

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

**VOL. XXXVII**

HELSINKI 2003

## INDEX

EUGENIO AMATO	<i>Note esegetiche e testuali alla Descriptio orbis di Dionisio d'Alessandria (II)</i>	9
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Velia, Quirinale, Pincio: note su proprietari di domus e su plumbarii</i>	27
LAURENT CHRZANOVSKI	<i>Le photophore autophore</i>	49
ZBIGNIEW FIEMA	<i>Observations on the Byzantine Church at Jabal Haroun near Petra, Jordan</i>	53
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Inscriptions at Auction</i>	69
MARTTI LEIWO	<i>Both and All Together? The Meaning of ἀμφοτέροι</i>	81
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Isis und ihre nordischen Schwestern</i>	101
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>A Piece of Dionysian Hilarity</i>	115
ERJA SALMENKIVI	<i>A Note on the Ptolemaic ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων</i>	123
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>A Study of CIL XIV 375, an Interesting Inscription from Ostia</i>	133
RAIJA SARASTI-WILENIUS	<i>Latin, Swedish and French – Some Considerations on the Choice of Language in the Letter Collection of the Gyldenstolpe Family</i>	159
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCVII–CCXV</i>	173
ANTERO TAMMISTO	<i>Swamp-Hens (Porphyrio spp.) and Ducks (Anatidae) in the Tomba di Morlupo and Other Republican and Early Augustan Romano-Campanian Mosaics and Wall Paintings</i>	207
HOLGER THESLEFF	<i>A Symptomatic Text Corruption: Plato, Gorgias 448a5</i>	251
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	259
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	308
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	310
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	313

## BOTH AND ALL TOGETHER?

### The meaning of ἀμφότεροι

MARTTI LEIWO

#### 1. Introduction

The standard meaning of ἀμφότεροι is 'both' but a semantic extension 'all (together)' is also recorded in dictionaries in three different contexts: 1) The Acts of the Apostles and Diod. Sic. 1.75.1–2, 2) Papyri, and 3) Byzantine chronicles.<sup>1</sup> The alleged semantic expansion is the centre of attention in this paper. I will argue that the meaning 'all (together)' is not a genuine semantic derivation as has been suggested (see below) but due to 1) hypercorrect use, 2) non-native speakers' misunderstanding of Greek epistolary formulas, and, 3) generally, grouping of pairs totally in line with the basic meaning 'both'. To start with, we can immediately put aside the passage of Diodorus. There is nothing strange in it, and it has nothing to do with the extended meaning.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This article has been carried out within the framework of the project Interaction between the Greek and the Roman World funded by the Academy of Finland. Martti Nyman, Hilla Halla-aho and Marja Vierros have read an earlier version of this article, and I am very grateful for their comments. *LSJ*, s.v. ἀμφότεροι; W. Bauer, *Griechisch–deutsches Wörterbuch zur den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. 6. ed. herausg. von K. Aland und B. Aland, Berlin – New York 1988, s.v.; E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Cambridge, Harvard 1914, s.v. Ε. Κριαράς, *Λεξικὸ τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς δημόδου γραμματείας 1100–1669*, τόμος Β, Θεσσαλονίκη 1971, s.v. See also E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* II, 2, Berlin – Leipzig 1934, 93–94, and especially note 2. This meaning may be understood, e.g., in *P. Lond.* II, 336, 13, 221 = *Chrest. Mitt.* 174.

<sup>2</sup> Diodorus discusses the questions of justice and punishment in Egypt: ...ἡγούμενοι τὰς ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις ἀποφάσεις μεγίστην ῥοπήν τῷ κοινῷ βίῳ φέρειν πρὸς ἀμφοτέρω. δηλὸν γὰρ ἦν ὅτι τῶν μὲν παρανομούντων κολαζομένων, τῶν δ' ἀδικουμένων βοηθείας τυγχανόντων, ἀρίστη διόρθωσις ἔσται τῶν ἀμαρτωμάτων (Diod. Sic. 1.75.1–2). This is a clear example of the normal use of the word: in both ways, i.e.

First, I present some new data from Greek ostraca of Mons Claudianus where ἀμφοτέροι refers to more than two, then I give an overview and analysis of the suggested parallels up until the Medieval Greek. Finally, before conclusions I give some instances of the modern usage.

## 2. Letters in Mons Claudianus

The Roman quarry and fortress at Mons Claudianus, Egypt, has furnished us with ca. 6000 written ostraca datable mostly between Trajan and Antoninus Pius.<sup>3</sup> The majority of the ostraca is in Greek, but there are a few Latin ones as well. The ostraca published so far reveal many linguistically interesting issues, but here I will only deal with a peculiar use of the word ἀμφοτέροι. The word is used 16 times in the private letters published in *O.Claud.* I-II, which form my data, of which 10 have the meaning 'all'. The meaning 'both' is clear in *O.Claud.* 230 (Dioskoros), 238 (Eponykhos), 267 (anonym) and 280 (Herakleides and Dionysios). Two letters are fragmentary: 234 (Dioskoros) and 263 (anonym) so that the exact meaning cannot be clarified. The meaning 'all' is found in 7 (= 6 + 1 uncertain but probable) instances of Dioskoros, and also in 237 (Didymos), 260 (Maximus) and 272 (Patrepabathes), i.e. 10 instances.

As can be seen the word is not much attested in the data (16 attestations – out of which 13 can be classified as regards their exact lexical meaning – from 416 documents<sup>4</sup>), but it is used most of all by a modest vegetable farmer called Dioskoros in his correspondence (*O. Claud.* II

---

offenders against the law should be punished and the injured parties should be afforded compensation and assistance. So Bauer, cit., πρὸς ἀμφοτέρα 'für alles, in jeder Hinsicht', is incorrect.

<sup>3</sup> The ostraca have been published in *Mons Claudianus. Ostraca Graeca et Latina* I, 1–190 (DFIFAO XXIX, 1992), (eds.) J. Bingen, A. Bülow-Jacobsen, W. Cockle, H. Cuvigny, L. Rubinstein, W. Van Rengen, and II, 191–416 (DFIFAO XXXII, 1997), (eds.) J. Bingen, A. Bülow-Jacobsen, W. Cockle, H. Cuvigny, F. Kayser, W. Van Rengen, and III, 417–600 (DFIFAO XXXV) 2000 (ed.) H. Cuvigny. I have discussed the ostraca material also in a paper "Substandard Greek. Remarks from Mons Claudianus" in N. Kennel-J. Tomlinson (eds.), *Ancient Greece at the Turn of the Millenium: Recent Work and Future Perspectives. Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens* (forthcoming).

<sup>4</sup> Naturally the word can manifest itself only in a suitable semantic context.

224–242). Dioskoros wrote letters concerned with small-scale transporting of vegetables. His letters are nearly all addressed to the same three persons, called Drakon, Eremesis and Ammonianos. The last one presumably was *curator praesidii* of Mons Claudianus.<sup>5</sup>

The salutary formula of Dioskoros is very idiomatic (all numbers refer to *O. Claud.*):

(225) Διόσκορος Δράκων καὶ Ερεμησις καὶ Ἀμμωνιανὸς κουράτωρ ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς φιλτάτοις πολλὰ χαίρειν).

(226) Διόσκορος Δράκων καὶ Ερ[εμησις] καὶ Ἀμμωνιανὸς κουράτωρ κ[αὶ] Πετοσῆρις καὶ Πανίσκος ἀμφοτέροι[ς] τοῖς φιλτάτοις πολλὰ χαίρειν).

(227)<sup>6</sup> Διόσκορος Δράκων καὶ Ερεμησις καὶ Ἀμμωνιανῶ τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις φιλτάτοις πολλὰ χαίρειν.

(228) Διόσκορος Δράκων καὶ Ερεμησις καὶ Ἀμμωνιανὸς κουράτ(ωρ)<sup>7</sup> ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς φιλτάτοις πολλὰ χαίρειν).

(229) Διόσκορος Δράκων καὶ Ερεμη[σις] καὶ Ἀμμωνιανὸς ἀμφοτέροι[ς τοῖς] φιλτάτοις πολλὰ χαίρειν).

(232) [Διόσκορος Δράκων] καὶ Ερεμ(ησις) καὶ Ἀμ[μμωνιανὸς κουράτωρ]ος<sup>8</sup> τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις φιλ[τάτοις ? ? πλε]ῖστα χαίρειν.

(233) [Ἀμμω]νιαν[ὸς καὶ Πετοσῆ]ρις καὶ Πανίσκος ἀ[μφο]τέροις τοῖς φιλτάτοις κ[αὶ τιμι]ωτάτοις πολλὰ χαίρειν[ι].

The reference of ἀμφοτέροις is in all cases clearly three or more recipients.

In addition, in (230) Διόσκορος Ἀμ[μμωνιανῶ καὶ] Σουροῦτι ἀμφο[τέροις χαίρειν] the reference is customary 'both' and in a fragmentary 233 ἀ[μφο]τέροις τοῖς φιλτάτοις κ[αὶ τιμι]ωτάτοις the number of recipients is unknown. Before suggesting any explanations some comments on Greek-Egyptian language contact will give useful context to these letters.

As we can see from the salutary formulas Dioskoros inflects recipients' name – as far as we can say – only once (Ἀμμωνιανῶ, 227),

<sup>5</sup> Bülow-Jacobsen, *O. Claud.* II, 43.

<sup>6</sup> The ostrakon is reused. The letter of Dioskoros has been written on the previous text of which some lines can be seen.

<sup>7</sup> The editor gives κουράτ(ορι) but the inflection is improbable.

<sup>8</sup> The completion κουράτωρ]ος is not plausible, as Dioskoros does not usually inflect this word, and even if he inflected it, the genitive would be strange here. Dioskoros was not so arbitrary in his opening formulas that this kind of form would be expected. Maybe another name should be read, e.g. καὶ Πανίσκ]ος, or the name Ammonianos is slightly extended.

which strongly implies that he was a native Egyptian speaker who used Greek as his second language (=L2). The uncertainty in inflecting names was typical of Egyptian speakers (see below). This Egyptian interaction is, in my view, very important when studying a) the use and b) the lexical meaning of ἀμφοτέροι in this context.

Greek ostraca and papyri show clearly that personal names were often left uninflected in certain documents, and there is much variation in the noun declension as a whole.<sup>9</sup> The reason of this frequent and systematic linguistic idiosyncrasy is the contact of Egyptian and Greek. Quite often imperfect learning and/or language attitude play a role in interference process. In case of language shift the shifting group may create both permanent changes and ephemeral variation in the language they are shifting to, i.e. target language (TL). Obviously some Egyptian speakers really shifted to Greek while others did not remaining more or less monolingual.<sup>10</sup> However, some amount of bilingualism certainly existed that was enough to create interference and cross-overs from Egyptian to Greek. There may have been lack of sufficient access to Greek in some remote Egyptian villages, if Greek was seldom spoken, but it is also conceivable that L2 users consciously or unconsciously used characteristics that are not typical among L1, i.e. Greek, speakers. Universally taken this kind of situation is common enough, and may result to a variety where L2 learners carry over some

---

<sup>9</sup> See P.W. Pestman, "Egizi sotto dominazioni straniere" in L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci (eds.), *Egitto e storia antica dall'Ellenismo all'età araba. Atti del colloquio internazionale, Bologna 31 agosto – 2 settembre 1987*, Bologna 1989, 150–152. See also P. Fewster, "Bilingualism in Egypt", in J. N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford 2002, 238–241; M. Leiwo, "Scribes and Language variation", in L. Pietilä-Castrén – M. Vesterinen (eds.) *Grapta Poikila. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens VIII*, Helsinki 2003, 1–11 with references to further reading.

<sup>10</sup> On the extent and quality of bilingualism in Roman Egypt, see Fewster, 2002, especially 241–245. I, for my part, have a slightly more positive view on common Egyptians' ability to use Greek, since there seems to be quite frequent interaction showing overcross from Egyptian to Greek starting from the 2nd cent. BC, cf. the language of Hermias, M. Vierros, "Everything is Relative. The Relative Clause Constructions of an Egyptian Scribe Writing Greek" in *Grapta Poikila*, cit., 13–23. If Greek in Egypt has extensive morphosyntactic interference, it has to have been widely used by the Egyptian speakers. However, this is a problematic issue, and needs detailed linguistic analysis of Greek morphosyntactic idiosyncrasies in Egypt from the Egyptian point of view. Only after such analysis we can tell the amount of interference.

features of their own native language, especially marked features, into their version of the TL. Moreover, if the shifting group is not integrated into the original TL-speaking community, this may create an amalgam, TL<sub>3</sub>, of the two varieties, that are TL<sub>1</sub>, which is the original native speakers' variety, and TL<sub>2</sub>, which is the variety of the shifting group.<sup>11</sup> What we cannot say at this moment, is how extensive this kind of amalgam was in Egypt. It is, however, possible that the use of ἀμφοτέροι sheds some small amount of light to this extensive question, if the outlines of my suggestion concerning its use are at all plausible.

In Egyptian one of the most marked features compared to Greek is the lack of noun inflection, i.e. there are no grammatical cases. Egyptians, who were not masters of Greek grammar, had difficulties, or were careless, with the Greek noun declension because Egyptian nouns had no cases.<sup>12</sup> Nor did Egyptian scribes who had a good command of Greek always follow strict rules, although there seems to have been various commonly used idioms and conventions.<sup>13</sup> The indifference in using case endings has even some sociolinguistic reasons, as in draft documents more variation can be found than in official ones. There may, however, have been various psycholinguistic factors functioning in the writer's mind as well, for instance a feeling that some words have to be inflected more carefully than others.<sup>14</sup> In any case, if the Egyptian name was not integrated in the Greek morphology, i.e. it was not Hellenized, it was not even possible to add case endings to it. We can be confident in arguing that the contact of Greek and Egyptian had a considerable effect on the Greek variety written by miscellaneous Egyptian scribes or any writers, and their native language has to be taken into account when providing an accurate description of all Greek varieties in Egypt.<sup>15</sup> After this short excursion to the theoretical background

---

<sup>11</sup> S.G. Thomason, *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Edinburg 2001, 74–75.

<sup>12</sup> Leiwo (above n. 9 and above n. 3). As regards the inflection of Egyptian and Hellenized names, see P.W. Pestman (above n. 9) 150–152; Fewster (above n. 9) 239–241. For the theoretical background, see Thomason (above n. 11, 66–71; 74–76).

<sup>13</sup> See P.W. Pestman, *The Archive of the Theban Choachytes (Second Century B.C.). A Survey of the Demotic and Greek Papyri Contained in the Archive*, Leuven 1993, § 25; F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods II, Morphology*, Milano 1981, 57–61; 72–74; 78–79 lists the variation in declension of some names without commenting on the reasons.

<sup>14</sup> Leiwo (above n. 9, 8–10).

<sup>15</sup> On interference in the formation of relative clauses during the 2nd cent. BC, see M.

of contact-induced change and variation, we turn back to our sources.

Other examples from the Mons Claudianus data containing ἀμφοτέροι are as follows. A standardlike morphosyntax can be seen in the salutary formula of two letters. The addressees of a letter of Didymos are the same as those of Dioskoros:

(237) Δίδυμος Δράκωνει καὶ Ερημησις καὶ Ἄμωνιανῶι ἀμφοτέροις πολλὰ χαίρειν).

Didymos leaves only the name Ερημησις uninflected, even if it seemingly has the Greek nominative ending *-is*. But the name is not, perhaps, properly Hellenized, and is therefore left uninflected. This is not at all strange, since uninflected foreign nouns are common and well tolerated in many inflecting languages, whereas borrowed verbs are generally adapted into the morphology of the target language, because their syntactic weight is greater.<sup>16</sup>

A letter of Maximus contains ἀμφοτέροις connected with 5 names which all are inflected in the dative:

(260) Μάξιμος Ἀλεξᾶτι καὶ Ὀρσενούφι καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδῃ καὶ Μαρίνῳ καὶ Λέοντι ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς πλεῖστα χαίρειν.

All the above examples from Mons Claudianus share, thus, the same idiom ἀμφοτέροις (mostly together with τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς or τοῖς φιλτάτοις) always inflected in the dative plural.<sup>17</sup> It is conceivable that the visual, and perhaps even phonetic, representation of this idiom has led to a transfixed use without proper understanding of the grammatical form of the noun as in *O. Claud.* 267 where the word should be in the nominative ἀμφοτέροι. I will come back to this question below:

(267) Νωρβανὸς καὶ Ἡρακ[λείδης (?) ἀμφο]τέροις Ταυρίνῳ πλεῖστα χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν παντὸς εὐχ[όμεθα σε ἰσχύειν (?)] καὶ ὑγιαίνειν...

Norbanus, who had a good Latin name, seems to have been more

---

Vierros (above n. 10, 13–23).

<sup>16</sup> W.U. Dressler, "What is the Core of Morphology", in J. Niemi, T. Odlin and J. Heikkinen (eds.), *Language Contact, Variation and Change* (Studies in Languages 32), Joensuu 1998, 26.

<sup>17</sup> The use of φιλτάτοις as an epithet becomes popular from the last half of the 2nd century onwards. The formula is usually, e.g., Ἀπολλώνιος στρατηγ[ὸ]ς Ἀπολλωνοπολίτου Ἑπτακωμίας Διδύμῳ καὶ Ἡρακλείῳ ἐπισκέπταις τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ τοῖς φιλτάτοις χαίρειν (*P. Brem.* 3, AD 2nd cent.).



familiar with Latin than Greek since he used a Latin salutary idiom translated into Greek in 268 (cf. also the letter of a Τιτιοῖς, O. *Claud.* 283). Norbanus is a L2 user in this context which explains the syntactic lapse ἀμφο]τέροις pro ἀμφοτέροι in 267 above (the reading ἀμφο]τέροις is more than probable), and it shows at the same time how this word was almost transfixed to the dative plural in this context.<sup>18</sup> Even 268 has a shaky syntax. The formula goes as follows:

(268) Νωρβανὸς Ταυρίνω τῷ ἀδελφῷ πλείστα χαίριν καὶ διὰ παντὸς εὖ ὑγιένων καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ὑγιένω καὶ τὸ προσκύνημά σου ποιῶ παρὰ τῆς κυρίας Ἰσιδος ... (= *ego quoque valeo*).<sup>19</sup>

In addition, I would like to cite what seems to be an excellent example of case confusion:

(280) Ἡρακλείδῃ καὶ Διονυσίῳ Πανίσκος καὶ Ἑρμίνος τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις πολλὰ χαίρειν. τὸ προσκύνημα ὑμῶν ποιῶμεν παρὰ τῇ Τύχῃ τοῦ πραισιδίου. ἔγραψες ἡμῖν τότε ὅτι "ἔπεμψα διπλοκέραμον ὕδωρ". οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν εἰ μὴ μικρὸν κέραμον. κόμισεν τὸ σφυρίδιον ἃ ἔπεμψες ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τῶν χερσμάτων ἵνα, ἐὰν εὕρῃς εὐκαιρίαν, πάλιν πέμψω ἡμῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. τὰ νῦν οὐπω γέγονεν τὰ λάχανα. μὴ ἀμελήσῃς περὶ τῶ(ν) δεμαχίων ἵνα ἀγοράσῃς. ἐρῶσθαι ὑμᾶς εὐχόμεθα, προσφιλέστατοι.

'Herakleides and Dionysios to Paniskos and Herminos both, many greetings. We pray on your behalf to the Tykhe of the *praesidium*. You wrote to us then that "I sent double jar of water". He did not give us but a small jar. Receive the basket of excrement (?) which you sent to us, and send it back to us from him (?), if you find an opportunity. At the time, the vegetables are not yet ripened. Don't forget to buy the slices (of fish). We hope you are well, dearest.' (My translation)

In spite of the seemingly correct syntax in the salutary formula – the

<sup>18</sup> As the case for the addressee, the dative is typical in many structures as well as in the opening formulas, see e.g. *BGU* 1, 237, 7–9, 88–81 BC; *BGU* 4, 1102, 30–35, 13 BC; *BGU* 8, 1811, 1–3, 8/7 BC, see also, e.g., *P. Amh.* 111, 10, AD 132: καὶ Τεσενούφι ὡς (ἐτῶν) 25 οὐλὴ μετόπῳ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν καὶ Στ[ο]τήτει ὡς (ἐτῶν) 21 ἀσήμῳ ἀμφοτέροις Ὡρου τοῦ Πανεφρύ[μ]μεως. This practise lead to misunderstandings, e.g., *P. Fam. Tebt.* 24, 5, AD 124 (there are two almost identical copies of the same text. I have combined them): [Εὐάγγελον Πάτρωνος καὶ Ἡρακλείδῃ]ν τὸν καὶ Οὐαλέριον καὶ [Λυσίμαχον ἀμφοτέρους Ἡρακλείδου καὶ Ἀρποκρατίωνα καὶ] Ἀκουσίλαον ἀμφοτέροις (= ἀμφοτέρους) [Λεωνίδου ...].

<sup>19</sup> I have found only one nearly identical idiom in Greek in a letter sent from Rome to Egypt (*BGU* 1, 27 = *Chrest. Wilck.* 445 2nd/3rd cent.): [Εἰρηναῖος Ἀπολιναρίῳ τῷ] [φιλτάτ]ῳ ἀδε[λ]φ[ῶ] πολ[λ]ὰ χαίρει[ν]. καὶ διὰ π[α]ντὸς εὐχομαί σε ὑγιένει(ν) καὶ ἐ[γὼ] αὐτὸς ὑγιένω. Latin interference seems clear in both cases.

dative Ἡρακλείδῃ καὶ Διονυσίῳ and the nominative Πανίσκος καὶ Ἑρμῖνος – the word order and the context together with *O.Claud.* 279, where the address is clear, all show that the recipients are Paniskos and Herminos, and the senders Herakleides and Dionysios.<sup>20</sup> This is further confirmed by the word order, as τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις agrees better with Paniskos and Herminos than with the other two names. I have not found parallels where the head and τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις were discontinuous in such a way that another pair of names would have been placed between the head and its attribute.

Although there are two recipients, they are later addressed in the second singular which is quite a common practice in these letters (e.g. 227; 228; 238 etc.). However, the senders refer to themselves in plural, although it is common to use singular even in that case, as the actual writer often considers himself the head of the personal pronoun. The confusion of cases in the salutary formula may, of course, be just a lapse, but it is fairly certain that the writer was an Egyptian. Further evidence to this is the ignorance of the antecedent of the relative pronoun (l. 10 ὅ pro ὅ) and the confusion of voiced and voiceless dentals even in script (δεμαχίων pro τεμαχίων).<sup>21</sup>

The letter of a Patrempabathes (272) shares the above mentioned characteristics, and it is clearly written by a person whose native language was Egyptian. His name is Egyptian, too, and it has not been recorded earlier.<sup>22</sup> The use of ἀμφοτερο is extraordinary and gives little credit to the writer's Greek skills (I understand the editor's stressing ἀμφοτέρο as if it were ἀμφοτέρο(ις), but the word is whole, and the place of the stress is odd as it is. The word should be left unstressed):

(272) Πατρεμπαβάθης / τῶ[ις] τρισὶ Βησαρίων καὶ / [...]εμων καὶ Ἑρμῖνος / ἀμφοτερο χαίρειν...

It seems that there are three recipients, but their names are not inflected. The beginning of the 2nd line is very worn, but -ισι is clear. The editor reads the numeral 'three' which, if it really is a number, is correctly put in the dative, although its use is somewhat strange. However, there are

<sup>20</sup> See also Bingen, *O. Claud.* II, 113–114.

<sup>21</sup> On relative clauses, see Vierros (above n. 9). On the interchange of voiced/voiceless stops, see G. Horrocks, *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*, London – New York 1997, 62.

<sup>22</sup> J. Bingen (above n. 20) 102.

examples of numerals used in this way.<sup>23</sup> The conjecture τεισὶ gives the impression that there were three persons who had the same father (cf. *P.Fam.Tebt.* 44, see note 23), though this is surely not the intention of the writer. But there is no doubt that by ἀμφοτερο all the recipients are meant.

Should we then, on the basis of all above, draw a conclusion that the word ἀμφοτέροι has been subject to a semantic derivation which has expanded its meaning to 'all'? This conclusion seems to have been made by some philologists (see note 1 and below). Let us have a closer look at the other data.

### 3. *Acts of the Apostles*

J.B. Bury suggested already at the end of the 19th century that the word really expanded its meaning from 'both' to 'all', and after his articles in the *Classical Review* and *Byzantinische Zeitung*, the assumed semantic derivation has been generally approved.<sup>24</sup> According to Bury, the change was, however, late, starting from the 10th century at the earliest, in spite of some examples in the *Acts of the Apostles*.<sup>25</sup> These instances together with some papyrological data are, however, worth of some discussion.

It is generally considered that the *Acts* were written in ca. 80–90, perhaps in Rome.<sup>26</sup> The writer writes good and rather old-fashioned Greek. The passage 19.14–16 of the *Acts* refers to the seven sons of Skeuas the ἀρχιερεύς who were attacked by a man possessed by an evil spirit. The commonly approved text has κατακυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων ἴσχυσε (=τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρόν) κατ'αὐτῶν. The *Vulgata* follows the Greek text and has here *et dominatus amborum, invaluit contra eos*. There are, however,

---

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., *P.Fam.Tebt.* 44, AD 188–9: ἀντίγρα(φον) ἀναφορίου. Οὐαλερίῳ [τ]ῷ καὶ Φιλαντινῷ καὶ Φιλαντινῷ τῷ καὶ Ἡρώδῃ ἀ[μφοτέροις Φιλαντι]νόου τοῦ καὶ Νιλάμμωνος καὶ Ἡρακλεία καὶ Διδύμη καὶ Φιλοσεράπιδι τοῖς τρισὶ Λυσιμάχου τοῦ [καὶ Διδύμου Ἀντινοε]ῖσι παρὰ Πισάϊτος Διογᾶ ἀπὸ κώμ(ης) Κερκεσοῦχω[v] Ὠρους Πολ(έμωνος) μερίδ[o]ς.

<sup>24</sup> J.B. Bury, "Ἀμφοτέροι in Later Greek", *CR* 11 (1897) 393–395; Eb. Nestle, "Ἀμφοτέροι = alle mit einander", *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 47 (1900) 1467–1468, and again J.B. Bury, "Ἀμφοτέροι for πάντες", *ByzZ* 11 (1902) 111. Cf. A. Bülow-Jacobsen, *O. Claud.* II, 44; Bingen (above n. 20) 260, note 3.

<sup>25</sup> *Act. Ap.* 19.14–16 and 23.8.

<sup>26</sup> I wish to express my warmest thanks to Ismo Dunderberg for this information.

some variants in the manuscripts which may originally be interpolations to the text, and even ἀμφοτέρων has sometimes been substituted by the standard αὐτῶν.<sup>27</sup> It is difficult to explain the meaning otherwise than 'all' or 'each'. However, the next passage has πᾶσιν: τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο γνωστὸν πᾶσιν Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλησι τοῖς κατοικοῦσι τὴν Ἔφεσον. The difference is that in the first case there is a set of sons, seven in number, who were attacked by the man each in turn. Even if a man was possessed by an evil spirit, he could hardly attack seven men together. The other passage simply tells that all Jews and Greeks in Ephesus heard of this incident.

The second passage, *Act.* 23.8, refers to three entities: Σαδδουκαῖοι γὰρ λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα, Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσιν τὰ ἀμφοτέρα. *Vulgata* has *Pharisei autem utraque confitentur*. Later in this passage the holy spirit and angels are made a pair because both were capable of linguistic communication, λαλεῖν: εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος (*Act.* 23.9). It does not change, however, the fact that τὰ ἀμφοτέρα refers to three. The crucial question is, where did this use of ἀμφοτέροι come from? I suggest that its origin lies in the formulaic legal language, where the difference between "x and y = ἀμφοτέροι" and "x or y = ἐκάτεροι" was sometimes confused. This confusion takes place, for instance, in an idiom used to confirm the repayment of a loan.<sup>28</sup> The normal formula "x shall have the right of execution upon y together or singly or upon which ever x pleases..." can be seen in *P. Amh.* 2, 49, 6–9 (108 BC):

καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις ἔστω Φιλουμένῃ ἐκ τε τῶν δεδανεισμένων ἐξ ἐνὸς καὶ ἐκάστου καὶ ἐξ οὗ ἂν αἰρήται καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς πάντων, ...

Sometimes this idiom was longer, which may have helped the confusion, cf. *P. Grenf.* 1, 18, 25–27 (131 BC):

ἡ δὲ πρᾶξις ἔστω Ἀπολλωνία[ι] ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν δεδανεισμένων, καὶ ἐξ ἐνὸς καὶ ἐκάστου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξ οὗ εἰαν (= ἂν) αἰρήται, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς πάντων, ...

When confusion happened, the result was, in a way, opaque, as in *P. Rein.* 16, 32–34 (109 BC):

<sup>27</sup> At least two MS (Ω [Athos, VIII–IX saec.] and *Sura Vulgata* [V saec.] have *eorum omnium* and the 1893 version of the British Biblical Society has αὐτῶν.

<sup>28</sup> Mayser (above n. 1) 94.

ἡ δὲ [πρ]ᾶξις ἔστω Διονυσίῳ τοῦ δανείου ἐκ τε αὐτῶν Διονυσίου καὶ [Σα]ραπίδος τῶν προγεγραμμένων καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων καὶ παρ' οὗ ἄν αὐτῶν νοήται καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς πάντων, ...

The conclusion we may draw from this is that legal language has influenced the writer of the *Acts*. In both cases the word is used in a meaning 'each (in turn)' which, in my opinion, is a hypercorrect use of ἀμφοτέροι. It originates from the writer's confusion between the words ἐκάτεροι and ἀμφοτέροι and from his tendency to write in a high register which has overcross from the legal language. The use is clearly idiolectic and exceptional, since there seem to be no parallels in the *NT* or elsewhere.

The development in the other papyrological material is different, but I argue that even there the reason lies in a formulaic language, but the confusion between both and all (together) was strengthened by misunderstanding and imperfect learning. Some later papyri show clearly the path to this confusion.

#### 4. Path to Confusion

The word is generally used in the opening lines of letters or in receipts and contracts where usually two or more persons are mentioned. The most common type is "X to A and B, both this or that", cf. *BGU* 8, 1811, 8/7 BC:

[Εὐ]ρύλοχος Ξείνωι καὶ [Ἄρ]τεμιδώρωι ἀμφοτέροις Σατύρου καὶ [τ]αῖς τούτων γυναιξὶ καὶ [τ]έκνοις...

'Eurylokhos to Xeinon and Artemidoros, both sons of Satyros, and to their wives and children...'

This formula could be modified to the following type (*O.Petr.* 22, AD 2):

Πανίσκ(ος) Ἰσιδώρ(ου) Νικάνωρι καὶ Πετειασμῆφι ἀμφοτέροις χ(αίρειν).

'Paniskos, son of Isidoros, to Nikanor and Peteasmephis both, greetings.'

A typical opening formula is also of the form "A and B, both of the position..., to X". This goes, for example, as follows (*P. Sakaon* 15, date AD 308):

Αὐρήλιοι Πτολεμ[αῖος] βουλ(ευτῆς) καὶ Παννεῦς ἀγορ(ανομήσας) ἀμφοτέροι ἐπιμ[ελ](ηται) κριθῆς Αὐρηλίῳ Παησιῶ ἀπὸ κώμ[ης] Θεαδελφίας χ(αίρειν).

'The Aurelii Ptolemaios, councillor, and Panneus, formerly agoranomos, both supervisors from the collection of barley. To Aurelius Paësios, from the village of Theadelphia, greeting.'<sup>29</sup>

Here the reference is unambiguous. Aurelius Ptolemaios and Aurelius Panneus are referred to with the word ἀμφότεροι in its original meaning 'both'.

However, sometimes the syntax is not so transparent. See the following (*P. Sakaon* 12, date AD 298, l. 6-9):

Αὐ[ρ]ήλιοι Ἡρωνεῖνος, καὶ Φιλάδελφος καὶ Ἀθανάσιος, ἀμφότεροι ἐξηγ(ητεύσαντες) Ἀλεξ(ανδρείας), καὶ Σερηνίων γυμν(ασιαρχήσας), δεκά(πρωτοί) ς-η/ το(παρχίας Θεμίστου μερίδος).

'Aurelii Heroninos, Philadelphos also called Athanasios, both formerly exegetai of Alexandria, and Serenion, formerly gymnasiarch, dekaprotoi of the 6th-8th toparchy of the Themistos division'.

The syntax is here more opaque, since the other person had a double name Φιλάδελφος (ὁ) καὶ Ἀθανάσιος. Double names were very common in Egypt, and the article was sometimes omitted like here. The signatures at the end of the papyrus show without any doubts that this interpretation is correct. However, at a quick glance or due to a careless attitude, this kind of pair was easily misunderstood<sup>30</sup> and the following discontinuous syntax increased the confusion even more (*P. Sakaon* 11, date AD 296 or 297 [the chronology has little importance, as here I am not giving a linear development but the reasons for the confusion]):

Αὐρήλιοι Ἡρωνίνοσ, καὶ Ἀθανάσιος καὶ Φιλάδελφος, καὶ Σερηνίων, ἀμφότεροι ἐξηγ(ητεύσαντες) Ἀλεξανδρίας, δεκάπρωτοι ς καὶ η τοπαρχείας Θεμίστου μερίδος.

'Aurelii Heroninos, Athanasios also called Philadelphos, and Serenion, both formerly exegetai of Alexandria, dekaprotoi of the 6th-and-8th toparchy of the Themistos division.'

The signatures show that all three persons were *dekaprotoi* but only

---

<sup>29</sup> Translations by the editor.

<sup>30</sup> This has happened in the 4th edition of Bauer's *Dictionary* (above n. 1), and hence transferred to the English version of that dictionary by W. Arndt – W. Gingrich, *A Greek – English Dictionary of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, s.v. ἀμφότεροι, where in *P. Gen.* 69.4. the word is given as an example of the meaning 'all', but it refers correctly to two not four persons.

Heroninos and Philadelphos had been *exegetai* of Alexandria. Nevertheless, the word order is not transparent, and, therefore, a non-native Greek speaker can easily analyse the clause so that ἀμφοτέροι has all three persons as its head. This is made very clear in an, perhaps, even more Egyptian social context (P. Gen. 67, 3-5, date AD 382):

ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις Ἀυρήλιοι Ἀμμωνιανὸς Πεκυσ[ί]ου καὶ Ἀ[σ]άεις Ἀτρη<sup>31</sup> καὶ Ἀπφοῦς Μάυρου καὶ Πουὰρ Ἀτίων[ο]ς ἀμφοτέρων ἀπὸ κώμης Φιλαδελφίας τοῦ Ἀρσιν[ο]ίτου νομοῦ.

'Aurelii Ammonianos son of Pekysios and Asaeis son of Hatres and Apfus son of Mauros and Pouar son of Ation, all from the village Philadelphia of the Arsinoite nome, agree (the following).' (My translation)

Here there are four persons, all of which seem to have an Egyptian background. They were illiterate, see 1.18–20: Ἀυρήλιος Κλαμάσιος γραμματ[ί]ον ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γραμμάτων μὴ ἰδόντων.

The scribe was, as far as I can judge, an Egyptian who shows the already familiar difficulties with the Greek cases writing ἀμφοτέρων pro ἀμφοτέροι. In my opinion it is evident that the scribe did not know the exact meaning of the word, but used it as an element in the formula referring to all parts of the contract. Thus I suggest that it was this kind of context that gave birth to the use of ἀμφοτέροι with reference to more than two. As we have seen above the Mons Claudianus ostraca show clearly that this confusion existed already in the turn of the first and second century. It seems also that some writers favoured formulas which they have learnt well even if they were not correct. Thus, the most of the Mons Claudianus examples showing this confusion come from Dioskoros. Next I discuss some later instances which have been considered to bear evidence for the change of meaning.

## 5. Byzantine and Modern use

Bury very plausibly showed that the majority of the Byzantine examples, where ἀμφοτέροι seems to mean 'all', have the original meaning of the word 'both'. He emphasised that phrases with ἀμφοτέροι had to do with grouping

---

<sup>31</sup> The name is *Htr* 'twin' which is transliterated in Greek as Ἀθρε, Ἀθρης, Ἀθρηης, Ἀτρηης, gen. Ἀτρητος (usually), *Demotisches Namenbuch*, E. Lüddeckens & alii (eds.), Wiesbaden 1980–2000, Band I, Lief. 12, s.v.

of two different entities together, thus being in line with the normal use of the word.<sup>32</sup> But he also found a couple of examples where the original meaning seemed to have changed. These had to do with arithmetics. The passage which he cites contains calculations of the naval and military budget titled  $\Delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$  τοῦ προχρέου where wages of officials are listed and summed up.<sup>33</sup> The sum is declared using an idiom  $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$  ἀμφοτέρα. Bury suggested that the semantic expansion might have been the result of a reanalysis of this arithmetic idiom used in addition:  $\gamma\iota(\gamma)\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$  ἀμφοτέρα which meant 'together' or 'total' or our '='.

Arithmetic addition was more difficult with the Greek numbers than with our 10 as there was no zero and the numbers totalled as many as 27. The method of teaching children to add seems to have been grouping into pairs, e.g.,  $((a+b)+c)+d)+e$ . As a result of this, ἀμφοτέρα was, in fact, correct, as it referred to the last pair,  $d+e$ .<sup>34</sup>

It is, indeed, true that this kind of semantic derivation from technical to a more general one sometimes happens – there are numerous examples in the modern languages. I believe, however, that it has not happened in this case, even if Bury argued so. Let us have some further evidence.

It is, in a way, surprising that the new *Lexikon der byzantinischen Gräzität, fasc. 1* has not included the word ἀμφοτέροι among the entries.<sup>35</sup> All the entries which have this stem are combined words with ἀμφοτερο- as their first part. They all have a meaning referring to 'both' or 'double' or 'two'.<sup>36</sup> This is solid evidence against a general and widely used semantic change.

---

<sup>32</sup> Bury (above n. 24) 394–5.

<sup>33</sup> Constantine Porph. *De cer.* 656, lines 11, 15, and 17, (ed.) Bonn. J.J. Reiske's 1829–30 Bonn edition is still the only full edition of Constantine Porphyrogenetus' *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*.

<sup>34</sup> Bury (above n. 24) 395. General information for teaching arithmetics, e.g. S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, 1977, 180–181; E. Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen*, Leipzig/Berlin 1914, 29–31; P. Collant, "A l'école avec les petits grecs" *CE* 11 (1936) 489–507; H. Maehler, "Die griechische Schule in Ptolemäischen Ägypten", in E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel and W van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium. Leuven, 24–26 May, 1982* (Studia Hellenistica 27), 1983, 191–203.

<sup>35</sup> *Lexikon der byzantinischen Gräzität. 1. fasc.* Erstellt von E. Trapp, Wien 1994.

<sup>36</sup> Ssvv. ἀμφοτερίζω, ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος, ἀμφοτεροδεξίωσις, ἀμφοτεροπρόσωπος, ἀμφοτερόφθαλμος.



Bury argued that some examples from the medieval Greek literature show, however, that the meaning 'all' was possible at that time. I would like to suggest, though, that even there the grouping into pairs is the most common reason for the use of the word. Bury suggested that in *Digenis Akritas* there are some clear examples of the change from 'both' to 'all'. As evidence he cited *Dig. Akr.* II 244: καὶ ἀμφοτέροι παρευθὺς εἰς τὸν γαμβρὸν εἰσηλθόν... 'and they (both) went at once to the brother-in-law' (my translation).<sup>37</sup> But this example does not show that there had been a change of meaning. In fact, even here we have the original meaning: a kind of pair consisting of the sister and her brothers who both went to the brother-in-law, i.e. sister's husband (cf. II 221 where the confused girl first goes to her brothers having her hair loose and tangled). In another occasion, where only the brothers are referred to, the text has another pronoun: σὲ γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἔχομεν ψυχὴν καὶ θυμηδίαν (II 240).

In other passages where a pair is not a possible interpretation, we also find the normal ὅλοι: καὶ ὅλοι σας ἀνατρέχετε ἀπέσω εἰς <τὸ> ποτάμιν (1720) 'and run all of you to the river away from here' and καὶ ὡσὰν τὰ εἶδετε, ἀγοῦροι μου, <εὐθὺς> ἐφύγετε ὅλοι (1723) 'and when you see that, my sons, escape all at once' (my translations).<sup>38</sup> The speaker does not include himself in his command.

In his *Lexicon of Medieval Greek* Emmanuil Kriaras gives the entry ἀμφοτέροι the meaning 'ὅλοι μαζί'.<sup>39</sup> He gives various examples, which, after a close analysis, all turn out to include some sort of grouping into pairs. In the *Chronicle of Morea* the word is seldom used, but we find a couple of instances which give more light to its later use. Consider, for example *Chron. Mor.* H 2832 and H 4279:<sup>40</sup>

βουλή ἅς ἔχωμε ἀμφοτέροι μὲ τί τρόπον καὶ στράταν  
νὰ πολεμήσωμεν καὶ αὐτὰ νὰ τὰ ἔχωμεν κερδίσει.

'Let us take counsel together as to the manner and campaign  
with which we should fight to win them  
(= the castles of Nauplion and Monemvasia) as well.'

<sup>37</sup> *Digenis Akritas, Poema anonimo bizantino a cura di P. Odorico, Firenze 1995.*

<sup>38</sup> *Dighenis Akritis, Versione dell'Estorial, a cura di F. Rizzo Nervo, Messina 1996.*

<sup>39</sup> E. Κριαράς, *Λεξικὸ τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς δημώδους γραμματείας 1100-1669, τόμος Β, Θεσσαλονίκη 1971, s.v.*

<sup>40</sup> H = codex Hauniensis.

τοῦ καθενὸς ἐδώκασιν πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν ὅπου εἶχεν,  
καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκλέξασιν ἀμφοτέροί τους ὅλοι  
ὡς ἄνθρωπον τιμιώτερον καὶ φρονιμώτερόν τους,  
κ' ἐποίησαν τὸν πατέρα μου ὡς ἀρχηγὸν εἰς ὅλους.

'each was given according to his rank,  
and afterwards all of them together elected  
my father, as the most honest and prudent man among them,  
and made him commander over all'.<sup>41</sup>

The interpretation of the first example is clear enough. Again there is a pair, I and you, as the speaker separates himself from the others, as is explicitly mentioned in H 2830: καὶ οὕτως εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς. They had to keep a meeting to decide together what measures they should take for capturing the two castles.

The other example is more complex and the text is different in P,<sup>42</sup> where we read ἀμφοτέροι οἱ πάντες. In any case, in H, there is a contrast between ἀμφοτέροι and ὅλοι which suggests that there is also a difference in semantics. The syntax of the clause is clumsy. If the text is correct as it is preserved in H, the words ἀμφοτέροι and ὅλοι are in agreement, but τους is strange. It seems to be a possessive pronoun with the preceding word as its head as in Modern Greek (e.g. τα παιδιά τους 'their children'). A gloss translation could be 'both of them all' being really 'all of them together' = ὅλοι μαζί in modern Greek, which must be what is meant. It seems that the word ἀμφοτέροι as opposed with ὅλοι also had a meaning that the lords all decided as if in pairs, one after another. This is further confirmed by the consecutive clause at the end of the sentence: ὡς ἀρχηγὸν εἰς ὅλους. He became the lord of them all, it is not a sequential process anymore. As a conclusion of this semantic analysis, I take one more example from the *Chronicle of Morea* (H 147-8):

εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον καιρὸν, εἰς τὸ ἔμπα τοῦ Ἀπριλίου,  
ἀμφοτέροι νὰ ἐσμίξουσιν, ν' ἀπέλθουν στὴν Συρίαν.

'In the following year, at the beginning of April,  
they would come together, to go to Syria.'

This example includes grouping again. There are two groups, the

---

<sup>41</sup> Translation by H.E. Lurier, *Crusaders and Conquerors. The Chronicle of Morea*, New York – London 1964.

<sup>42</sup> P = codex Parisiensis.

Count of Champagne and the other captains, who had earlier decided 'that they would go, each to his own lands, to make ready for the expedition' (H145-6). One after another they would then come together (including the Count of Champagne) in the springtime to go to Syria.

From the above examples the semantic difference between ὅλοι, πάντες and ἀμφότεροι can be seen. The last is always used in connection with some group consisting at least two different parties whereas the other two do not share this function. It should be remarked, ultimately, that the word ἀμφότεροι is not used anymore in standard Demotic Greek, where 'both' is 'και οι δύο'. The word is still used in learned language, and its meaning is exclusively 'both'.<sup>43</sup> It is used in various contexts. There is a fresh example of its use in an article, where the writer favours other learned expressions as well:

Η εμμονή όμως σε μια φολκλόρ εκδοχή του δράματος της ιστορίας καταδίκασε σε αποτυχία δημιουργούς σαν την πολύτιμη Λυδία Κονιόρδου ή την ευαίσθητη Σαβίνα Γιαννάτου (αμφότερες έκαναν ντουέτο με τον Γιώργο Νταλάρα, ...).<sup>44</sup>

'...both sang a duet with Giorgos Dalaras'.

It can also be used in literary Greek translations:

... ένα οχυρό που διεκδίκησαν Βρετανοί και Γάλλοι, ώσπου, αφού εξαντλήθηκαν αμφότεροι, έπεσε στα χέρια των Αμερικανών.<sup>45</sup>

'... a fort fought over by the British and French until wearing them out, it fell into the hands of the Americans' (English original).<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> See Γ.Δ. Μπαμπινιώτης, Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής γλώσσας, 2. ed. Athens 2002, s.v. ἀμφότεροι· το αμφότεροι δηλώνει μονολεκτικά ό,τι δηλώνεται περιφραστικά στις φράσεις 'και οι δύο / και ο ένας και ο άλλος μαζί'.

<sup>44</sup> Μ. Στεφανίδης, ΓΙΑΛΙΝΟ ΜΑΤΙ. Η κατάρα της Αθηνάς in ON OFF, Κυριακάτικη, ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΤΥΠΙΑ, 1.6.2003, 54.

<sup>45</sup> J. Eugenides, Middlesex 2003. Greek translation by Άννα Παπασταύρου, 119–120. I am grateful to Reetta Ihalainen for showing me these instances.

<sup>46</sup> J. Eugenides, Middlesex, paperback ed. 2003, 79. The Greek translation means literally 'as they both exhausted their strength'.

## 6. Conclusions

The above examples show that ἀμφότεροι did not undergo a real semantic change from 'both' to 'altogether', but obviously its function became more obscure than the original narrow use attested in the Greek literature up until Late Antiquity. Its use in legal language created a confusion between 'both = x and y' and 'each of two = x or y'. This meant that the meaning 'each (in turn)' gained some ground, at least idiolectically. The writer of the *Acts of the Apostles* seems to have used the word hypercorrectly as he aimed at a high register, but his way of using the word did not become popular, nor did it effect permanent change.

Formulaic use also created semantic confusion which originated in a non-native speech community. In letters and contracts ἀμφότεροι came to be used as a typical part of the opening clause, and sometimes its reference was ambiguous. Therefore, the semantic extension was due to a misunderstanding of the Greek idioms. The Mons Claudianus letters are an early example of L2 user's confusion in using Greek epistolary idioms. The multicultural context of these letters is obvious creating thus interference which had effect on the Greek variety in question.

I have argued that the use of ἀμφότεροι in the meaning 'all' has a very narrow papyrological context of imperfect learning and carelessness. The morphosyntax of the letters and other documents, where the word is used in this meaning, shows many traces of imperfect learning. Interference from Egyptian can be seen also in the form of careless use of Greek case-endings. The writers of the documents were obviously familiar with Greek epistolary and, at least some, legal idioms, but their full understanding of the meaning of these idioms was defective. In the letters of Mons Claudianus the phrase ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς φιλτάτοις/ἀδελφοῖς is a typical greeting formula which was attached politely to the names of the recipients without proper understanding of its original meaning. It was mainly used idiolectally, as the majority of the attestations comes from the letters of Dioskoros, who has many other morphosyntactic idiosyncrasies as well.

Medieval use confirms that in normal use the word was always connected to some sort of grouping into pairs, and in modern Greek the word belongs to a learned language, and its meaning is always 'both'. The expanding of the meaning of ἀμφότεροι is, thus, sociolinguistic: it is an example of hypercorrect use as regards the writer of the *Acts of the Apostles*,

and an example of imperfect learning as regards the Mons Claudianus and other documentary material, but it did not have permanent results which would have effected a semantic change.

*University of Helsinki*