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In the same year the dedicatee of this article was born, O. Hornnickel, the author of a small Gießen dissertation still ranking as a standard work in its field: *Ehren- und Rangprädicate in den Papyrusurkunden. Ein Beitrag zum römischen und byzantinischen Titelwesen* (Gießen 1930), wrote in a short discussion of the term εὐγενεστάτος (p. 12):

\[\text{Zerter Beleg J. 477, SB 7167.4; bzw. 5./6. *Lond. 1023.1. Letzter Beleg J. 635 *Flor 306.8. Ehrenprädikat der Frauen; in öffentlichen und privaten Urkunden weitverbreitet. Nur an zwei Stellen auch für Männer gebraucht: } *Ox 1664.15 (III). *Form 133 [byz.]. Die Anrede }\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\alpha\nu\text{ für Männer findet sich aber schon im 4. Jh. (vgl. WB s.v.)}\]

The new, electronic means of exploring the existing papyrological documentation via the Duke Data Bank on Documentary Papyri allows a late 20th-century scholar to work now with much greater precision and Hornnickel’s rather lapidary statement can be brought up-to-date easily. As the etymology and the word formation of the adjective εὐγενῆς (εὖ + γένος) seem clear enough and do not need a further, preliminary discussion, I give below a list of all attestations of εὐγενεστάτος in documentary papyri from the 3rd century A.D onwards as found through the DDBDP CD-ROM # 6, supplemented by the texts referred to by F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* III Abschn. 9 s.v.\(^1\) At the same time I wish to use the opportunity to supplement now a comment I made in a note to CPR X 118.4, written before I got access to the DDBDP: “Eine Adressatin -ια, die Tochter eines Heliodoros und εὐγενεστάτη ist, konnte ich in kontemporären Papyri aus Hermopolis nicht finden”. The fact of the matter is that there is, after all, such a person, viz. Aurelia Eutropia, Tochter des Heliodoros.

The attestations of εὐγενεστάτος known to date are given per city in Egypt (limiting myself to this country I have left documents from Nessana [Sinai] out of account; fathers’ names are given in the genitive, separated from the εὐγενεστάτος or εὐγενεστάτη by a /):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abu Sha’ar</td>
<td>Sarah; addressee of letter(^2)</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARCE 31 (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antinoopolis</td>
<td>Athanasia/Kyrou x Aleet (from Lykopolis), wife of Fl.Konon <em>pragnateutes</em>; party in dispute</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lond. V 1707.4 (cf. P.Cair. Masp. II 67161.3)</td>
<td>Aur. Maria/Mena: only as witness to marriage contract N.N., wife of Phoibammon doctor; receives from husb. in testament</td>
<td>566-573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lond. V 1711.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Cair. Masp. II 67151.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) I am grateful to P. van Minnen (Duke University) for kindly providing me with attestations entered into the DDBDP since the production of CD-ROM # 6. R.S. Bagnall read an earlier version of this paper and kindly corrected my English.

\(^2\) It is interesting that in l. 6 the phrasing ἡ ὑμῶν εὐγένεια is used for indicating both Sarah and her father, ἡ βιβας Ἰωάννης.
P. Münch. I 7.13  
Kakos/Iakybiou, wife of Patermuthis shipper (from Syene): inherited i.a. part of house 583

Aphrodis Kome
P. Cair. Masp. III 67306.3  
Aur. Maria/Eulogiou ex-protokometes: debtor of 5 solidi against hypothec 526
P. Cair. Masp. III 67300.2  
Sibylla & Herais/Mousaiou: landowners/lessors 526
P. Lond. V 1695.4  
Sibylla & Herais/Mousaiou Syrionos: landowners/lessors 531
P. Cair. Masp. I 67088.[4]  
Stephanos/Abraamioi ex-boethos: landowner 551
P. Michael. 42.B.6  
Aur. Rachel/Phoibammonos, wife of Besarion: leases out land given in hypothec 566
P. Cair. Masp. I 67005.17  
Sophia: in complaint sent in by widow 566-568
P. Cair. Masp. III 67325.iv  
Aur. N.N.(fem.)/Ioannou/Korneliou: syntelestria, landowner/lessor 585

Arsinoe
SB VI 9293.7 + BL VII 206  
Maria/[N.N. = ?] Apollo: leases out land 573
SB VIII 9777.8  
Theodosia, wife of Menas ex-hypodektes: leases out land 597
BGU III 395.12f. + BL VIII 26  
Maria/Apollo: party in contract of uncertain nature 599/600
SB I 4661.a.6, b.17  
Kale/[?Pses]eioü: buys land VII/VII
SPP XX 243.33  
Christodora/Georgiou monk: gives power of attorney to cousin

Gebelen
SB III 6258.1 = SPP III 1334  
Poac, priest: addressee of order V/VI
SB X 10553.1,4  
Ose: creditor of money V/VI

Herakleopolis
CPR VII 47A.10  
Theodora: buys (landed/house?) property VII

Hermopolis
SB III 7167.4 + BL VII 191  
[Aur. Eutropia/Heliodorou]: leases out land 477
CPR X 118.4  
[Aur. Eutropia/Heliodorou: idem (?) 482
CPR V 16.4  
Aur. Eutropia/Heliodorou: leases out land 486

3  It is a mystery to me why the editor of this text, C. Wessely, chose to restore this father’s name; after all, J.M. Diethart’s Prosopographia Arsinoitica (Wien 1980; = MPER NS XII) lists only 3 attestations (## 5814-5816) of the name Ψεσειω; two of them are the result of restorations and one of these derives from the present text. One wonders how many other names ending in -ειω could be restored.

4  In this text the full stop should be transferred from before έδοκα (l. 2) to the start of this line, before την κοραματιαν.

5  The editor reads τῷ εὐγενείῳ ὤς, but one should probably separate after εὐγενεί and regard one of the following omegas as superfluous, hence read τῷ εὐγενείῳ ὤς (a name ὤς is unknown, cf. F. Preisigke’s Namenbuch s.n. ὤς); the adjective εὐγενείος (‘well-bearded’) has a meaning completely different from that of εὐγενής. The personal names Εὐγενίος and Εὐγενία are, of course, derived from εὐγενής.

It is worth noting that in this text the simple positivus εὐγενής rather than the superlative εὐγενέστατος is used.
Εὐγενέστατος

SB XIV 12050.2 Fl. Aphthonia/Hypsistou (?): leases out land 498
P.Lond. III 1023.1 (p. 267) Aur. N.N. (fem.)/Pinoutionos: leases out part of a house V/VI
P.Berl.Frisk 5.7 Archontia/-ou: gives land in hypothec 509
P.Vindob.Sal. 9.3 Aur. Eucharistia/Theodorou: leases out land 509
SB XIV 11373.2 Aur. Kyra=Eustorgia/Abraamiou: leases out land given in hypothec 513
SB XVI 13037.14 Dioskourias: gave name to a measure (as owner of landed property?) 522
P.Flor. III 323.4 Georgia/-orou: buys land 525
P.Stras. 481.3 Aur. Eucharistia/Theotimou: receiving party in contract 538
P.Stras. 482.2 Aur. Maria/Ioannou: leases out land 542
P.Stras. 482.7 mother of Aur. Maria/Ioannou: gave land to daughter 542
SB XVIII 13583.3 Aur. Eurasia & Thebais: landowners 547
P.Stras. 338.3 Aur. Herais & Amaleet/Anoubionos: lease out parts of a house 550
SB VI 9085 inv. 16048.3,10 Aur. Aphthonia/Hypsistou: leases out land 565
SB VI 9085 inv. 16050.4 Aur. Aphthonia/Hypsistou: leases out land 579
SB VI 9085 inv. 16055.5 Aur. Aphthonia/Hypsistou: leases out land 598
P.Laur. III 77.5 Theophile/Biktoros = N.N.: owned landed property 603
SB XVIII 13173.7,17,42,47, 72,130,137 Aur.Isidora/Biktoros: buys slave 629?
SB VI 9085 inv. 16166.5 Fl. Eulogia/N.N.: leases out land 643
P.Stras. 655.3 N.N. (fem.): leases out part of a house V
P.Stras. 656.2 N.N. (fem.): leases out land 506
SPP XX 126.3 N.N. (fem.?):/Gennadiou: leases out land 515
P.Lond. III 994 (p. 259) N.N. (fem.)/Kollouthou: leases out a pottery 5176
P.Stras. 598.2 N.N. (fem.): leases out land 541
P.Stras. 477.1 N.N. (fem.): leases out land VI
P.Lond. V 1769.6-7 [a]/Sarapionos: co-owner of vineyard VI
P.Lond. V 1772.6 Aur. N.N. (fem.)/Janou (?): creditor of rent in kind VI
P.Lond. V 1780.1 Theodora/Apollotos: landowner VI
P.Flor. III 306.8 N.N. (fem.): leases out house property 635
P.Bad.IV 95.iv.67 Apa Amonios monk: mentioned in list VI/VII

Oxyrhynchus

P.Oxy. XIV 1664.15-16 Apion: addressee of letter III
P.Oxy. XXXIV 2724.3 Fl. Kyria: landowner 469
P.Oxy. XVI 1890.3 Serena/Petrou: leases out bakery + mill 508

6 Despite the editor (cf. his note to l. 3) I tend to believe that the reading ευγενέστατη (ed. ευτελέστατη) is possible. Moreover, to date an honorific epithet ευτελέστατος still has not occurred elsewhere, while the meaning of the adjective ευτελής (cf. F.M.J. Waanders, The History of ΤΕΛΟΣ and ΤΕΛΕΩ in Ancient Greek [Diss. Amsterdam 1983] 178: ‘cheap, mean, worthless’, and F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch s.v.: ‘wohlfeil, geringwertig, gering’) excludes its being applied in the context of an address (‘To the most worthless …’ makes no sense, of course).
This listing, however, is not the end of the matter, as in quite a few documents people are addressed in terms of η σήμερον εὐγένεια (for this abstract cf. H. Zilliacus, Untersuchungen zu den abstrakten Anredeformen und Höflichkeitstiteln im Griechischen [Helsingfors 1949] 47 ['abstrakte Höflichkeitstitel ... neu im 4. Jh.'])); 68 ['Anrede an Laici und Frauen, bisweilen auch an Geistliche'], and 88 ['ein Frauen zukommendes Ehrenprädikat']); it may be assumed, therefore, that these persons belong automatically to the category of the εὐγένεστοι / εὐγενεσταῖ. Not included in the following list are those papyri in which both the abstract εὐγένεια and the superlative adjective εὐγενεσταῖ are used for the same person; the following papyri with εὐγένεια have been mentioned already under εὐγενεσταῖ: JARCE 31 (1994) 165.6; P.Berl.Frisk 5.5,6,7; P.Lond. V 1711.E.23 and 1885; P.Michael. 42.A.4.27; P.Oxy. XVI 1890. 4,7,11,13,15 and XXXIV 2724.12; PSI VI 709.13 and VII 836.5,7,8; P.Stras. 598.5 and 656.7;

7 Despite the editor of the text I am not certain that Mary is the physical mother of Paul; it is well known that terms like ‘father’ and ‘mother’ could be used simply in an affective sense. One wonders whether this Maria is the same person as the Maria occurring in the preceding entry. It is known that the provincial government employed not only exceptores (= ‘secretary able to write shorthand’), but also scholastici; father and son could have shared the same employer.

8 A new edition of this text by B. Sirks is forthcoming.
Antinoopolis
P.Cair.Masp. III 67310.7  N.N. (fem.): money promised in marriage contract  VI
SB XVIII 13298.10 (?)  Anastasia/Doran(tinou)\(^9\): lends money  566-

Arinoe
P.Abinn. 9.3,7  Fl. Abinnaios: addressee in letter  c. 350
P.Abinn. 30.10  Fl. Abinnaios: addressee in letter  c. 350
P.Abinn. 33.6  Fl. Abinnaios: addressee in letter  c. 350
SB VI 9286.[10]  N.N.: receives greetings in letter  VII

Douch
O.Douche I 2.3  Father P-; addressee of letter  IV

Hermopolis
CPR VIII 28.13  Nearchides: addressee of letter  IV
P.Amh.II 145.13  Paula: addressee in letter  IV

Kellis
P.Kell. I 5.4-5.9,19  Pausanias: addressee of letter  ca. 330

Oxyrhynchus
PSI IX 1081.6  Limenios: addressee in letter  III/IV
P.Oxy. LV 3821.4,6  Heras: addressee of letter  c.341/2
P.Oxy. XLIX 3512.8,15  Fl. Ioannes/Martyriou, politeuomenos: landowner in contract  492
P.Oxy. XVI 1891.8  Fl. Apphou/Eulogiou, tribunus: lends money  495
P.Oxy. XVI 1959.10,16  Fl. Apphou/Eulogiou, tribunus: owner of house  499
P.Oxy. LXI 4004.10  Kanopus: addressee in letter  V
PSI VII 843.4,8  Eudaimon: landowner, addressee in letter  V/VI
P.Rein. II 108.12  N.N.: owner of bakery + mill early VI

Prov. unknown
PSI XIV 1446.2  N.N.: addressee in letter  IV
P.Stras. 180.2  Hermodoros: addressee in letter  IV
SB VI 9135.7  N.N.(male): addressee in letter  IV
SB XVIII 13589.7  Theodoros: addressee in letter  IV
P.Oslo III 162.10,12,14  Dorotheos: addressee in letter  IV
P.Stras. 229.9,13  [?Sam]bas/Theophilou, singularius (Thebaid): addressee in rent contract  502

\(^9\) The editor of the text restores παρασχεῖν τῇ σῇ ἐγενέστατος ἉνάστασιςΔωραντινόου. In itself, however, a restoration of, e.g., παρασχεῖν τῇ Αὐρηλίᾳ Ἁνάστασις seems conceivable and the word order in the editor’s restoration seems a bit unusual.
On the basis of the preceding lists the following observations may be made:

(1) The earliest attestation of a female εὐγενεστάτη is P.Oxy. XXXIV 2724 from the year 469, the latest is SB VI 9085 inv. 16166 from the year 643; the masc. εὐγενέστατος occurs already in the 3rd century, P.Oxy. XIV 1664. Likewise, the abstract εὐγένεια may also have been used already in the late 3rd century, cf. the date of PSI IX 1081 (Oxyrhynchos, III/IV).

(2) While the number of females bearing the epithet εὐγενεστάτη is much larger than the number of males bearing the epithet εὐγενέστατος (only 5 attestations, viz. SB III 6258 = SPP III 133; SB X 10553; P.Bad. IV 95.iv.67; P.Oxy. XIV 1664 and P.Stras. 560), the number of males addressed in terms of ή σή εὐγένεια is considerably larger than the number of females; in other words, the adjective is seen to be predominantly applied to females,10 the abstract predominantly to males.

3) There are far more Αὐρήλαιοι/-ίαι than Φλάοιοι/-ίαι bearing this honorific epithet (for these names as status-indicators in the papyri cf. J.G. Keenan in ZPE 11 [1973] 33-63 and 13 [1974] 283-304). Generally speaking ‘Flavius’ is a kind of ‘upper-class’ status-indicator (‘upper-class’ in a relative sense), but it would be wrong to infer that ‘Aurelius/-lia’ automatically points to a ‘lower-class’ person: from the papyri listed above we learn about the social standing of the εὐγενεστάται Αὐρήλαια that these women themselves often owned land or house property and that they were able to credit other people.11 As far as the sources tell us something about the parents, husbands or sons of these women, we find educated people like doctors, scholastici (= ‘advocates’) or exceptores (= ‘stenographer/secretary’), holders of some kind of local office (e.g.: a village headman or a tax-collector) and shippers. Male εὐγενέστατοι / εὐγενεῖς could belong to the military, to the clergy, or held some municipal or provincial office. We may conclude that male and female bearers of the epithet were at least ‘middle-class’ people who were not entitled to a specific honorific title or indication of rank (e.g.: ἐνδοξότατος, κράτιστος, μεγάλοπρεπέστατος, ὑπερφυέστατος), but who at the same time formed part of the municipal aristocracy.12 It is probably in keeping with this that in two marriage contracts, P.Lond. V 1711 F. 37 and P.Cair. Masp. III 67310.16, ‘decent behaviour’ (a ‘middle-class’ virtue) is required for an εὐγενεστάτη future wife (for a similar requirement, cf. the 4th-century personal letter PSI I 41, l. 13). Finally, it seems of some interest that the author of SB I 6000 choose the epithet εὐγενεστάτη for the description of a female party in his transaction; apparently this epithet occurred so frequently in the practice of this scribe that he treated it as a more or less fixed element in the phrasing of his text.
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10 J. Beaucamp, *Le Statut de la femme à Byzance (4e.-7e siècle). II. Les pratiques sociales* (Paris 1992; Travaux & Mémoires du Centre de Recherche d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Monogr. 6) does not pay specific attention to the epithet εὐγενεστάτη (called by her [p. 130 n.21]: ‘simple qualificatif honorifique’) in her ‘Annexe V: Titres et dignités attestés pour des femmes’ (pp. 401-407) in which she lists bearers of epithets like λαμπρότατη, ἐνδοξότατη and μεγαλόπρεπεστάτη.

11 To be sure, there are some cases of a marriage between a male Φλάοιος and a female Αὐρήλια, e.g. SPP XX 117 (Flavius Horigenios x Aurelia Horigeneia) and P.Münch. I 12 and 13 (Flavius Patermouthios x Aurelia Kak). On social mobility of women as a consequence of marriage cf. J. Beaucamp, *op. cit.*, 35.

12 In a few cases (cf. P.Oxy. XXXIV 2724 [Oxyrhynchos] and SB XIV 12050 [Hermopolis]) one finds the epithet combined with λαμπρότατος, an epithet which in the later 5th century had lost much of its old splendor (cf. ‘vir clarissimus’) and was also used for indicating members of society who did not belong to ‘the street’. Cf. Beaucamp [fn.10] 131 n. 22.