted me to formulate certain points more precisely.

and/or a failure to give due weight to the spelling of the vowel ‘o’ in an era when the duration of *omicron* and *omega* was no longer distinguished. In the situation outlined, a thorough clarification of these matters seems to be needed.

Let us start with the nominative singular. It is now customary to print it as ἰνδικτιών.¹ It was in this form that the term appeared in the *SEG* indices for a long time, but at some point the editors of the series decided to change the spelling to ἰνδικτιών,² following such a reliable source as *Paulys Real-Encyclopaedie*.³ It should be noted right away that the latter spelling is the only correct one. Aelius Herodianus (or Pseudo-Herodianus), *Partitiones*, p. 229.1 Boissonade, places the word under discussion in the category of oxytones; the accent on the final (and not the penulti-

¹ See, e.g., F. TINNEFELD, ‘Indictio’, [in:] H. CANKIĆ & H. SCHNEIDER (eds.), *Der neue Pauly* V, Stuttgart – Weimar 1998, p. 970; B. H. MCLEAN, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C. – A.D. 337)*, Ann Arbor 2002, p. 158; E. DICKEY, ‘Latin influence on the Greek of documentary papyri: An analysis of its chronological distribution’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145 (2003), p. 255 n. 13 and p. 256; R. S. BAGNALL & K. A. WÖRST, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, Leiden – Boston 2004 (2nd ed.), p. 327 (Index 1: Greek Words); A. ŁAJTAR, *Catalogue of the Greek Inscriptions in the Sudan National Museum at Khartoum* [= *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta* 122] Leuven – Paris – Dudley, Ma. 2003, p. 242 (Index); *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 55 (2009), p. 524 (Indizes, Allgemeine Wörterliste); G. OCHALA, *Chronological Systems of Christian Nubia* [= *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement* 16], Warsaw 2011, p. 99. The form ἰνδικτιών, unexpectedly, also appeared in *LSJ Revised Supplement* 1996, p. 158 (the authors cited *SEG* XXVI 1697 and XXXI 1389(a), and were probably influenced by the earlier drafting rules of this series). The online version of the *LSJ*, edited on 5 August 2017, shows the spelling ἰνδικτιών, ὦνος: <<https://lsj.gr/wiki/>> (accessed 17 November 2022).

² Systematically from volume XXXVI (1986), edited by H. W. PLEKET, R. S. STROUD *et alii*, onwards. The correct form ἰνδικτιών is printed there not only in indices, but also in the descriptions of inscriptions (see, e.g., *SEG* LXVI 1129, p. 331: ‘[w]hich combines the month name Ἀρτεμίσιος with the Roman ἰνδικτιών’).

³ See O. SEECK, ‘Indictio’, [in:] *RE* IX (1916), col. 1327. The form ἰνδικτιών can also be found in some relatively recent editions, cf. P.-L. GATIER, *Inscriptions de la Jordanie*, Paris 1986, p. 228 (Index général grec). It is taken for granted by H. FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten* [= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 148], Berlin – New York 2002 (passim).

mate) syllable of this word is confirmed by a number of sources, including the *Suda* (*iota* 373.I Adler): Ἰνδικτιῶν καὶ Ἰνδικτος λέγεται.⁴

The fact that Ἰνδικτιῶν is an oxytone determines the place of the accent in the other cases of this noun. According to the Greek accentuation principle (the so-called Law of Persistence), throughout the declension the accent must remain on the same syllable of a given noun. Furthermore, the fact that the final vowel of Ἰνδικτιῶν remains long⁵ causes that – as far as general rules allow – it should have the circumflex in the *casus obliqui*. Not all scholars are aware of this rule, which entails accent errors in their publications;⁶ there are, of course, those who follow the above principle.⁷

⁴ An interesting, also in terms of content, attestation is given by Hesychius Illustrius, Fr. 2.7–9 Müller: <Ἰνδικτιῶν> τοῦτ' ἔστιν <Ἰνακτιῶν> ἢ περὶ τὸ Ἰακτιὸν νίκη. Διὰ τοῦτο ἄρχεται μὲν Ἰνδικτιῶν ἀπὸ πρώτης καὶ καταλήγει μέχρι τῆς ιε' (of the Era of Actium). Cf. also *Anthologiae Graecae Appendix: Epigrammata sepulcralia* 748.9 Cougny: Ἰνδικτιῶν δ' ὑπῆρχεν ἢ τρίτῃ τότε; Nicephorus, *Breviarium historicum de rebus gestis post imperium Mauricii*, p. 22.16 de Boor: δευτέρα δὲ ἦν Ἰνδικτιῶν ἡνίκα ταῦτα ἐπράττοντο; Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio* 27.54 Moravcsik-Washington: ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἰνδικτιῶν ζ' (and *ibidem* 29.234; 45.40), Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium historiarum*, vol. 2, p. 475.16–17 Bekker: Ἰνδικτιῶν ἦν β', ἔτος ζφκζ'. It is also worth comparing this spelling with documents, even contemporary, of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, where they still use *indictio* in official documents: <<http://www.imis.gr/el/ἀρθρα-απόψεις-σχόλια-6790/ἡ-εκκλησιαστικὴ-πρωτοχρονιά-ἡ-Ἰνδικτιῶν-14435>> (accessed 17 November 2022). I thank Constantinos Balamoshev for pointing out to me that this is an unbroken tradition.

⁵ See below; the quotation from Aelius Herodianus.

⁶ Thus, McLEAN, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy* (cit. n. 1), p. 158, writes with indifference to the way the genitive is commonly supplemented: 'Beginning in A.D. 312, some inscriptions are dated according to indiction (Ἰνδικτίων), often abbreviated INΔ, as in Ἰνδ(ικτιῶνος) ιβ'". The (correct) genitive Ἰνδικτιῶνος is incompatible with the (incorrect) nominative Ἰνδικτίων (which, for its part, would require a genitive in the form of Ἰνδικτίωνος). The Law of Persistence is, in practice, not observed by J.-B. YON, *Palmyre*, Beyrouth 2012, who in Indices on p. 443 prints the correct nominative Ἰνδικτιῶν, but in the edition of inscription 498 on pp. 376–377 and inscription 503 on pp. 379–380, incompatibly, supplements the genitive by printing Ἰνδ(ικτιῶνος).

⁷ Undoubtedly, a place of honour goes to the editors of the *SEG* series of recent decades (cit. n. 2). As far as individual researchers are concerned, see, e.g., GATIER, *Inscriptions de la Jordanie* (cit. n. 3), who includes Ἰνδικτιῶν in the Index général grec on p. 228, and, accordingly, in the edition of inscription 53 on p. 68 resolves the abbreviation as Ἰνδ(ικτιῶνος); the same in subsequent inscriptions: 56 (p. 72), 57 (p. 74), 74 (p. 88), 80 (p. 93), etc.

The correct form of the nominative and genitive of the noun we are dealing with here is clearly indicated by Aelius Herodianus (or Pseudo-Herodianus):⁸

Τὰ εἰς ὧν λήγοντα ὀξύτονα θηλυκὰ, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ κλίνονται· οἶον· τρυγῶν, τρυγόνος (...). ἰνδικτιῶνος δὲ μέγα.

Feminine nouns ending in -ων with the acute accent on the last syllable (*oxytona*) take the *omicron* in further cases during their declension, for example τρυγῶν, τρυγόνος [...]; but note that ἰνδικτιῶνος retains the long ‘ο’.

The genitive of the term creates now even more confusion. As for the accent irregularities in modern editions of documentary texts, their source is easy to indicate. Since there are no hints of accents in the text of the documents, it is the author of the transcript who decides individually on their place and type. When it comes to the spelling of words in the transcript, the editors (plausibly) do not correct mistakes of the original, nevertheless are expected to give the standard spelling in the apparatus. This method is especially recommended wherever the text of a document shows deviations due to the interchange of ω and ο, typical of the Roman and Byzantine periods.⁹ Both variants are abundantly represented in the inscriptions. For example, in a compilation of selected numbered inscrip-

⁸ Aelius Herodianus, *Partitiones*, p. 229.1–4 Boissonade.

⁹ Such a procedure is followed by G. POETHKE in his edition of *Berliner Griechische Urkunden* 17, see e.g. BGU XVII 2709, l. 2: ἰνδικτιόνος (note the indication of the expected accent position and its prosodic adaptation to the short vowel in the transcribed original), and the subsequent correction in the critical apparatus *ad loc.*: ‘ἰνδικτιονος pap., ἰνδικτιῶνος’. It is worth emphasising that this scholar always gives the proper form of the genitive after abbreviations, printing ἰνδ(ικτιῶνος)/ἰνδικτ(ῶνος). Contrast A. BENAÏSSA, ‘Late antique papyri from Hermopolis in the British Library II’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 219 (2021), p. 198 (on *P. Lond.* III 1011), who prints ἰνδικτιόνος in line 3 and in the apparatus merely states ‘3 ἰνδικτιονος’ (with no comment on the place of accent and the shortness of ‘ο’). As to the misleading suggestion in the apparatus of the accent allegedly written in the original, cf. *P. Köln* III 151 r, whose editors print in line 4 (and 18) ἰνδικτιῶνος, and in the apparatus *ad loc.* explain: ‘ἰνδικτιῶνος. Papyrus’ as if the original gave rise to such a verdict (proparoxytonon).

tions, Roger Bagnall and Klaas Worp cite a handful of phrases containing either *ἰνδικτίωνος* or *ἰνδικτίονος* (accents imposed by the editors).¹⁰

It happens that in documents from the same time, two different versions of the term (written in full) appear simultaneously: *INAIKTIONOS/INAIKTIΩNOS*.¹¹ Theoretically, a question may arise as to how to supplement the word after the abbreviation in a situation where the author of the original text himself would certainly be consistent in spelling and write, accordingly, either *INΔ[IKTION-OS]* or *INΔ[IKTIΩNOS]*. This fact should not influence the editor's decision who, as stated above, is responsible for providing the correct form of the words not fully verbalised in the text.¹² Unfortunately, although – in addition to Herodian – numerous Greek literary sources provide the correct form *ἰνδικτιῶνος*,¹³ the genitive is still most commonly read¹⁴ and

¹⁰ BAGNALL & WORP, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (cit. n. 1), p. 9, table 1. The form *ἰνδικτίωνος* appears in SB XVI 12340, l. 8; *P. Cair. Isid.* 122, l. 16, while *ἰνδικτίονος* in *P. Mich.* XII 652, ll. 7–8, 22; *P. Princ. Roll* ll. 123, 128 = v. 9, 14.

¹¹ See CPR VI 5, where the second hand wrote *ἰνδικτ[ι]ωνος*, while the third hand wrote *ἰνδικτ[ι]ονος* (accents imposed by the editors).

¹² Of course, once approved, the form should be kept throughout the transcript, otherwise the reader is not sure about the editor's intention, cf. H. MAEHLER (ed.), *BGU XIX* 2769 r^o, col. i, l. 3: *ἰνδικ(τίωνος)*, l. 5: *ἰνδικ(τίονος)*.

¹³ Cf. Joannes Malalas, *Chronographia*, p. 343.1 Dindorf (plus 37 more instances), *Chronicon paschale*, p. 423.3 Dindorf (plus 38 instances), Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium historiarum*, vol. I, p. 307.13 Bekker (plus 76 instances). Of course, in Late Roman and Byzantine periods there are also cases of instability of the accent (*ἰνδικτιῶνος/ἰνδικτίωνος*). Even the aforementioned Cedrenus uses the latter form seven times, and in one case (vol. II, p. 8) places both forms side by side. It should also be mentioned that additionally the form with a short 'ο', that is *ἰνδικτίονος*, appears in literary texts. This is used without exception by Cyrillus Alexandrinus in his *Vitae*. At times when there was no distinction between *omega* duration and *omicron* duration, placing the accent on the penultimate syllable is an indirect confirmation of the correctness of the form *ἰνδικτιῶνος*. The hesitation about the place of the accent is attested by Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, who in *De ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae* moves back the accent in the inflection of the word, twice writing *ἰνδικτίονος* in the genitive.

¹⁴ Cf. R. S. BAGNALL & G. TALLEY, 'Ostraca from Hibis in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the archaeology of the city of Hibis', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 196 (2015), no. 2, l. 3: *δ ἰνδικτίωνος Φιβίωv* (δεκαδάρχης) *χ[αίρ(ε)w]*.

supplemented¹⁵ with the accent erroneously shifted backwards. This practice needs to change.

ADDENDUM

In this article I deal with the term ἰνδικτιών, ὦνος as a specific case of Latin loan-words in Greek, leaving aside a more general analysis of the incorporation of Latin words into Greek. The explanation of such processes is dealt with by linguists, especially in the context of bilingualism.¹⁶ Nevertheless, it can be observed that when incorporating Latin words ending in *-tio* into Greek, the Herodian guideline on the spelling ἰνδικτιών (see above) is sometimes extended to further feminine nouns, while masculine nouns are not subject to it. Hence (f) στατιών, ὦνος (= Lat. *statiō*, *ōnis*), (f) λεγεών (freq. written λεγιών), ὦνος (= Lat. *legiō*, *ōnis*),¹⁷ but (m) ὀπτίων, ὦνος (= Lat. *optiō*, *ōnis*),¹⁸ (m) Σκηπίων, ὦνος (Lat.

¹⁵ Cf. most recently N. GONIS, 'Ten documentary fragments of late date', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 67 (2021), p. 398; H. HARRAUER & R. PINTAUDI, 'Ein neuer Kompromissvertrag (PL III/1029)', *Analecta papyrologica* 33 (2021), p. 56; G. MESSERI, 'I tre papiri Palau-Ribes / Leone', *Aegyptus* 101 (2021), pp. 148 and 151. The authors of such supplements are mistaken about the accent, but aware that the vowel 'o' should be written as *omega*, which is not common.

¹⁶ The recent discussion and bibliography on this subject can be found, among others, in J. N. ADAMS, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003, p. 29; B. ROCHETTE, *Le latin dans le monde grec: Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain* [= *Collection Latomus* 233], Brussels 1997; IDEM, 'Greek and Latin bilingualism', [in:] E. J. BAKKER (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, West Sussex, UK – Malden, Ma. 2010, pp. 281–293; E. DICKEY, 'Latin influence on the Greek of documentary papyri: An analysis of its chronological distribution', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145 (2003), pp. 249–257; EADEM, 'Latin loanwords in Greek: A preliminary analysis', [in:] M. LEIWO, H. HALLA-AHO, & M. VIERROS (eds.), *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin* [= *Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens* 17], Helsinki 2012, pp. 57–70; EADEM, 'What is a loanword? The case of Latin borrowings and codeswitches in Ancient Greek', *Lingue e linguaggio* 17 (2018), pp. 7–36.

¹⁷ Cf. GIGNAC, *Grammar* I, p. 253; II, p. 48.

¹⁸ Latin differentiates between *optiō*, *ōnis* (f), 'choice', 'freedom of choice', 'privilege', and *optiō*, *ōnis* (m), 'an aide whom one chooses for oneself', 'assistant', in milit. lang., 'adjutant'; here the latter use comes into play.

Scipiō, ōnis). Of course, there are occasional deviations from the correct orthography, typical of the late period, of the type *στατίωνος* (Flavius Justinianus Imperator, *Novellae*, pp. 275–276 Schnopolitanus) or *πετιτίων* (Michael Psellus, *Poem* 8.784 Westerink). This well-known fact does not, however, authorise editors and lexicographers to arbitrarily shift backward accents in feminine nouns of Latin origin ending in *-ων*, despite the lack of evidence of this in the primary sources, as is done, among others, by Sergio Daris in his *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*.¹⁹

Jerzy Danielewicz

Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences
ul. Sławkowska 17
31-016 Kraków

Adam Mickiewicz University
Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology
Institute of Classical Philology
ul. Fredry 10
61-701 Poznań
POLAND

e-mail: j.danielewicz@gmx.net

¹⁹ S. DARIS, *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*, Barcelona 1991 (2nd ed.), p. 47 (*ινδικτίων*) and, in addition, pp. 55, 77, 89, 96–98, 112. To give a characteristic example: Daris prints (p. 97) *ῥεπαρατίων* without taking into account the fact that in *Stud. Pal.* XX 123 v^o, l. 33 (DDBDP transcription) there is a genitive in the form *ῥεπαρατιῶνος* and that such a declension is confirmed by Pseudo-Mauricius, *Strategicon* 1.6.10.1 Mihaescu: *ῥεπαρατιῶνα*.