Cover: Aeschylus, *Hiketides* at the Delphic Festival in 1930.

Contents

Scribes and Language Variation

Martti Leiwo

Introduction[1]

A consciously chosen or unconsciously used linguistic register is a major factor affecting the spoken language. In studying written documents only register is, of course, important, but when analysing language it has to be considered alongside the effects of scribes or copyists on a given linguistic issue. We also need to concern ourselves with the type of text (a letter, a document, a treatise, a speech, a manuscript, etc.) we are dealing with. This and the following articles by Hilla Halla-aho and Marja Vierros all tackle language variation from different angles. The themes and ideas were developed in three MA theses written under my supervision. Each contributor carried out her own independent work, and all theses were discussed during different phases of the work. The group met approximately once a month for a little more than a year. Halla-aho and Vierros will continue their research on similar topics at the doctoral level.[2]

Hilla Halla-aho has concentrated on phraseology, spoken language and language contact in Claudius Terentianus' letters (P. Mich. VIII 467–481). She analyses Terentianus' use of non-finite complements and connects this with the more general context of non-finite and finite complements in Latin and Greek. The study of substandard syntax has been a neglected area for too long, and it cries out for more detailed analyses, especially in contexts where ready-to-use idioms are not at the scribes' disposal. Below I consider a couple of examples which tackle questions similar to those she has analysed.

Marja Vierros deals with the language use of an Egyptian scribe, who did not – as it seems – have a very good command of Greek, but who nevertheless had to write Greek official documents. She raises the important question about the effects of contact, language attrition and imperfect learning on linguistic variation. The relative clauses under her investigation form an interesting insight into the linguistic competence of an Egyptian writing Greek. Her conclusions are confirmed to some extent by P. Mussies (1968), who has dealt with Egyptian interference in Greek syntax, but no thorough investigations have been made. My own analysis below deals with similar topics. Furthermore, Vierros's paper can also be connected on a more general level to the study of language contact.

[2] Mari Mustonen also took part in the project and presented her results in a seminar given by the three at the Finnish Institute at Athens.

Comments on Research in Historical Linguistics and Classical Philology

The linguistic research tradition of classical philology has its roots in comparative linguistic studies and in the spirit of the Neogrammarians who concentrated on historical morphology and sound laws. Research in these fields had an enormous influence on the study of classical languages.

After U. Weinreich's seminal treatise on language contact (1953), S.G. Thomason and T. Kaufman (1988), and Thomason again (1997) raised to an even more sophisticated level the study of its role and the problem of chronological change in language. It is clear that individual variation in language use can sometimes be even more important in the study of historical linguistics than has previously been thought, as it may detect practices which cannot be seen to happen systematically in every register (Labov 2001).

The Neogrammarian way of describing language change started from the creation of laws which explained phonological change. Neogrammarians stated that sound changes occurred automatically if the required context was found. The change was always diachronic. This led to the conclusion that all linguistic variation was free and had no rules to control it. However, the fundamental changes that have taken place in linguistic research over the last thirty-odd years have seriously challenged these concepts. Sociolinguistic studies have shown that linguistic variation is not free but is instead dependent on context. Social context and different registers control the variation. This has changed the attitude of some linguists towards the Greek and Latin data as well. We should now keep in mind that there are always several ways of explaining deviations from the norm. For example, individual and ephemeral variation which does not lead to a permanent change should not be neglected as a possible explanation. In addition, some phonological change existed in lower registers, but it never effected a historical change. There was much more variation and it occurred a great deal earlier than written texts can tell. Sometimes changes in pronunciation never manifest themselves in script, as we can see in, e.g., English and French, and the traditional orthography remains unchanged.

I would like to suggest ten questions which should be asked, when one studies a substandard Greek or Latin document:

1. What is the standard of a given document with which it should be compared?[3]
2. What is the register of the document?
3. What kind of deviation from the defined standard exists and why?
4. When is the main reason for linguistic idiosyncrasies simply imperfect learning?
5. What kind of spoken practice can a written text manifest?
6. When is there an internal change in process, and when could the variation be contact-induced?
7. What was the native language of the scribe/writer?
8. Who was responsible for the language use, the scribe or somebody else?
9. Was the text dictated, or was it composed autonomously or copied from a model/models?
10. What was the linguistic situation of the place where a document was copied (cf. Leiwo – Halla-aho 2002)?

---

[3] A standard has to be defined: for example, it does not make sense to compare a document written in Roman Egypt with one written in Classical Attica.

If answers cannot always be found, the questions should be, nevertheless, asked. I feel that even classicists should make their contribution to somewhat more universal linguistic questions, as they have a lot to offer for the studies of general linguistics. I shall deal with some of the questions below using data from Egypt.

Egyptian Names in Greek

Egyptian names rendered in Greek have been studied by P.W. Pestman (1993, § 25). The interesting *choachytes* documents from the 2ⁿᵈ century BC are helpful in showing a clear system whereby Egyptian names were hellenized. As a general rule the Greek nominative morpheme {ς} was appended to Egyptian names. The complete nominative ending depended on the form of the Egyptian name. A -ς was added when the Egyptian name ended in a vowel, e.g., *Pa-n3* = Πανα = Πανᾶ-ς, whereas -ις or -ης were used if the name ended in a consonant. This can be clarified with two examples: *Wsir-wr* = Οσορορηρ = Ὀσοροῆρ-ις, and *P3-Ḥṭ* = Πεχυτ = Πεχύτ-ης.[4] The system is, thus, seemingly clear, even if well-known phonological changes in Greek levelled the latter two endings both to /-is/, which probably caused confusion, even if the effects of this levelling have not been studied in detail from a synchronic point of view.

    Further examples show that the Greek declension of the Egyptian names was made according to the word ending. The system was clear enough, but its use naturally depended on the concern of the scribe and his command of Greek. The standard seems to have been as follows: -ς is inflected as (gen) -τος, (dat) -τι, (acc.) -ν; -ις as -ιος, -ει, -ιν; and -ης as -ου, -η(ι), -ην. But as a quick glance at the ostraca and papyri can easily show, there was much variation, and even ignorance or indifference towards declension. Names were often left uninflected. However, following this general rule, we have the simplified system Πανᾶς, Πανᾶτος, Ὀσοροῆρις, Ὀσοροήριος and Πεχύτης, Πεχύτου.

    If these general rules had been consistently followed by the scribes, we could even recognize the form of the Egyptian name from the Greek declension. If there are, for instance, the names Ταγης, Ταγητος and Φαρατης, Φαρατου, it is possible to conclude that the Egyptian names were Ταγη and Φαρατ or *Ta-w3* (accentuated according to Pestman as Ταγῆς) and *Pa-rd* (Pestman 1993, 485-6). But as already mentioned, scribes were not systematic with declensions. According to Pestman it is difficult to find linguistic reasons for the treatment of, e.g., three tomb names in Greek translations of Demotic *choachytes* documents. There we find an undeclined form ἐν θυναβουνούν, a declined form ἐν θυπαστήμει, and, according to Pestman, a partly declined form with lexical interference from Egyptian ἐν τοτη Πετεχώνσιος 'in the seat of Petechonsis'.[5] In my opinion, the last example belongs to the same category as the second one, as the only exception is that it has a lexical loan τοτη (= *t3 s.t* 'the seat'), which could not have been declined by the scribe without integrating it into Greek morphology. The reason for not declining the first name (θυναβουνούν = the tomb of Nabounoun) is, in my opinion, due to

---

[4] For convenience, I follow Pestman's accentuation.

[5] Pestman 1993, 76. The text is UPZ II 175a. θυ = *t3 Ḥ.t* 'the tomb' and the Egyptian name is *Nb-wnn*, Hellenized as Ναβουνουν. The name is not to be found in the Greek dictionaries of personal names Preisigke, *Namenbuch* or Foraboschi, *Onomasticon Alterum*. The second name Πατεστῆμις is, according to Pestman, a scribal error for Πατευτῆμις (attested in line 30 of the same text) = *P3-dj-Nfr-tm*.

the same thing, i.e. the name Ναβουνουν is not integrable into Greek morphology. Leaving aside on this occasion the reasons for the application of code-switching (τση), not inflecting nouns is a very intricate question which, however, may be clarified to some extent.[6] Egyptians who did not know much Greek often had difficulties with declension, but even scribes who had a good command of Greek did not always follow strict rules. Even if there seemed to have been a handy norm, it was not always followed.[7] This indifference has sociolinguistic reasons, as in a casual register more variation can be found than in an official one, but there may be some psycholinguistic factors as well. In any case the contact of Greek and Egyptian played a considerable role in the output of the Greek written by Egyptian scribes. Consequently, the scribe's native language (L1) should be taken into account when providing a description of Greek written in Egypt.

When we study the whole corpus of Greek ostraca and papyri, I am convinced that we should make a distinction between contact-induced ephemeral variation and internally motivated variation on one hand, and variation, either contact-induced or internal, leading to a permanent linguistic change on the other. Many scribes did not know Greek well, and their variety was different from that of native speakers. I believe that this fact has not been emphasized enough by previous linguistic research.[8]

The ostraca found in Narmouthis (OGN, see below) can be used to give us further information, even if they are some hundred years later than the documents of the *choachytai* mentioned above. The basic problem, however, still remains the same, namely that scribes who had Egyptian as their L1 used Greek (L2) in the documents. As the general formation of Egyptian nouns remained more or less the same for centuries, the interference in Greek also remained more or less the same, and it can, hopefully, be studied in a universal way, even if the material has a chronological gap. The starting point is, of course, the fact that Egyptian nouns had no inflection, i.e. there were no cases. Egyptian had, however, gender as well as grammatical suffixes that were of use when composing and understanding some Greek constructions. It seems that some Greek grammatical structures were easier to understand than others for speakers of Egyptian, because these latters had related structures in their own L1. These structures were apparently more transparent to L1 speakers than inflectional morphemes, but even in such cases the Greek structure was often misunderstood.[9]

As regards results achieved in studies of languages in contact, names without inflection in L1 provide a clear reason for not inflecting them in otherwise inflectional L2 if they are not wholly integrated into the morphological system of L2. In our data, however, the Egyptian names or loanwords are normally integrated so there are not only linguistic reasons for the lack of inflection.[10] Nevertheless, we may emphasize that in

---

[6] For code-switching in ancient non-literary texts, see Leiwo 2002, and Leiwo – Halla-aho 2002 with reference to a further bibliography.

[7] Gignac 1981, 57–61, 72–74, 78–79 lists the variation in declension of some names without commenting on the reasons.

[8] See, for example, Gignac 1981, XXI where the fact is very carefully phrased: "in some of these instances, bilingual interference could be a factor..." It is evident that bilingual interference and often imperfect learning was a major factor on many occasions, cf. Pestman 1989; Mussies 1968.

[9] See the interesting analysis of Mussies 1968, 74–75.

[10] Foreign names are inflected in e.g. Modern Greek only when they are integrated into Greek phonology and script (an article with the name is, naturally, always inflected), but in Finnish they are always inflected (Finnish has no article).

languages with otherwise obligatory inflection, uninflected loanwords are seemingly tolerated in nouns and adjectives, but not in verbs, where the signalling of syntactic functions is of prime importance (Dressler 1998, 26). With regard to our documents, we might think that in official registers nouns, especially names, would be correctly inflected, but in casual register there would be more variation. But the data show that even in casual registers the names were sometimes inflected correctly, sometimes incorrectly, and sometimes not at all. Moreover, this occurred even in official registers, as Vierros shows elsewhere (Vierros, forthcoming). Imperfect learning may cause some stereotypical errors characteristic of speakers of a given language, but at first glance Egyptian data seem to show no clear patterns. The apparent inconsistencies may be due to indifference, but there may be other reasons, some of which I present below.

To Inflect or not to Inflect – Is There a System?

The ostraca of Narmouthis are a real treasury for a study of language contact, since they include Demotic documents which have Greek interference and Greek documents which have Egyptian interference. As such, they belong to a category of texts with grammatical elements from another language.[11] The purpose of the ostraca seems to be clear. They are drafts of a future document written on papyrus, and were written by priests, who, according to the editors of the ostraca, Pintaudi and Sijpestijn, did not spend much time in planning the grammatical structure of the phrases. As drafts of a document they seem to represent a very casual register. It is evident that the priests wrote all kinds of documents both large and small on behalf of illiterate persons. Greek was evidently used for reasons of prestige as there were usually no legal motivation for the use of Greek in these kinds of documents. We may, however, ask whether the priests were totally indifferent to grammaticality even in casual, substandard registers. To be sure, later, when the document was written on papyrus, they spent more time with details, and the result is much closer to standard Greek registers (OGN I, p. 13).

The first draft of a document was made on ostracon, which was given a number that perhaps referred for the fair copy to be found in the papyrus archives. The correct sketch was found from the archive by the number (OGN I, p. 15). The ostraca contain notes of all kind: outlines of large documents and letters, receipts, bills, lists of names, and memoranda. Different registers are used even in these documents, but many are mere lists of items representing a kind of notebook register. A nice detail is the modernish use of phrases like μετὰ κολακίας 'with flattery, i.e. politely', or μετὰ κολακίας καὶ παρακλή-σεως 'politely and with encouragement'. This indicated to the scribe the register in which the final document had to be composed. Even these very short sketches contain a great deal of linguistic variation. I offer four examples:[12]

---

[11] For the typology of bilingual interference in inscriptions, see Leiwo 2002. These ostraca belong for the most part to my categories F: Morphological code mixing, i.e. isolated foreign grammatical elements in an otherwise Greek text and G: Phonological code mixing, i.e. isolated foreign phonological elements in an otherwise Greek text.

[12] The lines are marked only when they are relevant to my argument.

1. πρὸς   Πεβῆτι   καὶ   Πτολεμαῖς   καὶ   Φᾶσις   Παβοῦς
   To   Pebes-dat   and   Ptolemais-nom   and   Phasis-nom   Pabous-nom
   μετὰ   κολακίας   ιε̅.
   with   flattery-gen 15
   'To Pebes and Ptolemai(o)s [13] and Phasis son of Pabous, politely. 15.' (OGN I 1)

2. πρὸς   φίλους   μετὰ   κολαγίας   ις̅.
   To   friends-acc with   flattery-gen 16
   'To friends, politely. 16.' (OGN I 3)

3. πρὸς   Πλουτίων   τὸ   θεοκενιτα   μετὰ   κολακίας   καὶ
   To   Ploution-nom art.   Theogenes-acc? with   flattery-gen and
   παρακλήσεως   το   ι.
   encouragement-gen art.   10
   'To Ploution son of Theogenes/alias Theogenes politely and with encouragement.
   10.' (OGN I 4)

4. πρὸς   τοὺς   γραμματεῖς   κεωρκῶν   καὶ   γραμματιτέᾳ   σκα̣εων.   το   κ̅ζ̅
   To   art.   scribes-acc. farmers-gen and   scribe-dat+acc boats?-gen art. 26
   μετὰ κολακίας καὶ δώρων   καὶ   ἀστρονομίας.[14]
   with flattery-gen and gifts-gen   and   astronomy-gen
   'To the scribes of the farmers and to the scribe of boats?... 26. Politely and with
   gifts and a horoscope.' (OGN I 5)

These four short phrases are part of nineteen of the same kind, all beginning with the
preposition πρός followed by a noun or nouns, usually a name or names (= Prepositional
Phrase, PP). The notes have been written in the above part of the ostraca leaving quite
often a lot of free space on the lower part, perhaps for other comments which, however,
were never written. The ostraca have been lost, but photos have survived, and the editors
had to work using them (see OGN, Introduction). Therefore, it is impossible to be sure
whether all of these 19 ostraca were written by the same scribe. Nevertheless, it can
clearly be seen that the hand is very similar in each of the texts.

The use of cases is different in every example. No. 1 has πρός + the dative of the
first name followed by two names in the nominative. Even the patronymic of Phasis is in
the nominative: Παβοῦς pro Παβοῦτος.[15] No. 2 combines πρός with the accusative, which
is the standard in this PP, but in no. 3 the name in the PP is uninflected. The name Ploution
has an attribute τὸ θεοκενιτα which is a *hapax*. The meaning of the word is obscure, but it
looks like an accusative form with its -α ending. The stem θεογεν- is a good starting point,

---

[13] A common phonological, not merely a graphic variant of -ιος, cf. Gignac 1981, 26, 28. The reasons for this
variation, which becomes almost a new declension, are not tackled here.

[14] The expression γραμματιτέᾳ σκα̣εων remains obscure. The editors Pintaudi and Sijpesteijn comment: "si
potrebbe pensare a σκαφέων (zappatori), per quanto non si abbiano notizie di un loro γραμματεύς." According
to them, however, the unclear letter seems not to be φ, π or β: OGN I, p. 33 n. 5.

[15] The Egyptian name is *pbw3*, but its meaning is not known, *Demotisches Namenbuch*, Band I, Lieferung 7, 461.
The Greek declension follows the general model of Egyptian names ending with a vowel.

and I suggest that it is a name Theogenes, as phonological interference from Egyptian caused voiced stops to be written as voiceless ones, and, more seldom, vice versa as here no. 4 κεωρκῶν and no. 2 κολαγίας, respectively.[16] This name can be interpreted either as a patronymic, in which case the standard would be the genitive (το(ῦ) Θεογένητος = Θεογένους), or as an alias without the element καί (= τὸ(ν) καὶ Θεογένητα = Θεογένη). I believe that a patronymic is more likely.

No. 4 contains several idiosyncrasies, but the PP is in the accusative[17] coordinated with a common noun which seems to have both dative and accusative endings. The editors suggest that the scribe first wrote the dative and corrected it to the accusative without erasing the dative ending.[18] If this is true, and I consider it plausible, it shows that the scribe was trying to use the cases according to some standard. Was this due to a sudden subconscious diligence or was it a more or less conscious effort? I believe that the question can be clarified to some extent.

As I mentioned, there are 19 notes of this kind, all probably written by the same priest. Several syntactic and pragmatic reasons determine that in many languages the words have more weight at the beginning of a sentence than at the end.[19] Would this principle be relevant for the use of cases in our data? 18 of the 19 preserve the first word after the preposition (the word nearest the beginning). The distribution of the cases is interesting. The first word is in the accusative 11 times, in the genitive 4, in the dative 1, and in the nominative 2 times. It seems to show that scribes made some effort to choose the case of this most important word according to standard Greek grammar. But the objects of the same preposition later in their sentences show a clearly different distribution. In such cases where the PP should have a morphosyntactic agreement of other constituents after the first word (nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17) we find 3 accusatives, 4 genitives, 3 datives, and 3 nominatives as the next constituents in the sentence. This strongly suggests that the scribe considered subsequent constituents less important than the first. This conclusion goes along well with Vierros's results in her study of Hermias's use of cases (forthcoming). In any case a psycholinguistic tendency may be seen in the scribe's attempt to inflect the first word of the PP in the expected case, which here is in the accusative. It is, however, too early to draw any general conclusions as regards the use of L2 cases by Egyptian scribes, as these questions have to be studied more thoroughly in the future.

Draft of a Longer Document

An example of a more elaborated or sophisticated register is OGN I 103, which is a note for a document concerning a deceitful brother. Here is the full text.

---

[16] This was common in Egypt, as it seems that Egyptians could not easily distinguish between the Greek voiced and voiceless stops, see Horrocks 1997, 62 (Horrocks keeps using 'Coptic' claiming that it was "the final form of the old Egyptian language prior to its demise" (p. 61), but it is misleading to call Ptolemaic Egyptian 'Coptic', which is the normal term used of the form of script and the language of the Egyptian Christians. Instead, Demotic or Egyptian would be preferable).

[17] γραμματεῖς is most probably acc. pl., see Gignac 1981, 86.

[18] See also no. 11 γραμματιτες (plur.). For the general declension of nouns ending in -ευς, see Gignac 1981, 85.

[19] I leave the question open; see, e.g., in Devine–Stephens 2000 for good discussions.

1.   δ.
                    _____
2.   ιζ (ἔτει) ὁ πατὴρ ἡ-
3.   μῶν ἐτελεύτησεν
4.   ἀπὸ κυνὸν ἑστὼς καὶ τοῦ
5.   ἐν ἐμοῦ ἀπέδωκα τῷ ἀτε-
6.   λφῷ μου ἵνα αὐτὸν ἐλᾶ
7.   ζῶσαι ἄχρι τοῦ κθ (ἔτους). οὐκ ἔ-
8.   κνω τί ἔπραξεν πολλὰ
9.   ἃ ἀπωθον ἀπὸ Σωκωνώπιος.
10.   ἀρ' ὅτε ὁ πατὴρ ἐτελεύτησε
11.   καὶ ὁ προφήτης, ὡς ἔθος ἐσ-
12.   τίν, ἐμήνυσιν τὴν τάξιν
13.   τοῦ πατρός μου ὅτι [ὀφιλι]
14.   ὀφίλει πραθῆναι, ὁ ἀτελφό-
15.   ς μου οὐκ {ει} εἶπέ μοι σημᾶ-
16.   νε μετὰ τοῦ προφήτου οὔ-
17.   τε μὴν ὁ προφήτης.

Standard readings would be: l. 4 κοινῶν; l. 5-6 ἀδελφῷ; l. 7 ζῆσαι?; l. 7-8 ἔγνων; l. 9 ἀπώθει (editors), but perhaps it should be read ἔπαθον; l. 9 Σοκονώπιος; l. 12 ἐμήνυσεν; l. 14 ὀφείλει; l. 14-15 ἀδελφός, σημᾶναι.

One translation would be: *In the year 17 our father died having appointed shared (?) and I gave from my share to my brother so that he would be able to go on living till the year 29. I don't know why he did either so much that alienated (me/himself (?)) from Sokonopis or such things that I suffered by S. But when father died, and the prophet, as is customary, announced my father's order that (it? the land?) should be sold, my brother did not tell me to make a declaration with the prophet, nor did the prophet.*[20]

This draft of a document contains several problematic, but grammatically interesting features. Orthographically it is quite good, even if there are errors typical of Egyptian scribes, such as the uncertainty with voiced and voiceless stops and unstressed final vowels ἀτελφῷ, ἔκνω, ἐμήνυσιν (Horrocks 1997, 61-62). In addition, there are very few phonologically motivated errors: κυνὸν (κοινῶν), Σωκωνώπιος (Σοκονώπιος), ὀφιλι corrected as ὀφίλει by the scribe himself (ὀφείλει) and σημᾶνε (σημᾶναι). The name Sokonopis is in Egyptian *sbk-ḥ·pj* or *sbk-m-ḥb* of which the latter suits slightly better for the Greek declension Σοκονώπις, -ιος as it ends on a strong consonant.[21] It is noteworthy that the Greek declension follows the rules presented above.

_____

[20] The Italian translation of Pintaudi and Sijpesteijn is as follows: "*Nell'anno 17 nostro padre morì avendo lasciato (noi due) eredi in comune e dalla mia parte ho dato a mio fratello in modo tale che questa lo potesse mettere in condizione di vivere fino all'anno 29, non sono di grado di sapere perché egli ha fatto tanto da allontanarlo da Sokonopis. Comunque, quando nostro padre morì, il profeta, com'è uso, annunciò le disposizioni di mio padre che bisognava vendere. Mio fratello non mi disse di dare indicazioni in accordo col profeta, né il profeta.*" OGN I 123.

[21] *Demotisches Namenbuch* Band I, Lieferung 12, 918; For the declension, cf. Pestman 1993, 491; 492-493.

The habit of using standard orthography was common among trained Egyptian scribes (cf. also Vierros in this volume and forthcoming). The problems in our interpretation arise both from morphology and syntax. First, some comments on verbal morphosyntax. According to the editors the draft has one otherwise unattested form ἀπω-θον and an interesting form, ζῶσαι, here – in the editors' view – denoting the infinitive aorist (ζῆσαι). The form ζῶσαι is attested, but not in papyri or ostraca. As far as I can judge, there is only one certain attestation in an interesting sacral inscription from Delos.[22] The aorist infinitive ζῶσαι is thus a morphologically potential variant[23] for ζῆσαι. It could be a memorized form which the scribe failed to produce quite normatively.[24] Theoretically, this lapse could have been helped by the fact that ζῶσαι is a grammatical feminine participle (nom. plur.) of the same verb. However, the VP αὐτὸν ἐλᾷ ζῶσαι is syntactically difficult as the verb ἐλαύνω 'go on, lengthen?' would be constructed with an infinitival argument, which I have not come across elsewhere. Even if the editors consider the reading certain, the syntax is very strange and without parallels. Semantically the verb ἐλαύνω should need a nominal argument, e.g., ζῶσαν, but what would be the head of this feminine?[25] I leave the question open.

The other form is regarded as ungrammatical, and the editors interpret it as representing act. ind. 3 sg. ἀπώθει. The clause is, however, far from being semantically clear, and even the reading is uncertain (perhaps ἔπαθον would be possible). In my opinion a totally ungrammatical verb form without any comparisons and without a possible morphological or phonological motivation is not expected in this context. The scribes do not make similar mistakes with verbs. A solution worth considering would be that ἀπωθον is an active imperfect indicative constructed with the 1 sg / 3 pl ending -ον, even if it is against the norm.[26] However, even the deviation from the norm (= -εον, or -ουν) can well be a mere graphical one, as the final vowel is unstressed (cf. also l. 12 ἐμήνυσιν).

Syntactically the draft is quite sophisticated, but it is so concise as to be obscure. The scribe uses condensed structures some of which may represent learnt idioms. In line 9 ἄ is a constituent of ἀπωθον functioning as its subject or object, but semantically the phrase still remains unclear. As regards nouns, one lapse in the use of cases reflects patterns already discussed above, and may even be motivated by the preceding ending: καὶ τοῦ ἐν ἐμοῦ... (ἐν ἐμοῖ).

The perf. part. ἑστώς has no parallels in papyri with regard to the phrase in this draft, and even otherwise it is seldom used, but it is an adequate construction: [ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν] [ἐτελεύτησεν]ᵢ [ἀπὸ κοινὸν ἑστώς]ᵢ.[27] The PP ἀπὸ κοινῶν is attested in papyri, and is usually connected with land. A common phrase is ἀπὸ κοινῶν καὶ ἀδιαρέτων ἀρουρῶν +

---

[22] IG XI 4, 1299, end of 3ʳᵈ century BC. ὁ ἱερεὺς Ἀπολλώνιος ἀνέγραψεν κατὰ πρόσταγμα τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ γὰρ πάπ-πος ἡμῶν Ἀπολλώνιος, ὢν Αἰγύπτιος ἐκ τῶν ἱερέων, τὸν θεὸν ἔχων παρεγένετο ἐξ Αἰγύπτου θεραπεύων τε διετέλει λαθῶς πάτριον ἣν ζῶσαί τε δοκεῖ ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἑπτά. (...)

[23] Cf. aor. ind. variant ἔζωσα, LSJ s.v. ζῶ and ἐπέζωσε, P. Fouad 75 (Arsinoite, AD 64). Dressler (1998, 27) emphasizes the role of potential inflectional forms which are system-adequate, i.e. they are phonotactically and morphotactically potential, but may be norm-inadequate, and as such they are much less likely to be rejected by native speakers than system-inadequate forms.

[24] See, e.g., the discussion concerning so-called rule-processing and rote-processing in Riionheimo 1998, 247–251.

[25] Cf. the construction in Aesch. *Eum.* 605 τί δ᾽ οὐκ ἐκείνην ζῶσαν ἤλαυνες φυγῇ;

[26] See the interesting theoretical discussion in Dressler 1998, 26–30.

[27] The subscript i means that the subject of the two phrases is identical.

the number of *arourai*.[28] It is fairly reasonable to think that land is the intention here as well.[29] The verb ὀφίλει is used with the infinitive πραθῆναι and denotes obligation. The brothers inherited some land jointly, and one brother perhaps gave his share to the other for some time, but it turned out that the father had given some instructions concerning selling. This joint land then was the cause for their dissension and this draft of the document.

The last item of syntactic interest dealt with here is the infinitive σημᾶνε (l. 15-16). It is used as the complement of εἶπε instead of a finite complement constructed with ὅτι or ὡς popular in the post-Ptolemaic period (Mandilaras 1973, 329–331). Its use together with other infinitives of this ostracon shows the existence of infinitive constructions even in draft documents. The form itself (σημᾶνε = σημᾶναι) is corrected by the editors in the apparatus as σημῆναι but the correction is unnecessary.[30] The infinitive is used without a marked subject, which, however, has to be the same as the subject of the verb εἶπε. Omitting the subject seems to be due to the notebook register of this draft, as the subject is self-evident to the scribe who wrote the draft. The impression which emerges from this and other drafts is that the scribes had quite a good command of Greek, but the notebook register creates lapses which are typical of Egyptian speakers.

As a conclusion I would like to emphasize the importance of different aspects that should be dealt with when analysing and describing substandard language. Close analysis may reveal a satisfactory explanation for seemingly unmotivated idiosyncrasies. It is, however, self-evident that further studies are needed to lend more weight to the preliminary results presented here. I intend to deal with these questions more thoroughly elsewhere.

Department of Classical Philology
University of Helsinki

---

[28] E.g. P. Oxy I 47, AD 83/4-88; P. Ryl II 159, AD 31/32.

[29] Some documents were written concerning a Sokonopis, cf. OGN I 73.

[30] Cf. examples in P. Oxy XLIII 3133, AD 239; P. Oxy XLV 3263, AD 215; P. Rain. Cent. 65, AD 234; P. Rain. Cent. 66, AD 234; P. Rain. Cent. 67, AD 234, but they occur earlier as well, e.g. BGU IV 1078, AD 38.

Bibliography

Demotisches Namenbuch = E. Lüddeckens & alii., Lieferungen 1-18, Wiesbaden 1980-2000.

Devine - Stephens 2000 = A.M. Devine - L.D. Stephens, *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyberbaton in Greek*, New York – Oxford 2000.

Dressler 1998 = W.U. Dressler, What is the Core of Morphology?, in Niemi, Odlin and Heikkinen 1998, 15-32.

Gignac 1981 = F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Vol. II, Morphology*, Testi e documenti per lo studio di antichità LV - 2, Milano 1981.

Horrocks 1997 = G. Horrocks, *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*, London and New York 1997.

Labov 2001 = W. Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change. Vol. 2. Social Factors*, Malden and Oxford 2001.

Lass 1997 = R. Lass, *Historical Linguistics and Language Change*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 81, Cambridge 1997.

Leiwo 2002 = M. Leiwo, From Contact to Mixture. Bilingual Inscriptions from Italy, in J.N. Adams - S. Swain - M. Janse (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*, Oxford 2002, 168-194.

Leiwo - Halla-aho 2002 = M. Leiwo & H. Halla-aho, A Marriage Contract. Aspects of Latin-Greek Language Contact. *Mnemosyne* 55, fasc. 5 (2002) 560–580.

Leiwo (forthcoming) = M. Leiwo, The Relation between Written and Spoken Greek. Remarks from Mons Claudianus, in *Ancient Greece at the Turn of the Millennium. Papers from the 25th anniversary colloquium of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens.*

Mandilaras 1973 = B.G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, Athens 1973.

Mussies 1968 = G. Mussies, Egyptianisms in a Late Ptolemaic Document, *Antidoron Martino David*, Leiden 1968, 70-75.

Niemi, Odlin and Heikkinen 1998 = J. Niemi, T. Odlin and J. Heikkinen (eds.), *Language Contact, Variation and Change*, Studies in Languages 32, Joensuu 1998.

OGN = R. Pintaudi - P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Ostraca Greci da Narmouthis*, Quaderni di Medinet Madi 2, Pisa 1993.

Pestman 1993 = P.W. Pestman, *The Archive of the Theban Choachytes (Second Century B.C.). A Survey of the Demotic and Greek Papyri Contained in the Archive*, Leuven 1993.

Riionheimo 1998 = H. Riionheimo, Morphological Attrition and Interference in Language Contact: Sketching a Framework, in Niemi, Odlin and Heikkinen 1998, 15-32.

Thomason - Kaufman 1988 = S.G. Thomason - T. Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, Los Angeles 1988.

Thomason 1997 = S.G Thomason (ed.), *Contact Languages. A Wider Perspective*, Creole Language Library, Vol. 17, Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1997.

Vierros (forthcoming) = M. Vierros, The Language of Hermias, an Egyptian Notary from Pathyris (c. 100 B.C.), in *Akten des 23. Internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie*, Wien 22.–28. Juli 2001.

Weinreich 1953 = U. Weinreich, *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, The Hague 1953.