ORIENTALIA LOVANIENSIA
ANALECTA
229

IDENTIFIERS AND IDENTIFICATION METHODS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

Legal Documents in Ancient Societies III

edited by

MARK DEPAUW and SANDRA COUSSEMENT

UITGEVERIJ PEETERS en DEPARTEMENT OOSTERSE STUDIES
LEUVEN – PARIS – WALPOLE, MA
2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

MARK DEPAUW & SANDRA COUSSEMENT
Identity, Identifiers and Identification Methods 3

ANCIENT NEAR EAST

SOPHIE DÉMARE-LAFONT
Identifiers and Identification Methods in Mesopotamia . . 13

GUIDO SUURMEIJER
Identifiers and Identification Methods in Legal Documents from Old Babylonian Sippar (±1800-1500 BCE) 33

EGYPT

ARLETTE DAVID
Identification in Ancient Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the End of the New Kingdom (2650-1100 BCE) 57

MARK DEPAUW
Elements of Identification in Egypt, 800 BC – AD 300 . . 75

URI YIFTACH-FIRANKO
Did *BGU* XIV 2367 Work? 103

YANNE BROUX & SANDRA COUSSEMENT
Double Names as Indicators of Social Stratification in Graeco-Roman Egypt 119

KATELIJN VANDORPE
Seals and Stamps as Identifiers in Daily Life in Greco-Roman Egypt 141

ALAIN DELATTRE
Éléments de l'identification en Égypte (IV^e-VIII^e siècles) . 153

GREECE

MICHELE FARAGUNA
Citizens, Non-Citizens, and Slaves: Identification Methods in Classical Greece 165

KAREN R. KRISTENSEN
A Comment on Legal Identification in Ancient Crete . . 185

ALBERTO MAFFI
Identificare gli schiavi nei documenti greci 197

ROME

EVA JAKAB
Methoden der Identifikation in lateinischen *tabulae* . . . 209

IDO ISRAELOWICH
Identifications of Physicians during the High Empire . . . 233

PHILIPP SCHEIBELREITER
Identifikation von Vertragspartnern in der römischen Literatur 253

Index of identification elements and key topics 285

DID *BGU* XIV 2367 WORK?*

Uri YIFTACH-FIRANKO
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

BGU XIV 2367 is a unique text: it is one of the very few papyri that contain a regulation regarding the shape and contents of a legal document, in this case the double document, the Greek document *par excellence* in the third century BCE and largely also throughout the Ptolemaic period[1].

> οἱ δὲ δανείζοντες καὶ οἱ δανειζόμε[νοι ἔστωσαν γρα]|φόμενοι εἰς τὴν συγγραφήν· οἱ μὲν ἐ[ν τῶι στρατι]|ωτικῶι τεταγμένοι ἀπογραφέσθω[σαν τάς τε] | πατρίδας ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἂν ταγ[μάτων ὦσι] | καὶ ἃς ἂν ἔχωσιν ἐπιφοράς· [ο]ἱ δὲ πολῖτα[ι τούς τε] | πατέρας καὶ τοὺς δήμους· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἐν τ[ῶι στρα]|τιωτικῶι ὦσι καὶ τὰ τάγματα καὶ τὰς [ἐπιφοράς·] | (paragraphos) οἱ δὲ ἄλλ[οι] τούς τε πατέρας καὶ τὰς πατ[ρίδας καὶ] | ἐν ὧι ἂν γένει ὦσιν.
>
> '…and let the creditors and the debtors be recorded in the document. Let those stationed in the army be recorded by their city of origin (*patris*), by the division (*tagmata*) they are from and by the rank (*epiphorai*) they possess. Let the citizens be record by their fathers and by their demes, and if they are in the army also by their division and rank. Let all others be recorded by their father, their city of origin and their *genos*.'

The text is important for two reasons. First, it exhibits (alongside other texts of the Ptolemaic and Roman period), the sincere and continued interest of the state in legal documents, transactions and economic activity in general[2]. Second, and this is the point I want to focus on in this

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at a seminar of the Department of Classics, at the University of Berkeley, California in April 2008. I thank Professor Todd Hickey for his invitation to deliver that paper. I thank W. Clarysse and K. Vandorpe for their valuable suggestions and notes.

[1] The papyrus was published by W. Brashear after the publication of WOLFF 1978. Just before his death, Wolff managed to discuss it briefly in his discussion of BGU XIV (WOLFF 1982). See also MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI 1984: 1173-1187 at 1177-1178 with n. 18; KALTSAS 2001*:* 106 n. 42.

[2] This has been gradually acknowledged over the last couples of years. See in particular the proceedings of the colloquium *Legal Documents in Ancient Societies II* (YIFTACH-FIRANKO Forthcoming).

paper, it sheds unique light on the formation of a new type of Greek state, the territorial, large state, as opposed to the Greek polis[3].

The Greek city state was the total of its population, which was divided into subcategories. In Athens, we count citizens, metics, slaves and the citizens in their turn are divided into subcategories of their own. Most famous is of course the Cleisthenic order, following which each citizen belonged to one, newly-created tribe and deme[4]. Besides other administrative, social and religious functions resulting from this division, it also enables the citizens' disambiguation. With a moderately large citizen body, say of about 1,000 citizens, it is likely that very few people will bear the same name, father's name, and that of their deme, so the registration of these three elements would allow the reader to ascertain the identity of the person who appears in a written document.

The Macedonian conquest of the East, and the subsequent creation of the new, territorial states changed the picture. As Greek immigrants streaming to the new lands became detached from their old subdivisions, so did the older forms of identification become impracticable in the new land. At the same time, the new state, as any state, still needed for different purposes to control its population, and some identification mechanism seemed indispensable for that purpose. A partial solution was provided by the new *poleis*: an Alexandrian citizen, perhaps also a citizen of Ptolemais in Upper Egypt or one of Naucratis in the Delta, could be identified by his deme, as their Athenian counterparts were, but most settlers did not become citizens of the three poleis. *BGU* XIV 2367 is thus an attempt, the first attempt, and the only one as far as I know, to create an alternative categorization and identification mechanism in a non-political state.

The legislator first divides the population into four exhaustive categories: (1) soldiers, (2) citizens of a polis, (3) citizens of a polis serving in the Ptolemaic army, (4) civilians who are not citizens of a polis. The legislator then prepares a series of seven identifiers: personal name, father's name, deme, *patris* (city, region or ethnos of origin outside Egypt[5]), *genos* (roughly translated as 'occupation'[6]), *tagma* (military

[3] On the question of adoption and adaptation in Ptolemaic Egypt of concepts and institutions generated in the Classical polis, see multiple publications of Claire Préaux, published in the 1950's and 1960's, e.g. 1955: 107-111 and MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI 1966: 125-173 at 131-140.

[4] See HANSEN 2004: 117-129 and Faraguna's account in this volume.

[5] See e.g. MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI 1983: 248-252.

[6] See e.g. CLARYSSE/THOMPSON 2006: vol. 2 146-147 n. 115. Noteworthy is Elias Bickermann's observation (1927: 232-233) that the *genê* (designated in his paper as 'Amtsprädikate') all denote some connection to the state apparatus.

unit), and *epiphora* (rank within that unit)[7]. These identifiers were then applied, selectively, to each of the above four groups: personal names are used for all four categories, father's name is applied to the *polis'* citizens, both in and out of military service, and to civilians who are not citizens of a *polis*. It is not meant to be applied, on the other hand, to soldiers who are not citizens of a *polis*. Deme is, naturally, applied to citizens of a polis only, both in and outside military service, *tagma* and *epiphora* to soldiers regardless of whether they are citizens or not, and finally *genos*, to civilians who are not citizens of any of the *poleis*. In some cases, that of the citizens of a polis who are not soldiers, one applies just three identifiers (name, father's name, deme), while in the case of polis' citizens who are also soldiers one applies as many as five (name, father's name, deme, unit and rank). Remarkably absent from the categorization system of *BGU* XIV 2367 are other designations commonly applied in other timeframes and types of documentation: mother's name, grandfather's name, place of domicile, age and physical traits.

BGU XIV 2367 can be studied from different angles. One is its classical background. Our legislator did not operate in an intellectual vacuum. Apart from the relatively simple Cleisthenic arrangements, there were other, perhaps more complex subdivisions and identification mechanisms in the ca. 1,500 *poleis* and other forms of state in the Classical world, and it stands to reason that these various alternatives, as well as some theoretical models, helped our legislator to create his system. It is highly important, in other words, to study the intellectual background of *BGU* XIV 2367[8]. Here, however, we will study the Egyptian context: we possess several hundred legal documents from Ptolemaic Egypt, among which also a considerable number of double documents (i.e. the very type of document focused on in our law). These documents allow us to study when the law was introduced, what was the context of its introduction, and the extent to which it was adhered to by authors of legal documents[9].

[7] UEBEL 1968: 12.

[8] That Athenian prototypes may have inspired the formation of the Ptolemaic categorization mathods is shown by the very introduction of the *demos* as a population unit in Alexandria, and probably in other new *poleis*. See HANSEN 2004: 121-122, HANSEN/NIELSEN 2004: 59, and FRASER 1972: 42-44. BICKERMANN 1927: 231 noted that what we now identify as the *genos* was an Egyptian innovation. The question merits new investigation.

[9] http://hudd.huji.ac.il/ArtLogon.aspx?project=GLRT&username=u_DoubleDocument-2&password=CMHHGJFQJINFOOFQXUHU

Let us address first the date of introduction: *P.Eleph.* 2, an hereditary settlement of 284 BCE Elephantine, does not follow the precepts of our law: the document records just the personal name and the *patris* of the parties and the witnesses to the contract; we thus do not even know if they were soldiers or civilians[10]. The next double document, *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59001 of 284/3 BCE Pitos in the Memphite nome, conveys a completely different picture: two persons, the lender and the surety, are civilians, and as such identified by their father's name, *patris* and *genos*. The other persons are soldiers, and are identified by their *patris,* unit and rank[11].

> ἔγγυος τοῦ δα]γείου Ἰσιδώρου καὶ τῶν | [κατὰ τὴν συγγραφὴ]ν πάντων εἰς ἔκτεισ[ιν] | [Διονυσίωι Δημήτ]ριος Δάμωνος Θρᾶιξ ` τῶν Λυκόφρον[ος] ´ σύγκλη|[ρος.` -ca.?- ἀρουρῶν τεσσ]αράκοντα ´. [ἡ δὲ συγγραφὴ ἥδε] κυρία ἔστω οὗ ἂν ἐπιφέρηι | [Διονύσιος ἢ ὧι ἂν Διο-ν]ύσιος παραδῶι. Μάρτυρες | [Βίθυς Θρᾶιξ ἑκατονδεκ]άρουρος, Τηρήπης Θρᾶιξ | [τεσσερακοντάρουρος, Ἑ]βρύζελμις Θρᾶιξ τεσσαρακον|[τάρουρος, Ποσειδώνιος] Θρᾶιξ ἑβδομηκοντάρουρος, | [Ζίπυρος Θρᾶιξ σύγκληρος], ` [μετ]ὰ Βίθυος ἀρουρῶν ἑξήκοντα´, Διονύσιος Θρᾶιξ ἑξηκον|[τάρουρος, οὗτοι τῶν Λυκόφ]ρονος.
>
> 'Surety of Isidôros for payment to Dionysios of the loan and all the liabilities of the contract: Dêmêtrios son of Damôn, Thracian, of the troops of Lykophrôn, part-holder with Damôn (?) of forty arouras. This contract shall be valid wherever produced by Dionysios or by the person to whom Dionysios transmits it. Witnesses: Bithys, Thracian, holder of 110 arouras, Têrêpês, Thracian, holder of forty arouras, Hebrydzelmis, Thracian, holder of forty arouras, Poseidônios, Thracian, holder of seventy arouras, Dzipyros, Thracian, part-holder with Bithys of sixty arouras, Dionysios, Thracian, holder of sixty arouras, all belonging to the troops of Lykophrôn.'

All this is in complete accordance with the law. Such conformity is evident in virtually all double documents of the third century BCE, such as the following:[12]

[10] As is the case for example in the list of witnesses *P.Eleph.* 2,17-18 (284 BCE—Elephantinê): μάρτυρες Πολυκράτης Ἀρκάς, Ἀνδροσθένης Κῶιος, | Νουμήνιος Κρής, Σιμωνίδης Μαρωνίτης, Λῦσις Ἡράκλειτος Τημνῖται 'Witnesses: Polykratês, Arcadian, Androsthenês, Coan, Noumênios, Cretan, Simônidês, Maronean, Lysis and Hêrakleitos, Temnians'. The same identification method, by city of origin alone, is also applied in Athenian legal documents with regard to non-Athenians. See e.g. *Dem.* 35.14. The same is also the case in other poleis. See BICKERMANN 1927: 221-222; HANSEN 2004: 121, and HANSEN/NIELSEN 2004: 58-59.

[11] *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59001 *scriptura exterior* (274/3 BCE—Pitos, Memphitês) ll. 43-52.

[12] *CPR* XVIII 3 (231/206 BCE—Theogonis), 46-49 and *BGU* XIV 2386,4-8 (203/2 BCE—Takona). Such a complete conformity is evident in 132 Ptolemaic document surveyed for the purpose of this paper. Compare e.g. *CPR* XVIII 63-74; UEBEL 1968: 11-13.

Ἰσάζελμις Θρᾶιξ τῶν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Ἐτεωνέως | τῆς ε ἱπ(παρχίας) (ἑκατοντάρουρος) ἐμίσθωσεν Μασάρται Μηδόκου Θρᾳικὶ | καὶ Μνήμονι Ποσειδωνίου Μεγαρεῖ τοῖς δύο τῆς | ἐπιγονῆς τὸν αὐτοῦ κλ[ῆ]ρον κτλ. Ll. 55-58: συγγραφοφύλαξ Ἀθηνόδωρος Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἡράκλειος | τῶν οὔπω ἐπηγμένων Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῶν | ἐκ τοῦ Ἑρμοπολίτου πρώτῳ[ν] τῆς ε ἱπ(παρχίας) (ἑκατοντάρουρος).

'Isadzelmis, Thracian, one of the soldiers of Ptolemaios, the son of Eteôneus, holder of one hundred arouras, member of the fifth hipparchy, has leased out to Masartas, the son of Mêdokos, Thracian, and to Mnêmôn, the son of Poseidônios, Megarian, both of the progeny (ἐπιγονή), his own allotment land…'

μάρ[τ]υρε[ς· Φ]ι[λω]νάδης Κυρηναῖος δεκανικός,| Ἀττίας Θρᾶιξ ἰδιώτης οἱ [δύο τ]ῶν Φίλωνος, Εὔβιος Χ[αλ]κιδεὺς | διμοιρίτης, Λεύκιος Θρᾶιξ λοχαγός, οἱ δύο τῶ[ν Ἐ]νδίου,| Ἀριστόμαχος Πτολεμαίου Βιθυνός, Δημή[τρ]ιος Δημητρίλου Χαλκιδεύς, οἱ δύο τῆς ἐπιγονῆς.

'Witnesses: Philônadês, Cyrenian, dekanikos; Attias, Thracian, regular soldier both of the unit of Philôn; Eubios, Chalcidean, receiver of double payment; Leukios, Thracian, commander of a company, both of the unit of Endios; Aristomachos son of Ptolemaios, Bithynian; Dêmêtrios son of Dêmêtrios, Chalcidean, both of the progeny.'

There is an obvious explanation for the change. The law recorded in *BGU* XIV 2367 was introduced sometime between 284 and 273 BCE. This timeframe, around 275 BCE, rings a bell to every student of Ptolemaic legal history. This is the date in which Ptolemy II promulgated what was termed by H.J. Wolff as *das grosse Justizdiagramma*[13]. Wolff stressed in his *Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*, as well as in other, shorter publications the role played by the *diagramma* in the creation of a bi-national court system in the Egyptian chora, one court system, that of the *laokritai* serving Egyptians, and another, the *dikastêrion*, serving Greeks. The present law, if going back to the same act, highlights another, closely-related sphere of activity: the double document was the Greek document *par excellence* in Ptolemaic Egypt, and as such was to serve as a key piece of evidence if the contract was ever to become the subject of litigation[14]. The creator of the *dikastêria* had every reason, therefore, to warrant the authenticity of the document inter alia by regulating the parties' form of identification in it. The same identification method was also applied in the case of *enklêmata*, the contracts submitted by the parties in court[15].

[13] Bickermann 1927: 232; Wolff 1982: 371; Mélèze-Modrzejewski 1984: 1178.

[14] Wolff 1978: 144-154; Mélèze-Modrzejewski 1984: 1184-1187.

[15] As shown by *P.Hamb.* II 168 (mid third century BCE—Unknown Provenance), the same identification method was also applied in the *enklêma*, that is the document served to the Alexandrian court of the kritêrion by the plaintiff to set the litigation in motion. In

As already indicated above, the Ptolemaic state was extremely successful in enforcing the adherence to the law. Double documents, and for that matter also documents composed by the state scribe of the *agoranomeion*, for whom the law was apparently applicable also[16], whenever they could[17], followed to the letter the precepts of the law, down to the end of the Ptolemaic period. The only manifested change is the addition of the father's name, in the early second century BCE, as an identifier of soldiers[18]. Some elements of the law outlived the Ptolemaic state: the *patris* Macedonian is still used in the first century CE, in documents relating to the conveyance of allotment land (παραχώρησις), and the combination of the *patris* Persian with the *genos* τῆς ἐπιγονῆς as late as the mid second century CE[19].

the same context one should also take into consideration *BGU* VI 1250.11-15 (II BCE—Arsinoitês), imposing death penalty on officials changing the names of an individual (presumably including his father's name), or his *patris* μηθένα μετε[νομάζειν (read μετονομάζειν) μηδ' αὐτὸν] μηδὲ τὴν πατρίδα 'Let no one change his own personal name, nor that of his place of origin'. But perhaps the context here is change of names of the officials themselves, and not of any given person. The same law is probably mentioned among the laws of Alexandrian and royal origin recorded in *BGU* VI 1213 (III BCE—Arsinoitês) (l. 3): περὶ μεταβολῆ]ς πατρίδος καὶ ὀνομάτων 'regarding the change of place of origin or names'. See also Mélèze-Modrzejewski 1983: 244.

[16] This conclusion is drawn upon the fact that the same nomenclature is generally applied in *agoranomic* documents from Ptolemaic Egypt. That the same identification method was not systemacially applied in the third most popular type of document in the Ptolemaic period, the *cheirographon*, is shown, for example, by *P. Dion.* 32-35 (116-111 BCE—Hermopolitê). While #34 applies the nomenclature of *BGU* XIV 2367 in its entirety, #33 uses the name and the patronymic in the case of the author, and just the personal name in the case of the addressee. The identification methods discussed in this paper are not applied in petitions, as shown by Veïsse 2012. The same phenomenon was already noted by Bickermann 1927: 217-218, 236.

[17] There were, however, three population categories that were not dealt with in the law and apply double documents from the start: one is state officials, that are generally identified by the personal name and their position: see e.g. *P.Col.* III 55.2 (250 BCE—Arsinoitês): Ἀνόσις κωμογραμματεύς 'Anosis the village scribe'. The second are Egyptians, who are indentified by their domicile as well as by their profession: See e.g. *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59133 (256 BCE—Philadelphia), a contract of labor in which the prospective employees are designated as 'Memphite brickmakers' (Μεμφῖται πλινθουλκοί), or *P.Stras.* II 92 (244/3 BCE—Oxyrhynchitês), a lease contract in which the *kyrios* of the future tenant is termed (l. 4) an 'Oxyrhynchite goldsmith' (Ὀξυρυγχίτης χρυσοχός). See Mélèze-Modrzejewski 1983: 252-253; Vandorpe 2008: 89. The third group relates to women, who are designated, if Alexandrians or citizens of another *polis*, ἀστή, and if not, by their father's name and their *patris*. Both forms of designation are attested in the will *P.Petr.*[2] I 1.33-67 ll. 47-48 (Μύστα Δημητρίου Ῥοδία 'Mysta, daughter of Dêmêtrios, Rhodian') and l. 54 (Μενεία Μεννέου ἀστη 'Meneia daughter of Menneas, citizen of a polis'). Egyptian women are designated by their domicile: see e.g. the abovementioned *P.Stras.* II 92 (l. 3: Ὀξυρυγχ[ίτις).

[18] See e.g. *P.Hamb.* II 189.29-30 (216/5 BCE—Thôlthis) and Uebel 1968: 13.

[19] See e.g. *P.Mich.* V 303.1 (I CE—Arsinoitês, probably Tebtynis): Κρονίων Μάρωνος Μακεδὼν τῶν κατοίκων ἱππέων 'Kroniôn son of Marôn, Macedonian, one

Still, the fact that Ptolemaic scribes continued to follow the letters of the law does not mean that it still served the purposes for which it was created, that it still provided means for the effective disambiguation of contractual parties. I do believe that in the case of soldiers not all identifiers remained effective, but enough did to make their identification likely, and that this was also the case with regard to citizens of the *poleis*. But I suspect that this was not always the case with civilians.

If all individuals within the community bear the same identifier, using it for one of them would not allow us to distinguish one of them from the rest. This is the case with the *nomina gentilicia* Aurelius after the grant of Roman citizenship to peregrines by the Constitutio Antoniniana of 212 CE, and Flavius from the fourth century onwards. Even though the former identifier serves as a clear indication that the person acquired the status of Roman citizen, and the latter indicates his social standing, it ceases to be effective as a means of his personal disambiguation[20]. What happens to the identifiers of civilians in the Ptolemaic period is, I suggest, to some extent similar. According to *BGU* XIV 2367, civilians should be identified by four elements: name, father's name, *patris* and *genos*. A person's name and that of his father are supposedly unique and as such are what I term 'effective identifiers'. But what about the other two? Let us start with the *genos*.

Double documents dating to the generation after the promulgation of the law record a relatively large variety of *genê*: ἰατρός ('physician'), τῶν ἐπέργων ('one of the assistants'), τῶν περί τινα ('a person's attendants'), παρεπίδημος ('a man sojourning in a strange place'), and τῆς ἐπιγονῆς 'descendants of foreign military settlers'[21]. Documents from later decades present a different picture. Starting from abstracts of double documents of late third century Theogonis (CPR XVIII) and the documents of late third and early second century Thôlthis (mostly published in *BGU* IV, X and XIV), we find virtually just one *genos*, τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, meaning that the person designated was an offspring of soldiers not yet

of the cavalry men holding of allotment land'. *P.Stras*. IV 209.11 (152 CE—Dionysias) is one of the latest attestations of the combination Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς.

[20] On the former, see e.g. a case discussion by HAGEDORN 1979: 58-59. On the latter see KEENAN 1974: 301-302.

[21] See e.g. *P.Cair.Zen*. I 59001.5 (274/3 BCE—Pitos, Memphitês): τῶν περὶ δεῖνα. *P.Cair.Zen*. I 59137.5 (256 BCE—Philadelphia): ὁ παρὰ δεῖνος, *P.Col*. III 54 = *SB* IV 7450.5,24,26 (250 BCE—Arsinoitês (?)) τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, τῶν ἐπέργων, ἰατρός; *PSI* IV 385.4 (246/5 BCE—Philadelphia): παρεπίδημος. There is some, but not complete overlap between these categories and the ἔθνη recorded in *P.Count*. I. On the term παρεπίδημος see VEÏSSE 2012: ad n. 26.

engaged in active military service[22]. Now, for all that we know the reason could be the nature of the communities in which the documents were drawn up: military communities with high percentage of soldiers and their offspring[23]. Perhaps the large variety of *genê* exhibited by the Zenôn archive continued to be applied in archives exhibiting the same socio-economic and bureaucratic structure in later periods[24]. Be it as it may, within these specific military communities, as soon as *all* civilians carried the *genos* τῆς ἐπιγονῆς this *genos* ceased to function as an effective identifier[25]. The ultimate result of this process is the occasional omission of the *genos* in documents of the late Ptolemaic period[26], and finally the complete abandonment of the *genos*, with the exception of τῆς ἐπιγονῆς in the combination Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς.

The decline of the *patris* is a longer process. Originally, and in much of the third century, the *patris* denoted a person's actual origin. A Thracian was probably a person of a real Thracian background[27]. But this was no longer, or at least not always the case in later periods. From the late third century, and ever more in the second and the first, some *patrides* denoted the occupational-status designation: a Persian, for example, was not necessarily a person of Persians background. He was part of a status group whose members were all termed 'Persians' upon joining it[28]. The consequence of this new situation for the effectiveness of the *patris* as identifier is best demonstrated by the source material from late second and early first century Pathyris in Upper Egypt.

[22] On the term τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, see e.g. MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI 1983: 260; VANDORPE 2008: 90. Exceptions: *P.Petr.*[2] I 24.22 (παρεπίδημος); *P.Tebt.* III 815 fr. 7 recto l. 2 (τῶν ἐπέργων).

[23] LA'DA 1997: 567-568.

[24] I.e. a large quantity of officials on the one hand, a high number of Egyptians on the other. See e.g. SWIDEREK 1953/4: 231-284.

[25] Perhaps added as *genos* are τ[ῶν] ἐκ Παθύρεως τεκτόνω[ν in *P.Bad.*2.3 II 4 = *SB* XXIV 16315 = *P.Lond.* III 682 (98 BCE—Pathyris); *P.Grenf.* II 25.1.13 = *WChr* 106 = *P.Lond.* III 667 descr. (139 BCE—Latopolis): τῶ]ν Πτολεμαίου καὶ τῶν υἱῶν; *P.Lond.* III 1207.17 (99 BCE—Pathyris): τῶν ἐκ Παθύρεως σιδηρουργῶν.

[26] See e.g. *P.Ryl.* IV 588.8 (78 BCE—Crocodilopolis, Pathyritês): *agoranomic* document; *P.Würz.* 6.7-8 (102 BCE—Theadelphia): double document, and BICKERMANN 1927: 219.

[27] As still seems to be the case in the abstracts of double documents from Theogonis, published in *CPR* XVIII. See e.g. the onomastics in the list of witnesses in *CPR* XVIII 3 (231/206 BCE—Theogonis) quoted in n. 12, above, and *CPR* XVIII, p. 70. See also BICKERMANN 1927: 229; MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI 1983: 250, 261. VEÏSSE 2007: 290) argues that the same ethnic definition is manifested in the third century BCE the term Hellên as well.

[28] LA'DA 1994: 189; VANDORPE 2008: 88. See also CLARYSSE/THOMPSON 2006: 145, 155, 157-159, on Hellênes and Persians and status/tax-categories.

In the second century large numbers of Egyptians were recruited into the Ptolemaic army. One such large-scale recruitment takes place in Upper Egypt, starting from the 180s. Upon their recruitments, these Egyptians received the *patris* Πέρσης. These 'Persians' are especially well attested in the documentary material of Pathyris: in as many as 93 of the 118 Greek legal documents from Pathyris at least one of the parties is termed Persian, and in 60 both parties take this title[29]. Now, if most parties to contracts are termed *Persian*, this *patris* clearly cannot serve as effective identifier. This problem may not have been as acute as long as these 'Persians' were also active soldiers. At this stage they could still be effectively identified through their unit and their rank. Yet for these 'Persians' the military service was not for life. They were discharged as soon as there was no longer need in their service[30].

When the said Egyptians were discharged, they took the *genos* τῆς ἐπιγονῆς which was also assumed by their children[31]. Consequently, *Persês tês epigones* becomes quite a common designation in late Ptolemaic Pathyris: among the 207 attested names in Greek legal documents from Pathyris, as many as 127, that is over 60% are designated as *Persai tês epigonês*, or bear a similar designation[32]. Identifying a person under these circumstances as a *Persês tês epigonês* would not indicate his true individual identity any more than the combination *Marcus Aurelius* did after 212 CE. As means of disambiguation, the 127 Πέρσαι τῆς ἐπιγονῆς from Pathyris have just two effective identifiers, their name and that of their fathers.

The source material from Pathyris reveals yet another problem. Some of the identifiers of *BGU* XIV 2367 are distinctly Greek: take for example the *patris,* which originally denotes from which part of the Greek world the person emigrated into Egypt. But from the very start, Egyptians employed Greek legal documents as well. This phenomenon, already well attested in the Zenôn archive, as well as in later times, brought about the creation of an alternative identification mechanism, by the profession and

[29] See e.g. the loan contract *P.Dion.* 25 = *P.Rein.* I 26 = *MChr* 164 (104 BCE—Hermopolis). The creditor, Pasion alias Pasis, is termed (ll. 3-5): Πέρσης | ἑκατόνταρχος τῶ[ν] τῆς Ἀσκληπιάδου | ἡγεμονίας Ἀκωρ[ι]τῶν 'Persian, centurion, of the inhabitants of Akôris who are under the leadership of Asklêpiadês', while the debtor, Dionysios son of Kephalas, is termed (l. 6): Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς.

[30] VANDORPE 2008: 91-92, 96, 104-105 (on the combination of Persian and different military positions).

[31] CLARYSSE/THOMPSON 2006: 154; VANDORPE 2008: 91-92, 94.

[32] See e.g. *P.Adl.* 5 (108 BCE—Crocodilopolis, Pathyritês). Compare VANDORPE 2008: 95.

domicile of the contracting party[33]. In Pathyris, with its predominately Egyptian population, the problem became more acute, wherefore some scribes reverted to the same alternative identification mechanism: reporting the occupation of the contracting parties. This was predominately the case when the parties were priests[34].

Another option was to apply extended genealogy, indicating not only the name of the father, but also that the extended family. In some cases the scribe added the name of the grandfather[35]. In one particular case, the debt settlement *P.Grenf.* II 26 = *P.Lond.* III 660 descr. (103 BCE—Pathyris), due to the special social circumstances in which the loan was given the scribe uses for the identification of the debtors the names of three family members: their father, paternal grandmother, and paternal grand-grandfather[36]. All in all, however, the extended genealogical identification is applied in just 21 documents. In most cases, 22 out of 43, the scribe simply recorded the name of the native Egyptian and that of his father[37]. If we add these twenty-two cases to the 127 where the person is designated as Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς we get 149 persons out of 207, that is ca. 70% of the population of Pathyris, whose sole *effective* identifiers were their names and that of their fathers. The population of Pathyris was clearly under-identified.

Some of the elements of the Ptolemaic identification mechanism are still present in the Roman period. One still occasionally finds in several documents from the early first century Arsinoite nome the combination of the *patris* Macedonian and the unit designation τῶν κατοίκων ἱππέων; down to the mid second century CE one still finds in documents

[33] *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59133.7 (256 BCE—Philadelphia): Μεμφῖται πλινθουλκοί 'Memphitan brickmakers'. *P.Tebt.* III 815 Frag. 3,v,1 l. 26 (223/222 BCE—Tebtynis): Ἑρμοπολίτης γεωργός 'Hermopolitan farmer'; BICKERMANN 1927: 220, 234-235.

[34] *P.Köln* I 50.28 (99 BCE—Pathyris): ἱερεὺς Σούχου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης 'Priest of Souchos and Aphroditê'; *P.Stras.* II 88 col. 2 l. 18 = *SB* I 5229 (115 BCE—Diospolis Magna): τῶν ἐκ Παθύρεως. Compare for the latter, LA'DA 1994: 184-5.

[35] See e.g. *P.Grenf.* II 24.6-7 = *P.Lond.* III 658 (105 BCE—Crocodilopolis, Pathyritês).

[36] Ll. 3-8 (103 BCE—Pathyris): ὁμολογεῖ Ὧρος Παοῦτος Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς | συνλελύσθαι Πετεαρσεμθεῖ καὶ Πετεσούχωι | καὶ Ψεννήσει καὶ Φαγώνι, τοῖς δ̣ των (read τοῦ) | Πανοβχούνιος των (read τοῦ) Ταρεήσιος τῆς Πατοῦ̣τος τῆς Παοῦτος μητρὸς τοῦ προγεγραμμένου | πατρὸς Ὥρου κτλ. 'Hôros son of Paous, Persian of the progeny, acknowledges that he came to a settlement with Petearsemtheus and Petesouchos and Psennêsis and Phagônis, these four being the children of Panobchounis son of Tareêsis daughter of Paous, the mother of Hôros, the father of the aforementioned (i.e. Paous)")'.

[37] See e.g. *BGU* III 994 col. 3 ll. 4-5 (113 BCE—Pathyris). See also BICKERMANN 1927: 219.

written everywhere in Egypt the combination of the *patris* Persian and the *genos* τῆς ἐπιγονῆς[38]. But these are just two relics of a system, which as a whole is completely abandoned at the beginning of the Roman occupation. The old identification mechanism is replaced by new regional ones, differing considerably from each other in nature and date of introduction.

One system is introduced in the state scribes of the *grapheia*, as documented primarily in the source material of the Arsinoite nome. As early as the Ptolemaic period it was common to use a person's physical traits as means of its identification: the document reports in details the person's stature, the color of his skin, shape of his nose and hair, distinctive physical defects, as well as his approximate age[39]. But in the Ptolemaic system, physical identifiers have been applied very selectively: they were used in cases in which ascertaining the identity of the person was especially crucial, such as wills, public collections of abstracts of demotic documents and Greek double documents and sale certificates (*katagraphai*), where the detailed identification by bodily features is systematically applied in the case of the vendor only[40]. Now, after the Roman occupation—to be precise from around 14 CE—the same identification method is applied in the *grapheia* (public scribal offices) of the Arsinoite nome. Here, however, they are used massively, in every type of document, for all persons involved. Such a massive application requires of course modification of the old, and presumably time-consuming account. The rule in the Arsinoite *grapheia*—introduced sometime in the second decade of the first century CE—is to describe just the moles, scars, as well as the patronymic and the person's approximate age[41].

[38] See e.g. MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI 1983: 260-261.

[39] See e.g. *P.Petr.*[2] I 17.20-22: τάδε διέθετο νο]ῷν καὶ φρονῶν Μέναν̣[δρ]ος Ἀμφιπολί̣τη[ς] | [τῶν - ca.17 - κληροῦχο]ς ὡς (ἐτῶν) ξε̣ βραχ[ὺς ἐρ]υ̣θρίας τεται[νόθριξ σ]ύνοφρυς ὀξύ[ρ]ρ̣[ιν. 'Menandros of Amphipolis, [of the company of — —, cleruch,] about 65 years old, of ruddy complexion, with straight hair, meeting eyebrows and a sharp nose…'.

[40] Abstracts of double documents: see e.g. *CPR* XVIII 3.14-21 (231/206 BCE—Theogonis). Sale certificates (*katagraphai*): e.g. *P.Lips.* I 2.3 (99 BCE—Pathyris). Wills: e.g. *P.Petr*[2] I 17.21-22 (236/5 BCE—Crocodilopolis, Arsinoitês). Abstracts of Demotic documents in *SB* XX 14470.6-7 = *P.Aust.Herr.* 1 (160 BCE—Arsinoitês). See in general HÜBSCH 1968: 14-24, 46, 80-81.

[41] This identification method was probably not applied in the Augustan period (*P.Fay.* 89 = *MChr* 166 = *P.Lond.* III 826 descr., drawn up in 9 CE Pelousion). It is always used in *grapheion* documents from 20 CE onwards. See in particular, *BGU* II 636 (20 CE—Karanis) ll. 6-11 [ἐμ‹ίσ›θωσεν Σαταβο(ῦς) | [Πεθεβᾶτος] ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα [ο]ὐ[λὴ] πήχ‹ε›ι δεξιῶι Χαιρήμωνι Σωκράτους ὡς ἐτῶν | εἴκοσι δύο, οὐλη̣ι μήλωι δεξιῶ[ι] '….Satabous son of Pethebas, approximately thirty years of age, with a scar on

Another system is introduced in the Oxyrhynchite nome, that of the genealogical identifiers. One such identifier is used almost universally, always and everywhere: the name of the person's father. But in Greek documents of the Ptolemaic period no account is made of other family members, even when such an account, by the person's mother, is used for a person's identification by neighboring Egyptian scribes[42]. The extended genealogical identification system is applied in the Roman period in Oxyrhynchos: the mother's name is regularly added by the 70s, or little later, and those of the paternal and maternal grandfathers within a generation of that date. The result is a very detailed identifier, containing five names: the contractual party, his two parents and two grandparents[43]. Towards the mid second century we observe an integration of the Arsinoite and Oxyrhynchite systems: the resulting system consists of both genealogical elements and physical ones[44]. In the Roman period, the domicile is also added as a further identifier. This data was already used, we recall, in the Ptolemaic period in case of Egyptians, but the formula denoting it in the Roman period is different, so that we should presume introduction *ex novo* rather than continuity with the old, Ptolemaic practice[45].

his right forearm, to Chairêmôn son of Sôkratês, approximately twenty-two years of age, with a scar on his right cheek…' and HÜBSCH 1968: 24-34.

[42] DEPAUW 2008: 24-26.

[43] Among twenty document composed in the Oxyrhynchite *agoranomeion* in the first seven decades of the first century CE, only one contains the mother's name. In the period between 70 and 230 CE, the relations are reverse: fifty documents with the mother's name, and only eight without it. The same pattern is evident also in the Oxyrhynchite private-protocols and *cheirographa* as well as in the case of the paternal grandfather: two out of seventeen down to year 80, and then 35 of 44 in the next hundred years. For identification by both parents and grandfathers, see e.g. *P.Oxy.* III 496.2 = *MChr* 287 (127 CE—Oxyrhynchos). See also in general DEPAUW 2010: 121-139.

[44] A possible cause of this extension is discussed by DEPAUW 2011: 189-199 at 198 (on P.Oxy. I 34 verso = MChr 188 ll. 16-17).

[45] See e.g. *P.Brook.* 8.6-13 = *SB* VIII 9740 (177 CE—Ptolemais Euergetis): ὁμολογοῦ|[σιν ἀλλήλοις Ἀφρ]ο̣δισία Σαβείνου τοῦ Μύσθου μητρὸς Ἀμμω|[. . . . . ἀπὸ τῆς μ]ητροπόλεως ὡς (ἐτῶν) λα οὐλὴ ὀφρύϊ ἀριστερᾷ | [μετὰ κυρίου] Ἀχιλλᾶτος Ὡριγένους τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου μητρὸ[ς] | [. . . . . ἀ]π' ἀμφόδου Θεσμοφορίου ὡς (ἐτῶν) νβ χωλαινω(ντος) (read χωλαίνο(ντος)) | [- ca.10 -] καὶ ὁ γενόμενος αὐτῆς ἀνὴρ Πτολεμαῖος | [Πτολεμαίου] τοῦ Σωκράτους μητρὸς Σο̣ήρεως ἀπὸ κώ|[μης Καραν]ίδος ὡς (ἐτῶν) λζ οὐλὴ γόνατι ἀριστ(ερᾷ) κτλ. 'Aphrodisia daughter of Sabinos, son of Mystês, whose mother is Ammô[- -] from the *metropolis*, about 31 years old, with a scar on her left eye-brow, acting with Achillas son of Hôrigenês son of Hêrakleidês, whose mother is [- -] from the Thesmophorion quarter, about 52 years old, with a limp [- -] as her *kyrios* and her former husband Ptolemaios son of Ptolemaios, son of of Sôkratês, whose mother is Soêris, about 37 years old, with a scar on

I shall conclude with few general observations. The identification method within the Greek *polis*, as discussed in this volume by M. Faraguna, was relatively simple: every citizen was member in several sub-categories, in Athens most regularly the deme, and adding an account of the deme and the name of his father would usually serve as adequate means of establishing his identity. The Ptolemaic kingdom was a more complex entity: not only was not everyone a citizen of a polis: the Greek settlers in the new land were also dispersed through a vast territory, frequently without subunits one could draw on for the person's classification. *BGU* XIV 2367 was the first, and in fact the only attempt to cope with the new challenge. As in the polis, the identification was by population units: demes, military units and rank-groups, *genê*, *patrides*: but the new system was much more complex: division of the Greek population into four categories and applying different set of identifiers for each.

The law casts light on the world of its author: the identification criteria, deme, *patris*, etc. show that it was meant to be applied by Greeks only. This fits well with the same separationist tendency evident in other parts of the *diagramma*: primarily of course the creation of a different court system for Greeks and Egyptians. The system was also men-oriented: it contained no rulers regarding the identification of women, whose identification method can be deduced from the legal documents alone[46].

The source material also reinforces conclusions I have reached in the past in other studies of the Ptolemaic period: the Ptolemaic state was always able to have its way. Once the new regulation was introduced, it was meticulously followed by generations of scribes[47]. At the same time, and this is again along the lines of observations made elsewhere, in the course of time the identification system of *BGU* XIV 2367 became obsolete: this was especially the case when double documents, and instruments drawn up in the *agoranomeia*, began to be used by Egyptians as well.

Surely, the old system could be reinvigorated, placed on new foundations: for example by introducing domicile, profession, extended genealogy. But, although some scribes did apply these elements, for those standing outside the indented group of users of the Greek legal document,

his left knee, from the village of Karanis, mutually acknowledge…'. For the Ptolemaic designation of domicile see above n. 17, 25, 34.

[46] See above n. 17.

[47] See e.g. YIFTACH-FIRANKO 2008: 203-218.

none of these elements was ever systematically applied in the Ptolemaic period. In late Ptolemaic Pathyris, a scribe could claim that by terming a person X son of Y Persian of the *epigonê* he conformed to the law. He would be of course right, but adding the said *patris* and *genos* would hardly be conducive to the disambiguation of the person recorded.

The Roman approach was completely different: the old system was clearly outdated, but instead of introducing a new across-the-board one, the new rulers gave way to local initiatives: new identifiers, based on physical features, were applied in the Arsinoitês, others, based on genealogy, in the Oxyrhynchitês. Yet the two new systems had a common denominator: the Ptolemaic system, drawing on 'political' prototypes, was that of units, population categories which everyone had to belong to, and by which everyone could be identified. The same concept was not alien to Rome, and was to some extent applied also in Egypt: the provincial administration created, and rigidly controlled, new groups: But membership in these groups—the *gymnasia* vel sim. in the nomes' *metropoleis*, the *mouseion* in Alexandria and others[48]—was exclusive, rather than all-inclusive. It was assigned to privileged status groups, not to the population in its entirety. As most of the population remained 'unitless', the best, in fact only form of identification, was through universal traits: age, body features, family and domicile. In a sense, then, the change in the identification method in the Roman period mirrors a fundamental change in the structure of Egyptian society, as perceived by the provincial administration.

Bibliography

Bickermann E. 1927: 'Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte. I. Der Heimatsvermerk und die staatsrechtliche Stellung der Hellenen im ptolemäischen Ägypten', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 8: 216-239.

Clarysse W. and Thompson D.J. 2006: *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt,* Cambridge.

Depauw M. 2008: 'The Use of Mothers' Names in Ptolemaic Documents: A Case of Greek-Egyptian Influence?', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 37: 21-29.

— 2010: 'Do Mothers Matter? The Emergence of Metronymics in Early Roman Egypt', in T. V. Evans and D. D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford: 121-139

[48] See in particular Mélèze-Modrzejewski 1990.

— 2011: 'Physical descriptions, registration and εἰκονίζειν. With new interpretations for P. Par. 65 and P. Oxy. I 34', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 176: 189-199.

FRASER P.M. 1972, *Ptolemaic Alexandria,* Oxford.

HAGEDORN D. 1979: 'Marci Aurelii in Ägypten nach der Consitutio Antoniniana', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 16: 47-59.

HANSEN M.H. 2004: 'The Use of Sub-Ethnics as Part of the Name of a Greek Citizen of the Classical Period: the Full Name of a Greek Citizen', in T.H. NIELSEN (ed.), *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek* Polis (Historia Einzelschr. 180), Wiesbaden: 117-129.

— AND NIELSEN T.H. 2004: *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis,* Oxford.

HÜBSCH G. 1968: *Die Personalangaben als Identifizierungsvermerke im Recht der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri*, Berlin.

KALTSAS D. 2001: *Dokumentarische Papyri des 2. Jh. v. Chr. aus dem Herakleopolites,* Heidelberg = P.Heid VIII.

KEENAN J.G. 1974, 'The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations in Later Roman Egypt. (Suite.)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 13: 283-304.

LA'DA C.A. 1994: 'Ethnicity, occupation and tax-status in Ptolemaic Egypt', in BRESCIANI E. (ed.), *Acta Demotica. Acts of the Fifth International Conference for Demotists. Pisa, 4th-8th September 1993* (Egitto e Vicino Oriente 17), Pisa: 183-189.

— 1997: 'Who were those 'of the Epigone'?', in B. KRAMER ET AL. (eds.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses. Berlin 1995* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft 3. I), Stuttgart: 563-569.

MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI J. 1966: 'La règle de droit dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque' in, A.E. SAMUEL (ed.), *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology. 1), New Haven: 125-173.

— 1984: 'Le document grec dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia III*, Naples: 1173-1187.

— 1983: 'Le statut des Hellènes dans l'Égypte lagide: bilan et perspectives de recherches', *Revue des études grecques* 96: 241-268 = *Statut personnel et liens de famille dans les droits de l'Antiquité*, Aldershot 1993: III.

— 1990: 'Entre la cité et le fisc: le statut grec dans l'Égypte romaine', in *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Égypte romaine,* Aldershot: I = reprinted from *Symposion 1982. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Santander, 1.-4. September 1982)*, Cologne; Vienna 1989: 241-280.

PRÉAUX C. 1955: 'Sur les fonctions du πράκτωρ ξενικῶν', *Chronique d'Égypte* 30: 107-111.

SWIDEREK A. 1953-54: 'La société indigène en Égypte au III^e^ siècle avant notre ère d'après les archives de Zénon', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 7/8: 231-284.

UEBEL F. 1968: *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, Berlin.

VANDORPE K. 2008: 'Persian Soldiers and Persians of the Epigone. Social Mobility of Soldiers-Herdsmen in Upper Egypt', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 54: 87-108.

VEÏSSE A.-E. 2007: 'Status et identité dans l'Égypte des Ptolémées: les désignations d'«Hellènes» et d'«Égyptiens»', *Ktema* 32: 279-291.

— 2012: 'L'usage des ethniques dans l'Égypte du III^e siècle', in L. CAPDETREY AND J. ZURBACH (eds.), *Mobilités grecques: migrations, réseaux, contacts en Méditerranée, de l'époque archaïque à l'époque hellénistique*, Bordeaux: 57-66.

WOLFF H.J. 1978: *Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägytens in der Zeit der Ptolemaeer und des Prinzipats. 2. Band. Organisation und Kontrolle des privaten Rechtsverkehrs*, Munich.

— 1982, review of BRASHEAR W.M. (ed.), Ptolemäische Urkunden aus Mumienkartonage, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 99: 369-372.

YIFTACH-FIRANKO U. 2008: 'Who Killed the Double Document in Ptolemaic Egypt?', *Archiv für papyrusforschung* 54: 203-218.

— (forthcoming): *Legal Documents in Ancient Societies II: Transaction Costs in the Ancient World, the Center for Hellenic Studies of the Harvard Trustees, Washington DC, 27-28.7.2009*.