

THE JOURNAL OF JURISTIC PAPYROLOGY

FOUNDED BY
RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG

EDITED BY
TOMASZ DERDA
ADAM ŁAJTAR
JAKUB URBANIK

VOL. XLVIII (2018)



ΕΥΓΡΑΦΙΟΣ ΤΤ
ΗΕΗΩΘΗΚ
ΠΑΡΔΔΟΣ



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF PAPYROLOGY



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
FACULTY OF LAW AND ADMINISTRATION
CHAIR OF ROMAN LAW AND THE LAW OF ANTIQUITY



THE RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG
FOUNDATION

THE JOURNAL OF JURISTIC PAPYROLOGY

FOUNDED BY
RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG

EDITED BY
TOMASZ DERDA
ADAM ŁAJTAR
JAKUB URBANIK

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITORS
GRZEGORZ OCHAŁA

VOL. XLVIII (2018)

SCIENTIFIC BOARD

José Luis Alonso (Universität Zürich), **Roger S. Bagnall** (New York University), **Benedetto Bravo** (Uniwersytet Warszawski), **Willy Clarysse** (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven), **Bernard H. Stolte** (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen), **Dorothy Thompson** (Girton College, Cambridge University), **Jacques van der Vliet** (Universiteit Leiden/Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen), **Ewa Wipszycka** (Uniwersytet Warszawski)

LANGUAGE CONSULTANTS

English: **Giovanni R. Ruffini** (Fairfield University), French: **Chris Rodriguez** (Université Paris I), German: **Martin Lemke** (Uniwersytet Warszawski), Italian: **Fabiana Tuccillo** (Università degli studi di Napoli «Federico II»)

© For the book by Fundacja im. Rafała Taubenschlaga

© For the constituting papers by the authors

Computer design and DTP by
Tomasz Derda, Grzegorz Ochala, and Jakub Urbanik

Cover design by
Maryna Wiśniewska

Warszawa 2018

ISSN 0075–4277

This publication has been published with financial support
from the Institute of Archaeology and Faculty of Law and Administration
of the University of Warsaw

Wydanie I (wersja pierwotna)

Nakład: 200 egz.

Druk i oprawa: Sowa Sp. z o.o., ul. Raszyńska 13, 05-500 Piaseczno

CONTENTS

Klaas BENTEIN

Expressing lineage in Roman and Late Antique petitions and contracts:

A variationist perspective

1

Abstract: Onomastic studies typically state that lineage (the patronymic in particular) was expressed in Ancient Greek through the use of the genitive case. In this study, which is based on an extensive corpus of Roman and Late Antique petitions and contracts, I show that the actual situation was much more complex: up to eight different lineage expressions are attested. In line with recent variationist studies, I take it that variation in language is not random and try to connect the different types of lineage expressions to a number of parameters of variation, that is, diachronic, social, and text-internal factors.
Keywords: variation, ancient Greek, lineage, Roman Egypt, Late Antique Egypt, parameters of variation.

Andrea BERNINI

Fragmentarische Notiz einer lateinischen Geburtsanzeige

37

Abstract: The present papyrus – published here in *editio princeps* – preserves a fragmentary text related to a birth declaration, as evident by the mention of the *lex Papia Poppaea*, by the formula *q(uae) p(roxumae) f(uerunt)*, and by the reference to the public display. A comparison with the *professiones* and the *testationes* preserved on tablets and in papyri proves that the text is likely to be closer to a *professio* than to a *testatio*. Its exact nature is unclear, but its brevity suggests it to be a notice.

Keywords: declaration of birth, *lex Papia Poppaea*, public display of documents, exedra.

Anne BOUD'HORS

The Coptic ostraca of the Theban hermitage MMA 1152.

2. *Legal and economic documents (O. Gurna Górecki 69–96)*

53

Abstract: The present paper constitutes the second part of the publication of Coptic ostraca discovered by Tomasz Górecki in the Theban hermitage MMA 1152. The twenty-eight texts edited here are of legal and economic character, including a few letters of protection and tax receipts, fragments of private contracts, and various economy-related documents (lists, accounts, *dipinti*). While attesting to a limited administrative activity, these texts, like the letters, reveal their whole value when compared with other documents of the same sort coming from the region.

Keywords: Coptic, ostraca, Western Thebes, MMA 1152, administration, taxes, guaranties, accounts.

Christel FREU

Copies of labour contracts in Roman and Late Antique Egypt:

Institutions and society

103

Abstract: The article explores changes in writing and copying labour contracts from the first centuries of the Roman rule in Egypt to Late Antiquity. During the first centuries, some labour contracts – antichretic loans and wet nurses contracts – were notarial documents registered in public archives and copied at least twice. Labour contracts written in chirographic form, whose number grew from the second century on, were not necessarily registered, in which case the parties had to choose whether they wanted to make a second private copy. In Late Antiquity, chirographs drafted by private scribes and authenticated by notaries (ταβελλῶνες) were the norm; in the Oxyrhynchite nome, a reform obliged the scribes to notify whether the text was copied once or more. This new habit allows us to see that only work contracts related to liturgies (fiscal collection, and public postal or transport duties) were copied twice, as was already the norm in the Oxyrhynchites in the third century. All other private work agreements and antichretic loans were issued only once, to the benefit of the employer/creditor.

Keywords: labour contracts, παραμοναί, loans, προχρεία, liturgical work, chirographs, copies, αντίγραφον, ἴσον, notaries (High Empire), ταβελλῶν (Late Antiquity).

Grzegorz OCHAŁA

<i>Nubica onomastica miscellanea III. Notes on and corrections to personal names found in Christian Nubian written sources</i>	141
--	-----

Abstract: The paper, the third part in the ‘Nubica onomastica miscellanea’ series, offers a number of corrections to the reading of names in written sources coming from all over Christian Nubia. The texts represent a variety of epigraphic and papyrological genres and were written in Greek, Coptic, and Old Nubian.

Keywords: Christian Nubia, onomastics, ghost names, Greek, Coptic, Old Nubian.

Stefanie SCHMIDT

(mit einem Beitrag von Ruth DUTTENHÖFER)

<i>Drei Bischöfe von Syene namens Joseph. Inschriften, Tonlämpchen und ein Ostrakon ...</i>	185
---	-----

Abstract: This paper discusses the documentary evidence of the last three known bishops from Late Antique and early Islamic Syene/Aswan (5th/6th to 8th/9th cent. AD). All three bear the name of Joseph, two of them, Joseph (II) and (III), are known from already published inscriptions. A new bishop, Joseph (I), occurs for the first time in a Greek ostrakon from Elephantine, which is edited here for the first time. A bishop Joseph appears, moreover, on a series of pink clay lamps, which were found, among others, in Adulis (modern Eritrea). A lamp mold with the name of a bishop Joseph, excavated by Charles Clermont-Ganneau on Elephantine, permits the allocation of these Joseph-lamps to Syene as well.

Keywords: Syene/Aswan, Elephantine, Deir Anba Hadra, bishops, Late Antiquity, early Islamic period, funerary inscriptions, credit loan, inscribed terracotta lamps, Christian Nubia, Adulis.

Lothar THÜNGEN

<i>PSI I 55 – eine griechische Paraphrase zu D. 2, 14, De Pactis</i>	207
--	-----

Abstract: In 1912 Filippo E. Vassalli published *PSI I 55* and partly reconstructed its contents. His *editio princeps* was subsequently thoroughly checked in 1971 by Wolfgang Wodke, who completed Vassalli's text; he, moreover, attributed it to the *antecessor* Stephanus. Here, all earlier readings and conjectures will be examined and partly corrected. The text is seen critically in the light of the publications that have disproved Wodke's attribution to Stephanus. Besides, some new readings and conjectures are added. The papyrus was a part of a book based on East Roman law teaching in the Greek

language. It is a *paraphrasis* combining two series of lessons on the Digest, an index, and a *paragaphai* lecture. They are dated between spring of 534 and March of 536 and were taught by an unknown law teacher (in either Beirut or Constantinople). Afterwards, they were used by Stephanus for his *paragaphai* on the digest. The latter seems to have taught between March 536 and a short time after 542. The unknown law teacher was probably one of the eight addressees of Justinian's constitution *Omnem*, who taught at two law schools. Four of those *antecessores* have already been excluded by other authors. The others have left either no or too few texts. Therefore, the attribution to one of these *antecessores* is impossible, perhaps except for Anatolius, who taught in Beirut.

Keywords: Roman law, juristic papyrology, literary papyri, *Digesta Iustiniani*, law teaching in Greek, contract law, *paraphrasis*.

Jacques VAN DER VLIET

Two dated Coptic epitaphs from Dongola

321

Abstract: First edition of two funerary stelae from the Monastery on Kom H, Dongola, inscribed in Sahidic Coptic. Both stelae show interesting textual features and bear absolute dates that assign them to the third quarter of the eighth century.

Keywords: Christian Nubia, Dongola, Makuria, Sahidic Coptic, funerary epigraphy, monasticism.

Klaas Bentein

**EXPRESSING LINEAGE
IN ROMAN AND LATE ANTIQUE PETITIONS
AND CONTRACTS: A VARIATIONIST PERSPECTIVE**

1. INTRODUCTION

STUDIES OF NAMING PRACTICES in Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt¹ have made great progress in recent years.² The Trismegistos platform in particular,³ based at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, has

¹ I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer, as well as the editor, for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this article. Any remaining errors and inconsistencies are entirely my own. My work was funded by the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research (Grant no. 12B7218N), the Center for Hellenic Studies, and the European Research Council (Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, Starting Grant no. 756487).

² Valuable older studies include J. G. KEENAN, ‘The names Flavius and Aurelius as status designations in Later Roman Egypt’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 13 (1973), pp. 33–63; IDEM, ‘An afterthought on the names Flavius and Aurelius’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 53 (1983), pp. 245–250; Deborah W. HOBSON, ‘Naming practices in Roman Egypt’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 26 (1989), pp. 157–174; I. F. FIKHMAN, ‘On onomastics of Greek and Roman Egypt’, [in:] R. KATZOFF, Y. PETROFF, & D. SCHAPS (eds.), *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg*, Ramat Gan 1996, pp. 403–414.

³ To be found at <www.trismegistos.org>. For additional information, see M. DEPAUW & B. VAN BEEK, ‘People in Greek documentary papyri: First results of a research project’, *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 39 (2009), pp. 31–47.

stimulated and enabled the application of new, quantitative methods⁴ to explore long-term onomastic evolutions. Mark Depauw and Willy Clarysse, for example, have modelled a gradual increase of Biblical names in the fourth and fifth centuries, presumably reflecting the gradual Christianization of Egypt in these centuries.⁵ More recently, Yanne Broux and Sandra Coussement have explored the practice of polyonymy in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, with the former focusing on Greek-Egyptian double names, and the latter on Greek-Greek double names.⁶

In this article, I would like to draw attention to a topic which has received far less attention, that is how people expressed their lineage⁷ in Greek documentary texts. In formal texts in particular,⁸ it was common to refer to the father's name (the 'patronymic'), and sometimes even to the mother's name (the 'matronymic') and the grandfather's name (the 'pappo-

⁴ Not only in the form of traditional bar or line graphs, but also through network visualizations.

⁵ M. DEPAUW & W. CLARYSSE, 'How Christian was fourth century Egypt? Onomastic perspectives on conversion', *Vigiliae Christianae* 67 (2013), pp. 407–435. See also the older study by R. S. BAGNALL, 'Religious conversion and onomastic change in Early Byzantine Egypt', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 19 (1982), pp. 105–124.

⁶ Yanne BROUX, *Double Names and Elite Strategy in Roman Egypt* [= *Studia Hellenistica* 54], Leuven 2015; Sandra COUSSEMENT, *Because I Am Greek: Polyonymy as an Expression of Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt* [= *Studia Hellenistica* 55], Leuven 2016. Other recent quantitative studies include G. R. RUFFINI, 'The commonality of rare names in Byzantine Egypt', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 158 (2006), pp. 213–225; Yanne BROUX, 'Greco-Egyptian naming practices: A network perspective', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 55 (2015), pp. 706–720; W. CLARYSSE & Yanne BROUX, 'Would you name your child after a celebrity? Arsinoe, Berenike, Kleopatra, Laodike and Stratonike in the Greco-Roman East', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 200 (2016), pp. 347–362.

⁷ Studies such as D. HAGEDORN, 'Zur Verwendung von *νῑός* und *θυγάτηρ* vor dem Vatersnamen in Urkunden römischer Zeit', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 80 (1980), pp. 277–282, and W. CLARYSSE, 'Filiation the Egyptian way in Greek documents', *Lingua Aegyptia* 23 (2015), pp. 277–282, prefer the less common term 'filiation'.

⁸ Compare T. SMITHERMAN, 'Patronymics', [in:] G. GIANNAKIS *et alii* (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Leiden 2014, pp. 45–46, at 45, where he notes that 'the patronymic appears to have only been used as a way to officially identify and legitimize an individual in a formal context'.

nymic').⁹ Onomastic studies generally state that expressing one's lineage (the patronymic in particular) was done through the use of the genitive case,¹⁰ in continuation of Archaic and Classical times.¹¹ In this article, I wish to show that considerable variation existed in how people expressed the lineage.¹²

A couple of studies have discussed alternative lineage expressions:¹³ Dieter Hagedorn, for example, has studied the use of *νίος* / *θυγάτηρ* with the genitive,¹⁴ and Yanne Broux has drawn attention to the use of a new lineage expression in the Roman period, that is *ὁ τοῦ* with the genitive.¹⁵ Neither of them, however, gives a comprehensive overview of different existing lineage expressions. In line with a number of recent studies in Greek papyrology which have drawn attention to the existence and importance of different types of linguistic variation,¹⁶ I will describe the variation that can be found in Greek documentary texts, and try to relate such variation to a number of

⁹ See, e.g., J. L. WHITE, *The Form and Structure of the Official Petition: A Study in Greek Epistolography* [= *Dissertation Series / Society of Biblical Literature* 5], Missoula, MT 1972, who considers the expression of lineage a fixed structural part of petitions.

¹⁰ So, e.g., CLARYSSE, 'Filiation the Egyptian way' (cit. n. 7), p. 277: 'in Greek filiation is usually indicated by the genitive of the father's name'. Yanne BROUX, 'O τοῦ: An alternative for the Greek patronymic in Egypt', *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 41 (2011), pp. 45–57, simply refers to 'the Greek patronymic'.

¹¹ Cf. SMITHERMAN, 'Patronymics' (cit. n. 8), p. 45.

¹² In fact, already in ancient times, there existed variation: SMITHERMAN, 'Patronymics' (cit. n. 8), p. 45, mentions the use of the suffixes *-ιος* and *-ιδης* in Archaic Greek, turning the father's name into an adjective. See further Jean M. AITCHISON, 'Τελαμώνιος Αἴας and other patronymics', *Glotta* 42 (1964), pp. 132–138.

¹³ I define a 'lineage expression' as any expression that indicates lineage, whether morphologically or lexically. Compare with the notion of 'construction' in modern-day linguistics (e.g. Adele E. GOLDBERG, 'Constructions: A new theoretical approach to language', *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7 [2003], pp. 219–224).

¹⁴ HAGEDORN, 'Zur Verwendung von *νίος* und *θυγάτηρ*' (cit. n. 7).

¹⁵ BROUX, 'O τοῦ' (cit. n. 10).

¹⁶ See, e.g., Delphine NACHTERGAELE, 'The Asklepiades and the Athenodoros archives: A case study of a linguistic approach to papyrus letters', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013), pp. 269–293; K. BENTEIN, 'Minor complementation patterns in Post-classical Greek (I–VI AD). A socio-historical analysis of a corpus of documentary papyri', *Symbolae Osloenses* 89

language-internal and language-external factors. My approach can thus be considered ‘variationist’, not only in the sense that I explicitly focus on variation, but also in the sense that I believe that linguistic variation is not random, language being characterized by ‘structured heterogeneity’.¹⁷

My focus will be on the Roman and Late Antique periods (1st–8th cent. AD):¹⁸ I have analyzed how people express lineage in all contracts and petitions contained within so-called ‘archives’,¹⁹ resulting in an extensive corpus of over 1,500 texts (1,131 contracts and 398 petitions). The annotation of this corpus was done entirely manually, so as not to exclude hitherto unknown ways of indicating lineage. In total, I have collected 4,108 instances of indicating lineage, an average of a little less than three instances per text.

The article is structured as follows: in § 2, I give an overview of eight different lineage expressions. In § 3, I discuss a number of factors that seem to have influenced the use of these expressions, distinguishing between diachronic factors (§ 3.1), social factors (§ 3.2), and text-internal factors (§ 3.3). I conclude the article in § 4.

2. LINEAGE EXPRESSIONS: AN OVERVIEW

In what follows, I briefly discuss the different lineage expressions that can be found in my corpus. Table 1 gives a numeric overview of these different expressions:

(2015), pp. 104–147; Jerneja KAVCIC, ‘Variation in expressing temporal and aspectual distinctions in complement clauses: A study of the Greek non-literary papyri of the Roman Period’, [in:] K. BENTEIN, M. JANSE, & Jorie SOLTIC (eds.), *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*, Leiden 2017, pp. 22–55; Joanne V. STOLK, ‘Dative and genitive case interchange in Greek papyri from Roman-Byzantine Egypt’, *Glotta* 93 (2017), pp. 180–210.

¹⁷ For an introduction to variationist methodology, see, e.g., R. BAYLEY, ‘Variationist sociolinguistics’, [in:] R. BAYLEY, R. CAMERON, & Ceil LUCAS (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Oxford 2013, pp. 11–30.

¹⁸ I have also included the archive of Athenodoros *dioiketes*, which spans two centuries, 1st BC and 1st AD.

¹⁹ An overview of these archives can be found at <<http://www.trismegistos.org/arch/index.php>>.

Table 1. Overview of different lineage expressions²⁰

	1st–3rd cent. AD	4th–8th cent. AD	Total	Percentage
Bare genitive	1,225	1,297	2,522	61.4%
Bare nominative / indeclinable forms	104	86	190	4.6%
πατρός / μητρός + gen.	242	177	419	10.2%
ἐκ + gen.	10	7	17	0.4%
ἐκ πατρός / μητρός + gen.	2	100	102	2.5%
υἱός / θυγάτηρ + gen.	41	382	423	10.3%
τοῦ / τῆς + gen.	424	11	435	10.6%
Total	2,048	2,060	4,108	100%

2.1. The bare genitive

As table 1 shows, the bare genitive was, indeed, the dominant lineage expression throughout the Roman and Late Antique periods: 2,522 instances of the bare genitive can be found in my corpus, or as much as 61% of the total number of instances of lineage expressions. An illustration can be found in (1):

(1) ὁμολ[ο]γεῖ Χεῶς **Ἀρμιύσιος**, ὥς ἐτῶν εἴ[κ]οσι πέντε οὐλή ἀντίχι(ρι) ἀριστερῶι, Μιεύτι **Φομσάειος** ὥς (ἐτῶν) μ οὐλή ἀ[ν]τικνημί[ωι] δεξιῶι, πεπρακένοι αὐτῶ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι πατρικὴν εἰairὰν γῆν ἀρούρας τρ[ί]ς ἢ ὅσων ἐὰν ὦσιν ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆν (*P. Kron.* 48, ll. 3–7 [AD 35])²¹

‘Cheos, son of Harmiysis, about twenty-five years old, with a scar on his left thumb, acknowledges to Mieus, son of Phomsais, about forty years old, with a scar on his right shin, that he has sold to him, Mieus, the sacred land that belongs to him, Cheos, by inheritance from his father, three *arourai*, or as many more as there may be.’ [tr. E. M. Husselman]

²⁰ Reconstructed and doubtful forms have been excluded from the statistics.

²¹ Lineage expressions are indicated in bold. Translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

In this very common example, from a first-century contract of sale, the patronymic of both the vendor and the buyer is expressed in the genitive.

As a result of the rearrangement of the Greek case marking system,²² other cases, too, are used to indicate lineage in Greek documentary texts. As we will see, the nominative or zero case marking (indeclinable forms) are by far the most frequently used, but examples in other cases are also attested. So, for example, my database contains a couple of examples of the use of the dative instead of the genitive case,²³ including *Λυσιμάχῳ Δ[ιδυ]μῳι*, ‘to Lysimachos son of Didymos’ (*P. Fam. Tebt.* 6, ll. 10–11 [AD 99]), and *Αύρηλίῳ Σύρῳ Ψάιτι*, ‘to Aurelius Syros son of Psais’ (*P. Kell.* I 45, l. 4 [AD 386]).

2.2. The bare nominative & indeclinable forms

As table 1 shows, there are nearly two hundred examples (4.6%) where the nominative case or indeclinable forms are used instead of the more regular genitive case. The use of the nominative case is slightly more frequent than that of indeclinable forms, with 131 vs. 59 examples. The following example illustrates the use of the nominative case:

(2) Φλ(αύιος) Ἰωάννης **Ἀβραάμιος** κεντυρ(ίων) λεγ(εώνος) Συήνης ἀξειωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς γράματα μὴ εἰδεῖν (*P. Münch.* I 8, ll. 41–42 [ca. AD 540])

Flavius Ioannes, son of Abraamios, centurion of the legion of Syene, having been asked I wrote on her behalf because she is illiterate.

Interestingly, some documents show internal variation, in that both the genitive and the nominative cases are used for the same patronymic. In *P. Lips.* II 130 (AD 16), for example, we find *Μαρσισοῦχος Μαρεψήμιος* (ll. 5–6) and *Μαρσισοῦχος Μαρεψήμις* (l. 27), ‘Marsisouchos son of Marepsemais’; in *P. Mich.* V 258 (AD 32–33) *Παπνεβτόνις Ἀμεν[έ]ως* (ll. 1–2) and *Παπνεβτοῖνις*

²² See, most recently, STOLK, ‘Dative and genitive case interchange’ (cit. n. 16).

²³ Since these instances are rather infrequent, they have not been included in the numerical overview in table 1.

Ἀμενευ[ς] (ll. 17–18), ‘Papnebytnis son of Ameneus’; and in *SB XIV* 12087 (AD 162) Κάνωπος Δωρίων (fr. B, l. 1) and Κάνωπος Δωρίωνος (fr. B, l. 5), ‘Kanopus son of Dorion’. In most cases, such a variation can be related to a change of hand, but not always.

Next to the nominative case, indeclinable forms can also be found, always with Egyptian personal names.²⁴ Examples include *Αὐρηλίω Ἀτρῆ Ἀβόχ*, ‘to Aurelius Hatres son of Aboch’ (*BGU II* 373, l. 5 [AD 298]); *Κηλητοῦ Καῆτ*, ‘of Keletes son of Kaet’ (*P. Sakaon* 49, l. 4 [AD 314]); [*Πτολ*]εμαῖος [*Π*α]ντῆλ, ‘Ptolemaios son of Pantel’ (*P. Cair. Isid.* 82, l. 2 [AD 318]); Ἀμμώνιν Σωούκ, ‘Ammoni(u)s son of Soouk’ (*P. Abinn.* 61, l. 16 [AD 346]); and *Μαρτυρίας Ταχβάρ*, ‘of Martyria daughter of Tachbar’ (*P. Münch.* I 16, l. 16 [5th cent. AD]). Here, too, we find some internal variation, though on a much smaller scale. One can contrast, for example, *Αὐρηλίω Παμοῦρ Ψάιτος Παμοῦρ*, ‘to Aurelius Pamour son of Psais grandson of Pamour’ (*P. Kell.* I 33, ll. 3–4 [AD 369]), with *Αὐρήλιος Πεκῦσις Ψάιτο[ς] Παμούρις*, ‘Aurelius Pekysis son of Psais grandson of Pamour’ (*P. Kell.* I 44, l. 1 [AD 382]).

2.3. πατρός / μητρός *with the genitive*

In quite a few texts (contracts in particular), the bare genitive is accompanied by a genitive form of πατήρ or μήτηρ. As table 1 shows, there are 419 examples of this lineage expression in my corpus, for example (3):

(3) ὁμολογοῦσιν {ἀλλήλοις} Αὐρήλιοι Ζακαῶν Σαβοῦτος **μη(τρός) Θερμουθαρίου** ὥς (ἐτῶν) ξβ οὐλή ἀ[ντι]κνημίῳ δεξιῷ καὶ Ἀμμώνιος Ἀλλίωνος **μη(τρός) Θύνης** ὥς (ἐτῶν) μ οὐλή(ῃ) δακτύλῳ χειρ[ός] ἀριστερ[ᾶ]ς, ἀμρότεροι ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελφίας, ἔχειν παρὰ Φλαυίου Ἀρίωνος ἀπὸ πραιποσίτων διὰ χειρὸς ἀργυρίου σεβαστῶν νομίσ[ματο]ς κεφαλαίου τ[ά]λαντα εὐδομήκοντα ὀκτώ (*P. Sakaon* 65, ll. 1–9 [AD 328])

The Aurelii Sakaon son of Satabous and Thermoutharion, about 62 years old, with a scar on his left shin, and Ammonios son of Alion and Thyne,

²⁴ See further § 3.2.3.

about 40 years old, with a scar on a finger of his left hand, both from the village of Theadelphia, acknowledge that they have received from Flavius Arion, *ex-praepositus*, in cash a sum of seventy-eight talents of silver in imperial coin. [tr. G. M. Parassoglou]

Compared to example (1), we see that the father's name is again expressed in the genitive. In this example, however, mothers' names are also added, through the use of *μητρός* with the genitive. As I will further discuss in § 3.2.1, most examples of this lineage expression contain the form *μητρός*. There is only one example of *πατρός* with the genitive in my corpus, printed here under (4):

(4) [ἐπικελεύ]ει γυνῆι ἰέρεια Σούχου [Τομσάεις **πα**]τρός ἐμνίθου **X[αι]ρή-**
μ[ονος μητ]ρός Ταμεσθασύτμιος λέγο[υσα (CPR XV 4, l. 7 [AD 11])

The wife, priestess of Souchos, Tomsais, daughter of the *emnithes* Chairemon and of Tamesthasytmis, gives consent, saying ...

It seems that in this example, the insertion of *πατρός* provided a parallel to the use of *μητρός*. While there are no other examples of such a parallel in my corpus, one does find phrases of the type *παρὰ Κασ[ίου] ἀ[π]άτορος μ[η(τρός)] Ταοννώφρεως*, 'from Kasios fatherless, son of Taonnophris' (*P. Phil.* 12, ll. 3–4 [AD 150/173]), in case the father is unknown.

In a number of examples, *μητρός* is followed by another case than the genitive.²⁵ Most often, the proper name is in the nominative or remains undeclined: one finds, for example, *Χαίρεις Ἀπολλωνίου μητρός Θενοβέστις*, 'Chaireis son of Apollonios, his mother being Thenobestis' (*P. Mich.* V 250, l. 2 [AD 18]); [*Ο*]ννώφρις Ἀτρήους μητρός Θεναψήμις, 'Onnophris son of Hatres his mother being Thenapsemis' (*P. Mich.* V 294, l. 1 [1st cent. AD]); *Τοθῆς Ἀμμωνίου μητρός Ταλεδιτ*, 'Tothes son of Ammonios his mother being Taledit' (*P. Sarap.* 25, l. 1 [AD 124]); and *Αὐρήλιος Πᾶσις Νειλάμμωνος μητρός Τακέναι*, 'Aurelius Pasis son of Neilammon his mother being Take-nai' (*P. Sakaon* 95, ll. 1–2 [AD 301]).

²⁵ Since these instances are relatively infrequent, they have been included under 'πατρός/μητρός + genitive' in table 1.

2.4. ἐκ with the genitive

In some texts the genitive is additionally accompanied by a preposition to express lineage: ἐκ is the only preposition that is used as such.²⁶ The combination of ἐκ with the genitive is quite rare in my corpus, however: as table 1 shows, there are only 17 examples, most of which come from the Roman period.²⁷

In general, the genitival complement of the preposition is not a proper name: one finds complements such as ἐκ αὐτῆς, ‘from her’, ἐκ αὐτῶν, ‘from them’, ἐκ προφήτου, ‘from a prophet’, ἐκ δούλης, ‘from a slave’, etc. Moreover, in Roman times, the preposition often follows a verb of origin such as εἰμί or γίγνομαι, and is never used in combination with other lineage expressions. As such, it seems that the combination ἐκ with the genitive indicates ‘origin’, rather than lineage strictly speaking. For an illustration, consider the following example:

(5) τὸν δ’ αὐτὸν Ἡρακλείδην πρεσβύτερον ὁμοίως λελογχ(έναι) εἰς τὸ ἐπιβάλλον αὐτῷ μέρος ἐκ τῶν προκειμένων δουλικῶν σώματων δουρικὰ σώματα τρία, οἷς ὀνόματα Ἡρακλῆς ἐξ Ἀγαθοῦτος καὶ Σαράπουσιν σὺν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐσομένοις ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δουλικοῖς ἐγγόνοις καὶ τὸν ταύτης ἔγγονον υἱὸν Εὐφρόσυνον (P. Mich. V 326, ll. 16–18 [AD 48])

And that the said Herakleides the elder has also received, as his share of the aforesaid slaves, three slaves, whose names are Herakles, from Agathous, and Sarapous, with any offspring which may come from her from the present time, and her son Euphrosynos. [tr. E. M. Husselman]

In this short passage, ἐκ with the genitive is used twice. Few would consider ἐξ αὐτῆς, ‘from her’, in the phrase σὺν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐσομένοις ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δουλικοῖς ἐγγόνοις, ‘with any offspring which may come from her’, a true lineage expression. The first instance, however, is debatable: in the phrase ἐξ Ἀγαθοῦτος, ἐκ with the genitive is used with a proper name, and as such does seem to indicate lineage.

²⁶ Cf. also E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II.2: *Satzlehre*, Berlin 1934, p. 386.

²⁷ See further § 3.1. Note that no examples can be found in petitions.

Two more examples with a proper name can be found in the Roman period: in *P. Mich.* V 322a (AD 46), one finds ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς Τετοσίρεως, ‘of the same Tetosiris’ (l. 3). Here the genitival complement is a proper name, but again the pattern follows the verb γίγνομαι (ταῖς γεγονυέαις ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς Τετοσίρεως θυγατράσι Ταμαρήτι καὶ Θαυβάστι, ‘the daughters born of the same Tetosiris, Tamarres and Thaubastis’ [l. 3]). In *P. Oxy.* VI 907 (AD 276), we find τέκνα μου γλυκύτατα [ἐ]κ [τῆς συνούσης μοι - κα. 18 - γυναι]κὸς Αὐρηλίας Ἰσιδώρας, ‘my five dearest children by my ... wife Aurelia Isidora’ (ll. 3–4). Here, there is no verb of origin, but the prepositional group seems to carry the same semantic value, indicating who the children were born from.

Starting from the fifth century AD, a semantic change seems to occur. In the archives of Flavius Taurinos son of Plousammon (5th cent. AD), the soldiers of the *numerus* of the Mauri (6th cent. AD), Flavius Patermouthis son of Menas (6th cent. AD), and Phoibammon son of Triadelphos (6th/7th cent. AD), we find the expression ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γονέων, ‘from the same parents’, when a brother is mentioned whose parents have already been introduced.²⁸ For an illustration, consider example (6):

(6) Αὐρήλιοι Βίκτωρ ἐκ πατρὸς Φοιβάμμωνος μητρ[ρὸς καὶ Κολλοῦθος]
γνήσιος αὐτοῦ ἀδελφὸς ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γονέων, ἀμφοτέροι ποιμένες (*P. Michael.*
45, ll. 2–3 [AD 540])

The Aurelii Victor, son of Phoibammon and —, and Kollouthos his true-born brother, of the same parents, both shepherds. [tr. D. S. Crawford]

In lines 2–3 of this contract of sale, the brothers Aurelius Victor and Aurelius Kollouthos are introduced. A patronymic and metronymic are attached to the name of the first brother, and afterwards it is mentioned that the second brother is ‘of the same parents’. It would seem that in an example such as this, the value of ἐκ with the genitive comes closer to that of a real lineage expression.

²⁸ For similar examples, see *BGU* XII 2156, ll. 3–4 (AD 483); *P. Lond.* III 992, ll. 9–10 (AD 507); *P. Lond.* V 1724, l. 4 (AD 578–582); *SB* XVIII 13320, l. 8 (AD 613–641); etc. On the use of ἐκ μητρὸς with the genitive in inscriptions, compare M. N. TOD, ‘An ephebic inscription from Memphis’, *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 37 (1951), pp. 86–99, at 97.

2.5. *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός with the genitive*

This lineage expression can be considered a combination of *πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive and *ἐκ* with the genitive. As table 1 shows, this pattern is much more commonly attested than *ἐκ* with the genitive, with 102 instances, most of which from the Late Antique period.²⁹ Contrary to *ἐκ* with the genitive, *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive forms a clear lineage expression. It is also not limited to the female form:³⁰ there are quite a few examples with the male form, one of which is (7):

(7) *Αὐρηλίου Σαρμάτη καὶ Διογένι ῥιπαρίοις Ὁξυρυνχίτου παρὰ Αὐρηλίων Δωροθέου καὶ Παπνουθίου ἀμφοτέρων ἐκ πατρὸς Ἀφυνγχίου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως* (P. Oxy. XLVIII 3393, ll. 3–5 [AD 365])

‘To Aurelius Sarmates and Aurelius Diogenes, *riparii* of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Aurelius Dorotheus and Aurelius Papnuthis, both of them sons of Aphynchis, from the same city. [tr. M. Chambers *et alii*]

As in our previous example, two brothers are introduced, Aurelius Dorotheos and Aurelius Papnouthios. In this case, however, the father’s name is attached to both brothers, by means of the lineage expression *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive.

In many cases, we find the male and female form of this lineage expression combined: for example, *π(αρά) [Αὐ]ρηλίου(ν) Ἀνουφ[ί]ο(ν), ἐκ πα[τρὸς] Ἑρμανῶτος, ἐκ μη(τρὸς) Σοφίας*, ‘from Aurelius Anouphios son of Hermauos his mother being Sophia’ (P. Cair. Masp. I 67101, ll. 6–7 [AD 511]); *Αὐρήλιος Ψάις ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωάννου ἐκ μητρός Στεφανοῦτος*, ‘Aurelios Psais son of Ioannes his mother being Stephanous’ (P. Vat. Aphrod. I, l. 5 [AD 598]); and *Αὐρήλιος Ψάις [ἐκ πα]τρὸς Ἰερημίου(ν), ἐκ μητρός Μαρτί[ας]*, ‘Aurelius Psais son of Ieremias his mother being Maria’ (P. Cair. Masp. I 67110, ll. 4–5 [AD 565]).

In line with the case variation which we have observed with some of the lineage expressions discussed above, one finds instances where the

²⁹ As such, only few examples can be found in petitions, a genre which becomes less common in Late Antiquity.

³⁰ See further § 3.2.1.

nominative is used, or a form unmarked for case.³¹ One finds, for example, *Ἀυρήλιος Ἰωάννης ἐκ πατρὸς Ἑρμείου(ς), ἐκ μητρός Παχήλ, 'Aurelius Ioannes son of Hermeios his mother being Rachel' (P. Cair. Masp. I 67104, l. 3 [AD 530]); Ἰουλίου Ἀβρααμίου ἐκ μητρός Ταμινε, 'Ioulios Abraamios son of Tamine' (P. Cair. Masp. II 67170, ll. 10–11 [AD 565?]); and Ἀυρήλ[ιου]ς Μηνᾶς ἐκ [πατρὸς] Ψάτ[ε], 'Aurelios Menas son of Psate' (P. Mich. XIII 666, l. 2 [6th cent. AD]).*

2.6. υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive

With 423 attestations, most of which from the Late Antique period, *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive is one of the most frequently attested lineage expressions in my corpus. Most of the examples contain the male form, *υἱός*, but there are also nearly one hundred examples with the female form *θυγάτηρ*. For an illustration, consider example (8):

(8) [τήνδε τὴν δια]λ[υ]τ[ικὴν ἔγγραφον ὁμολογίαν, δύναμιν ἔχουσιν καὶ ῥεπουδίου, τίθενται καὶ ποιοῦνται πρὸς ἀλλή[λους ἐκόντες] καὶ πεπ[ει]σμένοι, ἐκ μὲν τοῦ ἐνὸς μέρους Φ[λ(ά)βιος] Κ[α]λ[λ]ίνικ[ος] υἱὸς Κολλούθου, νοτάριος τὴν τ[έ]χνην, [ἐκ δὲ] θ[ατέρ]ο(ς) [μέρους] Ἀυρηλία Κύρα θυγάτηρ Μηνᾶ, μητρὸς Μαρίας (P. Cair. Masp. II 67154f, ll. 1–5 [AD 527–565])

This written contract of divorce, having the force of a *repudium*, have put down in writing and made towards each other willingly and fully persuaded, on the one side Flavius Kallinikos son of Kollouthos, notary of occupation, on the other side Aurelia Kyra daughter of Menas, her mother being Mariam.

At the beginning of this contract of divorce, the lineage of both of the two parties is expressed through *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive. For the second party, Aurelia Kyra, the mother's name is added through the use of *μητρός* with the genitive.

³¹ As these instances occur relatively infrequently, they have been included under 'ἐκ πατρὸς/μητρὸς + genitive' in table 1.

Some further variation can be found in this particular lineage expression. First of all, *υἱός* and *θυγάτηρ* can be preceded by the article, mostly when they are accompanied by a (typically honorific) adjective, but not always. So, for example, in *P. Cair. Masp.* III 67169bis (AD 569) Flavius Viktor is addressed as τῷ λαμπρο[τάτῳ καὶ] λ[ο]γιωτάτῳ υἱῷ το(ῦ) λαμπροτάτο(υ) καὶ σ[ο]φωτάτο(υ) σ[χ]ο(λαστικοῦ) Φ[οι]β[άμμ]ωνος τοῦ υἱο(ῦ) τοῦ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς μνήμης Θωμᾶ [[κ[όμ]ετος, ‘to the most magnificent and most notable son of the most magnificent and most wise *scholastikos* Phoibammon son of the *komes* Thomas of magnificent memory’ (ll. 4–6). In this extraordinary identification cluster, the article is used twice with *υἱός*, once with an adjective, and once without.

Another type of variation concerns word order: sometimes we find the inverse word order, with the genitival complement preceding *υἱός* or *θυγάτηρ*, as in *Λουκίου Πομπηίου Λουκίου υἱοῦ*, ‘Lucius Pompeius son of Lucius’ (*P. Fouad.* 44, l. 5 [AD 44]); *ὁ τοῦ Πακύσιο(ς) υἱὸς Πεταῦς*, ‘Petaus son of Pakysis’ (*P. Mich.* IX 558, l. 22 [AD 98–117]); and *Μέγας Ψύρο(υ) υἱ(ός)*, ‘Megas son of Psyros’ (*P. Cair. Masp.* II 67154r, l. 4 [AD 527–565]).

As with most of our previous lineage expressions, case variation can also be found:³² *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* can be followed by the nominative, indeclinable forms, or the dative. One finds, for example, *Αὐ[ρ]ηλ[ί]α Κᾰκο(ῦ(?) θυγάτηρ Ἰακῶβ*, ‘Aurelia Kako daughter of Iakob’ (*P. Lond.* V 1736, l. 23 [AD 611]); *Τιρηνατ υἱὸς Φοιβάμμων*, ‘Tirenat son of Phoibammon’ (*P. Vat. Aphrod.* 4, fr. C, l. 15 [6th cent. AD]); and *Αὐρηλίω Κολλοῦθῳ [υ]ι[ῶ] Χριστωφόρῳ*, ‘to Aurelius Kollouthos son of Christophoros’ (*P. Mich.* XIII 666, ll. 3–4 [6th cent. AD]).

In one case, *τέκνα*, ‘children’, is used instead of *υἱός* or *θυγάτηρ*: *P. Col.* VII 181, ll. 2–3 (AD 342) reads *Αὐρήλιοι Κλήμιτος καὶ Ταπάεις ἀμφοτέρων τέκνα Ἡράτος μητρὸς Ἀλοῦτος*, ‘Aurelii Klemitos and Tapaeis, both children of Heras and Alous’.

³² As such instances occur infrequently, they have been included under ‘*υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive’ in table 1.

2.7. τοῦ/τῆς *with the genitive*

τοῦ/τῆς with the genitive is the second most frequently attested lineage expression³³ in my corpus, with 435 examples, almost all of them from the Roman period. For an illustration, consider example(9):

(9) Ἀ[λε]ξάνδρῳ στρατηγῷ παρὰ Τρύφωνος τοῦ Διονυσίου τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυ-
ρύγχ[χ]ων π[ό]λεως (P. Oxy. II 282, ll. 1-4 [AD 29-37])

To the *strategos* Alexandros from Tryphon son of Dionysios of the city of Oxyrhynchos.

Formally, this lineage expression is ambiguous: in a phrase such as παρὰ Τρύφωνος τοῦ Διονυσίου the article τοῦ might either be taken with Τρύφωνος or with Διονυσίου: so either παρὰ Τρύφωνος τοῦ (υἱοῦ?)/Διονυσίου or παρὰ Τρύφωνος/τοῦ Διονυσίου. Two elements³⁴ strongly suggest that the former interpretation is to be preferred, however.³⁵

First of all, the articles τοῦ/τῆς almost always follow a noun in the genitive case. If τοῦ/τῆς strictly belong to the ancestor's (rather than the actor's) name, there seems to be no reason why this should be so. This is not to say

³³ Cf. A. DEISSMANN, 'Der Artikel vor Personennamen in der spätgriechischen Umgangssprache', *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 22 (1902), pp. 1467-1468, at 1468, who notes that 'sehr häufig ist (...) der Gebrauch des Artikels bei Vater- oder Mutternamen im Genitiv, die einem Personennamen beigelegt sind'. J. H. MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, I: *Prolegomena*, Edinburgh 1908 (3rd ed.), p. 83, even notes that 'when a man's father's or mother's name is appended in the genitive, it normally has the article', which is clearly erroneous.

³⁴ Discourse-pragmatically, too, the former option seems to be preferred, as the article is hardly ever anaphoric (meaning 'the aforesaid') in lineage expressions. On the use of the article with personal names in Greek documentary texts, see, among others, DEISSMANN, 'Der Artikel vor Personennamen' (cit. n. 33); F. VÖLKER, *Syntax der griechischen Papyri*, I: *Der Artikel*, Münster 1903; F. EAKIN, 'The Greek article in first and second century papyri', *American Journal of Philology* 37 (1916), pp. 333-340; C. W. E. MILLER, 'Note on the use of the article before the genitive of the father's name in Greek papyri', *The American Journal of Philology* 37 (1916), pp. 341-348; MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri* (cit. n. 26), pp. 6-9.

³⁵ Compare U. WILCKEN, 'Papyrus-Urkunden', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 2 (1903), pp. 117-147; at 133; EAKIN, 'The Greek article' (cit. n. 34), p. 337; MILLER, 'Note on the use of the article' (cit. n. 34), p. 341.

that there are no exceptions to this general observation: there are quite a few cases in which there is lack of concord. So, for example, one finds *μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ πατρὸς Πετερψενήσις τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου*, ‘with my guardian, my father Petearpsenesis son of Herakleides’ (*P. Mich.* V 272, l. 11 [AD 45–46]), and *Ἀρμιύσις τοῦ Ἀλιμῆτος οἰκία*, ‘the house of Harmiysis son of Alimes’ (*P. Mich.* V 300, l. 7 [1st cent. AD]), where formally *Πετερψενήσις* and *Ἀρμιύσις* are nominative forms. For all intents and purposes, however, such forms were probably considered genitives. In fact, there are also examples where the article accompanies two nominative forms, as in *Πελώεις τοῦ Πατύνης*, ‘Peloeis son of Patynis’ (*P. Mich.* V 282, l. 9 [1st cent. AD]); *Πετεήσις τοῦ Πετεήσις*, ‘Peteesis son of Peteesis’ (*P. Mich.* V 304, l. 6 [AD 42?]); and *Ψοίφισ τοῦ Ὀννώφρις*, ‘Psoiphis son of Onnophris’ (*P. Mich.* V 322a, l. 46 [AD 46]). Only in Late Antiquity do we find two counterexamples to this observation (that is, *τοῦ/τῆς* following a noun in the genitive): *Εὐλόγιος τοῦ Εὐφραντίου ... μαρτυρῶ*, ‘Eulogius son of Euphrantius I testify’ (*P. Dubl.* 32, l. 19 [AD 512]), and *Φλαουίω (?) -ca. ?-] Οὐάλεντι τοῦ Αλοβαίου*, ‘to Flavius Valens son of Alobaios’ (*P. Ness.* III 18, ll. 5–6 [AD 537]). As there are only very few examples of *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive in Late Antiquity,³⁶ it may have been the case that this lineage expression was syntactically re-analyzed in later times.³⁷

A second indication concerns the fact that actors’ names can be accompanied by either *τοῦ* or *τῆς*. In *P. Mich.* V 232 (AD 36), for example, we find the phrase *παρὰ Ταορσείους τῆς Εὐτύχου με[τ]ὰ κυρίου τοῦ συγγενοῦς Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Χαιρήμονος*, ‘from Taorses daughter of Eutychos, with, as guardian, her relative Ptolemaios son of Chairemon’ (ll. 3–4). This strongly suggests that we should interpret as *Ταορσείους τῆς Εὐτύχου* (*θυγατρός*) and *Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Χαιρήμονος* (*υἱοῦ*). There is only one clear counterexample, to be found in *P. Mich.* III 188 (AD 120): *παρὰ τῆς Ταπεκυσίς τοῦ Ὠρον*, ‘from Tapekysis daughter of Horos’ (l. 20).³⁸

³⁶ See further § 3.1.

³⁷ That is, *τοῦ* first being interpreted as belonging to the noun it follows, and in a later stage as belonging to the noun it precedes.

³⁸ WILCKEN, ‘Papyrus-Urkunden’ (cit. n. 35), p. 133, discussing a similar example from *P. Amb.* 98, l. 6, notes that ‘dem bleibt nur übrig anzunehmen, dass entweder Grenfell-Hunt den Namen falsch gelesen, oder der Schreiber ihn falsch geschrieben hat.’

Since the use of *υῖός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive was rather infrequent in the Roman period,³⁹ and these nouns were mostly not accompanied by an article, it seems unlikely that diachronically speaking *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive should be considered an ‘abbreviated’ form of the lineage expression *υῖός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive. In this context, it is interesting to observe that in the living Egyptian language the patronymic *s3*, ‘son of’, was replaced by *pa*, ‘the one of’, with a female counterpart *ta* for *s3.t*, ‘daughter of’.⁴⁰ In the Hellenistic period, scribes sometimes hesitated, and instead of using typically Greek lineage expressions, rendered the lineage by transliterating the Egyptian pronoun *πα*, for example *Παα πα Τοτοη*, ‘Paa son of Totoe’ (*O. Taxes*. II 28 [256 BC]).⁴¹ Examples such as these can still be found in the Roman period, so that the use of *pa/ta* may have had an influence on the use of Greek *τοῦ/τῆς*. At the same time, it must be noted that *τοῦ/τῆς* can also be found outside of Egypt in the Post-classical period (in inscriptions), and is attested in the Ptolemaic and even in the Classical periods,⁴² so that Egyptian at most stimulated an already existing feature of Greek.

Yanne Broux has recently discussed the existence of another lineage expression which seems closely related to *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive, that is *ὁ τοῦ* with the genitive.⁴³ As she observes, the occurrence of this pattern is rather restricted: she finds only 144 examples, almost all of them from the second century AD, mostly from tax rolls. Moreover, only in half of these examples (54%) is *ὁ τοῦ* with the genitive used to indicate line-

³⁹ Cf. §§ 2.6 and 3.1.

⁴⁰ CLARYSSE, ‘Filiation the Egyptian way’ (cit. n. 7).

⁴¹ For further discussion, see B. MUHS, ‘Language contact and personal names in early Ptolemaic Egypt’, [in:] T. V. EVANS & D. D. OBBINK (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010, pp. 187–197.

⁴² MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri* (cit. n. 26), pp. 7–8, notes that both the bare genitive and *τοῦ* with the genitive are frequently attested for patronymics in Ptolemaic texts. He furthermore notes that the former is typically chosen ‘in der Breviloquenz’ (compare VÖLKER, *Syntax der griechischen Papyri* [cit. n. 34], p. 9). B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes II*, New York 1911, p. 266, has some examples from Classical Greek.

⁴³ BROUX, ‘O τοῦ’ (cit. n. 10). As she notes, the female form *ἡ τῆς* is unattested, but *ἡ τοῦ* can be found.

age. There are no instances of this expression in my corpus, which focuses on petitions and contracts.

2.8. υἱός μητρός *with the genitive*

The last lineage expression which I consider here is not explicitly mentioned in the statistics, because the attestations are extremely uncommon in comparison with the other lineage expressions and somewhat doubtful. This lineage expression could be considered a blend between two patterns which I have discussed under §§ 2.3 and 2.6: πατρός/μητρός with the genitive and υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive. That a blend of this type should have formed at such an early date is remarkable, since υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive became common only in the Late Antique period.

Four potential examples can be found in the archive of Apollonios the *strategos*, in so-called κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφαί, containing lists of tenants. For an illustration, consider example (10):

(10) Ἀρτβῶς υἱὸς μητρὸς(ς) Ταπεή[ιτος (ἐτῶν) .]
 Παχοῦμις ἀδελ(φός) μη(τρὸς) τῆς α(ὐτῆς) [Ταπε]ήιτος τῆς Παχοψαίτο(ς)
 (ἐτῶν)[.]
 Βῆκις ἀδελφὸς μητ[ρὸς] τῆς α(ὐτῆς) (ἐτῶν) β
 Ταπεήις Π[α]χοψαίτο(ς) γυ(νή) Ἀρτ[β]ῶ(τος) (ἐτῶν) .]
 Σενορσενού(φίς) θυγ(άτηρ) (ἐτῶν) κ
 Σενοσίρις ἀδελφῆι (ἐτῶν) ις
 Σενρῶφίς Ὀρσενούφιο(ς) γυ(νή) Ἀρτβ(ῶτος) (ἐτῶν) κ
 (*P. Alex. Giss.* 17, ll. 14–22 [AD 118/19])

Hartbos son of Tapeeis aged ...

Pachoumis, brother, son of the same Tapeeis daughter of Pachopsais aged ...

Bekis, brother, son of the same aged 2

Tapeeis daughter of Pachopsais wife of Hartbos aged ...

Senorsenouphis, daughter, aged 20

Senosiris, sister, aged 16

Senrophis daughter of Orsenouphis wife of Hartbôs aged 20.

A certain Hartbos lists the family that lives with him: his three sons, Hartbos, Pachoumis, and Bekis, his wife Tapeeis, his daughters Senorsenouphis

and Senosiris, and his daughter-in-law Senrophis (the wife of his eldest son who is also called Hartbos). It is doubtful whether *υἱός μητρό(ς)*, which is only used for the oldest son, Hartbos, really forms a fixed combination: parallel with *θυγάτηρ* in line 20, *υἱός* might stand on its own, simply meaning ‘(eldest) son’.

Two more examples from a later date can be found where such an ambiguity does not exist, but where the reading itself is doubtful. The first occurs in a fifth-century contract of lease, *P. Mich.* XV 731 (AD 499), where the addressor introduces himself as *Αὐρήλιος Ἀνοῦπ υἱὸς [ς μ]ητρὸς Ἀν. [κυ]μνοπώλης*, ‘Aurelius Anoup son of An. cumin seller’ (ll. 4–5): there is a substantial lacuna after *υἱός* in this text, which is big enough to house the name of the father, and is definitely too big to be filled with only two letters (as suggested by the edition on papyri.info).⁴⁴ The second, fragmentary example can be found in *P. Oxy.* XXIV 2420 (AD 611), a contract of surety, where we read *διὰ Ρουφ[-ca.?- υἱοῦ μητρὸς -ca.?-]*, ‘through Routh... (?) son of ...’: in this case, the use of *υἱὸς μητρὸς* is completely reconstructed, seemingly without any good ground.

3. PARAMETERS OF VARIATION

Having outlined the different lineage expressions which can be found in my corpus, I will now discuss a number of parameters of variation which seem to influence the choice for specific lineage expressions. For this purpose, I distinguish between three major types of parameters, that is (i) diachronic factors, (ii) social factors, and (iii) text-internal factors.

3.1. *Diachronic factors*

For an overview of the diachronic distribution of the various lineage expressions, consider table 2.

⁴⁴ P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Michigan papyri (P. Mich. XV)*, Zutphen 1982, pp. 88–89, renders the name as ‘Aurelius Anup, son of N.N. and N.N.’, thus suggesting this type of interpretation.

Table 2. Distribution of lineage expressions according to century⁴⁵

	<i>1st cent. BC</i>	<i>1st cent. AD</i>	<i>2nd cent. AD</i>	<i>3rd cent. AD</i>	<i>4th cent. AD</i>	<i>5th cent. AD</i>	<i>6th cent. AD</i>	<i>7th cent. AD</i>	<i>8th cent. AD</i>
Bare genitive	7	712	483	193	319	113	622	71	2
Bare nominative/ indeclinable forms	6	83	9	6	15	4	59	8	0
<i>πατρός/μητρός</i> + gen.	7	155	26	54	54	27	83	13	0
<i>ἐκ</i> + gen.	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	0
<i>ἐκ πατρός/μητρός</i> + gen.	0	0	0	2	3	1	91	5	0
<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	0	4	21	15	32	31	269	50	1
<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	3	259	155	7	0	1	8	2	0
Total	23	1,214	694	277	424	179	1,135	150	3

⁴⁵ Most of the texts in my corpus have a precise date. For texts with a broader date, the average of the two dates has been taken (so, for example, a dating between AD 420 and 570 would be added up as AD 495 = fifth century AD).

Evidently, the distribution of these numbers is heavily influenced by the number of texts available for each period, which we know varied considerably.⁴⁶ Even so, table 2 reveals a number of important diachronic tendencies. First of all, we see that the use of the bare genitive as well as that of *πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive remained more or less constant over time. The periods in which these patterns are best attested, the first and the sixth centuries AD, are also the periods in which the bare nominative and indeclinable forms are best attested. Second, we see that the use of *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive was almost entirely limited to the first and second centuries AD. Instances continue to be found up until the seventh century AD,⁴⁷ but much less frequently than before. Third, we see that the use of *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive was roughly limited to the sixth century AD: the earliest examples can be found in the third century AD,⁴⁸ but the pattern shows a (sudden) rise in frequency only in the sixth century. The same is true for *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive, although this lineage expression is attested more frequently already in Roman times, and continues to be frequently used in the seventh century AD.

These observations can be linked to the language change that was in progress during the Post-classical period, in particular when it comes to the use of the cases: as case marking started to wane in Post-classical Greek, the particular case forms had to be reinforced by means of prepositions.⁴⁹ It thus comes as no surprise that more heavily marked forms such as *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive and *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive become more frequent in later times. The data can furthermore

⁴⁶ Cf. R. RÉMONDON, 'L'Égypte au 5^e siècle de notre ère: les sources papyrologiques et leurs problèmes', [in:] *PapCongr.* XI, pp. 135–148; R. S. BAGNALL & K. A. Worp, 'Papyrus documentation in Egypt from Constantine to Justinian' [in:] R. PINTAUDI (ed.), *Miscellanea papyrologica*, Florence 1980, pp. 17–23; W. HABERMANN, 'Zur chronologischen Verteilung der papyrologischen Zeugnisse', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 122 (1998), pp. 144–160.

⁴⁷ See, e.g., *P. Ness.* III 46, l. 2 (AD 605); *P. Ness.* III 57, ll. 3 & 5 (AD 689).

⁴⁸ See, e.g., *P. Flor.* I 47a, ll. 2–3 (AD 217); *P. Flor.* I 47b, ll. 23–24 (AD 217); *P. Cair. Isid.* 104, l. 4 (AD 296).

⁴⁹ See, e.g., P. BORTONE, *Greek Prepositions: From Antiquity to the Present*, Oxford 2010, pp. 171–194.

be interpreted in terms of a ‘markedness shift’, that is, ‘a historical process through which an originally marked item loses its marked character (gets ‘demarked’), and thus makes room for the creation of a new marked form’.⁵⁰ To be more specific, *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive can be considered to have functioned as the ‘marked form’ with respect to the bare genitive (used in particular circumstances, as we will see in § 3.3.1), which was in its turn replaced by even more marked forms such as *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive and *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive.

3.2. Social factors

3.2.1. Gender

The first social factor which I want to consider here is gender, that is, to what extent lineage expressions were used for male vs. female ancestors. Consider the data in table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of lineage expressions according to gender

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male (perc.)</i>	<i>Female (perc.)</i>
Bare genitive	2,520	2	99.9%	0.1%
Bare nominative/ indeclinable forms	190	0	100%	0%
<i>πατρός/μητρός</i> + gen.	1	418	0.2%	99.8%
<i>ἐκ</i> + gen.	1	7	12.5%	87.5%
<i>ἐκ πατρός/μητρός</i> + gen.	41	61	40.2%	59.8%
<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	419	4	99.1%	0.9%
<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	435	0	100%	0%
Total	3,607	497	87.9%	12.1%

⁵⁰ S. C. DIK, *The Structure of the Clause* [= *Functional Grammar Series* 20; *The Theory of Functional Grammar* 1], Berlin 1997, p. 45.

Since the use of matronymics was uncommon,⁵¹ it is not unexpected to find that only in 12% of the examples, reference is made to a female ancestor. When we look at the data in table 3, however, we see that there are clear differences in terms of male vs. female usage. Perhaps the most striking observation that can be made is that the bare genitive was almost never used for reference to female ancestors:⁵² in my entire corpus, the only text in which this occurs is *P. Cair. Masp.* I 67112 (6th cent. AD), a contract of lease between Aurelius Phoibammon son of Viktor and Apa Apollos son of Dioskoros. In this document, Aurelius Phoibammon is referred to twice with *Ἀυρήλιος Φοιβάμμων Βίκτορος Ταγάπης* (ll. 3–4 and 23). Unless *Ταγάπης* is the nominative form of a male personal name, we are dealing here with a matronymic introduced by means of the bare genitive.

The lineage expression *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive is also exclusively used for male ancestors, as is bare nominative/zero case marking. The same is true for *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive, though to a lesser extent: there are some examples of this expression being used for maternal ancestors.⁵³ Other lineage expressions are used more commonly for female ancestors: this is particularly true for *πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive, which formed the equivalent of the bare genitive for female ancestors, with 99.8% of the references being made to females. As mentioned in § 2.3, there is only one example with a male ancestor. The lineage expression *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive, which seems to be closely related to *πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive, is also often used for female ancestors, but less so: only in 59.8% of the cases is this so. *ἐκ* with the genitive is also mostly used for female ancestors, or when reference is made to both the mother and father (cf. § 2.4).

⁵¹ On the rise of matronymics in the Roman period, see M. DEPAUW, 'Do mothers matter? The emergence of metronymics in Early Roman Egypt', [in:] T. V. EVANS & D. D. OBBINK (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010, pp. 120–139; and Yanne BROUX & M. DEPAUW, 'The maternal line in Greek identification. Signalling social status in Roman Egypt (30 BC – AD 400)', *Historia* 64 (2015), pp. 467–478.

⁵² Compare MILLER, 'Note on the use of the article' (cit. n. 34), p. 346: 'the name of the mother does not by itself accompany the name of the son or daughter.'

⁵³ See, e.g., *Chr. Mitt.* 316, l. 17 (AD 189/194); *P. Grenf.* II 69, l. 7 (AD 265); *P. Lond.* V 1724, l. 69 (AD 578–582).

3.2.2. Social status

In his 1980 article, Dieter Hagedorn argued that the use of *υῖος*/*θυγάτηρ* with the genitive in Roman documentary texts carried social value. Observing the co-occurrence of this lineage expression with references to municipal offices, he formulated the following rule:

Wenn in Urkunden römischer Zeit bei der Personenbeschreibung die Filiation mit Hilfe des Wortes *υῖος* (bzw. *θυγάτηρ*, s. weiter unten) angegeben wird, dann bedeutet dass: Der Vater des (oder der) Betreffenden hatte eine angesehene soziale Stellung inne, in der Regel, weil er ein munizipales oder sonstiges Amt bekleidete oder bekleidet hatte.⁵⁴

Table 4 shows the co-occurrence of the lineage expression *υῖος*/*θυγάτηρ* with the genitive with references to municipal offices in my corpus, focusing on the Roman period.

Table 4. Distribution of *υῖος*/*θυγάτηρ* with the genitive for officials (Roman period)

	<i>Title explicitly mentioned</i>	<i>No title mentioned</i>	<i>Lacuna</i>
<i>υῖος</i>	23	20	5
<i>θυγάτηρ</i>	4	5	1
Total	27	25	6

The table shows that there is, indeed, a significant co-occurrence between this particular lineage expression and references to municipal offices: in about half of the examples, such a co-occurrence can be observed. At the same time, however, I do not believe such a co-occurrence should be formulated in terms of a ‘rule’.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ HAGEDORN, ‘Zur Verwendung von *υῖος* und *θυγάτηρ*’ (cit. n. 7), p. 278.

⁵⁵ As J. N. ADAMS, *Social Variation and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 21–22, notes for Latin, departures from what is expected are common in (historical) sociolinguistic studies, so one can almost never formulate ‘rules’. What matters is frequency of usage,

As I already mentioned in § 3.1, the use of *υἱός* / *θυγάτηρ* with the genitive is rather infrequent in the Roman period. Only in certain archives, such as that of Patron's descendants and Pakebkis' descendants, where certain names are frequently repeated⁵⁶ does Hagedorn's rule work. In several other cases, it seems doubtful whether the individuals involved had an elevated social position: for example in *Cbr. Mitt.* 191 (AD 287), *υἱός* is used for Tmarsis, the father of Petechon the gravedigger. Similarly, in *P. Cair. Isid.* 66 (AD 299), Aurelius Isidoros reports to the *eparchos* that three individuals, Acotas son of Germanos (*Ἀκοτᾶν υἱὸν Γερμαν[οῦ]*), Chairemon son of Ptolemaios (*Χαι[ρ]ήμον[α υἱὸν Πτολ[εμα]ίου*), and Heron son of Mouranos (*Ἡρωνᾶ υἱὸν [Μουραν(οῦ)]*), had set his grain on fire. Aurelius Isidoros notes that it was the village officials Sotas and Leonides who provided him with these names.

There is another piece of evidence, however, which suggests that the use of *υἱός* or *θυγάτηρ* with the genitive signaled a high(er) social status: in Late Antiquity, *υἱός* or *θυγάτηρ* are quite often combined with honorific *epitheta*.⁵⁷ Consider table 5 below.

As this table shows, the use of honorific *epitheta* with *θυγάτηρ* and especially *υἱός* was quite common, whereas it is very infrequent with other lineage expressions. The first instances of this phenomenon can be found in the fifth century: in the archive of Flavius Taurinos son of Plousammon, for example, we find addresses such as *Ἀνρηλ[ί]α Κύρα τῇ ἐνγενεστάτῃ θυγατρὶ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνή[μ]ης Ἀβρααμίου*, 'to Aurelia Kyra the most noble daughter of Abraamios of blessed memory' (*BGU XII 2149*, l. 4 [AD 470]), and *[Φλαυίω Ἰ]ωάννῃ αἰδεσίμῳ σκρινιاریῳ τῆς κατὰ Θηβαίδα στρατιωτικῆς τάξεως υἱῷ [τοῦ τῆς ἀρίσ]της μνήμης Ταυρίνου*, 'to Flavius Ioannes the well-respected *scrinarius* of the military office son of Taurinos of most excellent memory' (*BGU XII 2155*, ll. 2–3 [*ca.* AD 481]). Although it

not individual occurrences. Also note that Hagedorn's rule does not seem to allow for reference to female ancestors (cf. § 3.2.1).

⁵⁶ So, for example, *Πτολλαρίωνι υἱῷ Πτολλαρίωνος γεγυμνασιαρχηκότος* (e.g. *P. Mil. Vogl.* III 130, l. 1 [AD 165]).

⁵⁷ Very few references to municipal offices can be found: for one example, see *P. Flor.* III 281, ll. 4–5 (AD 517).

Table 5. Distribution of *υἱός*/*θυγάτηρ* with the genitive with *epitheta* (Late Antiquity)

	<i>υἱός</i>	<i>θυγάτηρ</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>ἀρίστης μνήμης</i>	13	1	14	15,9%
<i>ἐνδόξου μνήμης</i>	1	4	5	5,7%
<i>ἐνδοξωτάτης μνήμης</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>εὐλαβοῦς μνήμης</i>	5	1	6	6,8%
<i>λαμπρᾶς μνήμης</i>	5	0	6	6,8%
<i>μακαρίας μνήμης</i>	21	3	24	27,3%
<i>μακαρίας καὶ λαμπροτάτης μνήμης</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>μακαρίας καὶ περιβλέπτου μνήμης</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>μεγαλοπρεποῦς μνήμης</i>	2	0	2	2,3%
<i>πανευφύμου μνήμης</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>λαμπρότατος καὶ σοφώτατος</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>λαμπρότατος καὶ περίβλεπτος</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>μακάριος</i>	13	1	14	15,9%
<i>μακαρίτης</i>	4	0	4	4,5%
<i>μακαριώτατος</i>	4	0	4	4,5%
<i>μεγαλοπρεπέστατος καὶ ἐνδοξότατος</i>	0	1	1	1,1%
<i>πανεύφημος καὶ ὑπερφυέστατος</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
<i>ὑπερφυέστατος</i>	1	0	1	1,1%
Total	76	11	88	

could be argued that *epitheta* such as μακαρίας μνήμης, μακάριος, and μακαρίτης simply refer to the father being dead,⁵⁸ most of the *epitheta* in table 5 clearly carry a tone of elevated social status.⁵⁹ Moreover, as the two examples from the archive of Flavius Taurinos son of Plousammon show, very often such *epitheta* were added to the names of the addressees, too.

Since out of a total of 353 instances of υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive, 88 carry a honorific epithet,⁶⁰ or in other words about one out of four instances, we can assume that there was an association between this lineage expression and elevated social status, in continuation of Hagedorn's observations for the Roman period. The discourse use of υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive suggests that there may also have been a connection with formality:⁶¹ it is very frequently used in the address of contracts and petitions, much less so in less central sections such as the list of witnesses⁶² or the indication of neighbouring plots in contracts of sale. Similarly, we see that in a number of texts, υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive is used in the address, and later on dropped. For example in *P. Cair. Masp.* II 67151 (AD 545/6), the person making known his will is first introduced as Φλάβιος Φοιβάμμων, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Εὐπρεπίου τοῦ ἀπογενομένου ἀρχιατροῦ, 'Flavius Phoibammon son of Euprepeios of blessed memory who had become chief physician' (ll. 5–6). A couple of lines later, this is simplified to ἐγὼ τοιγαροῦν ὁ προονομασθεὶς Φοιβάμμων Εὐπρεπίου, 'I now the aforementioned Phoibammon son of Euprepeios' (ll. 20–21), using the bare genitive for the patronymic instead of υἱός with the genitive.⁶³

⁵⁸ See, e.g., PREISIGKE, *WB*, s.v. μακάριος.

⁵⁹ Some of these *epitheta* were typically adopted for (high) officials, such as λαμπρότατος, πανεύφημος, and ὑπερφύστατος. For further discussion, see O. HORNICKE, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden: ein Beitrag zum römischen und byzantinischen Titelwesen*, Giessen 1930.

⁶⁰ Counting from the fifth century onwards, that is.

⁶¹ As mentioned in the beginning of this article, the use of patronymics in general was associated with formality.

⁶² For some exceptions, see, e.g., *P. Dubl.* 32 (AD 512); *P. Cair. Masp.* II 67126 (AD 541); *P. Cair. Masp.* II 67153 (AD 568).

⁶³ Compare the names at the beginning and end of *P. Cair. Masp.* I 67001 (AD 514) and *P. Lond.* V 1711 (AD 566–573).

While it could be argued that the use of *υῖός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive indicated elevated social status in Late Antiquity, again we should not turn this in a ‘rule’. In Late Antiquity, too, we find examples of the use of this lineage expression for persons who are clearly of lower social status: so, for example, *Αὐρήλιος Σερεῆνος [μυλοκόπος τὴν τέ]χνην υῖος Ἡλίου* [υ, ‘Aurelius Serenos millstone cutter son of Elias’ (*P. Oxy.* LI 364I, ll. 5–6 [AD 544]); and *Αὐρήλιος Ἀλλάμωνος ὁ καὶ Εἰώτ υῖος Πρεπόσιτος χαλκεὺς*, ‘Aurelius Allamonos also called Eiot son of Praepositos smith’ (*P. Rein.* II 107, ll. 2–3 [6th cent. AD]). Moreover, it was also not consistently used: for example, in *SB VI* 9085 inv. 16048 (AD 565), the landowner Aurelia Aphthonia is addressed as *Αὐρηλία Ἀφθονία τῇ εὐγενεστάτῃ θυγατρὶ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Ὑψίστου*, ‘Aurelia Aphthonia the most well-born daughter of Hypsistos of blessed memory’ (l. 3), whereas in *SB VI* 9085 inv. 16050 she occurs as *Αὐρηλία Ἀφθονία Ὑψίστου τῇ εὐγενεστάτῃ*, ‘Aurelia Aphthonia daughter of Hypsistos, the most well-born’ (l. 4).

3.2.3. Cross-cultural communication and language contact

As previous studies such as those by Yanne Broux and Sandra Coussement have shown,⁶⁴ ethnicity can play an important role when it comes to naming practices. As for lineage expressions, ethnicity seems to be particularly relevant for one type of pattern, namely the use of the bare nominative and indeclinable forms. As I mentioned in § 2.2, zero case marking always occurs with Egyptian names, such as *Ἀβὸχ* (*BGU* II 373, l. 5 [AD 298]), *Σωούκ* (*P. Abinn.* 61, l. 16 [AD 346]), *Π[α]ντῆλ* (*P. Cair. Isid.* 82, l. 2 [AD 318]), *Πλοκ* (*P. Cair. Masp.* I 67001, l. 7 [AD 514]), *Κελώλ* (*P. Lond.* V 1724, l. 36 [AD 578–582]), etc. The same is true for the nominative case, which is to a large extent used for Egyptian names with a Greek ending in *-ις*,⁶⁵ such as

⁶⁴ BROUX, *Double Names* (cit. n. 6); COUSSEMENT, ‘Because I Am Greek’ (cit. n. 6).

⁶⁵ On the Hellenization of Egyptian names, see, e.g. Maria VIERROS, *Bilingual Notaries in Hellenistic Egypt. A Study of Greek as a Second Language* [= *Collectanea Hellenistica* 5], Brussels 2012, pp. 167–173.

Μαρεψήμις (*P. Lips.* II 130, l. 27 [AD 16]), *Ἀρμιύσις* (*P. Kron.* 48, l. 28 [AD 35]), *Πετοῦφις* (*P. Gen.* I.2 12, l. 29 [AD 384]), *Καλεο(υ)ακίς* (*P. Cair. Masp.* I 67001, l. 8 [AD 514]), etc.⁶⁶

Interestingly, however, the use of the bare nominative for lineage expressions with Greek names is not completely unattested. So, for example, we find this use with names such as *Ἡλίας* (*SB XX* 14379, l. 15 [AD 320]), *Βίκτωρ* (*P. Lond.* V 1727, l. 71 [AD 583–584]), *Νικῶν* (*P. Lond.* III 992, l. 8 [AD 507]), *Θωμάς* (*P. Michael.* 40, l. 73 [6th cent. AD]), *Ἰωάννης* (*P. Lond.* V 1723, l. 27 [AD 577]), *Κόλουθος* (*P. Lond.* V 1727, l. 72 [AD 583–584]), *Ἀβραάμιος* (*P. Münch.* I 8, l. 41 [ca. AD 540]), *Ἀρσύνιος* (*SB I* 4503, l. 6 [AD 606]), *Γε[ώ]ργιος* (*P. Ness.* III 56, l. 18 [AD 687]), *Πραιπόσιτος* (*P. Münch.* I 11, l. 79 [AD 586]), etc. As the reviewer suggests, one could think of this usage in terms of cross-cultural communication and language contact, a practice which was common for Egyptian names being extended to Greek names. It is noticeable, in any case, that the use of the nominative with Greek names only first appears in the fourth century AD with names ending in *-ας*, *-ωρ*, *-ων*, *-ης*, and starting from the sixth century extends to names in *-ος*. There seem to be additional (text-internal) reasons motivating the use of the nominative pattern, however, which will be further discussed under § 3.3.2.

To conclude this section, it is interesting to note that the use of the nominative and indeclinable forms is almost never attested in petitions: only nine examples come from them.⁶⁷ This may be related to the fact that petitions are addressed to higher-level (Greek) officials, which may have stimulated the writers to pay extra attention to the sort of language they used. Since contracts, too, were meant to be preserved, they were written in more formal language, but clearly with a different purpose than petitions.

⁶⁶ As VIERROS, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 65), p. 170, notes, there may have been confusion between the endings *-ις* and *-ιος* of personal names ending in *-ις* in the nominative.

⁶⁷ See, e.g., *P. Ryl.* II 124, l. 14 (1st cent. AD); *P. Sakaon.* 37, ll. 2 & 8 (AD 284); *P. Mert.* II 92, l. 7 (AD 324).

3.3. *Text-internal factors*

In this final section, I want to have a closer look at two different text-internal factors: (i) the occurrence of lineage expressions in more elaborate identification clusters, and (ii) so-called ‘structural priming’.

3.3.1. More elaborate identification clusters

Many texts in the corpus contain quite elaborate identification clusters, referring not only to the actor’s father (the patronymic) and mother (the matronymic), but also to his/her grandfather (the papponymic).⁶⁸ In this section, I want to analyze to what extent different lineage expressions were used to distinguish these different types of ancestors, as a sort of ‘ambiguity avoidance’, in order to make clear to the reader of the text that one is dealing with different ancestors.⁶⁹ Table 6 below shows the use of lineage expressions in identification clusters containing both a patronymic and papponymic.⁷⁰

The table shows, first of all, that the use of both the patronymic and the papponymic was especially common in the Roman period, to which 73% of the examples are dated. It furthermore shows that the use of the same lineage expression for the patronymic and papponymic was, to a large extent, avoided (this is the case in only 21% of the examples): most commonly attested is the use of the genitive for both the patronymic and the papponymic.⁷¹ Less common is the double use of $\tau\omicron\upsilon/\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma$ with

⁶⁸ Sometimes even to the great-grandfather (what one could call an ‘epi-papponymic’).

⁶⁹ Compare TOD, ‘An ephebic inscription’ (cit. n. 28), p. 97, who notes that ‘occasionally, for the sake of clarity, $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ or $\theta\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$ (...) is inserted’. See also EAKIN, ‘The Greek article’ (cit. n. 34), pp. 337–338.

⁷⁰ For a similar approach (though on a much smaller scale, and without numerical information), see EAKIN, ‘The Greek article’ (cit. n. 34), p. 337.

⁷¹ See, e.g., *P. Mich.* V 300, l. 1 (1st cent. AD); *P. Mich.* V 313, l. 3 (AD 37); *P. Vind. Tand.* 25, l. 11 (AD 51); *P. Alex. Giss.* 15, ll. 4 & 24 (AD 117/18); *P. Kron.* 11, l. 3 (AD 121).

Table 6. Distribution of patronymics and papponymics⁷²

<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Papponymic</i>	<i>1st–3rd cent. AD</i>	<i>4th–8th cent. AD</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Perc.</i>
gen.	gen.	12	9	21	12.4%
gen.	indeclinable form	0	15	15	8.8%
gen.	nominative	7	4	11	6.5%
gen.	<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	89	7	96	56.5%
gen.	<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	0	1	1	0.6%
indeclinable	<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	1	0	1	0.6%
ἐκ πατρός/μητρός + gen.	indeclinable form	0	1	1	0.6%
<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	gen.	2	1	3	1.8%
<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	<i>τοῦ/τῆς</i> + gen.	14	0	14	8.2%
<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	<i>τοῦ</i> + gen.	0	1	1	0.6%
<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	gen.	0	5	5	2.9%
<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	<i>υἱός/θυγάτηρ</i> + gen.	0	1	1	0.6%
Total		125	45	170	

the genitive,⁷³ and even less frequent that of *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive.⁷⁴

The table shows that in the Roman period the most common sequence consisted of the bare genitive for the patronymic followed by *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive for the papponymic (82% of the cases).⁷⁵ This

⁷² Combinations of identical lineage expressions are indicated in bold in this table.

⁷³ See, e.g., *P. Mich.* V 351, ll. 7–8 (AD 44); *P. Fam. Tebt.* 20, ll. 10 & 11 (AD 120–121); *P. Mich.* III 189, ll. 17 & 30 (AD 123); *P. Kron.* 34, l. 2 (AD 134).

⁷⁴ See, e.g., *P. Cair. Masp.* III 67309, ll. 5–9 (AD 569).

⁷⁵ Compare MILLER, ‘Note on the use of the article’ (cit. n. 34), p. 347: ‘the omission of the article before the genitive of the name of the grandfather is comparatively rare, the

pattern was chosen even if there was some ground for ambiguity, for example when the names of the actor, father, and grandfather are identical, as in *παρὰ Ὁρου Ὁρ[ο]υ τοῦ Ὁρου*, ‘from Horos son of Horos son of Horos’ (*P. Mich.* III 184, l. 2 [AD 121]); *Παχόις Παχόιτος τοῦ Παχόιτος*, ‘Pachois son of Pachois son of Pachois’ (*P. Berl. Leihg.* I 22, ll. 8–9 [AD 155]); *Στοτοῆτις Στοτοῆτεω[ς] τοῦ Στοτ[ο]οῆτεως*, ‘Stotoetis son of Stotoetis son of Stotoetis’ (*Stud. Pal.* XXII 43, ll. 4–5 [AD 151]). In the Late Antique period, the picture is more diversified: as we have seen in § 3.1, the use of *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive became far less common after the second century AD. In my corpus, it is only used in seven cases to diversify between the patronymic and the papponymic (13% of the cases). Most common in this period is the use of the genitive followed by a nominative or an indeclinable form. Two patterns which become more frequently used in Late Antiquity, *νίος/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive and *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive are also used to distinguish between patronymics and papponymics: while the latter is only used for patronymics, *νίος/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive can be used both for patronymics and papponymics, mostly in combination with the bare genitive.

It is noticeable that whereas some people are consistently referred to by means of the same identification cluster, this is certainly not always the case. For example, in the archive of Kronion son of Cheos,⁷⁶ three of the actors, the siblings Harpaesis, Kronion, and Taorsenouphis, are consistently referred to with *Κρονίωνος τοῦ Χεῶτος*, ‘son/daughter of Kronion grandson/granddaughter of Cheos’.⁷⁷ For two of the siblings, however, Harpaesis and Kronion, one also finds the expression *τοῦ Κρονίωνος τοῦ Χεῶτος*.⁷⁸ Perhaps such differences can be related to scribal preferences, but this is in need of further investigation.

desire for clearness in the more complex combination outweighing the tendency to extreme brevity’.

⁷⁶ For further information on this archive, see <<http://www.trismegistos.org/arch/archives/pdf/125.pdf>>.

⁷⁷ See, e.g., *P. Kron.* 13, ll. 11–29 (AD 136/7); *P. Kron.* 16, ll. 3–4 (AD 138); *P. Kron.* 17, ll. 6–7 (AD 140).

⁷⁸ See, e.g., *P. Kron.* 34, l. 2 (AD 134); *P. Kron.* 6, ll. 3–4 (AD 144); *P. Kron.* 45, ll. 2–3 (AD 150/1).

To conclude this section, it may be clear that there is a close connection between textual and social factors:⁷⁹ perhaps one could argue that this section should have been included under the social factors, with $\tau\omicron\upsilon/\tau\eta\varsigma$ with the genitive serving as a dedicated lineage expression for papponymics. To my mind, this would be drawing a distorted picture: on the one hand, there are 435 examples of $\tau\omicron\upsilon/\tau\eta\varsigma$ with the genitive in my corpus, which means that the pattern is used only in one out of four examples for a papponymic. This hardly qualifies as a dedicated lineage expression. Second, we see that many other lineage expressions are used for the same purpose in more elaborate identification clusters, that is, to diversify between the patronymic and the papponymic. In general, however, such alternative expressions occur far less frequently, so that these, too, cannot be considered dedicated expressions.

3.3.2. Structural priming

The second text-internal factor which I want to consider here concerns ‘structural priming’. The concept of structural priming starts from the observation that people tend to repeat themselves, and say or write what they have just said or written.⁸⁰ Specifically with regard to lineage expressions, one could hypothesize that people may use the nominative or zero case marking (indeclinable forms) for ancestors’ names because actors’ names, too, are expressed in the nominative or with zero case marking. Table 7 shows the distribution of these different case patterns.

⁷⁹ On this close connection, compare e.g. E. FINEGAN & D. BIBER, ‘Register variation and social dialect variation: the register axiom’, [in:] Penelope ECKERT & J. R. RICKFORD (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge 2001, pp. 235–267, at 261: ‘we remain convinced that (...) linguistic constraints will eventually prove to have communicative underpinnings in many cases.’

⁸⁰ For a general definition, see, e.g., V.S. FERREIRA & Kathryn BOCK, ‘The functions of structural priming’, *Language and Cognitive Processes* 21 (2006), pp. 1011–1029, at 1012: ‘structural priming refers to speakers’ tendency to use current utterances that are similar in general form to sentences they have previously experienced’.

Table 7. Distribution of nominative/indeclinable forms

	<i>After nominative case/ indeclinable forms</i>		<i>After different case</i>	
	<i>1st–3rd cent. AD</i>	<i>4th–8th cent. AD</i>	<i>1st–3rd cent. AD</i>	<i>4th–8th cent. AD</i>
Nominative	69 (53.5%)	30 (23.3%)	23 (17.8%)	7 (5.4%)
Indeclinable forms	9 (14.5%)	17 (27.4%)	3 (4.8%)	33 (53.2%)

This table suggests that structural priming indeed has a significant effect on the use of the nominative case: when the ancestor's name follows an actor's name in the nominative, it will much more often be expressed in the nominative, too. This typically occurs when the actor introduces himself in the nominative at the beginning of the text, but the phenomenon can also be found in other contexts, for example in formulaic phrases such as ἔγραψεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν Μαρσιήμ[ι]ς Μαρσιήμης διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς γράμματα, 'Marepsemis, son of Marepsemis, wrote for them because they are illiterate' (*P. Mich.* V 301, ll. 9–10 [1st cent. AD]); εὐδοκεῖ ἡ γυνή μου Ταμειῦον Πατύνις τῇ πράσι ταύτην, 'my wife Tamieuson daughter of Patynis agrees with this sale' (*PSI VIII* 907, l. 4 [AD 42]); and Φλ(αύιος) Ἰωσήφ Βίκτωρ ἰατρὸς καὶ στρα(τιώτης) λεγ(εῶνος) Συήνης μαρτυρῶ, 'Flavius Ioseph son of Victor doctor and soldier of the legion of Syene I testify' (*P. Münch.* I 9, l. 106 [AD 585]).⁸¹ As Ela Harrison has argued,⁸² the absence of proper case marking is not problematic in such occasions, because the formulaic structure and word order can take over from morphological marking as a means of expressing linguistic relationships. Table 7 furthermore shows that structural priming does not have a

⁸¹ Interestingly, the nominative case used for actors' names may be an improper nominative, too. So, e.g., *PSI VIII* 914, l. 8 (1st cent. AD) and *P. Babatha.* 22, l. 29 (AD 130).

⁸² E. HARRISON, 'Simplification of case morphology in Koine Greek. Evidence from the private letters from Mons Claudianus', *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics* 7 (2002), pp. 41–53.

significant effect on the use of indeclinable forms: quite to the contrary, indeclinable forms are actually more often used when they follow an actor's name which is expressed in the accusative, genitive or dative case. In other words, people used indeclinable forms independently from the immediate context in which they occurred.

4. CONCLUSION

In a recent article, Yanne Broux has highlighted the relevance of onomastic studies, noting that 'personal names are the result of conscious choices made by parents, and were used strategically to place an individual in a family and social context. In antiquity, their meaning and etymology played an important role, expressing qualities as well as religious and cultural affinities. (...) Onomastics therefore provides an interesting approach, not only for the study of personal identities, but also of society at large'.⁸³ In this article, I hope to have shown that aspects of linguistic variation, too, though perhaps harder to discern, contributed to the creation of social meaning, and are worth investigating.

To be more specific, I have shown that the expression of lineage was not merely done through the use of the bare genitive. I have highlighted the existence of several other frequently occurring lineage expressions, such as *πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive, *υἱός/θυγάτηρ* with the genitive and *τοῦ/τῆς* with the genitive. Other constructions, too, can be found, though less frequently, such as *ἐκ* with the genitive and *ἐκ πατρός/μητρός* with the genitive.

I have drawn attention to correlations between these different patterns and diachronic, social, and text-internal factors, which, combined, explain a lot of the variation that is found. Generalizing, one could say that the default option to express one's lineage was to name a male ancestor, typically the father, by using a bare case form: the genitive, indeclinable forms (Egyptian), or the nominative (Greek). In situations which departed from the standard one, more elaborate marking was used: so for

⁸³ BROUX, 'Greco-Egyptian naming practices' (cit. n. 6), p. 706.

example, when there was a need for disambiguation, with the patronymic and papponymic occurring one after another (τοῦ/τῆς with the genitive); when one wanted to mention not only the ancestor's name but also his honorific epithets (υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive); or when one wanted to express one's descent in the female line (μητρὸς with the genitive). That heavier marked expressions should be used for non-default situations is in line with recent findings in functional linguistics, where the relationship between default vs. non-default situations and the corresponding marking has been highlighted on several occasions: the more default the situation, the less elaborate marking, and the other way around.⁸⁴

Even though these and other observations made in this article should not be interpreted as 'rules', they can make a rather important contribution to our understanding of the social, diachronic and textual context, in case this is missing.⁸⁵ Follow-up studies, expanding not only the number of expressions but also the corpus under analysis,⁸⁶ may further improve our understanding of the dynamics of lineage expression, and its intimate ties to social context.

Klaas Bentein

Ghent University
 Department of Linguistics
 Greek section
 Blandijnberg 2
 9000 Ghent
 BELGIUM
 e-mail: *Klaas.Bentein@ugent.be*

⁸⁴ Cf. the classic saying by J. W. DU BOIS, 'Competing motivations', [in:] J. HAIMAN (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax: Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24–6, 1983* [= *Typological Studies in Language* 6], Amsterdam 1985, pp. 343–365, at 363: 'grammars code best what speakers do most'.

⁸⁵ Compare HAGEDORN, 'Zur Verwendung von υἱός und θυγάτηρ' (cit. n. 7), p. 278, on υἱός/θυγάτηρ with the genitive: 'sollte diese Regel sich als richtig erweisen, dann könnte ihre Kenntnis in gewissen Fällen auch bei der Rekonstruktion bzw. Interpretation der Urkunden von Hilfe sein'.

⁸⁶ Including, for example, census declarations and tax lists, and perhaps also inscriptions.