<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Idiolect in focus : Two brothers in the Memphis Sarapieion (II BCE)

Vierros, Marja

de Gruyter
2021

Vierros , M 2021 , Idiolect in focus : Two brothers in the Memphis Sarapieion (II BCE) . in K Bentein & M Janse (eds) , Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek . Trends in *Journal of Linguistics. Studies and Monographs* , no. 331 , de Gruyter , Berlin , p

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/338662>

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110614404-003>

unspecified
publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Marja Vierros

3 Idiolect in focus: Two brothers in the Memphis Sarapieion (II BCE)

Abstract: The chapter discusses the Katochoi archive from the point of view of idiolects. Several documents written in the hands of Apollonios and Ptolemaios, sons of Glaukias, can be identified within the archive, which comprises of several types of documents. I study whether these autograph texts can be said to represent the idiolects of Apollonios and Ptolemaios and how this perspective might change our interpretation of the interesting linguistic variation found in the whole archive. Apollonios, for example, wrote many drafts and copies which do not necessarily reflect his personal language use in the morphological or syntactic levels. However, the orthography reveals individual practices. I will present examples of language use by both brothers, comparing them to the scribal language use found in the same archive.

1 Idiolect: A definition and its relevance

Idiolect can be defined as a “dialect of an individual person at one time”.^{1, 2} The term implies that all speakers have their own style of speaking and producing language, but also that this style is subject to change over time. Such unique features can include vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. Some scholars have argued that variationist linguists should not take idiolects into account, since “the grammars in which linguistic change occurs are grammars of the speech community” (Weinreich, Labov and Herzog 1968: 188).³ Later, Labov (2001: 34) expanded on this, stating that the individual does not exist as a linguistic object but nonetheless shows a personal profile of the comparative use of resources made available by the speech community. He continues, however, to say that sociolinguists agree that the primary site for linguistic investigation is

¹ This contribution has received funding from the Academy of Finland project “Act of the Scribe: Transmitting Linguistic Knowledge and Scribal Practices in Graeco-Roman Antiquity” (287386) and from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 758481 “Digital Grammar of Greek Documentary Papyri”).

² Britannica.com, s.v. “dialect”.

³ Cf. Labov (2001: xi).

the individual's productions and interpretations. These should be used, in turn, as components to construct the principal target of study: the language of the speech community. Indeed, the study by Labov on linguistic change and variation in Philadelphia includes many profiles of individual language users, descriptions of their language use, and their potential role as linguistic innovators who disseminate their inventions within their networks. Therefore, it seems that the study of idiolect is warranted, but it should also lead to further understanding of variation within the speech community.

When studying historical languages where the available data is limited by ancient texts that have largely been preserved contingently, I feel that there is a special need to investigate the possibility of certain features being idiolectal rather than being shared by the whole speech community. However, quite often, this kind of investigation is not possible. With Greek documentary papyri from Egypt, for instance, this is possible only when we have a set of texts from the same place and time, often in the form of an archive.⁴ The archives can contain several texts that have been written by one writer (identified either by handwriting or name – in the best cases, by both).⁵ One further reason to study idiolects is that, by discerning the linguistic features typical of individuals, we may be able to identify some of the writers and/or authors of the texts, even if handwriting analysis is not possible. On the other hand, we may need to distinguish the writer from the author – that is, the person who wrote the text was not necessarily the same person who was in charge of –, e.g. the choice of words and the syntax.⁶ The question of who was in charge of what parts of the language of a given text is complicated, and the pursuit to identify idiolects in this chapter is also an attempt to find some answers to this larger question.

An archive often also gives us more context on the speech community, people who produced the texts, the background of the community, families, language contact, etc. In the archive under investigation here, the family functions as a nuclear speech community. However, variation also occurs between family members, since the peer group from the larger speech community also exerts

⁴ For a thorough introduction on papyrus archives, see Vandorpe (2009). Several Ptolemaic archives are presented in Vandorpe & Waebeens (2009). Papyrus archives can conveniently be searched and studied via TM Archives.

⁵ Cf. Evans (2010) on identifying the language of individuals in the Zenon archive in the third century BCE, and Leiwo (this volume) on idiolects in archives of ostraca in the Roman period.

⁶ Cf. Evans (2010: 66–69) and Luiselli (2010: 73) (with bibliography).

an influence.⁷ While there are four brothers present in the archive, only two of them wrote most of the texts, and we do not have texts from other generations. Our brothers' language uses display both similarities and dissimilarities.

2 Context: The Katochoi archive and its documents

In this chapter, I will focus on the idiolects of two brothers on the basis of the documentary material found in the temple area of Sarapis in Memphis, Egypt, which is dated to the second century BCE. These texts have been preserved in the so-called “Katochoi of the Sarapieion” archive, published as a single volume by Ulrich Wilcken in 1927.⁸ The exact location of the papyrus find is unknown.⁹ These texts have fascinated both scholars and non-academic audience, because they tell a vivid tale about two girls, Taues and Taous, who are twins and protégées of the protagonists of the archive, and their hardships, including an evil mother figure. We know a great deal about the historical context of the multi-ethnic Memphis area thanks to the important monograph by Dorothy Thompson (2012), and the Katochoi archive has been studied extensively from the historical point of view. The language has been studied to a lesser degree, though already Wilcken (1927: iii) mentioned that the language requires future study from many different points of view. Now, the recent article by Bentein (2015) provides a linguistic analysis of many phenomena in the archive and discusses the influence of text type and status on the language. Indeed, the archive is a veritable source of material for further linguistic studies. I will give

⁷ See Hazen (2002).

⁸ Ca. 110 documentary Greek texts belonging to the archive are included in the UPZ I edition (Wilcken 1927). The main body of the archive is formed by documents **2–105** in UPZ I (the bold numbers in this chapter refer to the number assigned to the texts in UPZ I; non-bolded numbers may follow, indicating the line number). In addition, **110–111**, **144**, **145**, and **147** are included in the archive. The UPZ publication numbers do not correlate with the inner chronology of the archive. Some texts were not published in UPZ I – namely, the literary and Demotic Egyptian ones.

See Trismegistos archive ID 119 (www.trismegistos.org/arch/detail.php?quick2=119) for the whole list; the total number of texts listed there is 127 (3 of which are uncertain).

⁹ According to Wilcken (1927: 1–3), the texts from Memphis were found by local inhabitants around 1820 and then distributed via at least three different antiquities dealers (Henry Salt, Bernardino Drovetti, Johann d’Anastasy) to Europe.

a brief overview of the context for the sake of better understanding the environment and background in which these brothers wrote their texts. I will also discuss different registers and text types, since they had an influence on language use that cannot be overlooked, but what I wish to add to Bentein's work, is tracking down the writer vs. author and their impact on the different levels of language as well as give more examples and actual numbers of the distribution of the phenomena. However, many interesting phenomena are still left for future studies.

Memphis was the second largest city of Ptolemaic Egypt and had a multi-ethnic population. Greeks had settled there already before the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great. That Greek population was called "Hellenomemphitai".¹⁰ However, the protagonists of our archive came from the neighbouring Herakleopolite nome. Ptolemaios, the eldest son of Glaukias, was a recluse (*[en]katochos*) in the Sarapieion temple complex of Memphis since 172 BCE,¹¹ and his youngest brother, Apollonios, joined him after their father had died (before 164 BCE). Apollonios was perhaps born in 175 BCE,¹² so he was still in his teens when he was running errands and performing writing tasks for Ptolemaios and their other brothers between Memphis and Psichis in 164–158. In 158, he became a recluse himself for a few months. Ptolemaios was around twenty years his brother's senior, and Apollonios called him "father" in many occasions. They had two other brothers, Hippalos and Sarapion, who stayed in the village of Psichis, in the Herakleopolite nome, where the family owned a house. The house had been allotted to their father, Glaukias, who was a soldier-settler (*katoikos*).

10 Thompson (2012: 77). Cf. Herodotus (2.154.1–3), who speaks of Greek and Carian mercenaries who served under Psammetichos I (664–610 BCE) and their transfer to Memphis under the reign of Amasis (570–526 BCE). UPZ I 1 (Curse of Artemisia) is dated approximately to the fourth century BCE and evidences the mixed dialectal language use of the Hellenomemphitai.

11 What exactly is meant by a "recluse" or one who is "in detention" in the temple has not been finally determined; see the discussions in, e.g. Delekat (1964), Lewis (1986: 69–87), Legras (2011), Thompson (2012: 199ff). At any rate, these recluses lived in the area of the temple of Astarte within the Great Sarapieion and were not allowed to leave the temple area. Thompson (2012: 205–6) makes the interesting observation that the language of the cult Ptolemaios was involved in was neither Greek nor Egyptian but possibly Phoenician (based on the homeland of the goddess).

12 Thompson (2012: 228) assumes that Apollonios was 18 years old when Ptolemaios enrolled him in the army in 157 BCE (**14**); Wilcken (1927: 114) suggested the years 173 or 174 as Apollonios' year of birth. His day of birth was Hathyr 10 (i.e. the beginning of December in the years 175–173 BCE). He was referred as παιδάριον 'young boy' in texts written before Hathyr 10, 161 BCE.

Glaukias was entitled Macedonian and belonged to the esteemed group of *sunge-neis* ([‘king’s] cousins’, Lewis 1986: 74). Ptolemaios and Apollonios inherited their father’s title of Macedonian. It is clear that Glaukias had Greek/Macedonian ancestry, and his son Ptolemaios appeals to the king in one of his petitions by emphasizing his Greek (*hellēn*) status.¹³

Both Apollonios and Ptolemaios wrote Greek texts. Wilcken identified their individual handwritings. Apollonios learnt how to write possibly in the Sarapieion, since a training alphabet written in his hand has been preserved (147). He wrote more documents than Ptolemaios, who only wrote accounts, dream descriptions, and one private letter and copied some poetry. He could have embarked on some sort of administrative career that required writing skills, since he drafted some and copied many petitions as a young boy, and his handwriting developed toward cursive already early on.¹⁴ It must be noted that the copies of petitions as well as the copies of the receipts concerning twin’s matters were originally written in ca. 163–161, i.e. when Apollonios was in his early teens.

We do not know for sure if he copied these petitions at the time when they were originally written or if he used them as a learning material in later years. The petitions concerning his own matters as well as the letters were written later, when he was 17 or 18 or more. Approximately half of the private letters in the archive were written by Apollonios – only one by Ptolemaios, since Apollonios wrote many of the letters on behalf of Ptolemaios. The documents written by Apollonios, Ptolemaios, and other hands are presented in Table 1, which is organized by text types.

13 UPZ I 7: παρὰ τὸ Ἑλληνά με εἶναι ‘because I am Greek’ (also in UPZ I 8, a later version of the same petition). Veisse (2007) distinguishes the different aspects of Ptolemaios’ designations: “Macedonian” was restricted to the official sphere; geographically, he was a “man of the Herakleopolite”; culturally, he was a “Hellene”; being a “recluse” was the defining element of his social identity. We must note, however, that Apollonios added the word “Macedonian” in the titulature of Ptolemaios in several draft petitions (but, in the scribal drafts, the title is often missing). Apollonios also added marginalia to a copy of Euripides’ *Telephos*: “Apollonios, the Macedonian . . . a Macedonian, I say”, perhaps comparing himself to Telephos, who laments his destiny as a Hellene among barbarians; see Thompson (2012: 242).

14 Wilcken (1927: 115) describes the handwriting of Apollonios as ugly and uneven but notes that, already as a young boy, his hand was half-cursive and had developed to cursive in basic training. Wilcken’s view was that rapidity was the aim of Apollonios rather than beautiful handwriting.

Table 1: Documents in the Katochoi archive grouped by hand writing and genre.¹⁵

UPZ I documents	Ptolemaios	Apollonios	Scribal/other hands ¹⁶
Petitions (final)			7, 20 ¹⁷ , 36(?) ¹⁸
Petitions (drafts)		12+13, 18, 32, 44, 49+50, 52+53, 57	2, 3+4, 5+6, 8, 9+10+11, 15+16, 17, 19, 24, 40, 41, 42, 43+45, 46+47+48, 51
Petitions (copies)		14, 22, 33+34+35, 39	
Orders and reports		23, 26, 37, 38 (copies)	21, 25, 27, 28
Private letters	67	63, 65, 68, 69, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76 [72]; P.Mil. I 2, 28	59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 71, 72
Receipts		29 (copy), 31 (draft?)	30
Accounts	56, 82–85, 86 3–12, 87, 88, 90 13, 15–17, 92, 94 iii–iv, 95–100, 101 1–16, 18–23, 103–105; P.Mil. I 2, 27	54, 55, 58 (frgs), 89, 91, 93 (letter), 94 I–II, 101 (marg), 102 1–6	

¹⁵ Versions of same text are joined together by the plus symbol (+). Some versions of the same text are in different cells in this table, see below, text groups.

¹⁶ This column contains the texts written by hands other than those of Apollonios or Ptolemaios. In the case of petitions, orders, and reports, they were mostly written by scribes with trained hands, but, in the case of private letters, it is more difficult to determine the actual writer.

¹⁷ Whether this text was the final version that was sent is difficult to determine. It was written in fine calligraphic script and seems to be the text that was actually sent as the petition; however, three subscriptions were copied in one hand at the end (ll. 74–78), and, before that, there are some lines in Ptolemaios's hand that have been erased. Perhaps two “final” copies were made, and 20 was the version that stayed with the petitioner; the official marks would have been copied on it, too, after the decisions had been made.

¹⁸ Text 36 has subscriptions in other hands signifying the receipt of the petition by officials and some instructions on how to proceed with the case; in that respect, it seems to be the version actually sent to the *hupodioikētēs* Sarapion. But it also has corrections added above the line and a part written in Apollonios's hand (Wilcken, 115, 234). Texts 33–35 are Apollonios's copies of this same text, while 43 has been written in an elegant hand with corrections in two different hands and marginalia in Apollonios's hand.

Table 1 (continued)

UPZ I documents	Ptolemaios	Apollonios	Scribal/other hands ¹⁶
Marginalia/ additions	20 67–71 (m3)	21 24–5, 27, 36 (m4), 43 (m4)	
Dreams	77, 79, 80 (list only)	78	
Literature and educational material (copies)	Poseidippos's epigrams, part of a comic play	81 (Nectanebo), 147 (alphabet), writing exercises and Greek poetry	110 (Letter of Herodes), 111 (royal letter), 144 (model letter), 145 (model letter) ¹⁹

Whether Apollonios could also write Demotic Egyptian has been debated among scholars. Some say that he was more fluent in Demotic than in Greek, but others do not believe he knew how to write Demotic at all.²⁰ The brothers lived in a temple area where most other people – their fellow recluses and the people they had to write petitions against – were Egyptians. The twin girls Taues and Taous became their protégées after their father Hargynoutis, Ptolemaios' Egyptian friend, died. To have been able to communicate in this environment, it is very likely that Ptolemaios and Apollonios were able to speak Egyptian.²¹ Therefore, Apollonios could very well have also learnt to write Egyptian. As for bilingualism, one of the dream descriptions written by Ptolemaios (narrating a dream of a

¹⁹ Texts 110–111, 144–45 are on the other side of *Ars Eudoxi*, an astronomical treatise found in the archive.

²⁰ Thompson (2012: 230): “Apollonios was equally familiar with Egyptian language and culture. His Greek has a strong Egyptian flavour and, if the Demotic record betrays the language of his dreams, he dreamed in Egyptian, too (P.Bologna dem. 3173, etc).” Apollonios also wrote the Dream of Nectanebo (Koenen 1985), a Greek translation (or adaptation) of a Demotic literary text. Wilcken (1927: 350–351) expressed doubts about Apollonios' skills in Demotic, while Legras (2007) initially considered Apollonios to be biliteral but later (2011) changed his mind, with light arguments; cf. Vierros (2012b), Prada (2013).

²¹ It is possible that the mother of these two brothers was Egyptian (cf. Thompson 2012: 198) and, thus, they could have been completely bilingual. Greek was at least their father's tongue, but we have no way of knowing whether Glaukias was a first-generation immigrant or not. A Demotic ostrakon seems to refer to Apollonios also by his Egyptian name, Peteharempi (P.Dem.Bol. 3173), though this interpretation can be disputed. In any case, the names of the brothers represent Hellenized names rather than “common” Greek names, Ptolemaios being a Hellenistic dynastic name and Sarapion a theophoric name from the Hellenistic god Sarapis; Apollonios was also very common among Hellenized Egyptians. See e.g. the discussion in Vierros (2012a: 45–49).

certain Nektembes) appears to evidence code-switching: possibly Egyptian words (written in the Greek alphabet) in the middle of otherwise Greek text.²² Another dream describes the twins being in a school room of Thothēs (78 8–9), which suggests that Egyptian education was available at the temple.

A great deal of evidence attesting to the copying and drafting texts and, therefore, also on the recycling of papyri is also present in this archive. In some cases, our main hint that a text is just a draft is the fact that a version of the same text has been written on the other side of the papyrus or that many different texts are written on the same papyrus, on the same or both sides. Table 2 indicates which papyri contain multiple Greek texts; some papyri even contain three or four texts. There are also Demotic texts (some of which may have been written by Apollonios) which perhaps served just as scrap papyrus, where Demotic was washed out and Greek accounts written over or in between Demotic texts.²³ Two example cases of the reuse of papyri may clarify the complexity of understanding the nature of any given text. It is good to be aware of the physical aspects of the texts, since they can sometimes help us to understand in which order some versions were written and whether it was visually possible to copy from one text directly to another (e.g., if the model text was on a separate papyrus sheet). Case 1 (Figure 1) is papyrus 406 [2] from the Leiden National Museum of Antiquities: Text **33** is a claim for oil, written in the hand of Apollonios, a draft which breaks off in the middle of l. 15; other versions of the same text are found on other papyri (**34**, **35**, and **36**). Text **49**, rotated 180°, is a petition on behalf of the twins; only the first four lines have been written, and the text breaks off in the middle of the first word of l. 5. The text has two orthographic mistakes that are corrected in **50**.²⁴ Text **50** is a version of **49**, this time the whole text, and was clearly written after **49**, because it does not fit in a single place, since the text of **49** had already been written on the papyrus first.

22 79 3–5: τὸ δεῦτερον· Φαφερεσιενρηξ Παῦνι ἐν τῷ Βουβαστῷ χμεννι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τῷ Ἄμμωνος πελ λελ χασονχανι. [‘The second (dream): Faferesienreēx month of Pauni in the Boubasteion chmenni in the house of Ammon pel lel chasonchani’]. Wilcken (1927: 366) states that “diese barbarischen Lautgruppen in 4 und 5 können nach Lage der Dinge nichts anderes sein als griechische Transkriptionen von ägyptischen Wörtern” [“These barbaric sound groups in 4 and 5 can not be anything other than Greek transcriptions of Egyptian words”]. The meaning of these Egyptian words has not been deciphered as far as I know. On the other hand, they might represent some other language – e.g. Phoenician (cf. fn. 11) – or just gibberish. I follow here the original division of the transliterated Egyptian words in the papyrus, as did Prada (2013), who also discusses the language of the dreams and dream interpretation in general.

23 A comprehensive list of all Demotic palimpsests is available in Clarysse & Vandorpe (2006).

24 Text **47**, on a different papyrus, has the same beginning (but it differs from **50** at the end) and spans 25 lines but breaks off in the middle of a sentence.

Table 2: Reuse of papyri in the Katochoi archive.

<i>recto</i>	<i>verso</i>
UPZ I 2: Petition of Harmais (163)	UPZ I 52: Petition of Ptolemaios (draft) (161)
UPZ I 3: Petition of Ptolemaios for Herakleia (164) P. L. Bat. 24 pp. 24–25 no. 113 descr. (Dem)	UPZ I 4: Petition of Herakleia (same hand as that of <i>recto</i>) (164)
UPZ I 9: Petition of Ptolemaios (161–160)	UPZ I 100: Account (157)
UPZ I 12: Petition of Apollonios (158)	UPZ I 13: Petition of Apollonios (158–157)
UPZ I 14: Petition of Ptolemaios; palimpsest (157)	Demotic?
UPZ I 15: Petition of Ptolemaios (156)	UPZ I 16: Petition of Ptolemaios (156)
UPZ I 17: First petition to Sarapion (163)	UPZ I 86: Account (161)
UPZ I 18: Petition for the twins (163)	UPZ I 18v: Beginning of a petition (162–161) UPZ I 82: Account (163–161)
UPZ I 21: Notice (162) UPZ I 75: Beginning of a letter (after 162)	
UPZ I 23: Report of Apollonios, γραμματεὺς (162) UPZ I 26: Order from Mennides to Theon (162) UPZ I 27: Order from Theon to Dionysios (162)	
UPZ I 77: Ptolemaios's dream descriptions (158) UPZ I 97: Accounts (158) UPZ I 89: Account of twins' food supplies (159)	UPZ I 31: Receipt (162)

Table 2 (continued)

<i>recto</i>	<i>verso</i>
UPZ I 33: Initial oil claim (161) UPZ I 49: Petition for twins (beginning) (161) UPZ I 50: Petition for twins (161)	
UPZ I 43: Petition to Sarapion (161?)	UPZ I 34: Initial oil claim (161) UPZ I 44: Petition to Sarapion (3 lines) (162–161)
UPZ I 39: New oil claim (161) UPZ I 74: Private letter (161 or after)	
UPZ I 47: Petition for twins (162–161)	UPZ I 104: Account (162–161)
UPZ I 54: Account (161 or after)	UPZ I 55: Account (161 or after)
UPZ I 56: Bread account (106 or after)	Paris, Louvre 7171 + Paris, Louvre 7172 (literary; Pack 1965, 1435 = TM 59936), school texts
UPZ I 57: Petition (164–161) UPZ I 58: Notifications and fragments (163–162)	UPZ I 58: Notifications and fragments (163–162)
UPZ I 63: Letter/petition (158) UPZ I 80: List of dreams (158 or after) UPZ I 96: Accounts (158) (Demotic, washed away)	
UPZ I 67: Ptolemaios' letter (153–152)	UPZ I 103: Account (153)
UPZ I 78: Letter (dreams) (159 or after) (Demotic)	
P.Par. 2 (literary; Pack 1965, 246 = TM 59451)	UPZ I 79: Dream of Nektembes (159) UPZ I 90: Account (159) UPZ I 101: Account (156)
UPZ I 84: Account (160) (Demotic, washed away)	UPZ I 83: Account (161) Demotic, wisdom text
UPZ I 85: Account (160)	Demotic, wisdom text?

Figure 1: Positions of different documents in one papyrus sheet, Leiden 406 [2].

Case 2 (Figure 2) is taken from the Dresden papyrus (inventory number unknown): Text **43**, on the *recto*, is a petition in a scribal hand (other hands have made interlineal corrections and Apollonios' hand appears on the margins). Text **34**, on the *verso*, rotated 90 degrees to the right and written by Apollonios, is the second version of **33**. Text **44**, rotated 180°, contains only three lines of the petition (**43**) on the *recto*.

As e.g. **43** in Case 2 shows, the petitions written by scribal hands could also be drafts – i.e. they were still not the final versions of the text ready to be sent. We have very few cases where there is evidence that the petition was actually the one sent to officials. The ones that do are **7** and **36** (see Table 1); these bear the subscriptions that were made when the petition was received and are followed by a list of actions to be taken. Since **36** includes Apollonios' writing after the official response, we can assume that the petition had been returned to the petitioner. The existence of **7** in this archive also suggests the same (since the details of the papyrus finds remain unknown, however, it may be the case that the papyri were not all found at the same place; see above). Text **14** is a copy made in Apollonios' hand, but it includes the official markings, i.e. it represents a final, sent petition, but as a private copy. Distinguishing a copy from a draft is not always straightforward, but I attempted to make this distinction in Table 1 on the basis of Wilcken's judgements, corrections applied to the text, and differences between the versions (if several versions exist).

One approach for studying idiolect is to compare the versions of the same text written by different hands. They may be drafts or copies, sometimes with very similar wordings, but sometimes presenting significant development in composing the same text. I list below these versions, i.e. text groups, where one or more versions of the same text are by Apollonios' hand and some in scribal hands:²⁵

²⁵ Texts **7** and **8** are also versions of the same, but apparently neither is in Apollonios' hand.

Figure 2: Positions of different documents in both sides of the Dresden papyrus.

- Text group A: **18** (Apollonios' hand)
19 (scribal hand, same as in **9** and **24**)
- Text group B: **25** (scribal hand)
26 (Apollonios' hand)
- Text group C: **33** (Apollonios' hand, unfinished)
34 (Apollonios' hand)
35 (Apollonios' hand)
36 (scribal hand; hand 4 = Apollonios' hand)
- Text group D: **39** (Apollonios' hand)
40 (scribal hand, similar to **28**)
- Text group E: **43** (scribal hand, same as **10**, **41**, **42**;
hand 4 = Apollonios' hand)
44 (Apollonios' hand, unfinished)
45 (scribal hand?)
- Text group F: **46** (scribal hand?)
47 (scribal hand, same as **2** and **8**?; unfinished)
48 (scribal hand, unfinished)
49 (Apollonios' hand; unfinished)
50 (Apollonios' hand)

3 Linguistic material: Possible idiolectal features of Apollonios and Ptolemaios

I will consider several different levels of language in the search for the idiolectal features of Apollonios and Ptolemaios. I begin with the orthographic data, which often reveal issues relating to pronunciation and, therefore, ongoing phonological changes evidenced by misspellings. Orthography can also reveal aspects of education, i.e. the writing can be in accord with the standard spelling with certain words, but repeat certain idiosyncrasies with others. I will then look at some aspects of morphology and certain syntactic features – namely, the use of particles, participles, and conjunctions.

3.1 Phonology

The brothers are infamous for their poor ability to spell. Scholars have made statements such as that “[Ptolemaios] spelling was purely phonetic, his grammar shaky at best” (Lewis 1986: 74) and that “[Apollonios] spelling is notoriously poor. In particular, he has little sense for the quantitative distinctions of Greek vowels and diphthongs, a phenomenon which went hand in hand with the modification of the nature of the Greek accents” (Koenen 1985: 174, fn. 9).²⁶ Depauw and Stolk (2015: 209) also noted how the editorial regulations peak substantially in the mid-second century BCE due to the Katochoi archive, meaning that orthography was corrected by the papyrus editors to a significant amount.

The most common interchange of graphemes in Greek papyri in general, that between ι and ει, is expectedly also the most common in our archive.²⁷

²⁶ Wilcken (1927: 115) also noted a difference in the orthography between the brothers; he describes Apollonios’ orthography “noch vulgärer als die des Ptolemaios” [“even more vulgar than that of Ptolemaios”], mentioning his misspellings of ῥαυδος (for ῥάβδος ‘rod’), ἐμβλεύσαντες (for ἐμβλέψαντες ‘looking’), Σαραπιγήωι ‘Sarapieion’, and κάαγώ (κάγώ ‘and I’) and examples of metatheses such as πόρσωπον for πρόσωπον ‘face’ and Ἀφορδίτη for Ἀφροδίτη ‘Aphrodite’.

²⁷ Bentein (2015: 465–466). As Horrocks (2010: 161–162) presents it, the original diphthong ει had monophthongised already in the eighth–seventh century BCE, resulting in the new mid-high vowel /e:/. After the classical period, it was pulled towards /i:/ (affecting first the pre-consonantal and word-final allophones, but then applying generally); approximately at the same time, the distinction between short and long vowels disappeared. In the table of sounds of the Egyptian Koine of the mid-second century BCE, Horrocks (2010: 167), following Teodorsson (1977), presents ει as /i/ before a consonant and a raised /e/ before a vowel. See also Mayser-Schmoll (60–70), Gignac (1976: 189–191).

The standard ι written as ει occurs 100 times²⁸ (of which only nine occurrences are in hands other than those of Apollonios or Ptolemaios). The standard ει written as ι occurs 131 times²⁹ (of which seventeen occurrences are in hands other than those of Apollonios or Ptolemaios). Based on this analysis, it was slightly more common to write ει as ι than vice versa. In Ptolemaios' case, a few words are repeatedly written in the same way, thus making the number bigger (e.g. χαλκῖα for χαλκεῖα 'copper coin' 11 times in the accounts **98** and **99**). In any case, even this very common interchange was mostly avoided by other writers in the archive (cf. the number of documents by other hands in Table 1), but our brothers betray a lack of education in their orthography and confirming that they probably pronounced ι and ει similarly. In the copies Apollonios made, he occasionally confuses these letters even when the scribal hand did not.³⁰ That means that he could not always follow the standard orthography even when copying.

Examples of standard ι written as ει are found in all positions and by all hand writing types: word-initially in 9 instances (e.g. εἰδού for ἰδού 'see:imp' in **77** 15 and **78** 25; εἶνα for ἶνα 'that' **18r** 23); word-finally in 20 instances (mostly Apollonios and Ptolemaios; once in a scribal hand, e.g. λέγουσι for λέγουσι 'they say' **77** 14; ἔτει 'year:dat' for ἔτι 'still' **18r** 15; περεῖ for περὶ 'about' **77** 1, **80** 1, 2, 3, 4, 6); in stressed syllable (e.g. τειθεσθαι for τίθεσθαι 'pay' **14** 71; ἐπεῖ for ἐπὶ 'upon' **77** 23); in unstressed syllable (e.g. βασιλεικοῦ for βασιλικοῦ 'royal' **23** 5; δειὰ for διὰ 'through' **77** 6; λίθινα for λίθινα 'of stone' **57** 5); the ending -ιν was written as -ειν in 19 instances (e.g. πάλειν for πάλιν 'again' **18r** 26; πόλειν for

28 Analysis extracted with the aid of the Paratypa tool (see Henriksson, Dahlgren & Vierros forthcoming). Search description: select Deletions, then Original: ε (ends with), After: ι (begins with), filtered by collection (only UPZ I) and time (second century BCE), acquired 15 Dec 2017: total results 106; some occurrences not being exactly ει instead of ι removed. The Trismegistos Text Irregularities (TMTI, see Depauw and Stolk 2015) database gives 83 results (ει instead of ι, restricted to second century BCE and then using the Find-function for the provenance L01 (i.e. Memphis, Saqqara, Serapeum)).

29 Paratypa search (Additions; standard: ε (ends with), After: ι (begins with), restricted by UPZ collection and second century BCE, acquired 15 Dec 2017 (total number is 136, but five instances must be cleaned out as irrelevant for this interchange; some cases where the type of interchange is difficult to judge are counted, e.g. Μέμφιν for Μέμφει 'Memphis:acc/dat'; see below on morphology). TMTI gives 108 hits for "ι instead of ει" with the same additional actions as in the previous footnote).

30 E.g. in text group B: **26** ἐπισκεψάμενον, ἀρχισωματοφύλακα against **25** ἐπισκεψάμενον 'to be inspected', ἀρχισωματοφύλακα 'chief of the body guard'; in group C: **33**, **34**, **35** χάριν against **36** χάριν 'for the sake of'. However, in text group F, Apollonios wrote correctly μεθ' ἱκετείας 'by supplication' in **50** whereas the scribal hand in **46** wrote μετ' εἰκετείας, but, at the same time making other confusions between ι and ει not present in **46** or **47**.

πόλιν ‘city’ **18r** 12; σύμταξιν/ σύνταξιν for σύνταξιν ‘payment’ **39** 7, **50** 21, 34, **53** 21; χάριν for χάριν ‘for the sake of’ **33** 9, **34** 6, **35** 13 **110** 44; ἔσται for ἔστιν ‘is’ **18r** 15, **77** 13).

As Dahlgren (2017: 101) noted in the data she retrieved from the Roman period, this direction of interchange happened most in certain phonetic environments: adjacent to /m, n/, back vowels, liquid /r/,³¹ and /s/. When we look closer at the phonetic environment where this interchange occurs in the Katochoi archive, we find supporting evidence from the Ptolemaic period: the position after liquids /r/ and /l/ stand out with much higher numbers compared to other consonants (vowels did not yield results, thus agreeing with Horrocks’ and Teodorsson’s result that, before a vowel, ει was still a raised /e/).³² The position before /n/ and /s/ also stand out (see above, the ending -ιν).³³ Examples of standard ει written as ι are also found in all positions:³⁴ word-initially in 31 instances (ι for ει **70** 3, 25, **110** 4; ἰκοστοῦ for εἰκοστοῦ ‘twentieth’ **35** 19; ἰλήφασι for εἰλήφασι ‘receive:pf.3pl’ **52** 14, 16, **53** 16, 18, **54** 3, 6, etc.); word-finally (e.g. λέγι for λέγει ‘say:pr.3sg’ **79** 3; ἐπὶ for ἐπεῖ ‘upon’ **23** 20, **26** 6, **32**, 19 etc.); in stressed syllable (e.g. γραμματῖς for γραμματεῖς ‘scribes’ **38** 15, 18, **39** 17, **57** 21; χρίας for χρείας ‘needs’ **4** 19, **110** 57); in unstressed syllable (e.g. πιδάσεται for πειράσεται ‘attempt:fut.3sg’ **70** 14; θέλις for θέλεις ‘want:pr.2sg’ **68** 5); the ending -ειν was written as -ιν (e.g. πολὶν for πωλεῖν ‘sell’ **12** 20; φυγῖν for φυγεῖν ‘flee’ **79** 19; χαρίν for χαίρειν ‘rejoice’ **67** 2, **86** 1).

31 Liquids, however, can either raise or lower the quality of the vowel, depending on what the previous and following syllables contain (Dahlgren 2017: 96–97).

32 After /r/ 22 instances; after /l/ 14 instances, whereas, in other environments, there are no more than 10 instances. However, after /r/ cases include the same words several times, e.g. χάριν written for χάριν 6 times, all in Apollonios’ texts, and περεῖ written for περὶ 6 times (once, περεῖ), all in Ptolemaios’ texts. It therefore seems like Apollonios and Ptolemaios had their own mindset on how to write these particular words; pronunciation did not need to play a significant role, cf. Dahlgren (2017: 71) on semi-standard local variants. Apollonios wrote χάριν correctly only once, in his letter to Ptolemaios (**70**); Ptolemaios, on the other hand, managed to write περὶ correctly in two documents (**79**, **101**).

33 Before /n/ 24 instance; before /s/ 11 instances; before /a/ 10 instances; others, fewer than 10 instances.

34 The phonetic environment in this direction differs from that of ει written for standard ι. Here the position after a stop /k, p, t/ is the most common (and, when coupled with the aspirated or voiced allophones, even more so; especially π_ and φ_ together total 38 instances). However, before the liquid /l/, the interchange is frequent (32 instances); in that position, /s/ (17 instances) and /n/ (19 instances) are also significant. In the position _λ, one recurring word dominates the result: ἰλήφασι(ν) written for εἰλήφασι(ν) ‘receive:pf.3pl’ occurs 19 times, all in Apollonios’ texts; before /n/ and /s/, the cases are more varied.

Another very common confusion, that between *omicron* and *omega* tells that the loss of distinctive vowel length had already taken place.³⁵ For standard *omega*, the Katochoi papyri had *omicron* in 59 instances; in the opposite direction, 51 instances. Instances of expected ω written as o came almost exclusively from the hand of Apollonios (only 4 times in Ptolemaios' hand and 3 times in those of others).³⁶ Note also his use of two omicrons for the long vowel; $\tau o o v$ for $\tau \acute{\omega} v$ (79 2), a feature common in Coptic (Dahlgren 2017: 144). The other direction, expected o written as ω , appears also 5 times in scribal hands (+110), 8 times in Ptolemaios' hand; and the rest of the 38 instances were in Apollonios' hand. This count includes also instances where the writer avoided declining nouns of the third declension in the genitive case – e.g. Μακεδών for Μακεδόνοϝ 'Macedonian', see below 3.2. In both directions, Apollonios has confused *omicron* and *omega* also when the text he copied from had the standard form (e.g. in text group C, 34 against 36). Standard ω was written as o word-initially (e.g. $\acute{o} s$ for $\acute{\omega} s$ 'so that' 14 76, $\acute{o} \mu \eta v$ for $\acute{\omega} \mu \eta v$ 'believe:impf.1sg' 78 36); word-finally (e.g. δo for $\delta \acute{\omega}$ ³⁷ 'give:aor.3sg' 33 8, $\acute{\kappa} \acute{\alpha} \tau o$ for $\acute{\kappa} \acute{\alpha} \tau \omega$ 'below' 54 31, $\acute{\alpha} \xi i o$ for $\acute{\alpha} \xi i \acute{\omega}$ 'request:pr.1sg' 12 49); in stressed syllable (e.g. $\tau o v$ for $\tau \acute{\omega} v$ 'the:gen.pl.' 34 13, 110 122, $\acute{\rho} \acute{o} \tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon$ for $\acute{\rho} \acute{\omega} \tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon$ 'ever' 70 6, 24, 78 28); in unstressed syllable (e.g. $\acute{\epsilon} \delta o \acute{\kappa} \acute{\epsilon}$ for $\acute{\epsilon} \delta \acute{\omega} \acute{\kappa} \acute{\epsilon}$ 'give:aor.3sg' 78 37, $\rho o \lambda \acute{i} v$ for $\rho \acute{\omega} \lambda \acute{\epsilon} i v$ 12 17). Standard o was written as ω word-initially (e.g. $\acute{\omega} \nu \eta \lambda \acute{\alpha} \tau \alpha i$ for $\acute{o} \nu \eta \lambda \acute{\alpha} \tau \alpha i$ 'donkeydrivers' 12 40, $\acute{\omega} \pi \omega s$ for $\acute{o} \pi \omega s$ 'that' 110 65); word-finally ($\tau \omega$ for $\tau \acute{o}$ 'the:nom/acc.sg.' 32 9, 34 7; no other examples); in stressed syllable (e.g. $\beta \alpha \pi \tau \iota \zeta \acute{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ for $\beta \alpha \pi \tau \iota \zeta \acute{o} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ 'sink:pr. 1pl' 70 13, $\tau \acute{\omega} \pi \acute{o} \upsilon s$ for $\tau \acute{o} \pi \acute{o} \upsilon s$ 'places' 35 18); in unstressed syllable (e.g. $\epsilon \ddot{\upsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \mu \omega v$ for $\epsilon \ddot{\upsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \mu \acute{o} v$ 'sensible' 57 18, $\sigma \eta \mu \alpha \iota \nu \omega \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omega i$ for $\sigma \eta \mu \alpha \iota \nu \acute{o} \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omega i$ 'aforementioned' 14 12).

It is perhaps not as useful to review the phonetic environment when the overall figures of occurrences are relatively low, leaving more room for chance. Nevertheless, it could strengthen the idea that Egyptian was a relatively strong language for Apollonios. In the direction of standard ω written as o , dentals received the highest score ($\tau _ : 4$, $\delta _ : 12$, $\theta _ : 1$). In the opposite direction, the highest scores were seen before nasals ($_ v : 21$, $_ \mu : 8$).³⁸

³⁵ Cf. Horrocks (2010: 167).

³⁶ Twice in 110 (an administrative letter copied in a handwriting that seems to be unprofessional, see Wilcken 1927: 473–475 – i.e. perhaps material from scribal education) and once in a private letter (72) for which Wilcken did propose could be Apollonios' hand, but see below.

³⁷ Similarly written in 36, but not similarly corrected by the editor, see below on verbal inflection.

³⁸ In Coptic, ω was higher than o , and these phonetic environments can raise the quality of the vowel (Dahlgren 2017: 42–43, 59, 94). Coptic, of course, was not attested yet at this time, but the same phenomena may have already been present in the earlier phase of Egyptian.

Somewhat more interesting is the interchange of *eta* and *epsilon*, since this confusion would not occur with the commonly known raising of *eta* to /i/ but could rather simply reflect the loss of the distinctive vowel length of the /e/ sound combined with the slight raising of η (but not yet to /i/) as presented by Teodorsson and Horrocks.³⁹ However, it has also been suggested that this interchange was specific to Egyptian writers.⁴⁰ This would corroborate the bilingualism of Apollonios and Ptolemaios, whose texts repeat this confusion in spite of their emphasis on their Hellene identity and status. Mayser and Schmoll's lists (39–41) show that *eta* appears instead of *epsilon* in final position, before consonants and before vowels (α, η, ω, ου; the last especially in personal names ending -κλης and -ης),⁴¹ but *epsilon* instead of *eta* occurs only before consonants or in final position.⁴² Gignac lists several occurrences for the Roman and Byzantine period, and η > ε (standard η written as ε) is attested before or after a nasal or liquid (the latter only when unaccented), before /s/, and in final position. In the opposite direction, ε > η, back vowels and other positions also appear in the environment. Table 3 presents all examples of this interchange in our archive, categorized by hand. The first interesting feature is that Ptolemaios has not written *epsilon* instead of standard *eta* (η > ε) even once. He only ever replaces *epsilon* with *eta* (ε > η). In this direction, he has written ἕως 'until' quite persistently as ἥως – in total, 48 times. In contrast, his brother Apollonios wrote ἥως only once and ἕως correctly in ten documents (many of them copies of petitions). This particular word is also written correctly in most scribal hands. But Apollonios was not always capable of following the scribal hands, since in group F texts Apollonios copied δήοντα (50) even though the word was written δέοντα 'required' in 46, 47, 48. In 14, which is clearly a copy of a petition that has gone through the official rounds, Apollonios' version includes several confusions with *epsilon* and *eta*. It is presumable that they were present only in Apollonios' copy, not in the text he copied from (which is not preserved).

It is noteworthy that ε and η are confused in Apollonios' hand and the scribal hands also when *iota* adscripts (-ει instead of -ηι) apply. The long diphthong -ηι

³⁹ Horrocks (2010: 161–162) on /ε:/ (η) first being pulled to the position abandoned by /e:/ (ει) and only afterward towards /i/. See also his table of Egyptian Koine in the second century (p. 167), wherein η was raised to /e/, while ε was pronounced just as /e/.

⁴⁰ Clarysse (1993: 197). For a thorough discussion on Coptic *eta* having the quality of [e] see Dahlgren (2017: 106–112).

⁴¹ Mayser-Schmoll (39–41). In all papyri, in the centuries BCE 217 hits (Paratypa, 21 Dec 2017).

⁴² Mayser-Schmoll (46–49); before a vowel, only one special case is mentioned. In all papyri, in the centuries BCE, 249 hits (Paratypa 21 Dec 2017). The only vowels following this interchange are υ (5 times), ευ in initial position, and ι (e.g. ηι(ι) for ει); see below.

was, according to Teodorsson and Horrocks already merged with ει and raised to /i/ in the fifth century BCE.⁴³ It is therefore peculiar that the allegedly unpronounced

Table 3: All examples of the interchange between *eta* and *epsilon* in the Katochoi archive.

ε ~ η	Ptolemaios	Apollonios	Scribal/other hands
ε > η	πλήρης (πλήρης ‘full’) 77 14 έννῆα (έννέα ‘nine’) 77 11 ἦαν (ἐάν ‘if’) 67 10 ἦως (ἔως) (48 times) ⁴⁴ Ἡρακλήου (Ἡρακλέους ‘Heracles’) 84 80	δῆοντα (δέοντα ‘required’) 50 10 εὐσέβειαν (εὐσέβειαν ‘respect’) 58 5 μητήνεκα (μετήνεγκα ‘transfer’) 14 110 ἡτη (ἔτος ‘year’) 18v 2 ἡζημίσται (ἔζημίσται ‘cause loss’) 70 18 ἦως (ἔως) 54 5 πατέρα (πάτερ ‘father’) 78 36 ἰπή (εἰπέ ‘say’) 78 44	ἦως (ἔως ‘until’) 21 9
η > ε		ἀπελλάγηνν (ἀπηλλάγην ‘escape’) 12 27 Διοσκουδῆι (Διοσκουρίδῃ ‘Dioskourides’) 14 99, 53, 117, 123 ἀρχιπερέτην (ἀρχυπηρέτη ‘chief minister’) 14 97, 121 διοικητῆι (διοικητῇ ‘finance minister’) 14 139 ἐγγλογίζεται (ἐγλογίζεται ‘count’) 14 41 γραφῆι (γραφῇ ‘writing’) 14 73 δειακονῆι (διακονῇ ‘serve’) 18r 23 ἐπιμελητῆι (ἐπιμελητῇ ‘financial officer’) 50 11 εἶε (εἶῃ ‘be’) 68 2 ἐπητρίῃ (ἡπητρίᾱ ‘mender’) 91 16, 93, 10	ἐξερημωμένον (ἐξηρημωμένον ‘desolated’) 5 37 κατοχῆι (κατοχῇ ‘detention’) 6 36 διαλαβεῖν (διαλάβῃ ‘treat’) 10 32, 11 28 (?)

⁴³ Horrocks (2010: 112, 167); Dahlgren (2017: 111).

⁴⁴ 56 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 77 21, 25, 82 24, 84 16, 33, 49, 72, 92, 85 39, 86 2, 87 9, 90 8, 15, 92 2, 4, 96 25, 30, 31, 35, 45, 46, 98 19, 53, 57, 78, 81, 140, 99 15, 25, 26, 44, 47, 101 5, 13, 104 14, 105 16. Document 103 2 is the only instance in which Ptolemaios has written ἔως correctly, but, in the same document, l. 5, he has also written the word as ἦς.

written *iota* was not learned simply in connection with the letter η (and α and ω) in dative and subjunctive endings, but it also interfered with endings when they were mistakenly written with an *epsilon*. Apparently, the mute *iota* was learned on its own, connected to certain sounds /a, e, o/, not in connection with certain graphemes. In general, we can note that the variation $\varepsilon > \eta$ took place before back vowels or consonants and in final position and, in the opposite direction, before a consonant or in final position. Thus, the results show the same tendency as the observations of Mayser and Schmoll and those of Gignac. Since the surrounding consonants are exactly the same as the ones Dahlgren (2017: 100–106, 160–161) talks about, the influence of Egyptian phonology in these coarticulate spellings has to be taken into account.

Apollonios was clearly aware of his own difficulties with the interchange of η and ε , since he made several corrections around these graphemes, e.g. in his draft **18r** (l. 3 μητρός ‘mother’ corrected from μετρος, l. 19 ἔλθη ‘come’ corrected from ἡλθη, l. 28 ἀπῆλθεν ‘go away’ from απελθεν, μητέρα ‘mother’ from μητηρα).

Significantly rarer is the interchange of ε with α i. Both Apollonios and Ptolemaios wrote only once α i for ε and only once the other way around.⁴⁵ Supposedly these spellings were both pronounced /e/ by the second century BCE, but as an exception the Egyptian Greek variant is mentioned, where α i was more retracted.⁴⁶ Our brothers seem to use that variant. However, there is also one instance of Μαικεδόνοϝ written by Apollonios (**53** 2), to be compared with his spelling of Μεκεδώνος (**13** 6). This indicates that the quality distinction between /a, e/ was not very clear to Apollonios in an unstressed syllable (cf. below).

The raising of /y/ to /i/ is attested in the interchange of υ and ι . These instances are not very frequent but appear in the writing of both brothers in either direction, for which see Table 4. The word for ‘twins’, δίδυμοι, appears frequently, and Apollonios writes the word correctly in over twenty documents.⁴⁷ Ptolemaios, however, writes the word correctly only around half the time.⁴⁸ At any rate, the words presented in Table 4 all have a bilabial nasal /m/ next to the confused sound. Other writers in the archive managed to adhere to

45 εὐφράνεσθαι for εὐφραίνεσθε ‘rejoice:inf/2pl’ **78** 39 and παλεοῦ for παλαιοῦ ‘elder’. **94** 8 (Apollonios); ἔφαρ for ἔφερε ‘bring’ **79** 7 and ἀνύγετε for ἀνοίγεται ‘open:3sg’ **79** 7 (Ptolemaios). Their brother Sarapion had also one example of the first interchange: εἰδῆται for εἰδῆτε ‘know:2pl’ **66** 4.

46 Horrocks (2010: 167).

47 In **22**, **23**, **26**, **29**, **31**, **32**, **33**, **34**, **35**, **37**, **38**, **39** (corr. ex διδυμων), **44**, **49**, **50**, **52**, **53**, **54**, **55**, **57**, **78**, **89**.

48 **56**, **79**, **85**, **104** (**96** δειδυμῶν).

Table 4: Interchange of ι and υ.

ι ~ υ	Ptolemaios	Apollonios
υ > ι	ἰμεῖν for ὑμῖν ‘you’ 66 4 δοδίμη for διδύμη ‘twin’ 77 3, 11	διδιμῶν for διδυμῶν ‘twins’ 49 3 ἥμισι for ἥμισυ ‘half’ 52 15
ι < υ	ἥμισυ for ἥμισυ 67 5, 9 δοδίμη for διδύμη 77 3, 11 δοδυμῶν for διδυμῶν 84 1, 32, 56 85 2, 25	σησαμίνου for σησαμίνου ‘of sesame’ 33 7 ἥμισυ for ἥμισυ 52 12 53 15, 17, 54 6, 7, 11, 55 5 ἥμισι for ἥμισυ 52 15

standard orthography regarding υ and ι. In Apollonios’ hand, there are two interesting examples of αι written for αυ (καιτῶν for αὐτῶν **44** 2, αῖται for αὐταὶ **54** 31). In the first case, it is possible that there was simply a confusion as to how to perform the crasis with καί but with the latter example that is not the case; it seems that ι and υ were confused within the diphthongs αυ and αι. Apollonios has other examples of crases (**78** 15 κάγω for καὶ ἐγὼ ‘I too’ **68** 1 καυτός for καὶ αὐτός ‘myself’ [similarly in **11** 29 by a scribal hand; in letters by other hands **61** 5, **64** 2 καῦτοὶ for καὶ αὐτοὶ, **66** 2]).

Once, Apollonios wrote μου ‘my’ for μοι ‘me’ (**35** 22). Rather than confusion of /u/ and /y, i/, we should perhaps interpret this instance as a confusion between the genitive and the dative cases, since the dative case was sometimes difficult for Apollonios (see below). Or it was just a slip of the pen, since in the other version in Apollonios’ hand, the word was written μοι (**34** 10). Another case of υ confusion was with the old diphthong οι, which developed through /y/ to /i/. By the first century BCE, it had gone through /y/.⁴⁹ We have only two instances of υ written instead of οι: ἀνύγωι for ἀνοίγω ‘open:1sg’ **78** 7 (Apollonios); ἀνύγετε for ἀνοίγεται ‘open:3sg’ **79** 7 (Ptolemaios). There are more instances in the opposite direction but only with one word: τὸ θρύον ‘reed’ in θροιοπόλιον for θρυσώλιον ‘rush-seller’s shop’ (**12** 13, Apollonios) and θροία for θρύα/θρύων (ca. 15 times in Ptolemaios’ hand and once in Apollonios’). Furthermore, Apollonios occasionally wrote an additional γ in between vowels (representing a glide and relating to fricativization of γ), e.g. Σαραπίγῳι instead of Σαραπιέῳι ‘Sarapieion’.⁵⁰

Interestingly one feature is missing from the brothers’ writings that appears 15 times by scribal and other hands: the dropping of *iota* from different forms of

⁴⁹ Horrocks (2010: 167).

⁵⁰ Cf. Bentein (2015: 467), Gignac (1976: 71–72), Mayser-Schmoll (141–143). The twins’ names, Taues and Taous, were written in many instances with a γ (Ταγης, Ταυγης, etc.).

ποιέω ‘to do’, e.g. πεποήμεθα for πεποιήμεθα (17 21, 19 5) and ποιήσασθαι for ποιήσασθαι (10 19, 23). The dropping of *iota* with this verb has been connected to the imitation of Attic orthography by some well-educated scribes.⁵¹ Therefore, Apollonios, who always⁵² writes this verb with *iota*, is apparently ignorant of Atticist pedantry. On the other hand, he has occasionally dropped the *eta* from this verb.⁵³ This feature may also be used as an argument for Apollonios not being the writer of one letter (72), which Wilcken marked to be by the hand of Apollonios with a question mark. The handwriting indeed bears similarities to the hand of Apollonios, and the text also shares several similar problems with orthography as Apollonios’ texts. However, since Apollonios writes ποιη- only once (against 6 documents with ποιε-/ποιη- and 10 with ποι-) and 72 has two instances of ποιη- (ll. 8 and 16) and include no *iota* adscripts, which Apollonios usually writes (even hypercorrectly), it seems reasonable to conclude that this letter sent by Myrullas and Chalbas, who were titled as Arabs, was not written by him. In the opposite direction, there are few instances of the addition of *iota* in forms of βοηθός ‘assistant’ and βοήθεια ‘help’ both in texts by scribal hands (βοιηθείας 5 53, βοιη[θ]όν 46 19, βοιηθόν 47 23) and in Apollonios’ drafts/copies (βοιηθόν 50 26, 52 8, 53 9).

Some other orthographic variants of the brothers can be seen as pointing to Egyptian influence in addition to the confusion of *eta* and *epsilon*, such as problems with the voiced and voiceless/aspirated consonants (see further below) and the confusion between ε - α - ο, due to the reduction of unstressed vowels to schwa.⁵⁴ Table 5 presents the instances of interchange between α and ε, showing that the occurrences happen in unstressed syllables and often in connection with retracting consonants.⁵⁵ Some of these instances may be due to morphological “equalization of the endings” in *-es/-as* (see 3.2 below). Confusion between ε and ο are few, but they more clearly show the reduction of unstressed syllable (not morphological confusion) – e.g. προσβυτέρου for πρεσβυτέρου ‘elder’ (13 13) by Apollonios, who also wrote προσβύτη (78 36), and υπογραψας for υπέγραψε ‘subscribe:3sg’ (26 18). Once, Ptolemaios wrote ἐργάζοντος for ἐργάζοντες ‘working’ (77 21) (unlikely to be a mistake between genitive singular vs. nominative plural, since the subject is clearly plural: δυω ἄνθρωποι ‘two people’). Other hands in the Katochoi archive did not confuse ο for ε (and, in the whole corpus

⁵¹ Clarysse (2010: 40–41).

⁵² With one exception: 57 4 ἐπόησαν.

⁵³ 14 12, 18, 35, 37, 83, 114, 23 13, 26 16, 50 12, 58 4, 70 21; πεποιμένος 12 48–49; ποισάμενοι 13 27, ποισης 73 4, ποισις 74 10.

⁵⁴ Dahlgren (2017: 62–66).

⁵⁵ Dahlgren (2017: 115).

Table 5: Interchange of ε and α.

ε ~ α	Ptolemaios	Apollonios	Scribal/other hands
ε > α		ἀπελθόντες ‘go away’ for ἐπελ- ‘come’ 12 29 ἀπέδωκα ‘give’ for ἐπέδ- ‘give besides’ 14 104 (?), 105, 107 (?) ἐπέταξαν (-αξεν) ‘order’ 18r 6 ὑπογραψας for ὑπέγραψε ‘subscribe’ 26 18 ἀπάναγκον for ἐπάν- ‘compulsory’ 31 10 ἀνανεκει for ἀνενεγκεῖν ‘report back’ 43 22	Ἄραβας for Ἄραβες ‘Arabs’ 72 2 ὑβρίζοντας for ὑβρίζοντες ‘violating’ 8 21 τύπτοντας for τύπτοντες ‘beating’ 8 22
α > ε	σινδόνες for σινδόνας ‘linen cloth’ 84 4, 85 7	Μεκεδώνος for Μακεδόνας ‘Macedonian’ 13 6 ἐπέδοκα for ἀπέδωκα 52 4, 53 4 ἡνθρεκίσθαι for ἡνθρακίσθαι ‘roast’ 78 33 φοίνικες for φοίνικας ‘dates’ 89 16 θρίδακες for θρίδακας ‘lettuce’ 89 3 ὄρνιθες for ὄρνιθας ‘birds’ 102 4	ἐντρεπέντος for ἐντραπέντος ‘notice’ 5 24 ἐπειρότατον for ἀπειρότ- ‘most ignorant’ 110 54 προσεδρεύσετε for -σατε ‘serve’ 110 138 ἐξαργυρίζοντες for -ζοντας ‘turn into money’ 110 136 δηλώσαντες for -ντας ‘make known’ UPZ I p. 596 16

of papyri from the second century BCE, they have been confused only 27 times in total); the other direction (ε for ο) is more commonly attested in the whole corpus (60 from the second century BCE), but, in the Katochoi archive, only Apollonios once writes ἔθες for ἔθος ‘custom’ (**12** 20). Scribal hands confused ο and α twice (δύνομαι for δύναμαι ‘to be able:1sg’ in **9** 10 and **10** 22⁵⁶) as well as Ptolemaios and Apollonios once each.⁵⁷ In the other direction, 3 instances are attested in Apollonios’ hand and 3 in other hands.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Texts **9** and **10** are both petitions about the same subject but were written by two different scribal hands.

⁵⁷ The instances are not as clear: οἰδην for αἰδοῖον ‘genitals’ (**77** 30, Ptolemaios) and ἄμτος for ἄμητας ‘milk cake’ (**89** 9, Apollonios).

⁵⁸ Apollonios: ταῖς ‘the:fem.dat’ for τοῖς ‘the:masc.dat’ **39** 31; ἀρχισωματαφύλακος for ἀρχισωματοφύλακος ‘chief of the body guard’ **14** 94, 118. Others: βολάμενοι for βουλόμενοι

As for consonants, the distinction of voiced stops from voiceless was not present in Egyptian; thus, the confusion of these in Greek can only point to an Egyptian influence.⁵⁹ For dentals, τ and δ were confused by Apollonios and Ptolemaios, but not very often (5 examples of τ > δ⁶⁰ and two of δ > τ⁶¹). Confusions of κ and γ are more numerous but concern mostly the preposition ἐκ either alone or in compounds – notably, only one of these instances occurs in Apollonios’ hand; the remaining occur in scribal hands (the preposition alone and some compounds) and in Ptolemaios’ (word ‘napkin’ repeatedly in 83–85: ἐγμαγην/ἐγμαγῆα for ἐκμαγεῖον/ἐκμαγεῖα).⁶² In all cases of the preposition alone, the following word begins with /m/. Thus, voicing of the previous sound can be expected without assuming Egyptian influence.

3.2 Morphology

Nominal inflection. The use of nominative plural ending -es for -as in accusative plural of athematic nouns is a commonly known feature of Koine Greek.⁶³ We find it, e.g. in 70, a letter written by Apollonios: the nominative ending -ες was written instead of accusative ending -ας, even though the definite article shows that the writer’s intention was to write the accusative (πρὸς/ τοὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγοντες ‘to those who speak the truth’). In an account written by Apollonios, several nouns are in nominative with the -es endings (written -ες or -ης). Other items in that list are in the neuter or in the accusative of the second

‘willing’ 72 10, βουλαμένων for βουλομένων ‘willing’ 110 124, μικράν ‘small:fem’ for μικρὸν ‘small:masc/neut’ 110 201.

59 Mayser-Schmoll (143), Gignac (1976: 76–86), Horrocks (2010: 112), Dahlgren (2017: 58).

60 Apollonios: Ἀσταρδιδηνον for Ἀσταρτιεῖω ‘temple of Astarte’ 13 11, ἔδι for ἔτι ‘yet’ 33 11, ἀνδαποδῶ for ἀνταποδῶ ‘repay’ 53 30, δραπέδην for δραπέτην ‘runaway’ 69 6; Ptolemaios: δοσαυτη for τοσαύτης ‘that much’ 67 11.

61 Apollonios: βατίζειν for βαδίζειν ‘walk’ 78 3; Ptolemaios: προστάτι for προστάδι ‘vestibule’ 77 22. Other hands: τὲ for δὲ UPZ I p. 596, 110 83, παρεφετρευνόντων for παρεφεδρευνόντων ‘garrisoned’ 110 206. In addition, Apollonios apparently corrected himself in this respect: in 14 he wrote ἐπετοδοκα (for ἐπέδωκα) where, in Wilcken’s view, the syllable το was corrected to δο without deleting the first erroneous one (cf. also ἀπέτωδωκα in line 100 in the same document).

62 ἐγ for ἐκ ‘from’: 3 9, 19 6 (corrected from ἐν ‘in’) 46 11, 47 15, 50 15 (Apollonios), 110 182; ἐγδοκὴν for ἐκδοκὴν ‘understanding’ 110 86; ἐγλειπεῖν for ἐκλιπεῖν ‘leave’ 47 14. On the case of διγνύοι for δεικνύοι ‘point out’ (76 5, Apollonios), cf. Bentein (2015: 467). This word does not come up in searches in Paratypa, since this correction is not included in the apparatus. Wilcken only mentions it in the commentary to 76.

63 Bubenik (2014); Torallas Tovar (2014).

declension. Thus, it is likely that Apollonios meant to use the accusative throughout the list.⁶⁴ In a petition written by a scribe (8), -as was (hypercorrectly?) written instead of -es (ὕβριζοντας καὶ τύπτοντας ‘violating and beating up’, ll. 21–22). The reason was probably not so much confusion of cases *per se*, but rather the quality of the vowel in an unstressed final syllable, most likely a *schwa*, which made the writer confuse which vowel to write in the plural accusative vs. nominative. In letter 72 2, Ἀραβας is written instead of Ἀραβες ‘Arabs’, but this does not require us to identify Apollonios as the writer of the letter (cf. above).

Bentein (2015: 469–470) discusses a certain reluctance in this archive to decline third declension nouns, related to the “losses” in Greek declension of consonantal stems noted already by Jannaris ([1897] 1968). The examples Bentein gives come from scribal hands (5, 43), Apollonios (18v, 57, 77), and Ptolemaios (77). I would like to add that the nominative form Μακεδών ‘Macedonian’ appears instead of the genitive Μακεδόνοϛ four times (18v 1, 34 1, 43 2, 20 66); the latter two documents are otherwise from scribal hands, but these words have been added apparently in Apollonios’ hand in 43 (between the lines) and 20 where a whole line was deleted; 18 and 34 are all in Apollonios’ writing. In fact, 18v is the docket on the back side of the draft petition and reads παρὰ Πτολεμαίου Γλαυκίου Μακ[ε]δ[ών] ὁ ἐν κατοχῇ. . . (‘from Ptolemaios, son of Glaukias, Macedonian, who [is] in reclusion’). The ending of the word “Macedonian” is in a lacuna, so, in fact, it is difficult to say how the word was declined,⁶⁵ but the fact that the relative pronoun in the beginning of the second line is in the nominative suggests that the writer wanted to switch to the nominative here; most likely, therefore, he intentionally used the nominative also for the word ‘Macedonian’. In 34, the word is clearly left uninflected (as a parenthetical remark), just like in the additions in 43 and 20. In 18r, Apollonios, along the same line, uses nominative instead of dative in the title of a person.⁶⁶ This usage can be compared to the so-called phrase-initial inflection used by bilingual notaries in Upper Egypt, whose L1 Egyptian clearly had an influence on their habit of leaving latter parts of a phrase in the nominative case where Greek would have required agreement of all words in the phrase; very often this happened in the description of a person, like here.⁶⁷

64 89 3 θρίδακες for θρίδακας ‘lettuce’, 3, 13 σφλανγνίδης for σπλαγχνίδας ‘entrails’, 5 γογγυλίδης for γογγυλίδας ‘turnips’, 16 φοίνικες for φοίνικας ‘dates’.

65 The facsimile P.Paris pl. 26 shows that almost the entire word Macedonian is in a gap, in which a shorter version of the word admittedly seems to fit better.

66 18r 4 Φιλίππῳ Σωγένου στρατι[ώ]της (for στρατιώτη) ‘to Philippos, son of Sogenes, soldier’.

67 Vierros (2012a: 140–147).

The consonantal stem declension is seen avoided among some writers other than our brothers, e.g. with participles (private letter **64** 3 σημηνας ‘reporting:nom’ for σημήναντι ‘reporting:dat’, 11 παραγενηθεις ‘be assisted:nom’ for παραγενηθέντι ‘be assisted: dat’). However, in a petition (**2**), two participles were used in accusative instead of genitive (3 διαζώντα for διαζώντος ‘living through’, 7 διαιτώμενον for διαιτωμένου ‘living’), and the latter is not inflected in the third declension, so some other factor must play a role in the case confusion attested there.

Some case confusions may be caused by similarity in pronunciation combined with the factor of not knowing correct orthography. This can be behind most instances of confusions by Apollonios and Ptolemaios, but let us first examine the case which appears in other writers as well as in Apollonios’ texts. It was more common to write the dative Μέμφει ‘Memphis’ instead of the accusative Μέμφιν in the phrase ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μέμφει μεγάλῳ Σαραπιείῳ (‘in the Great Sarapieion at Memphis’). However, the accusative Μέμφιν was occasionally written by scribal hands (**3**, **17**, **47**, **48**) and by Apollonios (**13**, **52**, **53**, **58**). Since the preposition *pros* could also take the accusative case, this need not be understood as a mistake. However, the editors have mostly corrected the accusative into the dative. The phrase was indeed more common with the dative (at least in 14 documents in this archive). The weakness of the final /n/ is not unusual in papyrus Greek, and Bentein (2015: 468) also notes that it is quite often dropped; his examples all come from one document written by Ptolemaios (**77**) – the similar pronunciation of ι and ει was already discussed above. Therefore, it is not surprising to find these two forms confused. It is interesting, however, that when we compare the pair of petitions **12** and **13**, both drafts of the same text written by Apollonios, the word was written Μέμφι in **12** 9 and Μέμφιν in **13** 9 – i.e. if **12** was a later draft, as other factors also suggest, this would mean that Apollonios “corrected” the accusative into a form that resembles more the dative, even though it is not exactly written in the standard.⁶⁸ The fact that Apollonios seemingly added a hypercorrect *nu* into a dative form in **29** 6 (Κρατερῶν χειριστῇ τῷ προ Κρατερῷ χειριστῇ τῷ ‘to Krateros, the manager’), suggests that he simply was able to occasionally add an extra *nu* in forms he still understood as datives. The genitive instead of dative in μου ‘my’ for μοι ‘for me’ (**35** 22) was mentioned

⁶⁸ The earlier petition (**13**) has been left unfinished in the middle of the text, whereas **12** is the entire petition (albeit without the greetings at the end). In **13** 26, Apollonios also wrote dative instead of accusative: οὐθένα (corr. ex ουθενι) κοσμοι (for κόσμον) ποισάμενοι ‘doing nothing decent’, which was structured with a different verb with dative in **12** οὐθενι κόσμῳ χρησάμενο\ι ‘using no decency’. In **13** 1–2, Apollonios wrote the name of the addressee Poseidonios in the genitive plural Ποσιδωνεων, probably attracted from the following title τῶν φίλων ‘of friends’, but corrected it to the dative in **12**: Ποσειδωνίῳ τῶν φίλων.

already above (“Phonology”). Apollonios’ sudden feminine nominative *πασαι* ‘all’ instead of masculine dative *πᾶσι* may just be a slip of the pen; the article *τοῖς* shows he is not addressing only females, in which case the pattern of phrase-initial inflections could explain this mistake (74 7 *τοῖς ἐν οἴκῳ πασαι χαίρειν* ‘to all in the house, greetings’).

A genitive used instead of the nominative *ἡ δὲ οἰκίας* (for *οἰκία*) *τοῦ πατρὸς* (18 8) (‘father’s house’) could also be explained as a hypercorrect addition of final sigma, but the following possessive genitive could have attracted the case here. On the other hand, the definite article shows that Apollonios intended to write the nominative.

Several case confusions occur with names ending in *-ις* (gen. *-ιος*) or neuter nouns ending in *-ιον* (discussion in Vierros 2012a: 167–173), e.g. genitive instead of dative or nominative (68 3 *Πετοσίριος* for *Πετοσίρει* ‘Petosiris’ [first name of three, two others in the dative]; 65 5–6 *Πετευσοράπιος* for *Πετευσοράπις* ‘Peteusorapis’). Dative or accusative were written instead of genitive by Ptolemaios (88 2–4 *παρὰ τῷ Σαράπει . . . Ἀφροδισίῳ* ‘from Sarapis:dat, . . . Aphrodisios:dat’ for *παρὰ τοῦ Σαράπειος . . . Ἀφροδισίου* ‘from Sarapis:gen, . . . Aphrodisios:gen’; *Ἀφροδισίῳ* ‘Aphrodisios:dat’ for *Ἀφροδισίου* ‘Aphrodisios:gen’ 84 91 [with preposition *παρὰ*, 85 23]; *Σαραπίωνα* Sarapion:acc’ for *Σαραπίωνος* ‘Sarapion:gen’ 80 4 with the preposition *περί*⁶⁹). It is not surprising to find that the vocative was not used in 66 6 (*Ἀπολλωνίος* ‘Apollonios:nom’ for *Ἀπολλώνιε* ‘Apollonios:voc’).

In the dream descriptions written by Ptolemaios (77), very few instances that could be interpreted as something other than phonological effect on orthography occur. However, some of these could be morphological as well. Especially three participle forms in the nominative in one sentence: *οἶμαι τὴν Ταγὴν εὐφρονον* (for *εὐφρωνον*) ***οὔσα*** (for *οὔσαν*) *καὶ ἡδυτέραι τῇ φωνῇ καὶ εὖ **δειακεμμένη*** (for *διακεμένην*) *καὶ ὁρῶ τὴν Ταοῦν **γελῶσα*** (for *γελῶσαν*) *καὶ τὸν πόδα αὐτῆς μέγαν καθαρὸν* [‘I seem to see Tages rather sweetly singing (?) and well disposed, and I see Taous laughing, and her foot is big and pure’] (col.1, 16–20).⁷⁰ The bolded nominative forms instead of accusatives could easily be explained with the weakness of the final nasal (see above), but, since Ptolemaios omits the final nasal in this text only in these words and writes it correctly dozens of times (8 times in this very sentence), we should rather assume that he has meant to write these participles in the nominative case. In fact, all his participles in this text are in the nominative even when the head is in the accusative (cf. *Ταοῦν . . . προσπαιζουσα* [for *προσπαίζουσαν*]

⁶⁹ Three items above in this same list are also nouns and names with the same preposition, all correctly inflected in the genitive.

⁷⁰ Translation by Rowlandson (1988: 103).

‘Taous . . . joking’ col.1, 24–25, Ἄμμωνα . . . τρίτος ὢν [for τρίτον ὄντα] ‘Ammon . . . being third (i.e. in his trinity?)’ col.2, 25, βοῦν . . . οὐδαινουσα [for ὠδίνουσαν] ‘cow . . . being in labour’ col.2, 27).⁷¹ Therefore, this is more of a syntactic reanalysis of the participial complement as somehow outside the agreement pattern. The same phenomenon occurs in Apollonios’ letter about a dream 78 25 ἐμὲ δὲ ἄφες, εἰδού (for ἰδού), πολιὰς ἔχων (for ἔχοντα) ‘release me, see, I have grey hair’.

Verbal inflection. Verbs were inflected in a surprisingly standard manner. Only occasionally and mostly from Apollonios do we find interparadigmatic leveling⁷² – e.g. weak aorist vs. strong aorist εἶπα Ἀρμάεις for εἶπον Ἀρμάει ‘I told to Harmais’ (78 21), εἶπας ‘you said’ (52 5, 53 6; not corrected in the *apparatus*); εἶπα and εἶπας also in 62 14, 19, which was not written by Apollonios;⁷³ aorist ending in perfect stem: ἐνβέβληκαν instead of ἐνβεβλήκασιν ‘they threw’ (70 9; not corrected in the *apparatus*). In the pair of petitions 12+13, Apollonios used the form ὕβριζαν, which should apparently be taken as the active aorist 3rd person plural (i.e. ὕβρισαν); however, in 12, he corrected this from the imperfect ὕβριζον. Athematic verbs (–mi) were treated as thematic, which fits with expectations of this time: 70 2–3 ὀμνύο (for ὀμνύω) instead of ὀμνυμι ‘I swear’.⁷⁴ Future periphrasis μέλλομεν σωθῆναι ‘we will be saved’ is also found in 70 12.⁷⁵ The scribe of 8 used infinitive forms instead of finite ones: ανωσαι for ἀνέωσάν ‘thrust through:3pl’ and σκυλαι for ἔσκυλαν ‘stripped:3pl’ (both l. 21), ανελειν for ἀνέλωσι ‘take away:3pl’ (l. 15). These can perhaps be better placed under the category of syntactic confusion – e.g. the writer had used *acusativus cum infinitivo* just before line 15.

The formation of participles was not always clear: Sarapion, the brother of Apollonios and Ptolemaios, wrote a participial form for an imperative: 66 5 παραγενομενοῦ for παραγενοῦ ‘be present’. One interesting correction is from present to perfect participle in a copy written by Apollonios: ἀντι[[λαμβανο]]λημμένον

⁷¹ One dubious case is on col. 1, 21–22: δυω ἄνθρωποι ἐργάζοντος ‘two people working’, where the participle probably is meant to be plural nominative ἐργάζοντες, not singular genitive. The possibility of confusing ε and ο in instressed syllable, see above. In another dream account (79) written by Ptolemaios, there are participles in the accusative, e.g. ἔχοντα ‘having’ on l. 6.

⁷² Cf. Bubenik (2014: 2c).

⁷³ Of course, the sigmatic aorist forms of εἶπον are also found in e.g. Ionic prose.

⁷⁴ The athematic first person singular form (–μι) of this verb is quite rare in papyri: 31 hits of ὀμνυμι in all DDbDP, only three of which are from the Hellenistic period. The form was revived from the second century CE onwards. The search ὀμνω# received 385 hits; 44 of them from the Hellenistic period. The form in –ω appears, in fact, already in Classical prose writers such as Herodotos, Xenophon, and Plato; see Jannaris (1897: 234), Gignac (1981: 375–377).

⁷⁵ Cf. Bentein (2015: 471).

(read ἀντειλημμένου) ‘assist’ (39 4–5). In the scribal version of the same text, this word is not well preserved (ἀντε[ιλημμένου]), but, apparently, Apollonios first thought to use the present participle and then, perhaps after checking the exemplar, had to change the form to perfect participle. This suggests that he was not copying word by word. Another copy of a petition by Apollonios shows also that the copying process did not always result in similar forms: 35 has διδοῖ ‘give:3sg’ (l. 12) and λάμβανωσιν ‘receive:pr.ind.3pl’ (l. 18) and νομίζαντα (l. νομίσαντα) ‘thinking’ (l. 20), whereas other copies of the same petition have δο (l. δῶ) ‘give:subj.3sg’, λάβωσιν ‘receive:aor.subj.3pl’, νομίσαντα ‘thinking’ (33 8, 13, 14) and δοι (l. δῶ)⁷⁶ ‘give:subj.3sg’, λάβωσιν, and νομίσαντα (34 5, 8, 9), and the possible final text (36 11, 16, 17) has δοῖ, λάβω\σιν/ and νομίσαντα, respectively.

3.3 Syntax

In Ancient Greek, a large group of small indeclinable function words are labelled as “particles”.⁷⁷ As Revuelta (2014) points out, this is a “ghost term” and does not denote a homogenous word class, since it includes words with so many different functions (coordinating conjunctions, focusing devices, disjuncts, and discourse connectors). It has also been noticed that there was a general decline in the use of particles in Post-classical Greek, and, as Bentein (2015: 472) noted, this process is already visible in our archive. In general, documentary papyri provide good material for observing variation in so far as the use of particles. One question we might investigate is how these different function words were used by a second language speaker. If the actual spoken level of the language was not used in everyday discussions and if Greek literature was not read to a large extent, would an L2 user learn the nuances of the different connectors, disjuncts, and focusing devices? L2 users in general may be the driving force behind the diminishing use of particles. However, although our brothers were most likely bilingual, their Greek was in all probability on the L1 level. So how did they treat “particles”?

Bentein (2015: 472–474), for instance, noticed that “sentence connective particles” were quite frequent in petitions, but *asyndeton* is more commonly seen especially in the dreams texts. He also made the interesting observation that, in certain petitions, especially those addressed to the king, the highest

⁷⁶ It is strange that the editor has made this correction in 33 whereas in 36 the form δοῖ was not corrected.

⁷⁷ See, e.g. Denniston (1996 [1950²]) for Greek particles and Blomqvist (1969) for particles in Post-classical Greek.

addressee possible, particles may have been used to elevate the language in later drafts.⁷⁸ By comparing texts written by different hands, we can add further to this discussion. In Table 6, I have collected some of the most common particles in our archive, excluding, e.g. the sentence connector καί but focusing mostly on what Bentein called “sentence connective particles” and Revuelta calls “discourse connectors”, the particle δέ being the most common example.

Table 6: Selection of particles in the Katochoi archive.

	Scribal hands (petitions)	Petitions + orders/reports (copied or drafted by Apollonios)	Letters (other hands)	Letters / dreams (Apollonios's hand)
δέ	ALL	ALL (not 44, 49)	ALL	68 1; 69 (δ'); 78 25, 26; 76: [δέ]
μέν	6 35; 7 23; 8 11, 15; 9 6; 10 21; 11 21; 19 13; 20 29, 39, 43; 36 10; 40 5; 41 4, 13; 42 3, 14, 23; 43 12 (m2); 45 7; 46 3, 11; 47 5, 15; 48 4;	14 7; 23 10, 13; 32 13, 19, 23; 33 8; 34 5; 35 12; 37 19; 38 5; 39 6; 50 6, 15; 58 verso5	59 8; 71 5, 15	68 4
τε	2 25; 6 10; 8 13, 14, 17; 9 10, 16; 15 8, 13, 42; 16 14, (17), (27); 19 3, (11); 20 32, 49; 24 24; 41 21, 24; 42 6, 11, 35, 36; 43 17; 51 11, 16	12 31; 14 9, 13, 28; 31 6, 9, 12	59 14; 60 19, 21; 62 6, 8; 71 13	78 44
γάρ	2 5; 7 14; 8 8; 15 23, 26; 16 7, 8; 19 6; 20 15, 39; 42 10; 46 23	32 37; 50 34	60 15; 62 28, 29	68 6, 7; 70 17; 71 19
οὐν	2 24; 3 10 (-v); 5 10, 46; 6 9; 7 22, 29; 8 28, 10 20; 17 20; 19 30; 20 21, 41; 24 20; 25 9 (-v); 36 10; 40 12; 41 13; 42 38; 46 11; 47 15; 51 15	13 30; 23 20; 26 6 (-v); 32 19; 33 8; 34 5; 38 10, 17; 39 16; 50 15 (-v); 52 6; 53 7; 57 10, 12, 19	60 20; 62 25; 64 6; 72 16	73 4; 74 10
δή	39 27	[40 19]		

⁷⁸ Cf. Luiselli (2010: 88–94).

On this topic, the letters are the most interesting genre in the Katochoi archive: all letters written by other hands have instances of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, but, in Apollonios' letters, the word is quite rare. It occurs in three of his letters but not in his other five; in **76**, it was included but then later deleted by the writer.⁷⁹ Certain other particles ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, $\tau\epsilon$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, and $\omicron\upsilon\breve{\nu}$) are quite well attested in the petitions. It is further noteworthy that, in Apollonios' drafts and copies, these particles feature less abundantly; $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ mostly appears in the copies (only **32** and **50** are drafts, in my opinion), $\omicron\upsilon\breve{\nu}$ appears in drafts and copies equally, and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ appears only in two drafts. In letters in general, these particles are used sparingly and by Apollonios even more so. It is an open question whether the reason for this was because the letter genre was less formal making asyndeton more acceptable, or perhaps it was due to the influence of the register; Apollonios' letters, for instance, are mostly addressed to the members of his family. It is also interesting to note that Apollonios uses $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ four times; apparently, this was his favourite particle. Apollonios clearly knew how to use these small function words, since he had copied them in the petitions; however, he did not see the need to use them in his informal letters. Perhaps their function was not clear to him, or perhaps $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ as presenting an argument⁸⁰ can be said to be heavier than, for example, $\omicron\upsilon\breve{\nu}$ (marks transition from a subsidiary to a main unit) or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (connecting units on the same hierarchical level), and it stuck with him for that reason.⁸¹

Participles were another way of elevating the tone of the petitions. Bentein (2015: 476) argued that, in certain petitions, participles were used to avoid use of finite present tense forms. Main events in the past were narrated by using participles, making for long, complex sentences. The example Bentein gives is a petition (**6**) written by a scribal hand. I will examine one pair of texts (**12+13**) to see how Apollonios used participles. Both of these texts seem to be drafts, as they explain the same situation, but **12** gives more background information on the events that drove Apollonios to write the petition. We do not know for sure which one he wrote first – that is, which direction he intended going: toward a more stripped-down or elaborate version, but, as I have argued above, **13**, which breaks off in the middle and has fewer particles, seems to be the earlier version. Apollonios is not simply copying here as with the earlier petitions concerning the twins. He is drafting the text about his own affairs. He was

⁷⁹ The letter **72** is counted as not written by Apollonios in Table 6. It contains both $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\omicron\upsilon\breve{\nu}$.

⁸⁰ Revuelta (2014).

⁸¹ As a postpositive particle, however, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ suffered the fate of all other such particles, eventually disappearing altogether from the modern form of the language, see Jannaris (1968 [1897]: 400, 409).

approximately 17 years old by the time of writing, and he had gained some practice on the petition formulae when copying the earlier petitions. We may still note that his orthography is not in a good state here, possibly because he is actually the composer of the text, not simply copying text written by professional scribes.

Below, we have two versions of the same event. The longer version in **12** has different sentence division and is considerably more verbose. Even in the first version, **13**, however, the predicate ὕβριζάν (see above for the form) is complemented by three participles referring to the malefactors (ἐπισελθόντες ‘rushing in’, ἔχοντες ‘carrying’, ποισάμενοι ‘doing’) and one genitive absolute structure that refers to Apollonios himself. In the longer version, there are multiple genitive absolutes in the first sentence, followed by several participles complementing ὕβριζάν.

- (1) ἐμοῦ δὲ **καθημένου** ἔσω ἐν τῷ παστοφορίῳ **ἐπισελθόντες** (for ἐπισελθόντες) Τεεβήσιος υἱοὶ τρίτοι ὄντες Πεταῦς καὶ \Τεῶς/ καὶ Πετεαρτῶτης εἰ[.....] ραῦδους (for ράβδους) **ἔχοντες** οὐθένα (corr. ex ουθενι) κοσμῶι (for κόσμον) **ποισάμενοι** (for ποιησάμενοι) ὕβριζάν με.

‘I was sitting inside the *pastophorion*, when Teebesis’ sons, being three, Petaus and Teos and Peteartotes rushed in [. . .] carrying staves and violated me doing nothing decent.’

(UPZ I 13, ll. 16–28; 158–157 BCE) [my translation]

- (2) . . . ἔτους) κγ Παῦνι κε **ἐλθόντος μου** ἐπὶ τὸ θροιοπόλιον τὸ ὑπάρχον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἱερῶι ὥστε ὠνήσασθαι θροία, τοῦ δὲ **πολῶντος** μὴ **βολομένου** ἀποδώσθαι ἐξ ὧν ἔθες πασ [α] ι πολιν, ἀλλὰ **βολομενένου** ἄλλα εὐτελεστεραν μοι δοῦνα, **ἐμοῦ δὲ βολομένου** τῶν χρησίμων ἀγωράσ(αι), ἔδωκέ μοι μετὰ ἀνατάσεως καὶ **λαβῶ\ν/ἀπελλάγην\ν/** εἰς τὸ ἔμμουτοῦ παστοφορόριον. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα **ἀπελθόντες** οἱ τοῦ\του\ἀδελφοὶ Πεταῦτος τε καὶ Τεῶς ραῦδους **ἔχοντες** οὐθενὶ κόσμῳ χρησάμενο\ι/ {επη} **εἰσπηδήσαντες** εἰς τὸ παστοφόριον, ἐν οὗ καταλύω, ὕβριζάν με καὶ μαστικῶ [καὶ] ταῖς ρύδ [.] τοῖς ὠνηλάται **ὄντες** καὶ χρήματα **αἰθροντες** ἐφ’ οἷς ἔχο\υ/σι χρήμασιν οὐτε τοῦ ἱεροῦ **στυχασάμενοι** οὐτε τοῦ καλῶς **ἔχοντος**.

13. l. θρυπῶλιον 15. l. αὐ<τῷ> 16. corr. ex.. σαιθαι, l. θρύα 17. l. πωλοῦντος 18. l. βουλομένου 19. l. ἀποδόσθαι 20. l. ἔθος, l. πᾶσι, l. πωλεῖν 20a. l. βουλομένου 21. corr. ex ευτελεστερον, l. ευτελεστερά 22. l. δοῦνα<ι> 23. l. βουλομένου 24–25. l. ἀγοράς 27. l. ἀπηλλάγην 28. l. παστοφόριον 29–30. l. ἐπελθόντες 32. l. ράβδους 34. corr. ex χρησάμενο [.] 37. corr. ex φαστοφοριον, l. ὧ 38. corr. ex υβριζον 39. l. ἐμαστίγου<ν> 40. l. ράβδοις, l. ὀνηλάται 41–42. l. [ἀ] [θρ<οιζ>οντες 44. corr. ex χρημα [τεσ] σιν 45. l. στοχασάμενοι

‘In year 23, 25th of Pauni I went to the bulrush-shop which is attached to the said shrine to buy some reeds; but the seller refused to sell the ones he normally sells to all his customers, trying to force on me others of substandard variety. I demanded to buy the decent ones, which he gave to me in a threatening manner; I took them and went back to my cell. Later, however, the shopkeeper’s brothers, Petaus and Teos, arrived carrying staves, and without any decency charged into the cell where I live. They insulted me

and thrashed me with their staves, since they are donkey-boys, extorting money in addition to what they had already obtained. Neither the (sanctity of the) temple nor the law deterred them.'

(UPZ I 12, ll. 11–47; 158 BCE) [tr. Ray 2006]

I find it an important observation that this kind of participial style was attempted here, though it is not as elaborate as, for example, in the petition **6**, written by a scribe. When we compare the language of Apollonios in the petitions above to his letters written six years later (**68**, **69**, **70**) we may note that the sentences there are shorter and include finite verbs much more abundantly than in these petitions, and the use of participles is very moderate. In **68**, there are only two participles: ἀπόστιλόν (for ἀπόστειλόν) μοι ἐπιστόλιον ἔχων\τα/ (for ἔχοντα) Πολυδεύκην ('Send me a letter quickly by means of Polydeukes') (4–5) and βλέπω Μενέδημον κατατρέχοντά με ('I see Menedemos chasing me') (6). In **69**, there is one genitive absolute, ἀπόντος μου ('me being absent') (2), and one other participle (I do not count the two attributive participial forms), προσέχων μὴ εὔρη τι ('taking care that he finds nothing') (7). In **70**, the participles are used at the end of the letter: δύο ἡμέρας ποιεῖ ἐν τῷ Ἀνουβιεῖω πίνων ('[the *strategos*] will spend two days in the Anubieum drinking') (21–23) and αὐτοὺς δεδώκαμεν καὶ ἀποπεπτώκαμεν πλανώμενοι (for πλανώμενοι) ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν καὶ πιστεύοντες τὰ ἐνύπνια ('we have given ourselves away and have been deluded, led astray by the gods and trusting dreams') (26–30). Looking further at the genitive absolute structure, we have an interesting example of two versions of a bank receipt, one written by an official (**30**) and its copy written by Apollonios (**29** 6–12) from 162 BCE, i.e. when Apollonios was ca. 13 years old. The writer of the receipt⁸² did not use the genitive absolute correctly i.e. did not inflect the participle in the genitive and Apollonios has copied the structure as such (but added a prepositional prefix for the verb for some reason): π(α)ροντες Χρυσίππου καὶ Ἀρή(ου) (**30** 3–4) and συνπαροντες Χρυσίππου καὶ Ἀρήου (**29** 8–9); read (συν)παρόντων ('Chrysippos and Areos being present [together]'). A difference between the brothers should be noted: as mentioned above in connection with morphology, Ptolemaios chose the nominative case for all his participles in **77**, whereas Apollonios has not produced this type of syntactic reanalysis.

The use of tense in the letters is interesting. Present and perfect are generally the most common (cf. the use of aorist participles in **12** and **13**). In **68**, Apollonios uses perfect tense when telling past events in real life, but, at the end, when he refers to the ominous dream he has had, he uses the present tense. In the second

⁸² According to Wilcken (1927: 221), hand of a certain Chrysippos, "a strongly abbreviating chancery hand".

letter (69), the future is also found on line 5 (παρέσομαι ‘be present’), but there, too, when he refers to the dream about Menedemos, he uses the present. In the last letter (70), which is quite bitter and unhappy, he blames himself and his brother for believing the dreams, because they are now in trouble. Again, present and perfect tense are the most common, but note also the future *πράσεται* ‘try’ on line 14 and, two lines above, the periphrastic μέλλομεν σωθῆναι ‘we will be saved’. Future is not used, however, from line 19 onwards, when he speaks about the *strategos*, who will be coming “tomorrow” to the Sarapieion to drink for two days. Sadly, these texts are among the last from our brothers. We do not know if they survived their troubles or not.

In light of what we have seen above, we can conclude that the use of participles belonged very much to the stylistic genre of the petitions but are not totally avoided in the private written language register of individuals accustomed to using them, as Apollonios obviously was. The only letter written by Ptolemaios does not contain any participles, though it is also a very short letter. One of their brothers, Sarapion, wrote one participle form, but he obviously meant it as an imperative: παραγενομενοῦ for παραγενοῦ (‘be present’) (66 5).

The last point I will address is the use of final conjunctions ἵνα and ὅπως in purpose clauses. The latter is used more often than the former in the Katochoi archive, which is in accordance with Clarysse’s (2010: 43–45) table describing the chronological distribution of these conjunctions: during the third and second centuries BCE, ὅπως was still used more often than ἵνα, but, in the Roman period, ἵνα had clearly replaced ὅπως. In Apollonios’ case, there is a handful of instances of either,⁸³ though most occurrences come from scribal and other hands (14 ἵνα; 27 ὅπως). In a few instances, ὥς was used as a final conjunction by scribal hands (7 subscription Μενεδήμωι. προνοήθητι ὥς τεύξεται τῶν δικαίων [‘To Menedemos. See to it that he receives justice’]; cf. 9 12, 19 8/9, 45 [12]).

4 Conclusions

Writings by both Apollonios and Ptolemaios betray phonological spellings signalling some of the ongoing sound changes in Greek to a greater extent than what is evident from the scribes’ writings. However, they also have some of their own peculiarities. These differences partly reflect their lack of education in orthography, but some can be considered idiolectal, since both brothers do not necessarily share the same idiosyncrasies. Some of these help in identifying

⁸³ ἵνα: 18r 23 (εἶνα), 39 33, 78 35 (ἀ for ἵνα); ὅπως: 12 52, 14 27, 29, 40, 68 7.

the writer (e.g. Ptolemaios' habit of writing ἕως instead of ἔως 'until'). Some of them also suggest that the brothers' other language, Egyptian, was one factor behind their orthographic fingerprints.

From the morphological features, there is some hint of possible idiolectal language use, like the use of nominative with, e.g. the title Macedonian. This may naturally also be a more commonly spread phenomenon among bilingual writers with less education,⁸⁴ but, in the Katochoi archive, it is not found in other hands. Lack of systematic education, especially in official petition jargon, might be one major force behind the tendency to omit particles by Apollonios and Ptolemaios in their letters, but these can also be considered personal preferences or matters of register. But since other letter writers do not avoid particles to the same extent, genre does not seem to be the determining factor.

In sum, one writer who wrote several types of documents could leave us traces of several different -lects, and they need not all be personal or individual, as in the case of Apollonios, who left many copies written in his hand but not drawn up by him. He was familiar with the scribal lect but could not, or chose not to use it in his private letters. Understanding the differences between document types help us trace actual individual language patterns. When we are able to identify these idiolects, we can better understand variation in the speech community. In our case, it becomes clear that the orthographic variation is due to the individual performing the writing even when he is copying a text that has more standard orthography. This individual's spellings may signal his own pronunciation possibly influenced by his bilingual background and at the same time the lack of scribal education. In other words, the whole speech community can share the features of similar pronunciation to some extent, but it is only visible to us through one or two individuals. Then again, the texts with non-standard orthography may be composed with complex syntax and morphological sophistication, if the text is a copy of a text composed by a professional scribe. Since the Katochoi archive provides the possibility to identify such copying and drafting processes, we no longer need to wonder about the seeming conflict between the orthographic and morphosyntactic levels of one text. Moreover, it is useful to see that the idiolects truly differ even between family members, i.e. between Ptolemaios and Apollonios who shared a father and similar growth milieu. Apollonios' predisposition in petition writing gave him the advantage to adopt some features of legal formulaic language even if it did not lead him in using, for example, discourse connectors to a greater extent in his private writing.

⁸⁴ Cf. Vierros (2012a).

References

- Bentein, Klaas. 2015. The Greek documentary papyri as a linguistically heterogeneous corpus: The case of the katochoi of the Sarapeion-archive. *Classical World* 108. 461–484.
- Blomqvist, Jerker. 1969. *Greek particles in Hellenistic prose*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Bubenik, Vit. 2014. Koine, Origins of. *EAGLL* [online edition].
- Clarysse, Willy. 1993. Egyptian scribes writing Greek. *Chronique d'Égypte* 68. 186–201.
- Clarysse, Willy & Katelijn Vandorpe. 2006. A Demotic lease of temple land reused in the katochoi archive (Louvre N 2328A). *Ancient Society* 36. 1–11.
- Clarysse, Willy. 2010. Linguistic diversity in the archive of the engineers Kleon and Theodoros. In Trevor V. Evans & Dirk D. Obbink (eds.), *The language of the papyri*, 35–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahlgren, Sonja. 2017. *Outcome of long-term language contact: transfer of Egyptian phonological features onto Greek in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. PhD dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Delekat, Lienhard. 1964. *Katoche, Hierodulie und Adoptionsfreilassung*. München: Beck.
- Denniston, John Dewar. 1996 [1950]. *The Greek particles*, 2nd ed. revised by K.J. Dover. London: Duckworth.
- Depauw, Mark & Joanne Vera Stolk. 2015. Linguistic variation in Greek papyri: Towards a new tool for quantitative study. *Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies* 55. 196–220.
- Evans, Trevor V. 2010. Identifying the language of the individual in the Zenon archive. In Trevor V. Evans & Dirk D. Obbink (eds.), *The language of the papyri*, 51–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gignac, Francis T. 1976. *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Milano: La Goliardica.
- Gignac, Francis T. 1981. *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*. Vol. 2: *Morphology*. Milano: La Goliardica.
- Hazen, Kirk. 2002. The Family. In J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*, 500–525. Malden: Blackwell.
- Henriksson, Erik, Sonja Dahlgren & Marja Vierros. Forthcoming. *Orthographic variants and phonological change: A contextual search tool for Greek documentary papyri, ostraca and tablets*.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 2010. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*, 2nd ed. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jannaris, Antonius N. 1968 [1897]. *An historical Greek grammar chiefly of the Attic dialect as written and spoken from Classical Antiquity down to present time founded upon the ancient texts, inscriptions, papyri and present popular Greek*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Koenen, Ludwig. 1985. The dream of Nektanebos. *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22. 171–194.
- Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of linguistic change*. Vol. 2: *Social factors*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Legras, Bernard. 2007. La diglossie des enkatochoi grecs du Sarapieion de Memphis (IIe siècle av. n. è.). *Ktema* 32, 251–264.
- Legras, Bernard. 2011. *Les reclus grecs du Sarapieion de Memphis: Une enquête sur l'hellénisme égyptien*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lewis, Naphtali. 1986. *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case studies in the social history of the Hellenistic world*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Luiselli, R. 2010. Authorial revision of linguistic style in Greek papyrus letters and petitions (AD I–IV). In Trevor V. Evans & Dirk D. Obbink (eds.), *The language of the papyri*, 71–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prada, Luigi. 2013. Dreams, bilingualism, and oneiromancy in Ptolemaic Egypt: Remarks on a recent study. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 184. 85–101.
- Ray, John. 2006. The dreams of the twins in St. Petersburg. In Kasia Szpakowska (ed.), *Through a glass darkly: Magic, dreams and prophecy in Ancient Egypt*, 189–203. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Revuelta, Antonio. 2014. Particles, Syntactic features. *EAGLL* [online edition].
- Rowlandson, Jane. 1988. *Women and society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A sourcebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Teodorsson, Sven-Tage. 1977. *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine*. Lund: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Thompson, Dorothy. 2012. *Memphis after the Ptolemies*, 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Torallas Tovar, Sofia. 2014. Koine, Features of. *EAGLL* [online edition].
- Vandorpe, Katelijn. 2009. Archives and dossiers. In Roger S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of papyrology*, 216–255. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vandorpe, Katelijn & Sofie Waebens. 2009. *Reconstructing Pathyris' archives: A multicultural community in Hellenistic Egypt*. Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten.
- Veisse, Anne-Emmanuelle. 2007. Les identités multiples de Ptolémaïos, fils de Glaukias. *Ancient Society* 37. 69–87.
- Vierros, Marja. 2012a. *Bilingual notaries in Hellenistic Egypt: A study of Greek as a second language*. Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten.
- Vierros, Marja. 2012b. Review of Legras 2011. *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 49. 343–348.
- Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov & Marvin Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In Winfred P. Lehman & Yakiv Malkiel (eds.), *Directions for historical linguistics*, 97–195. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Wilcken, Ulrich (ed.). 1927. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (Ältere Funde)*. Bd. I. *Papyri aus Unterägypten mit 2 Tafeln*. Berlin: de Gruyter.