



HAL
open science

κλογιζουσθω for *κλογιζ σθω* in IG IX.1.2(4), 798.104:
Two False Characters in Search of an Author

Alcorac Alonso Déniz

► **To cite this version:**

Alcorac Alonso Déniz. *κλογιζουσθω* for *κλογιζ σθω* in IG IX.1.2(4), 798.104: Two False Characters in Search of an Author. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 2011, 176, pp.163-168. hal-04725083

HAL Id: hal-04725083

<https://hal.science/hal-04725083v1>

Submitted on 8 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ΕΚΛΟΓΙΖΟΥΣΘΩ FOR ΕΚΛΟΓΙΖΕΣΘΩ IN *IG IX.1²(4)*, 798.104
 TWO FALSE CHARACTERS IN SEARCH OF AN AUTHOR

1. ἐκλογιζούσθω in *IG IX.1²(4)*, 798.104

Among the public documents from Corcyra, *IG IX.1²(4)*, 798 provides essential information about the city's local institutions and the practice of private donations in Hellenistic times.¹ The first section (lines 1–38) contains the donation of 120 *mnai* of silver to the city by Aristomenes, prytan of Corcyra, and his wife Psylla. The donation is allocated for the purpose of hiring artists for a musical festival in honour of Dionysus every two years. The second part (from line 39 onwards) consists of a decree of the council meticulously establishing provisions for the administration of the fund. Although *IG IX.1²(4)*, 798 has been dated between 272 and 229 BC on historical grounds (cf. Guarducci 1967–1978: III, p. 251), linguistic and orthographic criteria suggest that it belongs to the 2nd century BC (cf. Dittenberger *ad IG IX.1*, 694, p. 156).

As expected, heavy fines are imposed on magistrates not abiding by the decree's regulations (lines 100–132). More specifically, if the ἀγωνοθέτας (the official in charge of paying the artist's wages) or the χειρίζοντες τὸ ἀργύριον (the three citizens elected annually responsible for the money) fail to submit proper accounts, the νομοφύλακες will audit them (lines 102–105):

[...] εἰ

δέ τί καὶ ὁ ἀγωνοθέτας ἢ οἱ χειρίζοντες τὸ ἀργύριον μὴ ὀρθῶς
 ἀπολογίζονται, νομοφύλακες ἐκλογιζούσθω καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἄλ-
 105 λα τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ δημόσια χρήματα. [...]

The verb ἐκλογίζομαι is to be taken here in its technical sense 'examine the accounts', 'audit' (cf. Fröhlich 2004: 204–5, 426),² a meaning also attested by συνεγλογίζεσθαι 'participate in the control of accounts' (*SEG 27*: 261, B.90, Beroia, ca. 180–150 BC, cf. Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993: 124).

The 3rd middle imperative ἐκλογιζούσθω is universally regarded as a regular outcome of ἐκλογιζόνσθω with a compensatory lengthening -όνσθω > -ούσθω.³ Understandably, Klaus Hallof endorses this view and accordingly does not amend the inscription's reading in his edition of Corcyrean inscriptions.

In spite of this general consensus among linguists and epigraphists, the purported evolution -όνσθω > -ούσθω is unsound. I briefly offer here the main conclusions of an in depth study of this question that will appear elsewhere (Alonso Déniz ms.):

a) Seemingly, nasal lenition would have triggered compensatory lengthening in order to preserve syllable weight unchanged: -όνσθω > -ούσθω, just as in πάνσα > πᾶσα. If so, the development -όνσθω > -ούσθω entails the existence of phonologically distinctive trimoraic superheavy syllables in Ancient Greek.⁴ However, Ancient Greek phonology contrasted exclusively *light* and *heavy* syllables. Superheavy

¹ This paper is part of the research project FFI 2009-07645 ("Interdialectal Contact in Ancient Greek") of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (MICINN). I thank Julián Méndez Dosuna for his insightful remarks and suggestions.

² Cf. also 'contraindre à compter' (*IJG 2*, p. 125), 'überprüfen' (Mannzmann 1962: 44), 'obtain accounts' (Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 165), ἀναλαμβάνω τον ἔλεγχον (Pappas 1996: 23), 'pedir cuentas', 'exigir la rendición de cuentas' (*DGE*, s.v. ἐκλογίζομαι). Less appropriate in this context are 'calculate', 'reckon' (*LSJ*, s.v. ἐκλογίζομαι) and '[die Gelder] eintreiben' (Laum 1914, vol. II, p. 7).

³ See F. Blass (*ad SGDI 3206*), J. Stenzel (*SGDI IV*, p. 396), Kühner and Blass (1890–1892: §§ 68.3, 211.9), Buck (1911: 220), Brugmann and Thumb (1913: 395), Thumb and Kieckers (1932: 133), Schwyzler (1939: 802), Buck (1955: §§ 77.2, 140.3b), Risch (1964: 8–9), Lejeune (1972: § 134), Méndez Dosuna (1985: 213), Abbenes (1990: 237) and Colvin (2007: 166).

⁴ Any vocalic or consonantal element that determines syllable weight is called 'mora'. Short vowels and consonants in syllable coda represent one mora, long vowels, two. Accordingly, the fourth syllable in ἐκ.λο.γι.ζούσ.θω exhibits three *morae* (ou = 2 *morae*, σ = 1 *mora*). Therefore, the long vowel -ou-, triggered by compensatory lengthening, would attest to the trimoraic nature of the syllable before nasal loss.

trimoraic syllables had no phonological status, as shown by the evidence of metrical rules in poetry, various sound changes and of some accentual phenomena governed by syllable weight.

b) More significantly, a change $-\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\omega > -\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\omega$ contradicts the regular behaviour of $-nsC-$ sequences, in which systematic nasal loss is not joined by compensatory lengthening: e.g., $*en-sk^wete > \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, $*kons-mo- > \acute{\kappa}\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, $*dem-s + *pot- > *denspot\acute{\epsilon}s > \delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta\varsigma$, $*kent-t\acute{\omicron}- > *kenst\acute{\omicron}- > \kappa\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, etc. Despite frequent claims to the contrary, this development is not restricted to a prehistoric stage of the language, but recurs over and over through the history of Ancient Greek, as shown by relatively late instances in sandhi like $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu + \sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma > \text{Att. } \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\text{Att. } \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ or $\text{Delph. } \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\varsigma > \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ (= $\text{Att. } \acute{\epsilon}\zeta \sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$). The alleged exceptions are wholly unwarranted: $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\lambda\eta\tau\iota$ is an epigraphic mistake, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ have been created on the analogy of $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha$ (< $*\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\nu\sigma\alpha$) and $\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega$ (< $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\omega$), and $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ borrowed its long $\acute{\alpha}$ and double $-\sigma\sigma-$ from other comparatives ($\theta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, etc.). Finally, $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\alpha$ (< $*\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\mu\alpha$), attested in Hesychius' lexicon, became $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ 'rope' replaced under the conjoint influence of the quasi-homonym $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ 'persuasion' and some quasi-synonyms that presented an / $\acute{\epsilon}$ / ($\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha$, $\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omicron}$).

c) The ending of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\zeta\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\omega$ is unparalleled. Even if $\text{Lac. } \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}$, $\text{Locr. } \delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\text{Att. } \eta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$, etc., are ambiguous (as is known, <O> stands both for long and short /o/ in most epichoric alphabets), in $\text{Epid. } \phi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}$ (*IG IV².1, 40.13*, ca. 400 BC) and $\phi[\epsilon]\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}$ (*ib. 41.13*) <O> represents unambiguously a short /o/, since for / $\acute{\omicron}$ / both inscriptions regularly use the false diphthong <ou> (cf. Nieto Izquierdo 2009: 482–3).⁵

All these facts are compelling evidence against the *communis opinio* and strongly confirm the idea that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\zeta\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\omega$ is a misspelling. In the following sections, I will support this hypothesis with further epigraphic arguments and try to prove that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\omega$ is the most likely correction.

2. Misspellings in *IG IX.1²(4)*, 798

IG IX.1²(4), 798 was published in minuscules at the beginning of the XVIIIth century by the French Benedictine Bernard de Montfaucon (*Montfaucon 1702*: 412–421). De Montfaucon tells almost nothing about the discovery of the stone. Apparently, his own edition bases on a copy that he received in April 1701 from Apostolo Zeno, famous Venetian antiquarian, man of letters and opera librettist of Cretan descent, whose family settled in Venice in the years before the fall of Candia to the Turks in 1669. Although Zeno in some of his letters refers to De Montfaucon's visit to Venice in the spring of the year 1701,⁶ he makes no further mention of this or the other copies of inscriptions he gave to the French traveller. Admittedly, the stone could have been copied in Venice, where many inscriptions arrived from Greek islands under Venetian rule. However, De Montfaucon's words clearly suggest that Zeno acquired his copy from an otherwise unknown Corcyrean.⁷ Therefore, it seems more likely that the stone was copied in Corcyra. Unfortunately, it has not been recovered ever since.

Be it as it may, the text published by De Montfaucon abounds in mistakes, most of which were already emended in Boeckh's edition (*CIG 1875*), who also established the arbitrary division of lines. Mistakes are of different types. Some are certainly attributable to the anonymous Corcyrean who made the first transcription or to a subsequent copy (or copies) derived from that archetype:

⁵ To my mind, Argolic $\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron} < \chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\theta\omega$ (Buck 83.10, 575–550 BC?) and $\rho\omicron\gamma\eta\alpha\psi\acute{\alpha}\nu\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}$ (*Schwyzler 83, B.26*, ca. 460–450 BC) exhibit an analogically restored nasal ($-\tau\omicron, -\tau\alpha\iota : -\sigma\theta\omega :: -\nu\tau\omicron, -\nu\tau\alpha\iota : x$, hence $x = -\nu\sigma\theta\omega$).

⁶ "Martedì è partito con mio sommo rincrescimento il nostro P. di Montfaucon [...]. Ho veduti molti begli Manoscritti, che pubblicherà in sei tomi, tosto ch'è sia giunto a Parigi" (Morelli 1785: No. 55, vol. I, p. 108). "L'ordinario passato mi trovava fuor di Venezia [...]. Era però già partito sino dal Lunedì il dottissimo Padre di Montfaucon, con cui spesso ho tenuto regionamento" (Morelli 1785: No. 56, vol. I, pp. 110–1).

⁷ "Inscriptiones Coreyreas eiusdem Zeni beneficio ac dono nacti sumus: prima egregia est, singularissimumque antiquitatis monumentum. Eam quia ineditam aestimo, hic publici iuris facere destinavi, qualem a Graeco Corcyreo descriptam idem amicissimus nobis Zenus accepit" (Montfaucon 1702: 412).

a) Misspellings due to interference with Modern Greek pronunciation: <ε> for <αι>,⁸ <η> for <ει>,⁹ <οι> for <ει>,¹⁰ interchange of <ο> and <ω>.¹¹

b) Mistakes due to wrong segmentation of the text in *scriptio continua*.¹²

c) Misspellings due to visual resemblance of minuscule letters.¹³

d) Other mistakes.¹⁴

Symptomatically, glaring misspellings also abound in other Corcyrean inscriptions preserved only through Zeno's copies: ΦΑΙΑΚΟΣΙΝΗ for Φαίακος γυνή (IG IX.1²(4), 855.1, II–I BC?; corrected by F. Ossann), Ἀριστοδαμος for Ἀριστοδάμας (IG IX.1²(4), 799.1, Hellenistic period; cf. Ἀριστοδάμαν[τι] .4), etc.¹⁵

Actually, later more accurate copies of some inscriptions also expose the blunders in the transcriptions of Zeno: ΙΑΚΧΟΣ for Ἰάκχου (IG IX.1²(4), 839.2, III–II BC?), ΑΠΕΛΑΟΥ for Ἀγελάου (*ib.* 3), ΑΠΟΛΛΙΝΙΑΛΣΟΣ for [κατ]ὰ πόλιν ἄλφος (IG IX.1²(4), 787.5, 250–200 BC).¹⁶ Last but not least, Zeno's transcript of IG IX.1²(4), 1011 (II BC), an inscription that is still preserved, is nothing but gibberish: cf. e.g. line 3 ΠΥΝΘΑΝΕ ΑΝΤΙ CEO ΕΥΓΕΝΗΣ ΤΙΣ ΔΕ ΕΥΓΕΝΟΥΣ for [εἰ τάχ]α πυνθάνεαι τίς ἔφυν, ξένε, τίς δὲ ἐγενήθην (*lapis*).

In my opinion, the linguistic arguments put forward above (§ 1), the fact that misspellings are abundant in IG IX.1²(4), 798 and the overall poor quality of Zeno's copies cast serious doubts on ἐκλογιζούσθω. It should also be stressed that, in general, copies of texts prior to the development of modern epigraphy are highly unreliable. More particularly, extraordinary and unparalleled spellings only attested in this kind of documents are in most cases negligible (Threatte 1980: 12–3).

3. ἐκλογιζό{υ}σθω

Dittenberger (*ad IG IX.1*, 694, p. 156) stated that ἐκλογιζόνσθω should have regularly evolved into ἐκλογιζόσθω. Accordingly, “sane accurate -όσθω, non -ούσθω scribendum erat” (cf. Epid. φερόσθω). However, there is compelling evidence against the correction ἐκλογιζό{υ}σθω.

To begin with, 3rd pl. thematic middle imperative -όσθω(ν) (< *-όνσθω(ν)) is otherwise unattested in Hellenistic inscriptions, in which only -έσθων or -έσθωσαν are found. In Attic inscriptions -έσθων and

⁸ Cf. τε for τᾱι (.82), ἐφερεθεῖσιν for ἐφαιρεθεῖσιν (.93), συναλλάσσονται for συναλλάσσοντες (.55).

⁹ Cf. ποιήτω for ποιείτω (.94).

¹⁰ Cf. οἱ δὲ for <ε>ὶ δὲ (.100), συνοίκει for συν<ε>ίκει (.121), ἀναθέμονον ποι for ἀναθέμεν ὄ(ν)π<ε>ι (.143), ἄχροι (.134) for ἄχρει (= ἄχρη). According to Dittenberger (*ad IG IX.1*, 694, p. 156) and Hallof (*ad IG IX.1²(4)*, 798, p. 28), in these examples <ο> for <ε> is due to a confusion of minuscules. However, if this were the deciding factor of the mistake, we would also expect to find instances of <ο> for <ε> in other contexts, not only in combination with <ι>.

¹¹ Cf. παραδόντι for παραδῶντι (.76), παραλάβοντι for παραλάβῶντι (.99), δώσει for δόσει (.82), δῶντο for δόντω (.116).

¹² Cf. καθῶς κἀδοκῆ for καθῶς κα δοκῆ (.11), Γλαύκους Ὠσανδρός for Γλαύκου Σάσανδρος (.36–38), ποιῆσαι ἔν τι for ποιῆσαιέν τι (.67), ἂν πράξαιεν for ἀνπράξαιεν (.73), ἂν πράξωντι for ἀνπράξωντι (.90).

¹³ Cf. δοδέντα (.36) for δοθέντα and πόδοδον (.39) for πόθοδον. The latter was already emended by De Montfaucon (Montfaucon 1702: 429) in his notes to the text. However, ἐγδανεισῶντι for ἐγδανεισθῶντι (.77–8) could have well been already in the inscription.

¹⁴ Cf. Ψύλλας for Ψύλλα (.5), πρὸς for πρὸ (.93), καὶ for κα (.12), κα- for κα- (as if from καὶ + vowel, cf. κᾶρξονται for κ' ἄρξονται .17, κᾶδύνατον for κ' ἄδύνατον .25, etc.), ἀναθέσεις for ἀναθέσιος (.144), τοῦ for τᾶς (.40) (cf. also § 4 for other mistakes). The omission of *iota* after a long vowel in ἀρημένους for αἰρημένους (.121), τᾶ for τᾱι (.3), τῶ for τῶι (.40.), ἦ for ῆ (.118) is more likely to be a late feature of the ancient Corcyrean than a modern mistake (cf. perhaps the hypercorrect <η> for <η> in Ἀριστομένη for Ἀριστομένη, .59). Most probably, the original text included Attic-Ionic Koine forms: προστατησ- (.106, .109, .110) δημοσία (.105, .130), τετάρτη (.2), ἀρχή (.84), ἀγωνοθέτης (.94) vs. ἀγωνοθέτας (.103), τεχνιτῶν (.6, .35) vs. τεχνιτᾶν (.4), ἐκδανισθῆναι (.14) vs. κατακρησθῆμεν (.127). Finally, itacistic δανίζ- (.9, .14, .28) for the more frequently attested δανείζ- (*passim*) and ἀποτισ- (.69, .71, .75, .101) for ἀποτεισ- (.110) could also be ascribed to the original inscription.

¹⁵ Cf. also ΧΑΙΡΑΙ for χαῖρε (IG IX.1²(4), 983, Hellenistic period?, *ib.* 1052 and 1055, Roman period), ΑΜΥΡΑΛΟΥ for Ἀμφιάλου (IG IX.1²(4), 979.1.2, Hellenistic period; corrected by Dittenberger), ΝΑΣΟΙΓΑΙΑ for νάσωνι τᾱιδ' (IG IX.1²(4), 929.4, 250–200 BC; corrected by Ruhnken), ΛΑΚΠΟΥ for Λακρίτου (IG IX.1²(4), 819.1, II BC; corrected by Dittenberger; of this inscription only line 3 is extant today).

¹⁶ The stone was reported to be missing in the 1930s and only a copy and an *ectypon* by H. Nesselhauf are preserved.

-όσθων still coexisted in the fifth century BC.¹⁷ However, -όσθων had disappeared by the fourth century BC.¹⁸

More significantly, in *IG IX.1*²(4), 798 in addition to the Koine type ἀπολογιζάσθωσαν (.97), there are two clear instances of 3rd middle imperative -έσθω (for 3rd pl. -σθω = -σθων, cf. Buck 1955: § 140.1): αὐτοὶ εἰσπρασσόντ<ω>, καὶ κρινέσθω ἕκαστοι καθὼς κ' αὐτοὶ προαιρ<ῶ>νται (.125), ἐκδανειζέσθω καὶ αἱ πεντήκοντα μναί (.134). Coordination with ἐόντω strongly supports the interpretation of ἐγδανειζέσθω as a 3rd pl. in the following passage: μὴ ἐόντω τὰ ἐπιτίμια μηδὲ τὰ χρήματα Ἀριστομένεος καὶ Ψύλλας μηδὲ τῶν ἐπινόμων Ἀριστομένεος καὶ Ψύλλας, ἀλλὰ δημόσια εἰς τὰν τῶν τεχνιτῶν μίσθωσιν, καὶ ἐγδανειζέσθω μετὰ τοῦ ἄλλου ἀργυρίου (.127–131). The examples above suggest that μισθούσθω (.83) is more likely to go back to *μισθοέσθω than to *μισθοόσθω or *μισθοοúsθω. Therefore, ἐκλογιζόσθω would be at odds with the systematic use of -έσθω in the rest of the document.¹⁹

4. ἐκλογιζ<έ>σθω

Boeckh (*ad CIG* 1845) proposed the correction ἐκλογιζ<έ>σθω, which was eventually accepted by Ahrens (1843: 297). However, Dittenberger (*ad IG IX.1*, 694, p. 156) argued that a misspelling ἐκλογιζούσθω for ἐκλογιζέσθω cannot be easily explained: “errorum, quibus sane scatet apographum, causae plerumque in propatulo sunt, cum in hac flexione ου pro ε scriptum esse permirum videri debeat”. As expected, there are no further interchanges of <ου> and <ε> in the inscription.

Nonetheless, mere sloppiness is the only possible explanation for some irrational misspellings in our text (some of the examples cited above could also fit into this category, cf. § 2, especially those in n. 14): Μερτίλου for Μυρτίλου (.38), μὲν Ἀριστομένη for μετ' Ἀριστομένη (.59).

Furthermore, some errors can be brought about also by mental association or by other words in the same text (cf. West 1973: 21). This accounts for some of the mistakes found in *IG IX.1*²(4), 798: εἰσπράσσονται for εἰσπρασσόντω (.124–5), καθὼς ἔχουσι for καθὼς ἔχειν (.140), possibly γεγραμμένον for γενόμενον (.145–6), παραδοίητο for παραδοίην {το} (.74)²⁰ and ἐξέσθω (.105) for ἐξέστω, with unexpected -σθω after other imperatives in the inscription.²¹ After all, ἐκλογιζούσθω is not the only oddity that needs correction and the source for the aberrant ending in -ούσθω is probably the imperative μισθούσθω found some lines before (.83).²²

Greek inscriptions attest to crazy mistakes of similar kind:

- 3rd pl. ἐμπεδορκοῖην for ἐμπεδορκοῖεν (Rhodes and Osborne *GHI* 88.49–50, *post* 350 BC), induced by 1st sg. ἐμπεδορκοῖην (.39) some lines above (cf. Siewert 1972: 7).
- 3rd sg. ὠμολόγησεν for ὠμολόγησιν (*IG II*², 1629.505, 325 BC), induced by ἀποδώσειν in the following line.

¹⁷ Cf. Threatte (1996: 465–6): εὐθυνόσθων (*IG I*³, 78a.20, 422 BC?), χρῆσθῶν < *χρηόσθων (*IG I*³, 182.11, 430–405 BC), ηλόσθων (*IG I*³, 82.36, 421 BC) vs. [εὐθ]υνέσθων (*IG I*³, 78b.20), [ἐπ]αράσθων < *ἐπαράέσθων (*IG I*³, 75.26, 423 BC).

¹⁸ Cf. εὐθυνέσθω[v] (*SEG* 26, 28.28, 374 BC), χρήσθων < *χρηέσθων (*SEG* 26, 28.43, 374 BC), καταδε[δέ]σθωσαν (*DTWii* 106.a.5, ca. 350–300 BC).

¹⁹ Abbenes (1990) contends that there is no cogent proof for a 3rd pl. -έσθω in Dorian dialects. Accordingly, he takes all 3rd pl. -έσθω in this inscription to be mistakes for Koine -έσθω<v>, whereas ἐκλογιζούσθω would be the only dialectal form (Abbenes 1990: 241). Unfortunately, as far as *IG IX.1*²(4), 798 is concerned, Abbenes' claim brings up an unexpected problem. In the document 3rd pl. imperative active endings show the following pattern: 1 example of Koine -ντων (ταξάντων .138) vs. 18 instances of dialectal -ντω. Under Abbenes' hypothesis, the distribution in the middle would be awkwardly the opposite: 4 Koine variants vs. only 1 alleged dialectal form (ἐκλογιζούσθω). Even allowing for some randomness, the ratio between local and Koine variants would be expected to be somehow similar.

²⁰ Other possible emendations of this passage are παραδοί<ε>ν τὸ <κεφάλαιον καὶ τὸν τόκον> (Blass, cf. .73 and .75) and παραδοίην <αὐ>τό (Boeckh).

²¹ The correct form ἔστω appears in line 118. An inverse spelling <σθ> for <στ> is unlikely, since <σθ> remains otherwise unchanged in the inscription. As a matter of fact, ἔσθωσαν for ἔστωσαν, ἐξέσθω for ἐξέστω, etc., found in Hellenistic papyri, are probably due to the association with middle forms (Mayser and Schmoll 1970: 154).

²² Remember that the lines of the text were arbitrarily established by Boeckh.

- 3rd sg. καταστασεῖ for καταστασεῖ (IC IV, 72, I.51, Gortyna, 5th BC), caused by κατι[στά]τῶ (*ib.* 45–6), καπιστάμεν (*ib.* 54).
- 3rd sg. διατελεῖν for διατελεῖ (CID IV, 106.29, Delphi, 184 BC), caused by πράττειν (.28) and διατηρεῖν (.27) (cf. Wilhelm 1933: 2).
- Inf. ἐχσαιρῆς for ἐχσαιρῆν (IG I³, 82.16, 421 BC, *stoichedon*). Final <Σ> in ἐχσαιρῆς takes up the 34th position of the *stoichos* and there is also a <Σ> in the 35th position of the line immediate above (ἈθENAΐAς).
- ἦλθοντες for ἔλθοντες (IG II², 1672.297, 329 BC), probably caused by the blending of οἱ ὕστερον ἔλθοντες and οἱ ὕστερον ἦλθον (cf. Kunst 1919: 499).

As is the case with ἐκλογιζούσθω, the instances above are isolated errors with no further implications for the morphology of Ancient Greek.

Judging from the evidence of other inscriptions, the stonecutter of IG IX.1²(4), 798 could be regarded as the prime suspect of the error ἐκλογιζούσθω. However, we cannot exclude that the responsibility lies with the incompetent Corcyrean who transcribed the text.²³

5. Conclusions

Although universally assumed to be a genuine dialectal form, 3rd pl. middle imperative ἐκλογιζούσθω is a ghost of Ancient Greek morphology and is better explained as an irrational mistake for ἐκλογιζέσθω. As long as the stone is not found, it must remain undecided whether ἐκλογιζούσθω was mistakenly written by the amateur who transcribed the inscription or must be attributed to the engraver of the stone.

Bibliography

- Abbenes, J. G. J., 1990. The Middle Imperative Plural, Type φερέσθω in Greek, *HSF*, 103. 236–244.
- Ahrens, H. L., 1843. *De Graecae linguae Dialectis. II: De dialecto Dorica*. Gotinga.
- Alonso Déniz, A., ms. A propósito del supuesto alargamiento *πένσμα > πείσμα, etc. en griego antiguo.
- Brugmann, K. and A. Thumb, 1913. *Griechische Grammatik. Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax*. München.
- Buck, C. D., 1911. On a New Argive Inscription, *CPh*, 6. 219–220.
- Buck, C. D., 1955. *The Greek Dialects. Grammar. Selected Inscriptions. Glossary*. Chicago.
- Colvin, S., 2007. *A Historical Greek Reader. Mycenaean to the Koiné*. Oxford–New York.
- DGE = Adrados, F. R., et al., 1980–. *Diccionario griego-español*. Madrid.
- DTWü = Wunsch, R., 1897. *IG III.3. Appendix inscriptionum Atticarum. Defixionum tabellae in Attica regione repertae*. Berlin.
- Fröhlich, P., 2004. *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IVe–Ier siècle avant J.-C.)*. Genève.
- Gauthier, P. and M. V. Hatzopoulos, 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia*. Athènes–Paris.
- Guarducci, M., 1967–1978. *Epigrafia greca I–IV*. Rome.
- Hellenica = Robert, L., 1940–1965. *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*. Limoges.
- IJG = Dareste, R., B. Haussoullier and T. Reinach, 1894–1904. *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*. Paris.
- Kühner, R. and F. Blass, 1890–1892. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. I: Elementar- und Formenlehre*. Hannover.
- Kunst, K., 1919. Zur eleusinischen Rechnungsurkunde des Jahres 329/28 v. Chr., *BPW*, 39. 493–501.
- Laum, B., 1914. *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*. Leipzig.
- Lejeune, M., 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- LSJ = Liddell, H. G., R. Scott and H. S. Jones, 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a Revised Supplement*. Oxford.
- Mannzmann, A., 1962. *Griechische Stiftungsurkunden. Studie zu Inhalt und Rechtsform*. Münster.

²³ According to his own experience, Louis Robert (*Hellenica* VII, p. 61) thinks that modern editors are more likely to be the source of mistakes: “on peut dire, en général, que les lapicides ont commis beaucoup moins d’erreurs que les éditeurs d’inscriptions; ces derniers ont beaucoup d’occasions de faire des erreurs de lecture [...], parce que les pierres sont effacées ou qu’on doit les étudier dans de mauvaises conditions ou parce que des éditeurs d’inscriptions ne sont pas préparés à leur tâche”.

- Mayser, E. and H. Schmoll, 1970. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Bd. 1. Laut- und Wortlehre: I. Teil : Einleitung und Lautlehre.* Berlin.
- Méndez Dosuna, J., 1985. *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal.* Salamanca.
- Montfaucon, B. D., 1702. *Diarium Italicum, sive, Monumentorum veterum, bibliothecarum, musaeorum, atque notitiae singulares in itinero Italo collectae.* Parisiis.
- Morelli, J., 1785. *Lettere di Apostolo Zeno.* Venezia.
- Nieto Izquierdo, E., 2009. *Gramática de las inscripciones de la Argólida.* Madrid.
- Pappas, T. G., 1996. *Θεατρικὲς παραστάσεις στὴν ἀρχαία Κέρκυρα. Ἱδρυση τῶν Διονυσίων: IG IX 1 694.* Athens.
- Rhodes, P. J. and D. M. Lewis, 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States.* Oxford.
- Risch, E., 1964. Das Attische im Rahmen der griechischen Dialekte, *MH*, 21. 1–14.
- Schwyzler = Schwyzer, E., 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora.* Lipsiae.
- Schwyzler, E., 1939. *Griechische Grammatik. I: Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion.* München.
- SGDI = Collitz, H. and F. Bechtel, 1884–1915. *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. I–IV.* Göttingen.
- Siewert, P., 1972. *Der Eid von Plataiai.* München.
- Threatte, L., 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. I: Phonology.* Berlin–New York.
- Threatte, L., 1996. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. II: Morphology.* Berlin–New York.
- Thumb, A. and E. Kieckers, 1932. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I.* Heidelberg.
- West, M. L., 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts.* Stuttgart.
- Wilhelm, A., 1933. Wiederholung einer Präposition in Relativsätzen, *SO*, 1–9 [= *Kleine Schriften* II.V, 99–107].

Alcorac Alonso Déniz, 41–43, Quai de Valmy, 75010 Paris
alcorac.alonso@gmail.com