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**INΔΙΚΤΙΩΝ IN EDITIONS OF PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS: A PHILOLOGIST’S COMMENT ON THE SPELLING AND DECLENSION OF THE TERM**

This article points out misspellings of the word \textit{INΔΙΚΤΙΩΝ} occurring in papyrological and epigraphic publications, especially committed when supplementing the genitive of this word after the abbreviation \textit{IN/INΔ/INΔIK}. Determining the correct spelling of the term entails conclusions regarding, more generally, the issue of transcription of documents.

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

* This publication is the result of research work carried out within the project \textit{Late Greek Poetry: A Selection (Edition, Translation, Commentary)} financed from the state budget under the programme implemented by the Minister of Education and Science (Poland) called the National Programme for the Development of the Humanities (grant no. 0082/NPRH9/H22/88/2021). I would like to thank the anonymous referee of this article for their comments, which prompted me to formulate certain points more precisely.
and/or a failure to give due weight to the spelling of the vowel ‘o’ in an era when the duration of omicron and omega was no longer distinguished. In the situation outlined, a thorough clarification of these matters seems to be needed.

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


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

mate) syllable of this word is confirmed by a number of sources, including the Suda (gota 373.1 Adler): Ἰνδικτιῶν καὶ Ἰνδικτος λέγεται.4

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

4 An interesting, also in terms of content, attestation is given by Hesychius Illustrius, Fr. 2.7–9 Müller: (Ἰνδικτιῶν, τούτ’ ἐστιν (Ἰνακτιῶν, ἢ περὶ τὸ Ἀκτιον νίκη. Διὰ τοῦτο ἀρχεῖα μὲν Ἰνδικτιῶν ἀπὸ πρώτης καὶ καταλέγει μέχρι τῆς ηε (of the Era of Actium). Cf. also Anthologia Graecae Appendix: Epigrammata sepulcralia 748.9 Суеху: Ἰνδικτιῶν δ’ ὑπήρχεν ἢ τρίτῃ τότε; Nicephorus, Breviarium historicum de rebus gestis post imperium Mauricium, p. 22.16 de Boot: δευτέρα δὲ ἦν Ἰνδικτιῶν ἴνα ταῦτα ἐπράπτωντο; Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio 27.54 Moravcsik-Washington: ἦτε ἐστίν Ἰνδικτιῶν ζ’ (and ibidem 29.234; 45.40), Georgius Cedrenus, Compendium historiarum, vol. 2, p. 475.16–17 Becker: Ἰνδικτιῶν ἦ β’, ἔτος Ὑφκζ’. It is also worth comparing this spelling with documents, even contemporary, of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, where they still use indicitio in official documents: <http://www.imis.gr/el/άρβηρα-ποίησις-συνάλγω-6790/Η-εκκλησιαστική-πρωτοχρονιά-Η-Ινδικτιῶν-14435> (accessed 17 November 2022). I thank Constantinos Balamoshev for pointing out to me that this is an unbroken tradition.

5 See below, the quotation from Aelia Herodianus.

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

7 Undoubtedly, a place of honour goes to the editors of the SEG series of recent decades (cit. n. 2). As far as individual researchers are concerned, see, e.g., Gattier, Inscriptions de la Jordanie (cit. n. 3), who includes Ἰνδικτίων in the Index général grec on p. 228, and, accordingly, in the edition of inscription 53 on p. 68 resolves the abbreviation as Ἰνδ(ικτίων); the same in subsequent inscriptions: 56 (p. 72), 57 (p. 74), 74 (p. 88), 80 (p. 93), etc.
The correct form of the nominative and genitive of the noun we are dealing with here is clearly indicated by Aelius Herodianus (or Pseudo-Herodianus):\(^8\)

\[Τά εἰς ων λήγοντα δἐύτονα θηλικά, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροὶ κλῖνονται οὗν τρυγόν, τρυγόνον (…) ἱδικτιώνος δὲ μέγα.\]

Feminine nouns ending in \(-ων\) with the acute accent on the last syllable (\(οξυτόνα\)) take the \(ομικρόν\) in further cases during their declension, for example τρυγόν, τρυγόνον […] but note that ἱδικτιώνος retains the long ‘ο’.

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

\(^{8}\) Aelius Herodianus, \textit{Partitiones}, p. 229.1–4 Boissonade.

\(^{9}\) Such a procedure is followed by G. Poetcke in his edition of \textit{Berliner Griechische Urkunden 17}, see e.g. \textit{BGU} XVII 2709, l. 2: ἱδικτιώνος (note the indication of the expected accent position and its prosodic adaptation to the short vowel in the transcribed original), and the subsequent correction in the critical apparatus \textit{ad loc}: ‘ἱδικτιώνος παπ., ἱδικτιώνος’. It is worth emphasising that this scholar always gives the proper form of the genitive after abbreviations, printing ἱδικτιώνος/ἱδικτιώνος. Contrast A. Benaisa, ‘Late antique papyri from Hermopolis in the British Library II’, \textit{Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik} 219 (2021), p. 198 (on \textit{P. Lond.} III 1011), who prints ἱδικτιώνος in line 3 and in the apparatus merely states ‘3 ἱδικτιώνος’ (with no comment on the place of accent and the shortness of ‘ο’). As to the misleading suggestion in the apparatus of the accent allegedly written in the original, cf. \textit{P. Kölh} III 151 r, whose editors print in line 4 (and 18) ἱδικτιώνος, and in the apparatus \textit{ad loc.} explain: ‘ἱδικτιώνος. Papyrus’ as if the original gave rise to such a verdict (proparoxytonon).
tions, Roger Bagnall and Klaas Worp cite a handful of phrases containing either ἰδικτιῶνος or ἰδικτίωνος (accents imposed by the editors).

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

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

11 See CPR VI 5, where the second hand wrote ἰδικτιίωνος, while the third hand wrote ἰδικτιῶνος (accents imposed by the editors).

12 Of course, once approved, the form should be kept throughout the transcript, otherwise the reader is not sure about the editor’s intention, cf. H. Mauhler (ed.), BGU XIX 2769 ṅ’, col. i, l. 3: ἰδικτιῖωνος, l. 5: ἰδικτίωνος.

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

supplemented\(^\text{15}\) with the accent erroneously shifted backwards. This practice needs to change.

ADDENDUM

In this article I deal with the term \(\text{ινδικτιῶν}, \text{ώνος}\) as a specific case of Latin loan-words in Greek, leaving aside a more general analysis of the incorporation of Latin words into Greek. The explanation of such processes is dealt with by linguists, especially in the context of bilingualism.\(^\text{16}\) Nevertheless, it can be observed that when incorporating Latin words ending in \(\text{-tio}\) into Greek, the Herodian guideline on the spelling \(\text{ινδικτιῶν}\) (see above) is sometimes extended to further feminine nouns, while masculine nouns are not subject to it. Hence (f) \(\sigmaτατιῶν, \text{ώνος}\) (= Lat. \(\text{statio}, \text{onis}\)), (f) \(\lambda\gammaευόν\) (freq. written \(\lambda\gammaευόν\)), \(\text{ώνος}\) (= Lat. \(\text{legió}, \text{onis}\)),\(^\text{17}\) but (m) \(\text{ὀπτίων}, \text{ώνος}\) (= Lat. \(\text{optió}, \text{onis}\)),\(^\text{18}\) (m) \(\Sigmaκηπίων, \text{ώνος}\) (Lat.

\(^{15}\) Cf. most recently N. Gonis, ‘Ten documentary fragments of late date’, \textit{Archiv für Papyrologie, 67} (2021), p. 398; H. Harrauer & R. Pintaudi, ‘Ein neuer Kompromissvertrag (PL III/1029)’, \textit{Analecta papyrologica 33} (2021), p. 56; G. Messeri, ‘I tre papiri Palari-Ribes / Leone’, \textit{Aegyptus 101} (2021), pp. 148 and 151. The authors of such supplements are mistaken about the accent, but aware that the vowel ‘o’ should be written as \(\omega\gamma\mu\), which is not common.


\(^{18}\) Latin differentiates between \(\text{optió}, \text{onis}\) (f), ‘choice’, ‘freedom of choice’, ‘privilege’, and \(\text{optió}, \text{onis}\) (m), ‘an aide whom one chooses for oneself’, ‘assistant’, in milit. lang., ‘adjutant’; here the latter use comes into play.
Scipio, ōnis). Of course, there are occasional deviations from the correct orthography, typical of the late period, of the type στατιόνος (Flavius Justinianus Imperator, Novellae, pp. 275–276 Schnopolitanus) or πετιτίων (Michael Psellus, Poem 8.784 Westerink). This well-known fact does not, however, authorise editors and lexicographers to arbitrarily shift backward accents in feminine nouns of Latin origin ending in -ων, despite the lack of evidence of this in the primary sources, as is done, among others, by Sergio Daris in his Il lessico latino nel greco d’Egitto.19
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19 S. Daris, Il lessico latino nel greco d’Egitto, Barcelona 1991 (2nd ed.), p. 47 (Ινδικτίων) and, in addition, pp. 55, 77, 89, 96–98, 112. To give a characteristic example: Daris prints (p. 97) ῥεπαρατιόν without taking into account the fact that in Stud. Pal. XX 123 ν0, l. 33 (DDBDP transcription) there is a genitive in the form ῥεπαρατιὼνος and that such a declension is confirmed by Pseudo-Mauricius, Strategicon 1.6.10.1 Mihaescu: ῥεπαρατιῶνα.