

Menander, *Epitrepontes* 807 and the suffix of the feminine perfect active participle in fourth-century Athens¹

Menander's intertextuality with inscriptions is a rich and rewarding one;² this paper explores the relationship between the language of Attic inscriptions and the text of Menander. It focuses on a very minor area of grammar, the feminine perfect active participle, examining its phonological and its morphological development. A recently discovered papyrus has given us a precious indication about Menander's orthography which editors have overlooked; this paper aims to correct this neglect.

In classical Attic, the endings of the perfect participle were -ώς, -υῖα, -ος, formed to a dental stem (e.g. λελυκότ-). The suffix is usually traced back to I.-E. *-uos-, seen in the masculine and neuter, alternating with *-us-, seen in the feminine (-υῖα < *-usja).³ The Attic form has thus undergone several changes: the loss of consonantal /w/; the generalisation of different ablaut grades throughout the cases of each gender; and the rise of the *t*-inflection, parallel to similar developments in the I.-E. *s*-stems elsewhere in Greek.⁴ Didactic grammars of Greek normally prescribe -ώς, -υῖα, -ος as the endings of this participle, reflecting our manuscript evidence.⁵

Attic inscriptions spell the feminine suffix as both -υῖα and -ῶα, the former predominantly in the fifth century, the latter mainly in the fourth.⁶ However, from about 320 B.C., the feminine

¹ Helena Beeley and Dr. Gertjan Verhasselt kindly read first drafts of this paper. The participants in the OIKOS Postgraduate Colloquium 2013 in Oxford listened to a first version (thanks go especially to the organisers Prof. Chris Pelling and Prof. Nicholas Purcell, and Prof. Irene de Jong, a generous respondent). Prof. Cornelia Römer kindly responded to queries about *P. Mich.* 4752.

² To cite an early example, Rostovtzeff (1941) 202 discusses Menander in the context of inscriptions records of pirate abduction.

³ Schwyzler (1939) 539-541, Rix (1976) 234-5.

⁴ Schwyzler (1939) 514 (on other categories which gain a *t*-inflection in Greek cf. 517, 520-1); on the animate *s*-stem nouns Meissner (2005) 131-142.

⁵ Goodwin (1894) 71 ('Perfects in ως (with stems in οτ-) have an irregular feminine in υια'); Smyth (1920) 83-4.

⁶ Threatte (1980) 338-339; Lejeune (1972) 247.

ending is $-\epsilon\tilde{\alpha}$, until the older spelling is restored in the Roman period.⁷ The change in the Roman period reflects only the restoration of an older orthography; the change in the late fourth century, however, must be phonological.⁸ The origin of the $-\epsilon\tilde{\alpha}$ ending in the feminine was the subject of furious debate in the early twentieth century, but the problem was never solved; discussion on the point has now been abandoned. That discussion will be reviewed towards the end of this paper, as the nature of the change (whether it is phonological or morphological) is important to the question at hand.

Menander was born in 341/2 B.C., and wrote his first play for production in 321 B.C.;⁹ we might therefore suppose that the change on the inscriptions of $-\upsilon\tilde{\alpha}$ to $-\epsilon\tilde{\alpha}$ reflects the kind of dialect spoken by his parents' generation. This allows for some time lag between the completion of the change and the change in the orthography. We can infer that Menander used the form $-\epsilon\tilde{\alpha}$ (presumably something like /ɛːa/, perhaps with a phonetic glide [ɛːja]) in spoken Greek himself.¹⁰ Any indication to that effect has however been totally lacking from Menander's texts: the form of the suffix is exclusively $-\upsilon\tilde{\alpha}$, to the exclusion even of the epigraphic form $-\tilde{\alpha}$. Below is a dossier of the forms known prior to 2012:

Dysk. 36 εἰδῦα; *Dysk.* 595 ἀνηρηκυῖα (ανηρευκυια[P. Bodm. 4]); *Ep.* 490 ἀπολωλεκυῖ(α);¹¹
Ep. 570 γεγονῦ(α); *Ep.* 807 ἡδικηκυῖαν; *Pk.* 131 ἀπειρηκυῖα; *Pk.* 789 ἀκηκουῖα; *Pk.* 994
εὐτυχηκυῖας; *Pk.* 1011 ἀνευρηκυῖαν; *Sam.* 237 γεγονῦ(α); *Sam.* 240 εἰδῦ(α); *Sik.* 214
πεφυγῦ(α)

⁷ Thraette (1996) 470, who finds no example of $-\epsilon\tilde{\alpha}$ in the Roman period (from 20/19 B.C.).

⁸ Henry (1967) 260 says that the change 'is more of a dialectal than a phonological or morphological phenomenon'. It is unclear to me what he means by this. If 'dialectal' means 'betraying the influence of another dialect', the influence must still be either on the phonological or the morphological level.

⁹ On Menander's date see Schroeder (1996).

¹⁰ In linguistic notation, angled brackets refer to orthography, square brackets indicate phonetic transcription (the sounds themselves), and slashes to phonemic (structurally significant) transcription. The overlaps with the Leiden system are unfortunate but will hopefully not cause any confusion.

¹¹ Not especially legible but certainly υ rather than ϵ .

Sik. 214 requires further comment. Sandbach in text and commentary claims that the papyrus reads $\pi\epsilon\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\tilde{\upsilon}$.¹² The situation is more complex. The papyrus reads $\pi\epsilon\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\upsilon\eta\kappa\omicron\rho\eta$. This might better be explained as an error for $\pi\epsilon\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\tilde{\upsilon}$ ἢ κόρη,¹³ rather than taking $\eta\iota$ as an error for $\tilde{\eta}$.¹⁴ The ancient grammarians thought the form in $-\tilde{\upsilon}\alpha$ to be typically Attic.¹⁵ It might therefore be supposed that this form should be found in the texts of comedy; yet it nowhere appears on papyrus texts of Menander. Thus the Menander papyri have $-\upsilon\tilde{\alpha}$, the grammarians prescribe $-\tilde{\upsilon}\alpha$, and the contemporary Attic inscriptions read $-\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\alpha$. Grammarians' knowledge is not always to be believed without qualification, but it is nevertheless suspicious that all three sources of information about Menander's dialect differ from one another. How might this lack of agreement be resolved?

One solution is to discount the grammarians as wrong, to see the inscriptions as reflecting innovative morphology, and to see the feminine perfect participle as a morphologically conservative trait in Menander. There is, after all, no particular reason to assume that Menander and the inscriptions should have the same linguistic features. However, the new Michigan papyri have now produced a piece of evidence which has to be added to our dossier, and which may allow us to see the situation rather differently. The papyrus, dated palaeographically to the mid-second century A.D., consists of several strips, so the inevitable gaps cause us some difficulty; but the new texts have considerably enriched our understanding of this part of the play, as well as our understanding of the language of Menander.¹⁶

¹² Gomme / Sandbach (1973) 655, stating that P. Sorb. 'retains the correct spelling'.

¹³ Thus Kassel (1965) 17, Arnott (2000) 252, and Blanchard (2009) 16.

¹⁴ Thus Reeve *apud* Kassel (1965) 17, Gallavotti (1965) 20, Gallavotti (1972) 29, Belardinelli (1994) 176-77. Belardinelli gives the fullest discussion of the question of the feminine perfect active participle in Menander, but ignores the change on the inscriptions from 320 B.C.

¹⁵ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ ι τὸ ἐν διφθόγγῳ ἀποβάλλειν πεφύκασιν οἷον κλαῖω κλάω, ποιῶ ποῶ καὶ τὸ τετυφύια καὶ γεγραφύια τετυφῶ γεγραφῶ λέγουσιν (Herodian, 2. 281 Lentz); cf. Moeris, 201. 24 (ὡν κλαῖειν / κλαίειν), *Antiatticist* 1426.3 (ὡν υἰός / υἰός).

¹⁶ For recent work, Furley (2013), Petrides (2014), Bathrellou (2014).

The line in question is *Ep.* 807; the line was recorded in the appendix to the second edition of Sandbach (1991), but the only note given is ‘reliquiae minimae’. In fact the three witnesses to the text (*P. Mich.* 4733; *P. Oxy.* 3532; *P. Oxy.* 3533) gave us μηδὲν ἠδικηκυῖαν τυχ.ν (in the context of Menander papyri, hardly ‘minimae’).¹⁷ But the new Michigan texts (*P. Mich.* 4752 a, b and c) give us the following end to the line:¹⁸

]κειαντυχειν

The –ει- is clearly legible on the plates, with a tiny spot of ink from the top hasta of <κ>.¹⁹ How are we to interpret this spelling? If it is an error for –υῖα, then there is little more to be said. The morphology of the participle in Menander would be an interesting case of archaism in his language, contrasting with the language of contemporary Attic inscriptions. But there is perhaps a more interesting alternative. The papyrus might be our missing evidence that Menander in fact *did* use the same morphology as the inscriptions, and that he therefore was writing in a dialect reflecting contemporary Attic trends. In other words, the Michigan papyrus has given us a form which we expect to find in Menander on philological grounds, while the ending –υῖα requires explanation.

For many, the notion of an isolated survival of this kind will be unacceptable. But first, it is worth considering what is at stake. The idea of using inscriptional evidence to improve the spelling – or indeed the morphology – of our editions is nothing new (neither in Greek nor in Latin). So interpreting the spelling of the feminine perfect active participle in –εῖα as a genuine spelling on the basis of inscriptional evidence is no radical suggestion. Nonetheless,

¹⁷ Furley (2009) 88; Furley’s edition makes the readings of individual papyri conveniently accessible.

¹⁸ Römer (2012).

¹⁹ Thus Römer (2012) 117 in the diplomatic transcription. There are two letters missing in the previous line and one in the following line; it is therefore not unthinkable that the missing letters in 807 are [κ]ν, and that the spot of ink belongs to υ not κ. The argument in this paper is moot if this is true. However, we need space for half of *eta* as well, which this writer seems to make quite broad. Prof. Römer (p.c.) assures me that there is not enough space for three letters <πασ> in the line above, and that on these grounds a reconstruction [-κ]υειαν can be ruled out.

further arguments may be sought before adopting the spelling –εῖα in a literary text. We can start by asking ourselves what sort of error a spelling –εῖα for –υῖα would be. Many errors are random, caused by a lack of concentration with consequences that take many forms. The presence of the sequence <ει> later in the same line (in τυχεῖν) may also have contributed to the mistake. However, there is another kind of error, common to writers of many languages and famously common in Greek papyri, caused by the presence of two available spellings for the same sound. The two spellings usually begin by recording different sounds; if the two sounds in question merge, the spellings may be retained. Thus English words beginning with <r> are pronounced the same as words beginning with <wr>, after /wr/ and /r/ merged in word-initial position. If this is the kind of error that lead to a spelling <εῖα> for <υῖα> on the Michigan papyrus, then it must also be assumed that a speaker of Egyptian Greek realised the suffix as [ɛ:a] or [i:a], rather than as [y:a] (or the like). It requires, therefore, merger of a rounded ([y:]) and an unrounded ([ɛ:] or [i:]) front vowel. Is this a change which can be documented for Egyptian Greek?

In fact, the evidence points in quite a different direction. In the table below is a dossier of forms of the feminine perfect participle from papyrus documents arranged chronologically by century; the forms are derived from the grammatical literature, supplemented using computer searches of the *Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri*. Where possible, the readings have been verified on images. Texts dated only to a given century have been listed first.

3 rd -1 st B.C.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. εἶδῦια <i>PSI</i> 667.6 (mid 3rd B.C.) 2. [υποπε]φευγῦιαν <i>Zen. pap.</i> 59279. 8 (251 B.C.) 3. τετοκυ[αζ] <i>Zen. pap.</i> 59292. 304 (250 B.C.) 4. εφεστηκυῖαν <i>PSI</i> 396.8 (241 B.C.) 5. ενεστηκυῖας <i>Amh.</i> 33.6 (after 157 B.C.) 6. ενεστηκυῖας <i>BGU</i> 1244.7 (2nd c. B.C.) 7. τετευχῦιαι <i>Par.</i> 8.23 (129 B.C.)
1 st A.D.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. εἶδῦειαι <i>PMich.</i> 226-356 <i>passim</i> (1st c.)

	<p>9. συνπεπτωκοιας <i>PSI</i> 914.5 (1st c.)</p> <p>10. ειδηα <i>PCorn.</i> 49.11 (1st c.)</p> <p>11. ειδυειαι <i>PMich.</i> 346a.10 (A.D. 13)</p> <p>12. τετελευκουης <i>PMich</i> 304.1, 4 (A.D. 42?)</p> <p>13. συνπεπτωκοιας <i>PSI</i> 907.2 (A.D. 42)</p> <p>14. γεγονουιας <i>POxy.</i> 283.15, 8 (A.D. 45)</p> <p>15. ειδοιειας <i>PMich.</i> 322a.43 (A.D. 46)</p> <p>16. ειδηειος <i>PSI</i> 1319.76 (A.D. 76)</p> <p>17. εδυης <i>PLond.</i> 289 (ii. 184-5).37 (A.D. 91)</p>
2 nd A.D.	<p>18. ειδυειης <i>P. Fam. Tebt.</i> 11.21 (A.D. 108-12)</p> <p>19. ειδυης <i>BGU</i> 1579.28 (A.D. 118/9);</p> <p>20. ανηλωκυεια <i>PMich.</i> 188.16 (A.D. 120)</p> <p>21. ηδυης <i>P. Fam. Tebt.</i> 21.29, 34 (A.D. 122)</p> <p>22. γεγονυειης <i>PTebt.</i> 381. 7 (A.D. 123)</p> <p>23. τετελευτηκυεις <i>PTebt.</i> 381. 8 (A.D. 123)</p> <p>24. ειδυης <i>BGU</i> XI 2020.21 (A.D. 124)</p> <p>25. ειδυειαι <i>P. Fam. Tebt.</i> 13.51 (A.D. 133/4)</p> <p>26. ηδυης <i>PMeyer</i> 8.20 (A.D. 151)</p> <p>27. ειδυειαι <i>PSI</i> 1065.24 (A.D. 157)</p> <p>28. γεγονυειαν <i>PSI</i> 1143.10 (A.D. 164)</p> <p>29. ειδυειησ <i>SB</i> 7618 (= <i>PSI</i> 1263.26) (A.D. 166/7)</p> <p>30. ειδυης <i>POxy.</i> 2134.35 (c. A.D. 170)</p> <p>31. ιδυης <i>POxy.</i> 2134.47 (c. A.D. 170)</p> <p>32. ηβροχηκυης <i>PMich</i> 369.11-12 (A.D. 171)</p> <p>33. μετηλλαχυης <i>PSI</i> 1227.14-15 (A.D. 188)</p>
3 rd -5 th A.D.	<p>34. μεμισθωκοιαιαν <i>SB</i> 7443.14 (A.D. 285)</p> <p>35. ειδυειας <i>SB</i> 7443.14 (A.D. 285)</p> <p>36. μετηλλαχυειης <i>PCornell</i> 18.6-7 (A.D. 291)</p> <p>37. ειδυειαι <i>POxy.</i> 1645.20 (A.D. 308)</p> <p>38. ειδειης <i>P. Herm</i> 25 (5th c.)</p> <p>39. ιδειης <i>PMon.</i> 15.19 (A.D. 493)</p> <p>40. ειδειης <i>P. Flor.</i> 3.313 (A.D. 449)</p>

The Ptolemaic data show clearly that Egyptian Greek remained more conservative than Attic when it came to this feature. The roughly contemporary Attic spellings –*ῥα* and –*Ία* are scarcely recorded. The conservative spellings in our sample are of course of least linguistic

interest, insofar as phonological developments are disguised rather than revealed by educated spellings.²⁰ Our real interest, however, is the period when the papyrus was being written; and the most interesting examples are those which, by their spelling mistakes, show what kind of sound the suffix of the feminine perfect participle contained. Certain examples explicitly notate a rounded vowel in the suffix, by writing <οι> for <υ> (see in the table examples 9, 13, 14, 15, 26, 34). The basis of this must be the sound change /oi/ > /y/ which took place during the first century A.D.²¹

The variation in spellings with <οι> and spellings with <υ> are an indication that the sound was still rounded in the second century. Individual variation between a highly explicit spelling with <οι> and an archaising spelling with <υ> indicates that writers spelling the feminine perfect participle <-υια> or the like must also be notating a rounded vowel. Indeed, since later writers use spellings such as <-ουεια> (see example 35), we can infer that the rounded vowel was not only regular in the second century, but was diachronically highly stable. Therefore, we can conclude that Egyptian Greek retained a rounded vowel in this category.

However, even if this be admitted, there are still a handful of examples which do not obey this stricture (examples 10, 16, 38, 39, 40).²² Purely methodologically, a Greek speaker producing a feminine perfect participle with a suffix realised as /ɛ:a/ could be a speaker with an Attic pronunciation. But this is a weak argument. Developments in Attic in the Imperial period for this feature are masked by the archaising orthography; we do not know if Attic

²⁰ The conservatism in this case is suggestive; a study of ‘colonial lag’ (Görlach 1987, sceptically) in Egyptian Greek may have some interesting results.

²¹ For the fronting of /oi/, see *SB* 10535.33 (c. AD 30), with <υι> for oi. Schwyzer (1939) 195-6 suggests that oi was pronounced [y] until late antiquity.

²² Furthermore, two examples were found in the literature which turned out to be incorrectly recorded: ειδειης *CPR* 7 = *StudPal.* 20, 28.12 (AD 227), reported by Gignac (1976) 204; another, γεγονειαν *SB* 8. 9923 (A.D. 175-6) has been reread by Hagedorn as γεγονυιαν (but the papyrus is badly damaged on the crucial line). The *ed. pr.* of *P. Mich.* 189 read ανηλωκευε[, which may in fact be correct, contrary to later editions, judging from the image at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/i/image/api/image/apis/X-1315/109R.TIF/full/large/0/native.jpg>.

speakers *always* pronounced these forms in the same way. In any case, the same argument might also argue that the unrounded variants are ‘real’ Egyptian Greek, and that the rounded realisations represent in their turn a particular dialect realisation. Nonetheless, the examples of the unrounded spelling do need to be accounted for in various rather different ways.

Three of these, 39, 40 and 41, all from the 5th c. A.D., may be discounted, as the texts are later than our papyrus, and so can reflect a more advanced stage of iotacism (but possible a level of iotacism only found in a given subset of speakers). Of the earlier papyri, 10 and 16 reveal speakers unfamiliar with every department of Greek grammar. The text of example 10, *PCorn.49*, is revealing, insofar as the unrounding of the feminine perfect participle suffix seems to be accompanied by the fronting of [oi] to [y] (thus $\mu\omicron\iota$ is spelled $\mu\upsilon$); the speaker seems to have a vowel system featuring some kind of systematic change. Example 16 is also in a text clearly written by someone who learned Greek as a foreign language, judging from the difficulties with Greek case syntax consonantism (especially voiced vs. voiceless stops). These two documents, then, do not constitute a counterargument against the view that Egyptian Greek retained a rounded vowel in the suffix of the feminine perfect participle. They may well show that some individuals had precocious phonologies, in which the iotacism had proceeded much more quickly.²³ But the spellings with <oi> or <ou> can only be explained on the assumption that a rounded vowel was still being pronounced; they can hardly be seen as *graphic* redetermination of a spelling <—vĩα>.

In any case, the sheer rarity of the error must give us pause when we return to our Menander papyrus. Either the scribe copying the *Epitrepointes* made, on an otherwise rather carefully written papyrus, an extremely unusual and uncharacteristic error, which by coincidence

²³ Teodorsson (1977) assumes that the earliest example of a misspelling may be diagnostic of a merger, but this is not methodologically sound *for every speaker* in a community, and results in very early dates for sound changes in the Greek vowel system. Again, it is possible that some speakers did produce a changed vowel system earlier than others, but the dating of a merger as a whole is rather more difficult than finding the earliest examples of mergers.

exactly matched a spelling we know from independent evidence to have been the spelling current in fourth-century Athens; or one example of a perfect participle as Menander spelled it managed, *mirabile dictu*, to survive copying intact. In theory, such survival is not impossible, though difficult to parallel. The major advantage of the account given in this paper is that the puzzling allomorphy needed to account for Menander and the language of the inscriptions can be made a figment of transmission. There was a single fourth-century suffix of the feminine perfect participle, and it was –εῖα; although the spelling was mostly levelled in favour of the Attic spelling known elsewhere, an isolated instance has been preserved for us. Editors should almost certainly restore the spelling –εῖα to our text of Menander; this is no more problematic than other cases in which we are guided by our inscriptional evidence to the correct orthography of Greek texts. It gains additional weight from our new manuscript evidence, but it should be noted that the original problem is independent of this particular evidence. Even if my argument – that the error as it stands on the Michigan papyrus is best explained as an archaism in default of evidence that it could have its origin in the vowel system used in the speech of the scribe – is not accepted, the difference between Menander and the inscriptions must be explained.

The origins of this –εῖα are still unclear. The perfect participle suffix can be reconstructed as *-υος-, giving a nominative singular m. *-υός, f. *-us-ια, nt. *-os.²⁴ The most commonly found explanation in the literature is morphological, and posits analogical change in the feminine of the perfect participle based on the *u*-stem adjectives (-ύς, -εῖα, -ύ).²⁵ This analogy, however, has no basis in either functional or formal similarities between the two categories. Consider the nominative singular: the patterns -ύς –εῖα -ύ is hardly

²⁴ The Greek reflexes of this suffix never show metrical or phonological effects of digamma, however the comparative evidence is unambiguous, cf. Avestan *vidnā* ~ εἰδώς, Sanskrit *viduṣī* ~ εἰδύια, Gothic NPI. *galiuga*° *weitwōds* (*ICor.* 15:15, ψευδοῦ μάρτυρες, lit. ‘false-knowers’).

²⁵ Hatzidakis (1896) 464-465; Kühner / Blass (1890) 532. Arena (1970) 104 suggests this happened after forms with the zero-grade of the suffix were interpreted as nominatives (i.e. ἡδύς : ἡδεῖα :: *λελυκ-υσ- : X, where X = λελυκεῖα; it is not clear under what circumstances a form like *λελυκ-υσ would actually surface, however).

superimposable on the perfect endings –ός –ῶα –ός; given the variation in the formation of masculine and neuter, to suppose that the feminine has simply been transferred stretches credulity. The *u*-stem adjectives and the perfect participle also share no overlap in their word-formation (e.g. they do not share a vowel grade, nor are they formed to the same roots) or function (beyond being adjectival).²⁶ An older view took –εῖα to be an archaism, reflecting a full-grade of the suffix *-ues-ja.²⁷ Phonologically this would be unproblematic, and the hypothesis was supported from Doric dialects, which have been taken to show that a form such as *-ues-ja did once exist.²⁸ Thus in Theran, *IG* XII.3 330 (‘Testament of Epicteta’) gives us επιτετελεχεια, εσταχεια (25) and συναγαγοχεια (27); finally on the Heracleian Tables we have ερηγηεια.²⁹ Its introduction into Attic, however, is hard to explain.³⁰ Indeed, it looks more likely that the Doric examples have themselves been influenced by the Attic suffix –εῖα, rather than the other way round;³¹ this also explains why some Doric dialects (for example Cyrenaean) do not have –εῖα,³² and why other Doric forms with a sequence –υ(ι)α- are unaffected.³³ Thus a proto-Greek paradigm with three ablaut grades *-uos-, *-ues- and *-us- disappears on closer examination,³⁴ as does the notion of a Doric origin for –εῖα.

²⁶ See Kalén (1918) 2: ‘Tamen, quo modo id fieret, neque ipse [Hatzidakis] demonstravit, neque facile intellegi potest, cum inde a graecae linguae primordiis nulla omnino harum duarum classium communis fuerit forma neque altera alteri similiter exiens.’ Contrast Hatzidakis’ argument if –ῶα had been introduced *into* the *u*-stem adjectives; a pattern *-ός, -ῶα, -ός would have an obvious motive, even without any functional overlap in the two categories. Even if the outdated view of Prellwitz (see Kalén (1918) 2 n.2), that nouns in –ῶα were derived from *u*-stem adjectives, were true, this would still not help our participles.

²⁷ Meyer (1880) 241.

²⁸ Buck (1955) 119; Schmidt (1883) 354. Fraenkel (1910) reconstructed a form *ῠιδεῖα for Laconian on the basis of epigraphic data; however the form βιδεοι is late (all examples 2nd or 3rd c. A.D., which may call into question the form’s restoration in *IG* V.1 674 (1st c. A.D.)), while βιδουοι is the only form attested in earlier documents (e.g. *IG* V.1 136 and 206, both inscriptions of the 1st c. B.C.). βιδεοι is therefore the result of some change within Laconian, and is not evidence of the Proto-Doric situation.

²⁹ Uguzzoni / Ghinatti (1968) 33-4.

³⁰ Threatte (1996) 470.

³¹ Kalén (1918) 5.

³² Kalén (1918) 8; Dobias-Lalou (2000) 156, citing *SEG* IX 72.102.

³³ Kalén (1918) 33.

³⁴ In terms of modern debate in Indo-European studies, this amounts to an indication that the paradigm of the perfect participle was hysterokinetic (with accent moving between the suffix and the ending) rather than amphikinetic (with accent moving between root, suffix and ending, and producing the three ablaut grades required by Meyer’s theory); on this terminology see Rix (1976) 122-124.

The crucial evidence against the morphological explanation, however, is that the same change can be paralleled in nominal categories; we cannot therefore appeal to the history of the perfect participle suffix as such.³⁵ It must have taken place in the Greek words ἄγυια ‘street’,³⁶ ὄστρῦα ‘oyster’ and ματτήη ‘meat dish’ before they were loaned into Latin as *agēa* ‘gangway’ (Ennius fr.511 Skutsch, cf. *Isid. orig.* 19. 2. 4),³⁷ *ostrea* (Lucilius and later) and *mattea* ‘delicacy’ (Varro, *de ling. lat.* 5. 112; the palatal quality of the vowel in the suffix is confirmed by Romanian *maț* ‘gut’). Furthermore, the change is attributed specifically to the Attic dialect, according to Pollux 10. 128 (on the variation πτέον / πτύον ‘fan’). Around the same period, Athenaeus records hesitation between ὄρεα and ὄρυα ‘sucking pig’ (9. 366); the spelling ὄροῦα in Hesychius (glossed as χόρδη ἔφθη) attests the reality of the rounded vowel, as does the Epicharmus play entitled Ὀρυα (Athen. 3. 94). Finally, Greek shows variation in a single lexeme κώδεια, κωδύα and κώδῦια, best explained as being reflexes of precisely this sound change, lexicalised from different dialect sources as ‘bulbs’ of various sorts (either poppy heads or garlic bulbs). This last item was the impetus for the argument of Danielsson and Kalén that the change must be phonological. In fact Kalén’s survey of the evidence led him to the conclusion that the change began in Ionic, before spreading to Attic (and thence, having entered the Koiné, into other Greek vernaculars).

On this theory, the absence of the form from Egyptian papyri becomes all the more interesting – and significant for our argument. The change must have happened at a time subsequent to the colonisation of Egypt, which remained unaffected by this particular

³⁵ Full examples and references can be traced in the papers of Danielsson (1916) and Kalén (1918).

³⁶ This word is often assumed to have been lexicalised from a perfect participle derived from the root of ἄγω (*h₂eg-); this explanation, while attractive, may not be correct. Even if it is, the word’s morphological adaptation (the loss of the reduplication) and lexicalisation (as ‘street’ as early as Homer) will have protected it from change by analogy on the perfect participle. As a result, the change has to be formulated in such a way as to account for the participle and the noun separately (i.e. a morphological explanation is insufficient).

³⁷ Cf. Schulze (1892) 261 n. 3 (with earlier literature), Danielsson (1916) 518, and especially the full discussion of Arena (1970). Skutsch (1985) 666 argues for a change υι > ει > η to account for this form, but this is unnecessary, as there is no reason Latin /ē/ could not represent Greek ει (/ē/); see Bechtel (1923) 356. Shipp (1960) took *ἄγεια to be Doric, since ἄγυια is also attested in Ionic.

development and retained its rounded vowel. To reiterate the main conclusion of this paper: the feminine perfect active participle suffix in Egyptian Greek retained a rounded vowel until a few hundred years after *P. Mich.* 4752 was written. As a result, the misspelling –εῖα for –υῖα is unexpected, and requires an explanation. One possibility is that dumb chance has reproduced the orthography we expect, on other grounds, Menander to be using, and hence without any diagnostic value. But another, more intriguing possibility, is that this is an example of Menander’s own orthography luckily preserved. This paper aimed only to present the case that the second possibility is worth serious consideration.

Bibliography

- Arena, R., (1970), ‘Lat. *agea* (Ennio, *Ann.* 492 Vahlen)’, *RIL* 104: 99-110.
- Arnott, W. G., (2000), *Menander III*. Cambridge Mass.
- Bathrellou, E., (2014), ‘On Menander, *Epitrepontes* 693-701 and 786-823’, *ZPE* 192:63-84
- Belardinelli, A. M., (1994), *Menandro Sicioni. Introduzione, testo e commento*. Bari.
- Blanchard, A., (2009), *Ménandre: Les Sicyoniens*. Paris.
- Blanchard, A., (2013) *Ménandre: Le Héros, L’Arbitrage, La Tondue, La Fabula Incerta du Caire*. Paris.
- Buck, C. D., (1955), *The Greek Dialects*. Oxford.
- Danielsson, (1916), ‘Rez. J. Sundwall, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier*’, *GGA* 178/8-9:490-532
- Dobias-Lalou, C., (2000), *Le dialecte des inscriptions grecques de Cyrène (= Karthago 25)*. Paris.
- Fraenkel, E., (1910), ‘Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik’, *KZ* 43:193-219
- Furley, W. D., (2009), *Menander: Epitrepontes*. London.
- Furley, W. D., (2013), ‘Pamphile regains her voice: on the newly published fragments of Menander’s *Epitrepontes*’, *ZPE* 185: 82-90.

- Gallavotti, C., (1965), *Menandri Sicyonius*. Rome.
- Gallavotti, C., (1972) *Menandri Sicyonius*. Second ed. Rome.
- Gignac, F. T., (1976), *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*.
I: *Phonology*. Milan.
- Gomme, A.W. / Sandbach, F. H., (1976), *Menander: A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Goodwin, W. W., (1894), *A Greek Grammar*. London.
- Görlach, M., “‘Colonial Lag’? The alleged conservative character of American English and other ‘colonial’ varieties’, *English World-Wide* 8/1: 41-60
- Hatzidakis, G. N., (1896), ‘Περὶ φαινομένων τινῶν φθογγικῶν ἀνωμαλιῶν’ *Αθηνα* 8:458-468
- Henry, A. S., ‘Notes on the language of the prose inscriptions of Hellenistic Athens’, *CQ*
17/2 (1967) 257-295
- Kalén, T., (1918), *Quaestiones Grammaticae Graecae*. Göterborg.
- Kassel, R., (1965), *Menandri Sicyonius*. Berlin
- Kühner, R. / Blass, F., (1890-92), *Ausführliche Griechische Grammatik. Erster Teil –
Elementar- und Formenlehre*. 2 Bände.
- Mayser, E., (1938-), *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Berlin /
Leipzig.
- Meissner, T., (2005), *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Indo-European*. Oxford.
- Meyer, G., (1880), ‘Miscellen’, *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 5:240-
241
- Petrides, A. K, (2014), *Menander, New Comedy and the Visual*. Cambridge.
- Rix, H., (1976), *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*.
Darmstadt.
- Römer, C., (2012), ‘New fragments of Act IV, *Epitrepontes* 786-823 Sandbach (P. Mich.
4752 a, b and c)’ *ZPE* 182:112-120

- Rostovtzeff, M., (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Oxford.
- Teodorsson, S.-T., (1977), *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koiné*. Göteborg.
- Threatte, L., (1980), *A Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions. Volume I: Phonology*. Berlin / New York.
- Threatte, L., (1996), *A Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions. Volume II: Morphology*. Berlin / New York.
- Sandbach, F. H., (1991), *Menandri Reliquiae*. Second ed. Oxford
- Schmidt, J., (1883), 'Das suffix des participium perfecti activi', *KZ* 26:329-377
- Schroeder, S., (1996), 'Die Lebensdaten Menanders (mit einem Anhang über die Aufführungszeit seines Ἐαυτὸν Τιμωρούμενος)', *ZPE* 113 (1996) 35-48
- Schulze, J., (1892), *Quaestiones Epicae*. Gütersloh.
- Schwyzler, E., (1939), *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich.
- Skutsch, O., (1985), *The Annals of Ennius*. Oxford.
- Smyth, H. W., (1920), *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Uguzzoni, A. / Ghinatti, F., (1968), *Le tavole greche di Eraclea*. Rome.

Ben Cartlidge, St John's College, St Giles, Oxford OX1 3JP, UK

benjamin.cartlidge@sjc.ox.ac.uk