

Particle-usage in Documentary Papyri (I–IV A.D.): An Integrated Sociolinguistically-informed Approach

Klaas Bentein

1. Introduction

The Ancient Greek language abounds in what are traditionally called ‘particles’.¹ These are typically described along two interrelated dimensions. The first is the *syntactic* dimension: scholars have come to recognise that particles function at a variety of linguistic or discourse levels.² Consider, for example, the beginning of Plato’s *Apology* (17A–B):

- (1) ὅτι μὲν ὑμεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πεπόνθατε ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν κατηγορῶν, οὐκ οἶδα· ἐγὼ δὲ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ὀλίγου ἐμαυτοῦ ἐπελαθόμην, οὕτω πιθανῶς ἔλεγον. καίτοι ἀληθές γε ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν οὐδὲν εἰρήκασιν. μάλιστα δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν ἐθαύμασα τῶν πολλῶν ὧν ἐψεύσαντο, τοῦτο ἐν ᾧ ἔλεγον ὡς χρῆν ὑμᾶς εὐλαβεῖσθαι μὴ ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ ἐξαπατηθῆτε ὡς δεινοῦ ὄντος λέγειν. τὸ γὰρ μὴ αἰσχυρθῆναι ὅτι αὐτίκα ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεγχθήσονται

¹ J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) xxxvii, defines a particle as “a word expressing a mode of thought, considered either in isolation or in relation to another thought, or a mood of emotion.” For further discussion of some of the problematic aspects of defining particles see most recently K. Loudová, “Particles (formal features),” in G. Giannakis et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (Leiden 2014) 24–31, and A. Revuelta Puidgollers, “Particles (syntactic features),” in *Encyclopedia* 31–41.

² See e.g. G. Wakker, “Welaan dan dus nu. Partikels in Sophocles,” *Lampas* 28 (1995) 254–257, and “Emphasis and Affirmation. Some Aspects of μήν in Tragedy,” in A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles* (Amsterdam 1997) 210–213; S. E. Porter and M. B. O’Donnell, “Conjunctions, Clines and Levels of Discourse,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 20 (2007) 3–14.

ἔργῳ, ἐπειδὴν μηδ' ὀπωστιοῦν φαίνωμαι δεινὸς λέγειν, τοῦτό μοι ἔδοξεν αὐτῶν ἀναισχυντότατον εἶναι, εἰ μὴ ἄρα δεινὸν καλοῦσιν οὗτοι λέγειν τὸν ἀληθῆ λέγοντα.

How you, men of Athens, have been affected by my accusers, I do not know; but I, for my part, almost forgot my own identity, so persuasively did they talk; and yet there is hardly a word of truth in what they have said. But I was most amazed by one of the many lies that they told—when they said that you must be on your guard not to be deceived by me, because I was a clever speaker. For I thought it the most shameless part of their conduct that they are not ashamed because they will immediately be convicted by me of falsehood by the evidence of fact, when I show myself to be not in the least a clever speaker, unless indeed they call him a clever speaker who speaks the truth. (transl. Fowler)

In this passage, γε (line 3) is used to focus on a single word, ἀληθές, whereas καίτοι (3), δέ (4) and γάρ (7) specify the functional relationship between sentences. The particles μέν (1) and δέ (2) are also used across sentences, establishing a correlative relationship between ὑμεῖς and ἐγώ. ἄρα (9) is used with yet another function: rather than referring to the immediate sentential or discourse context, it refers to the communicative context, that is, the relationship between speaker and hearer. Wakker³ refers to these different discourse levels as the ‘representational’ level of discourse (concerning the representation of experience), the ‘presentational’ level of discourse (concerning the structure of discourse), and the ‘interactional’ level of discourse (concerning the interactional situation)⁴ respectively.

³ In *New Approaches* 210–213; see also *Lampas* 28 (1995) 254–257.

⁴ On this level see further Wakker, in *New Approaches* 212: “The *interactional* level accounts for the fact that every coherent stretch of discourse is integrated into a specific interactional situation. Particles primarily functioning at this level may pertain to the involvement of the discourse participants (speaker-addressee, narrator-reader) in the communicative situation, or to their commitment to the message being exchanged; they may modify or specify the illocutionary intention, or indicate the turn-taking system in a conversation.”

Another point of interest from a syntactic point of view is the position which particles occupy inside the sentence/clause: scholars have observed that particles are often placed in second position (the so-called ‘Wackernagel’ position).⁵

The second dimension that has received scholarly attention is the *semantic* dimension. In this context, scholars have discussed the semantic contribution of individual particles: for example, within the larger group of discourse-connecting particles, a distinction can be made between *additive* (e.g. *καί* ‘and’), *adversative* (e.g. *ἀλλά*), and *causal* (e.g. *οὖν*) particles.⁶ Similarly, within the category of focus particles, *expansive* (e.g. *καί* ‘also’), *restrictive* (e.g. *γε*), *parallel* (e.g. *πάλιν*), and *replacing* (e.g. *οὐκ ... ἀλλά*) particles can be distinguished.⁷

In this article I argue that yet another dimension needs to be taken into account: the *social* dimension. Diachronically, one of the major changes between Classical and Post-classical/Byzantine Greek concerns the use of particles: many of the particles that are typical in Classical Greek become far less frequent⁸ in the Post-classical and Byzantine periods.⁹ This development is typically attributed to two factors: the functional overlap between different particles, which must have caused difficulty for second-language speakers, and the shift from pitch to stress

⁵ See e.g. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* lviii–lxi.

⁶ See Loudová, in *Encyclopedia* 24–31, with regard to Ancient Greek.

⁷ See A. Revuelta Puidgollers, “Parallel Focus Particles, especially in Ancient Greek,” in M. Martínez Hernández et al. (eds.), *Cien años de investigación semántica: de Michel Bréal a la actualidad II* (Madrid 2000) 1188.

⁸ See e.g. J. A. L. Lee, “Some Features of the Speech of Jesus in Mark’s Gospel,” *NT* 27 (1985) 1–26. For further discussion of the diachrony of particles see H. Tonnet, “Aperçu sur l’évolution historique des particules de liaison (joncteurs) en grec,” *Cahiers Balkaniques* 12 (1988) 135–150. For particles in the Post-classical period see esp. M. E. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies* (Leiden 1962), and J. Blomqvist, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (Lund 1969).

⁹ I define ‘Post-classical’ as the period from the third century B.C. to the sixth A.D. and ‘Byzantine’ as the period from the seventh century to the fifteenth.

accent.¹⁰ However, the use of particles in these periods is not a *yes-or-no* matter: particles appear much more frequently in some texts than in others. It will therefore be interesting to analyse to what extent particles in these later periods can be said to function as ‘social markers’,¹¹ and if so, exactly which aspects of social identity they mark. Sociolinguistic questions of the type ‘Who still uses particles?’, ‘Are particles primarily used in more formal contexts, or also in less formal ones?’, ‘Does the use of particles vary according to the social status of the addressee?’, etc. have rarely been raised, and even less often been answered.¹² Clarysse has recently made interesting observations with regard to the Ptolemaic papyri, but his findings are based on a rather small corpus of texts, and therefore have limited validity.¹³

By focusing on the Post-classical papyri, I do not wish to claim that particles in Classical Greek had no social value whatever. However, as is the case with other linguistic features, this social value is rather difficult to recover, because of the nature of our textual witnesses.¹⁴ It is likely to have been

¹⁰ For the first point see E. Schwyzer and A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* II (Munich 1950) 556, and for the second J. J. Fraenkel, “A Question in Connection with Greek Particles,” *Mnemosyne* 13 (1947) 183–201. For further discussion see Blomqvist, *Greek Particles* 132–147.

¹¹ For the concept of ‘social markers’ see further K. R. Scherer and H. Giles (eds.), *Social Markers in Speech* (Cambridge 1979).

¹² One notable exception being Lee, *NT* 27 (1985) 1–26.

¹³ W. Clarysse, “Linguistic Diversity in the Archive of the Engineers Kleon and Theodoros,” in T. V. Evans and D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford 2010) 35–50. For further observations with regard to the documentary papyri see also R. Luiselli, “Authorial Revision of Linguistic Style in Greek Papyrus Letters and Petitions (AD i–iv),” in *The Language of the Papyri* 88–94; K. Bentein, “The Greek Documentary Papyri as a Linguistically Heterogeneous Corpus: The Case of the *katochoi* of the *Sarapeion*-archive,” *CW* 108 (2015) 461–484.

¹⁴ On this topic see further K. Bentein, “Register and the Diachrony of Post-classical and Early Byzantine Greek,” *RBPh* 91 (2013) 35–38. With regard to the Classical period, some attention has been paid to the different generic contexts in which particles are used: see e.g. Wakker, in *New Ap-*

different from that in the Post-classical papyri, owing to factors such as diachrony, language contact, literary vs. non-literary language, etc. Concerning the social value of particles in the Post-classical language, it is sometimes generalizingly stated that particles were an artificial feature which was lost from the ‘ordinary’ language and maintained only by speakers educated in the Classical language,¹⁵ which would, perhaps, obviate the need for a sociolinguistic focus. I should stress that this assumption cannot be taken for granted, and that the situation is much more complex: (i) persons with a ‘Classical’ background were, perhaps, most likely to use particles; however, this does not mean that they used particles in *all* social contexts; (ii) clearly, less educated persons made use of particles too; however, they only did so in *some* contexts; (iii) the Post-classical period alone spans nearly one thousand years, so it is very likely that the socio-linguistic situation changed over time; some particles remained in use much longer than others, and some are still in use in Modern Greek (e.g. *ἀλλά, καί*); (iv) new particles were also formed during the Post-classical and Byzantine periods (e.g. *διὰ τοῦτο, ὅθεν, λοιπόν*, etc.). In view of these considerations, I believe there is a real need for an *integrated* approach towards particle-usage (especially for the Post-classical and Byzantine periods), which includes a socio-linguistic dimension.

The article is organized as follows: in §2 I give a more precise description of the corpus that has been used for this study; in §3 I outline the socio-linguistic framework; in §4 I analyse four groups of particles: (i) focus particles (*γε, γοῦν*), (ii) coordinating particles (*τε, μέν ... δέ*); (iii) compound discourse-connecting particles (*τοῖνυν, τοιγαροῦν, μέντοι, καίτοι*); (iv) modal particles (*ἄρα, μήν, δή*).

proaches 210–213, and Y. Duhoux, “Les particules: une classe des mots à supprimer en grec ancien?” in E. Crespo et al. (eds.), *Word Classes and Related Topics in Ancient Greek* (Louvain-la-Neuve 2006) 526–529.

¹⁵ See e.g. Thrall, *Greek Particles* 7.

2. The corpus: Post-classical documentary papyri

The present study is embedded within a larger research project which aims at analyzing the language of documentary papyri.¹⁶ The project focuses on documents contained in so-called ‘archives’, that is, groups of texts that have been collected in antiquity by persons or institutions, for example because they were useful and needed to be kept, or because they had sentimental value. The value of archives for different types of research has recently been stressed by Vandorpe:¹⁷ (a) much contextual information is known; (b) they contain texts that are related, which offers a direct means for comparison; (c) there is a rich secondary literature on these archives.¹⁸

For this article, I focus specifically on letters and petitions from the first four centuries A.D. A full list of the archives that have been investigated is in the Appendix, arranged according to the location where they have been found: (i) Dionysias; (ii) Hermopoli(te)s; (iii) Karanis; (iv) Oxyrhynchus/Oxyrhynchites; (v) Panopolis; (vi) Tebtynis; (vii) Theadelphia.¹⁹ It is worth pointing out some tendencies within the corpus. First, letters are prevalent: there are 702 letters, and only 250 petitions. However, petitions are generally somewhat longer: letters have an average length of 17.5 lines (90 words), while petitions have an average length of 22 lines (151 words). Second, some archives contain a high number of texts: especially noteworthy in this regard are the archives of Apollonius the *strategus* (174 texts)

¹⁶ This project, entitled ‘Morpho-syntactic variation in the Greek documentary papyri (I–VIII A.D.). A socio-historical investigation’, is funded by the Belgian American Educational Foundation (2013–2014) and the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research (2013–2016).

¹⁷ K. Vandorpe, ‘Archives and Dossiers,’ in R. Bagnall (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Oxford 2009) 238–240.

¹⁸ As one of the reviewers notes, however, this does not imply that all documents that do not form part of an archive are not valuable for socio-linguistic research.

¹⁹ For a few of the papyri only the nome is known (e.g. Hermopolites, Oxyrhynchites), and not the specific city.

and Heroninus the *phrontistês* (295 texts).

As an anonymous reviewer mentions, in principle it would be possible to analyse *all* particles used in documentary texts, by means of the papyrological navigator at www.papyri.info. While this is evidently true, such an approach also has a number of disadvantages: (i) one would also need to take into account diachrony; (ii) it would be hard to analyse all the social contexts in which particles are used; (iii) one would be likely to overlook newly formed particles; (iv) it would be difficult to analyse the interrelationship with other linguistic features, and more generally the formation of linguistic registers (which is one of the long-term goals of the research project).²⁰ The main goal of the present study is to analyze a select number of particles, and to demonstrate what an integrated approach might look like. Hopefully, it will serve as a stepping stone for further, more large-scale research on particle-usage.

3. The socio-linguistic framework

Socio-linguistic research in the twentieth century (by William Labov among others) has dramatically improved our understanding of the linguistic and social mechanisms of linguistic change. However, the Labovian framework has the disadvantage that it does not offer an *integrated* account of the relationship between language and society: it mostly investigates the relationship between individual socio-linguistic variables such as gender, age, education, etc., and language. A framework which does attempt to offer an integrated theory for the language-society relationship is the *Systemic Functional* framework.²¹ Systemic Functional linguists take into account three main ‘vectors of context’, called *field* (concerning the nature of the social

²⁰ In addition, some searches would be very time-consuming (e.g. $\gamma\epsilon$, which would also give us all the words beginning with these two letters).

²¹ See e.g. R. Hasan, “The Conception of Context in Text,” in P. H. Fries and M. Gregory (eds.), *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives* (Norwood 1995) 183–283, and *Semantic Variation. Meaning in Society and in Sociolinguistics* (London 2009).

activity, e.g. science), *tenor* (concerning the interactants and their social relation, e.g. informal conversation) and *mode* (concerning the ways in which interactants come in contact, e.g. written communication).

For the purposes of this article, particular attention will be paid to the tenor vector, as the mode of discourse remains stable, and the field of discourse is known to have relatively little influence on grammatical differences. Systemic Functional linguists subdivide the tenor vector into three dimensions: agentive role, social status, and social distance. In what follows, I discuss how each of these three subvectors can be operationalised with regard to the documentary papyri.²²

Agentive role is relatively straightforward: various agentive roles can be discerned in the papyri. For example, a letter can be written by a mother to her son, a brother to his sister, a friend to a friend, a citizen to an official, etc. The disadvantages of working with such very specific agentive roles, however, are (i) that it is not always possible to determine them clearly (e.g. are we dealing with a friend, an acquaintance, or a business connection?), and (ii) that we do not take into account that some of these agentive roles are clearly related (e.g. a mother writing to her son, a brother to his sister, a husband to his wife, etc.). Therefore, it is useful to work additionally with more generic agentive roles or ‘macro-roles’. Following Stowers,²³ three can be discerned: family relations, relations between equals, and hierarchical relations (a subordinate writing to a superordinate, or a superordinate to a subordinate).

Social status is a complex notion. The Romans themselves focused heavily on ethnicity, by dividing the population into

²² For a recent treatment of this topic see S. E. Porter and M. B. O’Donnell, “Building and Examining Linguistic Phenomena in a Corpus of Representative Papyri,” in *The Language of the Papyri* 287–311. See further Bentein, *CW* 108 (2015), and “The Greek of the Fathers,” in K. Perry (ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Oxford 2015).

²³ S. K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia 1986) 27.

three strata: holders of Roman citizenship, citizens of the Greek cities of Egypt (Alexandria, Ptolemais, Naucratis, Antinoopolis), and Egyptians.²⁴ As Mairs notes, however, it is important for scholars not to focus exclusively on ethnicity when approaching identity: “important though the ethnic question is ... there is a sense in which it has tended to impede more holistic consideration of personal and corporate identities.”²⁵ Moreover, for our present purposes this threefold classification has the disadvantages that it is far from easy to know which class an individual belonged to, and that it was only valid for a certain period of time (viz., until the reforms in the third century). It is therefore worth concentrating on other social aspects, including professional occupation. Mairs notes that “occupational groups had long been an important feature of Egyptian social organisation, and continued to be,” citing Clarysse and Thompson:²⁶

It was through their membership of an [occupational group] that most in Egypt found a livelihood, their partners, their neighbours and friends, support in life as in death. The [occupational group] formed a basic social unit in the multifarious lives of the people; it played a significant communal role and for its members provided a key focus of identity.

As there are many different professional occupations,²⁷ it will be helpful to categorise them under larger occupational groups: (i) actors and athletes; (ii) craftsmen and tradesmen; (iii) officials; (iv) landowners/tenants; (v) liberal professions (e.g. estate managers, doctors, lawyers); (vi) other service workers (e.g. slaves, prostitutes); (vii) military; (viii) priests/clergy. Since

²⁴ See e.g. R. Bagnall, “The People of the Roman Fayum,” in *Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: Sources and Approaches* (Aldershot 2006) 7.

²⁵ R. Mairs, “Intersecting Identities in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt,” in R. J. Dann and K. Exell (eds.), *Approaching Ancient Egypt* (forthcoming).

²⁶ W. Clarysse and D. J. Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt II* (Cambridge 2006) 205.

²⁷ See N. Lewis, *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford 1983) ch. 7, and R. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton 1993) ch. 2.

officials are so often attested as the senders or addressees of documents, it will be interesting to make a further distinction between higher officials and lower, local officials.²⁸ It should also be stressed that these occupational groups are not mutually exclusive. For example, in most of the texts belonging to the first-century Harthotes archive, the main figure, Harthotes, identifies himself as a public farmer. In *SB XX 14099*, however, he explicitly identifies himself as a priest.

Other elements that are relevant when it comes to social status are gender, age, education (literacy), and location.²⁹ These will not be further taken into account in this article, which focuses on professional occupation.

In order to operationalise *social distance*, I concentrate on the difference between official (formal) and non-official (informal) documents.³⁰ While petitions are formal, letters can be more formal or less formal. Three main types of letters are typically distinguished: ‘private’ letters, ‘business’ letters, and ‘official’ letters. Only the last of these three types is more formal.

4. Analysis of particle-usage

4.1 Focus particles: γε, γοῦν

Traditional scholarship recognizes two main semantic values for γε, ‘limitative’ (as in, he is a *good* man; but perhaps not a clever one) and ‘emphatic’ (as in, he is a good man; with no

²⁸ On different types of officials see e.g. M. R. Favilene, “Geography and Administration in Egypt,” in *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* 521–540.

²⁹ Gender has received quite a lot of scholarly attention. See e.g. K. Vandorpe, “Identity in Roman Egypt,” in R. Riggs (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2012) 260–276, with references.

³⁰ Compare Lee, *NT* 27 (1985) 1–26. For a definition of formality see F. Heylighen and J.-M. Dewaele, “Formality of Language: Definition, Measurement and Behavioral Determinants,” *Internal Report, Center “Leo Apostel,” Free University of Brussels* (1999): <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/papers/formality.pdf> (last accessed 20 Oct. 2014). In papyrology, it is more traditional to distinguish between ‘private’ and ‘public’ documents (e.g. B. Palme, “The Range of Documentary Texts: Types and Categories,” in *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* 358–394).

attention to other qualities, often implying he is a *very* good man).³¹ Wakker more generally qualifies the particle as *de-marcating*: “by using γε the speaker demarcates the applicability of his utterance.”³² Using the terminology introduced in §1, we can speak of a restrictive focus particle, functioning at the representational level of discourse.

In his study of particle-usage in the archive of the engineers Cleon and Theodorus, Clarysse notes that “the enclitic γε, common in the classical language, all but disappears in the later Ptolemaic papyri.”³³ The same observation can be made with regard to our corpus: with only eight instances,³⁴ the particle occurs infrequently. The texts in which γε occurs are predominantly from the second and third centuries (6/8 instances). The particle typically modifies words and word groups rather than entire clauses, as in (2):

(2) ἔπειτα [τῶι] γε ὑψίστῳ θεῶι χάριν τινὰ καὶ πολλὴν εἶχον ἄν,
εἰ ὄψει θεωρεῖν τὰ κατὰ σὲ πράγματα [οἷ]ός τ’ ἦν ἐγώ (*P.Herm.*
6.26–28; ca. 317–323 A.D.)

Then would I render great thanks to the highest god, if I were able to see for myself how things are with you. (transl. Rees)

In this letter, a certain Besodorus addresses his friend, the *scholasticus* (lawyer) Theophanes, expressing his wish that the latter may soon return home; he would thank the highest god, if he could see how things are with Theophanes. γε is used to make a strong assertion: it highlights in particular who would be thanked if Besodorus’ wish would come true. Note how γε is placed after the article [τῶι], while stressing the entire word

³¹ Denniston, *The Greek Particles* 114–116.

³² G. Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam 1994) 308.

³³ Clarysse, in *The Language of the Papyri* 39; cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* II.3 (Berlin/Leipzig 1934) 123–125.

³⁴ *P.Giss.Apoll.* 27.9, 12 (113/4–120 A.D.); *P.Alex.Giss.* 38.19 (117–138); *P.Mich.* VIII 473.16 (II); *P.Harrauer* 35.27 (ca. 250); *P.Cair.Isid.* 62.16 (296); *P.Herm.* 6.26 (ca. 317–323); *P.Ammon* I 3.v.13 (348).

group [τῶι] ὑψίστῳ θεῶι.

As Wakker³⁵ among others notes, γε can also modify (subordinate) clauses. In the archive of Apollonius the *strategus*, an instance is found where γε is attached to a subordinating conjunction:

(3) ἀλλ' οὐδὲ [ἐκεῖν]α πράγματα διευθύνει[ς, ἵ]να γε κατὰ τοῦτο ἐν Χάκοις ὄντες ἡσθῶμεν ἐπὶ σοί (*P.Giss.Apoll.* 27.7–10; 113–120 A.D.)

Sondern Du bringst nicht einmal jene Geschäfte in Ordnung, damit wir uns, als wir in Chakoi waren, immerhin daran hätten freuen können. (transl. Kortus)

This letter is written by a certain Tryphon to Apollonius. Tryphon complains that while he has written many letters to Apollonius, the latter has not made any effort to settle certain matters. γε highlights the purpose introduced by the subordinating clause: if Apollonius had settled the matters, then at least Tryphon could rejoice when in Chakoi.

γε is mostly used in informal contexts. The agentive roles assumed by the senders of the texts in which it appears are varied: in *P.Cair.Isid.* 62 (297 A.D.), for example, the sender assumes a subordinate agentive role (citizen to official), while in *P.Mich.* VIII 473 (II A.D.) the sender assumes a familial role (sister to brother), and in *P.Herm.* 6 (#2 above) an equal role (friend to friend?). What is noticeable, however, is that the senders and especially addressees all have a high social rank: three documents are addressed to officials, one to a veteran, and one to a *scholasticus*.

γε often combines with other particles and particle groups:³⁶ among others, it coalesces with οὖν to form γοῦν. Denniston notes that there is little semantic difference between γε and γοῦν: he argues that γε retains its original value(s), while οὖν “adds a sense of reality or essentiality, but often does little more

³⁵ *Conditions and Conditionals* 308–309.

³⁶ See Denniston, *The Greek Particles* 150–151, for the Classical period.

than emphasize.”³⁷ γοῦν occurs even less often than γε in our corpus: there are four instances, three of them from the fourth century. In all instances, γοῦν modifies a word or word group, as in (4):³⁸

(4) προσειπε[ῖν] σε ἀναγκαῖον τὸν τῆς τ[ῶ]ν Ἑλλήνων σοφίας
προστά[τη]ν καὶ ἡ[μ]ῖν ἡδὺν καὶ χρηστόν· θεῶν δὲ ἔργον
παρασχέσθαι τὰς ἀφορμάς. ἡὐ[τ]ύχηται γοῦν μοι τὸ τυχεῖν τοῦ
ἀρίστου τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ κυρίο[υ] μου ἀδελφοῦ Θεοφάνου[ς]
(*P.Herm.* 3.2–11; 317)

I must address you, the champion of the wisdom of the Greeks and one who is pleasing and useful to us; but it is the work of the gods to provide the means. At least I have been fortunate in falling in with the best of men, my lord and brother Theophanes.
(transl. Rees)

The *archiprophētēs* (chief-prophet) Anatolius writes to his friend Ambrosius, whom he reverently calls “the champion of the wisdom of the Greeks.” Anatolius considers it his duty to speak with Ambrosius, but notes that the gods have to provide the opportunities. γοῦν highlights ἡὐ[τ]ύχηται: Anatolius has at least had the fortune to meet with Theophanes.

Like γε, γοῦν occurs primarily in informal contexts, though not exclusively. In most documents, the sender assumes a non-hierarchical, equal agentive role. So far as one can tell, the social rank of the senders and addressees is high: one document is addressed to the prefect, and two others are written by an *archiprophētēs*.

γε can also be found with μέντοι and καίτοι.³⁹ In our corpus, the former combination is found only once;⁴⁰ the latter occurs

³⁷ *The Greek Particles* 450.

³⁸ The other three are *P.Sakaon* 37.12 (284 A.D.), *P.Herm.* 2.6 (317), *CPR* VIII 28.16 (IV).

³⁹ Compare Denniston, *The Greek Particles* 405, 564, for Classical Greek, and Blomqvist, *Greek Particles* 28–34, 43–45, for Post-classical.

⁴⁰ *P.Mich.* VIII 501.10 (II A.D.).

four times,⁴¹ *καίτοι* being used both as a particle and as a concessive conjunction (typically with conjunct participles). These particle groups are found in informal contexts, with various agentive roles. The social status of the senders is not always clear, but the addressees typically are of a high social status: *P.Mich.* 486, for example, is addressed to the legionary soldier Apollinarius, and *SB* 11882 to the anchorite Apa Iohannes.

4.2. Co-ordinating particles: *τε, μέν ... δέ*

With regard to *τε*,⁴² Elliot distinguishes three main uses:⁴³ (a) ‘free *τε*’, where either a single *τε* is used in the sense of ‘and’, or a series, *τε ... τε* meaning ‘both ... and’; (b) the phrase *τε καί*, or *τε ... καί* ‘both ... and’; (c) *οὔτε, μήτε, εἴτε*, singly or repeated. Elliot hypothesises that *τε* disappeared in the order (a), (b), (c)—*οὔτε, μήτε*, and *εἴτε* remaining in use the longest. In the New Testament, in any case, there are almost no examples of free *τε*, *τε ... καί* is more common, and *οὔτε* and *μήτε* even more so. In what follows, I discuss uses (a) and (b)— use (c) goes beyond the scope of this article.

As in the New Testament, in our corpus use (b) is more frequent than (a). There are 50 examples of *τε καί* and 46 of *τε ... καί*.⁴⁴ Most commonly, *τε καί* coordinates regular nouns and proper nouns, as in (5),⁴⁵ and less frequently adjectives.⁴⁶

⁴¹ *P.Mich.* VIII 486.6 (II A.D.); *P.Prag.* I 109r.5, 10 (249–269); *SB* XIV 11882.4 (IV/V).

⁴² Mayser, *Grammatik* II.3 155–167, gives a very detailed description of the use of *τε* in the Ptolemaic papyri.

⁴³ J. K. Elliot, “*τε* in the New Testament,” *ThZ* 46 (1990) 202.

⁴⁴ On the use and development of these two particle groups in the Post-classical period see J. Blomqvist, “Juxtaposed *τε καί* in Post-classical Prose,” *Hermes* 102 (1974) 170–178. Blomqvist argues that *τε καί* remained longer in use as it formed part of certain set phrases.

⁴⁵ Similar examples are *P.Mich.* V 226.26–27, 34–35 (37 A.D.); VI 421.19 (41–54); *P.Mil.Vogl.* VI 264.8 (127); *PSI* V 463.20 (157–160); XV 1553.4, 25 (200–249); *P.Herm.* 2.25–26 (317); *P.Abinn.* 3.5 (346–351).

⁴⁶ E.g. *Stud.Pal.* V 58.2; 61.2 (both after 267).

With τε ... καί, verbs can also be coordinated.⁴⁷

- (5) ἔσχον ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων [ἀ]πὸ Λουκ[ί]ου Λουσί[ο]υ Γέτα τοῦ προηγεμονεύσαντος κριτῆ(ν) Γάϊον Ἰούλ[ι]ον Ἰόλλαν ἱερέα καὶ γυμνασίαρχον Ἀλεξανδρεία(ς), ὃς διακούσας ἐμοῦ [τ]ε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔστησεν μείναι τῆι γυναικί[ι] μου τῆ]ν κυρείαν ἀκολούθως οἷς ἔχωι ὑπομνημα[τισμοῖς] (*P.Oxy.* XLIX 3464.10–15; 54–60 A.D.)

I received from the former prefect L. Lusius Geta as judge concerning all C. Iulius Iollas(?), priest and gymnasiarch of Alexandria, who having heard both myself and the others laid down that the ownership should remain with my wife according to the record of proceedings which I have in my possession. (transl. Whitehorne)

Mnesitheus petitions the *strategus* C. Iulius Asinianus, recounting how he had a dispute with some men concerning the property of his wife, and how C. Iulius Iollas had decided that the ownership of this property should remain with her. τε καί is used to coordinate the two parties heard by C. Iulius Iollas, that is, Mnesitheus and “the others.”

From a social point of view, both τε ... καί and τε καί are often found in formal contexts, that is, in official letters and especially petitions (72/96). The senders typically assume a subordinate agentive role, addressing high officials. This agrees with Mayer's observation (with regard to the Ptolemaic period) that “in schlichten privaten Stücken, Briefen Kurzen Mitteilungen ist τέ – καί seltener als in amtlichen Urkunden, Kontrakten, Erlassen u. dgl.”⁴⁸ However, both particle groups can also be found in informal contexts, that is, in private and business letters: thus, for example, in the archives of Apollonius the *strategus*, Heroninus, and Theophanes (friends writing to friends, family to family, business connections to business con-

⁴⁷ E.g. *PSI* XII 1261.5 (212–217 A.D.); *P.Ryl.* II 239.5–6 (III). For an exceptional example with τε καί see *P.Herm.* 6.31 (317). Compare Mayer, *Grammatik* II.3 159 ff., on the syntactic differences between τε καί and τε ... καί.

⁴⁸ Mayer, *Grammatik* II.3 159.

nections, etc.).⁴⁹

Instances of τε without καί occur less frequently: I count 30 in our corpus. Examples of Elliot's 'free-standing' τε are even less frequent, since in many cases it is unclear, owing to lacunae, whether τε is followed by καί.⁵⁰ The combination τε ... τε, which is still attested in the Ptolemaic period, does not occur in our corpus. As a free-standing particle, τε often connects clauses or sentences, as in (6):⁵¹

(6) προσέταξεν ἡ θεία τύχη τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν τὸ Ἰταλικὸν νόμισμα εἰς ἥμισυ νόμισμου καταβιβασθῆναι· σπούδασον οὖν πᾶν τὸ Ἰταλικὸν ἀργύριον ὃ ἔχεις ἀναλῶσαι ἀγοράσας μοι εἶδη παντοδαπὰ καὶ π[ο]ίας εὐρίσκεις τιμῆς. τούτου τε ἔνεκα ἀπέστειλα πρὸς σε ὄφφ(ικιάλιον) (*P.Ryl.* IV 607.3–10; 314–324 A.D.?)

The divine Fortune of our masters has ordained that the Italian coinage be reduced to the half of a nummus. Make haste, therefore, to spend all the Italian silver that you have on purchases, on my behalf, of goods of every description at whatever price you find them. For this purpose I have dispatched an officialis to you. [transl. Roberts and Turner]

This letter is written by Dionysius, who is in government service, to a certain Apion. Dionysius has inside information of a decree considering the depreciation of the Italian *nomisma*, and so asks Apion to “spend all the Italian silver.” The final two sentences of this passage are connected causally not only by τούτου ἔνεκα, but additionally by τε. In the New Testament, Larsen notes, “when τέ conjoins two clauses or sentences, the second event is considered to overlap with or be a close continuation of the first event.”⁵²

⁴⁹ Examples are *P.Brem.* 15.4, 10 (II); 40.8 (II); 55.9 (II); *P.Flor.* II 145.3 (264); *P.Ryl.* II 239.5–6 (III); *P.Herm.* 2.23–24 (317); *P.Herm.* 6.14, 16 (317).

⁵⁰ Moreover, we have to take into account the possibility that δέ was meant for τε. Cf. Mayser, *Grammatik* II.3 156: “in manchen Fällen liegt die Vermutung nahe, daß τέ aus δέ verschrieben ist.”

⁵¹ Similar examples are *P.Meyer.* 8.14 (151 A.D.), *P.Rein.* II 115.5 (261?), *P.Cair. Isid.* 62.23 (296), *P.Sakaon* 38.25 (312).

⁵² I. A. Larsen, “Notes on the Function of γάρ, οὖν, μὲν, δέ, καί, and τε in

From a social point of view, the texts in which free-standing $\tau\epsilon$ occurs are similar to those in which $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ and $\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ occur: they are predominantly formal (16/19), the sender assuming a subordinate agentive role. Again, some instances can be found in private and business letters.⁵³ The addressees typically have a high social status: often they are high officials such as the prefect, *strategus*, *praepositus pagi*, etc. The social status of the senders is not always known, but seems more varied: they include landowners, priests, actors and athletes, and estate managers.

A second case of ‘correlative coordination’⁵⁴ is formed by the particle combination $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$,⁵⁵ which is already found in Archaic Greek.⁵⁶ Lambert describes the semantic difference between $\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ and $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ as follows:⁵⁷

Dans le premier cas [$\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$], des éléments divergents se trouvent pris dans un mouvement convergent qui les réunit, alors que dans le second cas, des éléments distincts se trouvent pris dans un mouvement divergent qui les oppose (non dans le réel mais sur le plan discursif).

This contrast is often rendered by the translation “on the one hand ... on the other hand.” Syntactically, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is typically used across clauses/sentences, often to contrast personal

the Greek New Testament,” *Notes on Translation* 5.1 (1991) 43.

⁵³ E.g. *P.Lond.* III 962.4 (254); *P.Rein.* II 115.5 (261?); *P.Ammon* I 3.iv.19 (348).

⁵⁴ Cf. F. Lambert, “Un cas de coordination corrélatrice: $\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ en grec ancien,” in P. de Carvalho and F. Lambert (eds.), *Structures parallèles et corrélatrices en grec et en latin* (Saint-Étienne 2005) 99–116.

⁵⁵ As Larsen, *Notes on Translation* 5.1 (1991) 40, observes with regard to the New Testament, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is not always followed by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$: in our corpus it can also be followed by $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ and even more often by $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$: e.g. *P.Mich.* VI 421.19–20 (41–54 A.D.); *PSI* XII 1259.13–4 (II/III); *P.Flor.* II 156.2–6 (III); *SB* XIV 12577.3–7 (III). These examples will not be discussed here.

⁵⁶ On the use of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, *Grammatik* II.3 129–130.

⁵⁷ Lambert, in *Structures parallèles* 114.

pronouns or proper nouns, as in (7):

- (7) συνεβίω[σα] Δημ[η]τροῦτι Ἡρακλείδου, κα[ὶ] ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἐπεχορήγησα αὐτῇ τὰ ἐξῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν. ἡ δὲ ἀλλότρια φρονήσασα τῆς κοινῆς συμβιώ[σεως] κατὰ πέρ[α]ς ἐξῆ[λθε] καὶ ἀπηνέκαστο τὰ ἡμέτερα ὧν τὸ καθ' ἐν ὑπόκειται. (*P.Oxy.* II 282.4–14; 29–37 A.D.)

I married Demetrous, daughter of Heraclides, and I for my part provided for my wife in a manner that exceeded my resources. But she became dissatisfied with our union, and finally left the house carrying off property belonging to me a list of which is added below. (transl. Grenfell and Hunt)

In this petition to the *strategus*, Tryphon the weaver complains that his wife has left him, carrying off various items belonging to him. By using μὲν ... δέ, Tryphon contrasts himself with his wife: while he provided everything for his wife, she nevertheless became dissatisfied.

μὲν ... δέ is mostly used for binary pairs, but occasionally it occurs in longer enumerative stretches. In this case, the particle group can be followed by another δέ, or by καί, as in (8):

- (8) τοῦ δὲ Γαλάτου ὀφείλοντος, σὺν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφοῖς Διδύμωι πρεσβυτέρωι καὶ Διδύμωι νεωτέρωι καὶ Λυσιμάχωι, Κάστορι καὶ Λυσιμάχωι ἀμφοτέροις Λυσιμάχο(υ) ἐπὶ μεσειτεία τελειωθείση τῶι ι (ἔτει) Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ἀπὸ τῶ[ν] ὑ]παρχόντων αὐτοῖς πατρικῶν κατοικικῶν ἐδαφῶν κλήρου κατοικικοῦ ἀρουρῶν ὀγδοήκοντα δύο ἐν τῇ Πολέμωνος μερίδι, ἀφ' ὧν περὶ μὲν Τεβπῦνιν ἐν δυσὶ σφραγίδι ἄρουραι τριάκοντα ἐπτά, περὶ δὲ Θεογονίδα ἐν μιᾷ σφραγίδι ἄρουραι εἴκοσι πέντε πρότερον Λευκίου Τε[ρ]εντίου καὶ περὶ Κερκῆσιν ἐν ἑτέρᾳ σφραγίδι αἱ λοιπαὶ ἄρουραι εἴκοσι. (*P.Mich.* V 232.6–11; 36 A.D.)

Galates, with his brothers Didumos the elder, Didumos the younger, and Lusimachos, was indebted to Kastor and Lusimachos, both sons of Lusimachos, in accordance with a mortgage executed in the –tenth year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus. This mortgage affected the catoecic estates belonging to them by inheritance from their father consisting of a catoecic allotment of eighty-two arouras in the division of Polemon. Of these there are in the vicinity of Tebtunis thirty-seven arouras in two

parcels, in the vicinity of Theogonis twenty-five arouras in one parcel, formerly the property of Lucius Terentius, and in the vicinity of Kerkesis the remaining twenty arouras in another parcel. (transl. Boak)

In this petition addressed to the *exegetes* Chaeremon, a widow, Taorses, asks to be allowed to resign her claims to an estate which had been mortgaged by her deceased husband. The estate consists of parcels situated in the vicinity of different cities: one near Tebtynis, one near Theognis, and one near Cercesis. μέν ... δέ is used to coordinate the first two parcels, and is followed by καί to include the last parcel.

Clarysse notes with regard to the Ptolemaic papyri that μέν ... δέ “is common ... in legal texts, but rare in private letters.”⁵⁸ While it is true that μέν ... δέ often appears in formal contexts, similarly to what was found for τε (... καί), it should be noted that the image given by our corpus-based research is more varied: out of a total of 56 examples, only 31 appear in a formal context (petitions or official letters). Many others occur in private letters.⁵⁹ As a consequence, the agentive role assumed by the sender is not predominantly subordinate; even in formal contexts, the sender often has a non-hierarchical, equal agentive role. In private letters, μέν ... δέ is even used in letters written by one family member to the other,⁶⁰ which is atypical of most of the particles and particle groups discussed in this article. The senders and addressees of the texts in which μέν ... δέ appears tend to have a high agentive role: they are (high) officials, landowners/tenants, estate managers, or military.⁶¹

Finally, μέν ... δέ also forms part of the more elaborate co-

⁵⁸ Clarysse, in *The Language of the Papyri* 38. Compare Lee, *NT* 27 (1985) 1–6, on the use of μέν ... δέ in the Roman and Byzantine papyri, the Septuagint, and the New Testament.

⁵⁹ E.g. *P.Brem.* 14.12–13 (II), 49.7–8 (II), 51.4–5 (II); *P.Mich.* VIII 496.12–13 (II); *P.Flor.* II 233.3–4 (264).

⁶⁰ E.g. *P.Wisc.* II 84.3–4 (II).

⁶¹ Interestingly, in *P.Oxy.* II 282.6–9 (#7 above) Tryphon the weaver also uses the particle group.

ordinate particle group ἔνθεν μὲν ... ἔνθεν δέ. In our corpus this is found only once, in *P.Herm.* 2.8–10 (317 A.D.), a private letter written by an *archiprophētēs* to the *scholasticus* Theophanes.

4.3 Compound discourse-connecting particles:

τοῖνυν, τοιγαροῦν, μέντοι, καίτοι

As was noted with regard to γε, it is a typical characteristic of Ancient Greek particles that they are often found in combination, sometimes even coalescing. One class of such compound particles, the focus of this section, is that of the τοι-particles: τοῖνυν, τοιγαροῦν, μέντοι, and καίτοι.⁶²

All these particles function at the ‘presentational’ level of discourse: they specify the functional relationship between different sentences and larger units, and are therefore considered ‘discourse markers’ or ‘discourse connectors’.⁶³ Semantically, a distinction can be made between τοῖνυν and τοιγαροῦν on the one hand and μέντοι and καίτοι on the other:⁶⁴ the former establish a causative/additive functional relationship between sentences and larger units, whereas the latter an adversative one.⁶⁵

In the Classical period, τοῖνυν, μέντοι, and καίτοι typically occur in second position, while τοιγαροῦν can be found in first position, “as a consequence of [its] strength,” Denniston notes.⁶⁶ We see the same with μέντοι in our corpus:

⁶² τοῖνυν and τοιγαροῦν are not discussed in Mayser, *Grammatik*; for μέντοι and καίτοι see Mayser II.3 169–170.

⁶³ See Revuelta Puigdollers, in *Encyclopedia* 31–41. Note that τοῖνυν also has modal characteristics: see G. C. Wakker, “‘Well I will now present my arguments’”. Discourse Cohesion marked by οὖν and τοῖνυν in Lysias,” in S. J. Bakker and G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden 2009) 63–81.

⁶⁴ Note too their morphological relationship when it comes to the position of τοι (beginning vs. end).

⁶⁵ καίτοι is sometimes used as a concessive conjunction, typically with participles, as in *P.Meyer.* 8.13 (151) and *P.Fouad.* 26.44 (157–159). This will not concern us further here.

⁶⁶ *The Greek Particles* 566.

- (9) μέντοι πεί[θ]ομαί σε μηδὲ ἔν διστάζειν ἐν τοῖς προκ[ειμένοις].
(*P.Mich.* VIII 485.17–19; II)

I trust you, however, to show no hesitation whatsoever in the aforesaid matter. (transl. Youtie and Winter)

In this letter, Ammonius writes to his friend Iulius Sabinus, entrusting him with a task. He ends the letter by emphasising that he trusts that Sabinus will act as requested.

Of these four discourse-connecting particles, τοίνυν occurs most often, with 34 instances in our corpus; the large majority (31/34) date to the fourth century.⁶⁷ As White notes,⁶⁸ in letters and especially petitions, particles such as τοίνυν, as well as the more frequent διό, ὄθεν, and οὖν,⁶⁹ often serve a fixed purpose: to mark the transition from the background of the request to the actual request, as in (10):

- (10) ἀξιοῦμεν τοίνυν τὴν σὴν ἀνδρίαν εὐεργε[τῆσαι ἡ]μᾶς κα[τ]ὰ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰς κελεύσεις, ἡγεμόν, [σοῦ καὶ] ἄ[λ]λων ἀρχόντων, τὰς ἀσθενεστέρας κώμα[ς ταῖς εὐ]ποθμ[ο]ύσαις κώμαις συνάπτεσθαι, καὶ ἡμᾶς [κοινωνη]θῆναι τοὺς μερισμοὺς τῆ εὐποθμουση κώμ[η] τοῦ πεδίου, λέγομεν τῆ Ἑρμουπόλει, ἣ καὶ ἔτι πρότ[ερον ...] τοῖς δεκαπρώτοις ἐπενεμήθημ[ε]ν ἀντ[ί]. (*P.Sakaon* 42.13–9; ca. 323)

We ask, therefore, that your Worthiness show his beneficence and that, in accordance with the laws and the edicts, my lord, both of yourself and of other governors, which provide that the poorer villages be attached to the richer ones, we too share our imposts with the rich village of the plain, and we mean Hermoupolis, to which even in the past we had been allotted ... the *dekaprōtoi*. (transl. Parassoglou)

This petition is addressed to Sabinianus the prefect. Sacaon,

⁶⁷ The particle occurs particularly often in the archive of Sacaon: e.g. *P.Sakaon* 30.9 (307–324 A.D.); 38.4, 9, 12 (312); 39.10 (318); 40.6 (318–320); 41.5, 6 (322); 42.13 (323); 48.19 (343).

⁶⁸ J. L. White, *The Form and Structure of the Official Petition: A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Missoula 1972) 15–18.

⁶⁹ On the semantic/pragmatic difference between τοίνυν and οὖν in the Classical period see Wakker, *Discourse Cohesion* 72.

Esouris, and Arion, all three from the village of Theadelphia, narrate how they have been reduced to poverty as they did not receive any water for the irrigation of their fields. They ask, therefore, that Theadelphia be attached to Hermopolis, meaning that the latter village should help with the taxes. τοίνυν, which is used immediately after the request-verb ἀξιοῦμεν, indicates a shift from the sketching of the background to the actual request to the prefect.

However, τοίνυν can also be found earlier, as in (11):⁷⁰

- (11) Αἰλείωι Πουβλίω[ι τῶι διασ]ημο[τάτ]ωι ἐπάρχῳ Αἰγύπτου παρὰ Α[ὐ]ρηλίου Εἰσιδώ[ρου] [Πτολεμαί]ου ἀπὸ κώμης Καρανίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου νομοῦ. τ[ὰ] παράνομα τῶ[ν] πραγμάτων, ἡγεμῶ[ν] δέσποτα, ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἀνακόπ[τ]εται εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς ἀνδ[ρ]είας. ἀλ[ωνίας] μοι τοίνυν ἐπικιμένης ἀπὸ συνκομιδῆς ἀρου[ρῶν] ἑνδεκα περὶ πεδίο[ν] τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης, καὶ γενομένου μου ἐπ[ὶ] τὴν αὐτ[ο]σίαν π[ρὸς] τοὺς γεωργικῶν ἔργων ἀπαλλαγῆναι π[οιή]σασθα[ι] κατὰ τὴν [ἐβδό]μην καὶ εἰκάδα τοῦ Μεσορῆ μηνὸς τοῦ διεληλυθό[τος] ἔτους, εὗρον τα[ύτη]ν ὑπὸ κακούργων ἐμψησθῆσαν. (*P.Cair.Isid.* 66.1–9; 299 A.D.)

To Aelius Publius, the most eminent prefect of Egypt, from Aurelius Isidorus, son of Ptolemaeus, of the village of Karanis in the Arsinoite nome. Unlawful conduct, my lord prefect, is suppressed by none other than your Worthiness. Since, then, I had a quantity of grain on the threshing floor after harvesting of eleven arouras in the plain of the same village, I went to make an inspection, so as to bring the farm labors to an end, on the twenty-seventh of the month of Mesore of the past year, and I found that this grain had been set on fire by malefactors. (transl. Boak and Youtie)

In this petition, the landowner Aurelius Isidorus informs the prefect Aelius Publius that he had a quantity of grain on the threshing floor, which was set on fire. τοίνυν again marks a transition, but this time from the introductory statements to the sketching of the background.

Interestingly, τοίνυν has a very marked profile in terms of the

⁷⁰ For a similar example see *P.Abinn.* 55.6 (351 A.D.).

social context in which it is used. It is predominantly used in petitions (27/34), or to be more precise formal contexts, i.e. including official letters (30/34). The agentive role of the sender is mostly hierarchical, that of a subordinate writing to a superordinate (typically a citizen writing to an official). The addressee is typically a higher official such as a *praepositus pagi*, a *strategus*, or the prefect of Egypt. Only occasionally can the particle be found in other social contexts, as in (12):

(12) ἤδη μὲν τὸ ἐμὸν ἐποίησα, καὶ οὐτ[ε ἐ]λουσάμην [οὔ]τε προσέκύνησα θεοῦς φοβουμένη σου τὸ μετέωρον, εἴπερ ἐστὶ μετέωρον, μὴ τοίνυν γενέσθω μετέωρον, ἵνα κἀγὼ μὴ σκυλῶ εἰς τὰ δικαστήρια. (*P.Flor.* III 332.10–14; ca. 114–119)

I have already done what was up to me and I have neither bathed nor worshipped the gods, in my fear for what hangs over you, if indeed it is impending. Let it therefore not remain impending, lest I too encounter trouble in the law courts. (transl. Bagnall and Cribiore, *Women's Letters*, no. 43)

Eudaimonis addresses her son Apollonius. Here τοίνυν again marks the transition from background to request. While the addressee happens to be an official (a *strategus*), the particle is used in an informal context, by a family member writing to another family member.⁷¹

Other causal discourse-connecting particles do not share this social background: οὖν can be found in all sorts of contexts; διό and ὅθεν are mostly found in petitions, including those addressed to lower-ranking officials. Neither does τοιγαροῦν share this social profile; there are only three instances, all in private letters. In two texts, *P.Tebt.* II 315 (II A.D.) and *P.Herm.* 2 (317–323), the agentive role of the sender is not entirely clear; the social status of sender and addressee is equally unclear. *P.Herm.* 8 (IV) is more evident: this document was written by a subordinate to a superordinate, in this case a person of faith to the anchorite Apa Iohannes.

⁷¹ For some other atypical examples see e.g. *P.Flor.* II 209.11 (III), *P.Herm.* 6.10 (317–323), *P.Oxy.* XII 1424.9 (318).

μέντοι and καίτοι occur infrequently: the adversative discourse connector ἀλλά is much more common.⁷² For the use of καίτοι as a discourse-connecting particle, there is only one potential example, *P.Alex.Giss.* 38.6 (117–138 A.D.). Because of lacunae, however, it is unclear whether καίτοι is used as a particle. For μέντοι there are nine examples, most (6/9) from the second century.⁷³ The particle is only found in informal contexts, i.e. private and business letters. The agentive role of the sender is never subordinate; in some cases, it is superordinate, but mostly either an equal writing to an equal or a family member to a family member. The senders and addressees of the documents are most often officials or estate managers.

The use of μέντοι and καίτοι with the particle γε has been discussed under §4.1.

4.4 Modal particles: ἄρα, μήν, δή

The last group of particles to be discussed here is that of the modal particles ἄρα, μήν, and δή, which function at the interactional level of discourse (cf. §1). Modal particles are particles “by means of which a speaker may signal his own attitude towards the proposition he presents.”⁷⁴ As Wakker notes, the meaning and actual usages of these particles are a complicated matter.⁷⁵ Rather than subdistinguishing various uses, as Deniston does, Wakker attempts to give a very general characterisation of each of these particles in functional terms: “in using μήν the speaker expresses his positive commitment to the

⁷² On the semantic/pragmatic difference between ἀλλά and μέντοι/καίτοι in the Classical period see S. R. Slings, “Adversative Relators between PUSH and POP,” in A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles* (Amsterdam 1997) 114, 122, and on the semantic difference between μέντοι and καίτοι.

⁷³ *P.Brem.* 53.35 (114); *P.Giss.Apoll.* 6.21 (117); *P.Brem.* 11.25 (II); *P.Mich.* VIII 485.17 (II: #9 above); *P.Tebt.* II 411.12 (II); *PSI* XII 1248.21 (235); *P.Flor.* II 127.10 (256), 167v.22 (260–268); *P.Ammon* I 3.iv.13 (348).

⁷⁴ Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals* 343.

⁷⁵ Wakker, in *New Approaches* 209.

truth of the proposition; he indicates that he as it were personally guarantees its truth” (213); “the primary meaning of δῆ is that of an attitudinal particle which demands the addressee’s special attention for the (interesting and important) proposition presented by the speaker” (216). “ἄρα is a modal particle, by which the speaker signals his lively interest in the (new information contained in the) proposition uttered. In other words, by using ἄρα the speaker characterises the propositional content of the clause as ‘interesting’ and thus invites the addressee to pay attention to this interesting fact.”⁷⁶

As was observed of the focus particles in §4.1, modal particles occur infrequently in the papyri.⁷⁷ ἄρα occurs only six times in our corpus.⁷⁸ In four of these it follows the negative μή; in only two is it used in a positive context.⁷⁹ An illustration is (13):

(13) ὅθεν ἐπιδίδομι τὸ βιβλίδιον ἀξιῶν εἶναι αὐτὸ ἐν καταχωρισμῷ μὴ ἄρα τι ὕστερον ἀναφανῆ (*P.Oxy.* XLI 2997.15–18; 214 A.D.).

Therefore, I submit this report, asking to have it placed in the registry, in case something should be discovered in the future.
(transl. Constantinides)

Horion, *phrontistês* of the estate of Claudia Isidora, requests that his petition (documenting a fire that destroyed parts of an irrigation machine) be placed in the registry, in case future inquiry would discover something. ἄρα indicates the particular interest the speaker attaches to the possibility that something should be discovered in the future.

The six texts in which ἄρα occurs all have a similar social profile: five are petitions to officials (typically higher officials

⁷⁶ Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals* 343.

⁷⁷ Compare Clarysse, in *The Language of the Papyri* 36–40, with regard to the Ptolemaic papyri.

⁷⁸ *P.Mich.* XI 617.12 (145/6 A.D.); *P.Tebt.* II 335.9 (165?); *P.Oxy.* XLI 2997.17 (214); *P.Cair.Isid.* 77.27 (320); *P.Ammon* I 3.vi.13 (348), II 41.22 (348).

⁷⁹ *P.Mich.* XI 617.12; *P.Ammon* II 41.22.

such as the *strategus* or *praepositus pagi*).⁸⁰ The petitioners assume a subordinate agentive role; they have a high social status (they are mostly landowners; *P.Ammon* II 41 was written by a *scholasticus*).

In the Classical period, μήν typically occurs in dialogic contexts, which is obviously not the case in the documentary papyri. The particle is only attested in combination with other particles. To be specific, it is found in the particle groups οὐδὲ μήν (1 instance),⁸¹ οὔτε μήν (1),⁸² ἀλλὰ μήν καί (5),⁸³ οὐ μήν ἀλλὰ καί (7),⁸⁴ ἔτι μήν (1),⁸⁵ and ἦ μήν (1).⁸⁶ Almost all of these (15/16) come from the fourth century.

In the first four combinations, Denniston suggests an adversative value for μήν,⁸⁷ but Wakker argues that the particle maintains its original modal value:⁸⁸ “the adversativity results from the fact that contrasting assertions are made and does not belong to the meaning of μήν.” From a sociolinguistic point of view, it is noteworthy that these particle groups occur predominantly (13/16) in formal contexts.⁸⁹ Most of the relevant texts are addressed to officials (the prefect of Egypt, the *strategus*) or

⁸⁰ The addressee of *P.Tebt.* II 335 is unknown.

⁸¹ *P.Prag.* I 109r.7–8 (249–269 A.D.).

⁸² *P.Cair.Isid.* 62.21 (296 A.D.).

⁸³ *P.Cair.Isid.* 73.7, 12 (314 A.D.), 74.7 (315); *P.Mert.* II 91.9–10 (316); *P.Oxy.* XII 1424.13 (318). On ἀλλὰ μήν see J. Blomqvist, “ἀλλὰ μήν, ἀλλὰ μέντοι, and Atticistic Particle Usage,” *Eranos* 93 (1995) 3–23. Blomqvist argues that ἀλλὰ μήν was “revived by the Atticists in conscious imitation of Attic writers of the classical period” (18).

⁸⁴ *P.Sakaon* 38.16 (312 A.D.); *P.Panop.* 28.6 (329); *Stud.Pal.* XX 86.17–8 (330); *P.Abinn.* 12.9 (342–351), 3.15 (346–351); *P.Oxy.* XLVIII 3420.44 (IV); *P.Panop.* 25v.8 (IV; note that there is a lacuna after οὐ μήν ἀλλὰ).

⁸⁵ *Stud.Pal.* XX 86.22 (330 A.D.).

⁸⁶ *P.Abinn.* 13.12 (342–351 A.D.).

⁸⁷ *The Greek Particles* 357–358.

⁸⁸ Wakker, in *New Approaches* 225.

⁸⁹ For the use of these particles in an informal context see *P.Prag.* I 109r.7–8 (249–269 A.D.) and *P.Oxy.* XLVIII 3420.43 (IV).

military officers (the *praefectus alae*). Given that these particles often occur in petitions, the agentive role is typically subordinate, but officials sending a document to another official also make use of them, as in (14):

(14) σπούδασον οὖν κατὰ τὰ γραφέντα σοι ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ διασημο(τάτου) δουκὸς στρατιώτας ἀποστῆλαι εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπαίτησιν διὰ τοῦ ἀποσταλέντος ὀφ(φικιαλίου) ὑπὸ τε τοῦ αὐτοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ διασημο(τάτου) δουκὸς οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ διασημο(τάτου) καθολικοῦ, γειγνώσκων ὡς εἰ μὴ βουληθῆς τούτους ἀποστῆλαι ἀνενεχθήσεται εἰς γνῶσιν τοῦ αὐτοῦ κυρίου μου δουκὸς ὡς σου τὴν ἀπαίτησιν τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ οἴκου ἐνεδρεύσαντος. (*P.Abin.* 3.10–20; 345–350 A.D.)

See to it zealously therefore that in accordance with the instructions given to you by my said lord the most Illustrations Duke you send soldiers for the said collection by the official sent by my said lord the most illustrious Duke and also by my lord the most illustrious Catholicus, knowing that if you should refuse to send them it will be brought to the knowledge of my said lord the Duke that you have impeded the collection of the Imperial revenues. (transl. Bell et al.)

The *procurator* of the imperial estates Flavius Macarius informs the cavalry commander Flavius Abinnaeus that the *dux* has ordered a military detachment to be put at the disposal of his staff for the collection of taxes. He urges that this detachment be made available to the *officialis* who is sent. By using οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ the *procurator* stresses the fact that this *officialis* has been sent not only by the *dux*, but also by the *catholicus*.

With respect to the group ἤ μὴν, Wakker notes that “the combination of these semantically comparable particles ... affirms the truth of a proposition in a very strong way and makes the declarative utterance have the value of a *strong assurance*.”⁹⁰ This combination is also typically found in a dialogic

⁹⁰ G. Wakker, “Modal Particles and Different Points of View in Herodotus and Thucydides,” in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation* (Leiden 1997) 228.

context; in our corpus, it occurs as part of an oath:⁹¹

- (15) ἐγὼ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ ἐνεπίστε[υσ]α ὁμός[ας ἦ μὴν(?)] ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
 περισ[πᾶσθαι μηδένα(?)] κινδυνεύειν, περίστασιν γὰρ ταύτης
 τῆς προφάσεως ἔνεκεν πάσχω καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν. (*P.Abinn.*
 13.11–16; 342–351 A.D.)

For I trusted in god, having taken an oath that nobody should be in danger of being annoyed on our behalf. For I am in peril every day on this account. (transl. Bell et al.)

The *exactor* Ploutammon requests some service from Flavius Abinnaeus, as the latter seems to have placed him in danger. ἦ μὴν is used in the context of an oath: Ploutammon strongly assures Abinnaeus that no one will be in danger of being annoyed.

ἔτι μὴν and ἦ μὴν seem to have a similar social background as οὐδὲ μὴν, οὔτε μὴν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καί, and οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ (καί): they occur only in formal contexts, wherein the sender is most often in a subordinate agentive role. The addressees of the texts in which the particles occur are officials or military officers.

Of simple δὴ there are twenty examples in our corpus.⁹² δὴ often occurs in combination with a verb of saying: it is found once following φημί, eight times following λέγω, and three times preceding λέγω. A typical example is (16):

- (16) πο[λυ]πραγμονοῦντος δέ μου ἔμαθ[ον] [ἐκ τεκμηρίων τοῦς
 τοῦ]το [το]λμήσ[α]ντας, λέγω δὴ Ἀκοτᾶν υἱὸν Γερμ[α]νοῦ κα[ὶ]
 Χαυρή]μων[α υἱὸν Πτ[ο]λεμαίου]υ Ἄρβα [ου] ἀπὸ τῆς αὐ[τῆς]
 κώμ[ης Κ]ηραν[ίδος] καὶ Ἡρων[α υἱὸν Μου]ραν(οῦ) ἀπὸ
 κώμης Π[το]λεμαίδος Νέα[ς] (*P.Cair.Isid.* 67.15–18; 299 A.D.)

Then, by dint of taking much trouble, I learned from certain evidence who had dared to do this thing, namely Acotas, son of Germanus, and Chaeremon, son of Ptolemaeus and grandson of Harb...., of the same village of Karanis, and Heron, son of

⁹¹ Note however that we are dealing with a restoration.

⁹² E.g. *SB* XIV 12087.b.2 (162 A.D.), V 7558.37 (172/3?); *P.Mich.Mchl.* 11.10 (II/ III); *P.Sakaon* 37.12 (284); *P.Cair.Isid.* 65.12 (298/9), 66.12 (299); *P.Col.* VII 169.11 (318); *SB* XXIV 16333.11 (340); *P.Ammon* II 45.25 (348); *P.Oxy.* XLVIII 3420.19 (IV).

Muranus, of the village of Ptolemais Nea. (transl. Boak and Youtie)

In this petition, the landowner Aurelius Isidorus informs the prefect Aelius Publius that after his grain was set on fire he learned the names of the perpetrators. By using $\delta\acute{\eta}$, Aurelius Isidorus invites the prefect to pay particular attention to the contents of the clause introduced by $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$, which provides the actual names.

The social contexts in which $\delta\acute{\eta}$ occurs are quite similar to those outlined for the other modal particles: 19 out of 20 occur in a formal context (typically petitions),⁹³ with the sender assuming a subordinate agentive role. The addressees are typically high officials, such as the *strategus*, the *epistrategus*, or the prefect.

Finally, there are also five instances of the particle group $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\eta}$,⁹⁴ the semantic value of which is quite transparent. As Wakker notes, “ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ expresses ... the close link with the previous utterance, whereas $\delta\acute{\eta}$ demands the addressee’s special attention.”⁹⁵ This particle group is found only in petitions, the sender assuming a subordinate agentive role. As with simple $\delta\acute{\eta}$, the addressees are high officials.

5. Concluding remarks

In this article, I have outlined the semantic and syntactic properties of different types of ‘particles’: (i) focus particles, (ii) co-ordinating particles, (iii) compound discourse-connecting particles, and (iv) modal particles, focusing on documentary papyri dating from the first to the fourth century A.D. I have argued that it is also worth taking into account a third descriptive dimension, the *social* dimension. This allows for an integrated approach to particle-usage.

⁹³ $\delta\acute{\eta}$ occurs in an informal context in *P.Oxy.* XLVIII 3420.19 (IV).

⁹⁴ *SB* VI 9458.20 (II); *P.Cair.Isid.* 74.13 (315); *P.Mert.* II 91.14 (316); *P.Sakaon* 48.13 (343); *P.Oxy.* XLVIII 3393.9 (365).

⁹⁵ Wakker, in *New Approaches* 216–217.

In order to determine the social characteristics of the particles under investigation, I have referred to the Systemic Functional model, which stipulates that there are three main ‘vectors of context’, called Field, Tenor, and Mode. Tenor appeared particularly relevant for the purposes of this study: it can be further subdivided into three main subvectors: ‘agentive role’, ‘social distance’, and ‘social status’. Using these three subvectors, it was shown that the particles under investigation can be considered ‘social markers’, in that they are typically used in texts that belong to the higher social strata.

To be more specific, most of the texts in which these particles appear have a sender and especially an addressee of high status (e.g. officials, estate managers, landowners). In terms of agentive role and social distance, the contexts of use of the particles differ to a greater degree: when it comes to social distance, for example, a focus particle such as γέ can only be found in informal contexts, while the modal particles ἄρα, μήν, and δή almost always occur in formal contexts. Similar observations can be made with regard to agentive role: a particle such as τοίνυν, for example, shows a high correlation with a hierarchical (subordinate) agentive role, whereas other particles (e.g. μέν ... δέ) are used with a broader range of agentive roles.

It goes without saying that the investigation presented here has limited scope: among other matters, it would be interesting to expand the analysis so as to cover a third main type of documentary texts, contracts. In terms of particles, the use of new formations such as διό, ὅθεν, λοιπόν, etc. needs to be analysed, as well as that of firmly established particles such as γάρ, δέ, καί, and οὖν.

Further analysis of these and other linguistic elements may help us determine the social context of documents about which little is known—in terms of sender and addressee, their relationship, the type of document, etc.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ Recent editions make little use of this type of information. E.g., in his re-edition of (part of) the archive of Apollonius the *strategus*, Kortus makes frequent reference to beginning and closing formulae and honorific epithets

APPENDIX: ARCHIVES STUDIED

Archive ⁹⁷	Date	Letters	Petitions
Dionysias			
Flavius Abinnaeus praefectus alae	IV (325-375)	38	18
Hermopolis			
Apollonius strategus	I-II (58-150)	140	34
Aurelius Adelphius	IV (300-399)	2	0
Aurelius Asclepiades, Adelphius, Aurelia Charite, & Demetria alias Ammonia	III-IV (200-325)	4	1
Aurelius Cyrus nyctostrategus	IV (380-399)	0	2
Boule of Hermopolis	III (200-299)	7	13
Damarion strategus	II (184-186)	0	0
Theophanes	IV (300-99)	10	6
Hermopolites			
Apa Iohannes	IV (375-99)	15	0
Archive from the Hermopolites	I (61-63)	0	1
Aurelius Nikon alias Anicetus	III (200-299)	2	0
Hermias & Maximus	IV (300-350)	1	0
Nearchides	IV (300-399)	5	1
Tryphon Phibas	III (200-250)	4	0
Karanis			
Aurelius Isidorus	III-IV (267-324)	6	27
Aeon son of Sarapion & Valerius son of Antiourius	III-IV (299-399)	3	3
Claudius Tiberianus	II (100-125)	11	0
Gaius Iulius Agrippinus	II (103-148)	4	8
Gemellus Horion	I-III (93-214)	1	13
Iulius Sabinus & Iulius Apollinaris	I-II (96-147)	14	1
Iulius Serenus	II-III (179-219)	1	1

to reconstruct the social context, but a much stronger case could be made if other linguistic areas would also be taken into account: M. Kortus, *Briefe des Apollonios-Archives aus der Sammlung Papyri Gissenses* (Giessen 1999).

⁹⁷ This appendix is based on the information provided by the Trismegistos website (<http://www.trismegistos.org/arch/index.php>). It does not include archives which do not contain any letters or petitions. Texts that consist of several unrelated subdocuments have not been investigated.

Saturnila & sons	II-III (175-199)	9	0
Socrates tax collector & family	II (107-185)	8	1
Oxyrhynchus			
Applications to join the gerousia	III (225-226)	1	0
Aurelia Diogenis alias Tourbiaina	III (200-299)	1	0
Aurelius Heras praepositus pagi	IV (316-324)	4	0
Aurelius Serenus alias Sarapion son of Agathinus	III (240-80)	0	1
Boule of Oxyrhynchus	III - IV (200-375)	5	1
Claudia Isidora alias Apias	III	1	2
Comon son of Mnesitheus	I (25-99)	4	1
Corn dole of Oxyrhynchus	III (200-299)	1	2
Dius strategus	I-II (99-100)	2	1
Logistae of Oxyrhynchus	IV (303-360)	1	4
Papnouthis & Dorotheus	IV (330-390)	29	3
Sarapion alias Apollonianus & sons	II-III (120-299)	18	5
Theones	II (100-199)	0	1
Tryphon weaver	I (15-83)	2	5
Panopolis			
Aurelius Ammon scholasticus	III-IV (281-399)	1	23
Descendants of Alopex	III-IV (298-399)	0	7
Tebtynis			
Cronion and Isidora	II (100-199)	5	2
Cronion son of Apion head of the grapheion of Tebtynis	I-I (20 B.C.-56 A.D.)	1	10
Cronion son of Cheos	II (106-153)	3	3
Diogenis	II (138-147)	3	0
Pacebcis' descendants	II (127-162)	0	1
Patron's descendants	II (108-176)	21	5
Philosarapis	I-III (89-224)	3	3
Sarapias & Sarapammon	II-III (165-270)	1	2
Turbo	II-III (100-299)	4	0
Theadelphia			
Administrative archive of Theadelphia	I-III (98-225)	1	2
Aphrodisius son of Philippus & descendants	I-II (98-161)	0	2
Harthotes priest & public farmer	I-I (5 B.C.-61 A.D.)	1	6

Heroninus	II-III (199-275)	292	3
Ptolemaeus son of Diodoros	II (138-162)	1	11
Sacaon	III-IV (254-343)	5	16
Sheep-lessees of Theadelphia	III-IV (260-306)	2	0
Soterichus and Didymus	I-II (65-135)	1	0

*April, 2015*⁹⁸

Dept. of Classics, Univ. of Michigan
 Dept. of Linguistics, Ghent Univ.
 Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium
 Klaas.Bentein@UGent.be

⁹⁸ My work was funded by the *Belgian American Educational Foundation* and the *Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders*. Parts of this article were presented at the Classical Association Annual Conference in Bristol, 12 April 2015. I would like to thank Arthur Verhoogt for helping me develop the socio-linguistic framework outlined in §3, and two anonymous referees for helpful comments on an earlier version of the article.