

Before ὅτι, πῶς, πού, and νά became the regular conjunctions for indirect discourse in Modern Greek, there was considerable variation in how dependent statements were introduced. διότι became more common in the Hellenistic period, but subsequently was marginalised. Papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt attest the combination ὡς ὅτι, but also ὡς ἵνα and πῶς ἵνα to introduce purpose clauses. These conjunctions are thought to mean no more than ὅτι and ἵνα respectively. Several questions are raised given the decline of ὡς in the Koine and concerning the relationship between the combinations in the papyri and ὅτι να in popular mediaeval texts. Why did such a variety of double conjunctions emerge in this period? Since they were employed alongside the classical means of introducing dependent clauses (statements, commands, expressions of purpose), what was their perceived relationship? What exactly caused their occasional and, on first sight, inconsistent use?

Existing treatments have been based primarily on three possible examples in the New Testament and were written before much of the relevant papyrological evidence was published. Consequently, they could only draw on literary texts whose reliability is reduced by their manuscript transmission. Indeed, many of the examples collected by Jannaris (1897) and Mayser (1934) were from scholia. These are difficult to date and often were adapted freely and modernised to meet the needs of mediaeval readers. Moulton (1908: 212) noted the use of ὡς ὅτι with a superlative in late Hellenistic inscriptions, but there has been no attempt to explain what connection there may be between this combination (in which ὅτι is redundant) and those found in the later texts (in which ὡς is superfluous).

The papyri contribute datable, autograph evidence not subject to the limitations of the manuscript tradition. However, they present a complex situation, as reflected in *SB XIV 12085.7-11* [5<sup>th</sup> CE].

καθὼς μοι ἴπας ἵνα πεμφθῶσειν / ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ καὶ Ἴπρον ὡς ὅτι  
ἔγραψας / αὐτῷ ὡς ἵνα <ἐν>έγκη αὐτὰ μεθ' αὐτοῦ. γίγνωσκε / δὲ ὅτι ὄχλησα  
Ἑρακλίῳ ἅμα Ἀννιανῷ / καὶ οὐδέν μοι δέδωκεν.

There are four dependent clauses (introduced by ἵνα, ὡς ὅτι, ὡς ἵνα and ὅτι). In the case of the second and the third, ὡς has been added in above the line as an afterthought. The addition in this order in this particular text challenges the suggestion (cf. Horrocks 1997: 210-11) that ὅτι or ἵνα was added to ὡς to clarify its function by indicating the mood (much as να does in Modern Greek). The use of ἵνα with and without ὡς does reflect a difference between the report of writing and direct speech, but this distinction cannot be so easily applied to the two ὅτι clauses.

In this paper, I will give a brief review of the evidence provided by the papyri and then I will discuss a few problematic texts in detail. Particular attention will be given to the type of texts and to the registers of language represented by them in order to clarify the reasons for the variety found in the papyri and for the emergence and survival of ὅτι να alone.