XVI

CAT. 77

Greeks and Egyptians: Ethnicity, Status, and Culture

by Roger S. Bagnall

For more than a half century, the interaction of Greeks and Egyptians, and of Greek and Egyptian cultures, has provided the central interpretive motif for studies of Hellenistic Egypt. From the belief in a mixed society and culture which dominated scholarly thinking for more than a century until the Second World War, scholars have moved to something approaching consensus that by and large Greeks and Egyptians led parallel rather than converging lives, that their cultures coexisted rather than blended.[1] And yet within this consensus there is significant conceptual disarray, visible at the level of detail as well as of generalization. One example will suffice: the Cretan cavalryman Dryton was married in 150 B. C.[2] to a woman named Apollonia, also called Senmonthis, his second wife. She had one Greek name and one Egyptian. Was she a Greek or an Egyptian? The last five years have seen four scholars – two Demoticists and two Hellenists – divide evenly in print on this point, with one Demoticist and one Hellenist on each side.[3] This family has been known for nine decades now, and is the center of a small archive. Several generations and many relatives are known. Why can we not reach consensus on this woman's ethnic identity?

Our difficulties of interpretation stem from three major roots, I think. One of them, perennial and incurable but partially and slowly ameliorable, lies in the sources. We have an abundance of documentation of various sorts for Hellenistic Egypt, but it is very unevenly distributed in time, place, and type of document. Little of it is interpretive except for the occasional literary works, themselves often lacking in sufficient historical context to be fully understandable as cultural documents. The other two difficulties, however, are grounded in our own failures. First, a failure to take into account factors of place and time can cause faulty comparisons and create nonexistent conflicts. We cannot assume that we may interpret a document of the second century on the basis of our understanding of the third, or even that a generalization about Ptolemy I should be seen as being in opposition to a contradictory generalization about Ptolemy II.[4] More important, however, has been the lack of conceptual clarity about our questions. What does the question "Is Apollonia Greek or Egyptian?" mean in the middle of the second century? What do we mean by "Hellenization" or "Egyptianization"? Along with lack of clarity, lack of sophistication; with few exceptions we have not managed to think our way through the conceptual questions to anything but the most obvious results.[5] None of these deficiencies can be remedied in a brief article. My object, rather, is to review selected areas of Greek-Egyptian interaction as they are reflected in recent scholarship and sketch the directions in which these inquiries seem to be leading.

When the Romans took possession of Egypt after three centuries of Ptolemaic rule, they did not find Egyptian vs. Greek a useful distinction. Their lack of such a distinction has been seen as a reflection of their hostility to Egypt,[6] but it may perhaps better be taken as their attempt to make manageable sense in their own juridical framework of a complex situation. They did recognize the claim to separate status on the part of the citizens of the three Greek cities of Egypt (Alexandria, Ptolemais, Naukratis), who are called "Alexandrians" or *astoi*, and who had privileges different from the remainder of the population. The bulk of the people, however, who lived either in the nome capitals or in the countryside, were all "Egyptians."[7] The government did give the residents of the metropoleis (principal towns) of the nomes some special privileges (mostly fiscal), and in the third century A. D. they were to find themselves defined as citizens of

municipalities. But for more than two centuries, in legal status they too were Egyptians. It did not matter whether they were descended from Greeks and nothing but Greeks for ten generations or whether their father had learned Greek and given them Greek names. They were Egyptians. Now we may criticize this lumping together as crude, but it surely must reflect the fact that the Romans found no simple way of dividing Greeks and Egyptians. Citizenship did not help much because there were only three Greek cities, and most Greeks did not live in them, as they did in most parts of the Greek world which the Romans acquired. After all, the Roman government had no aversion to dividing society into strata and keeping them separated.[8]

What follows must be prefaced with a crucial point: the problem of ethnicity which we are considering has to do with a narrow segment of society. The large mass of the population, the royal farmers (peasants who held land belonging to the king on a quasi-permanent lease), remained entirely Egyptian, while the urban Greeks and probably most of the military settlers in the countryside remained unequivocally Greek in language and culture (which is not to deny the possibility of intermarriage). Our concern here is with a border region of unknown size and importance, those for whom such an ethnic distinction was no longer clear.[9]

Less than a century before the Roman takeover, Ptolemy VIII had still thought the distinctions usable. In the famous edict of 118 B. C. (*P. Tebt* I 5.207-220=*C. Ord. Ptol.* 53)* about the jurisdiction of Greek and Egyptian courts, the sovereigns speak of Greeks and Egyptians as recognizable groups.[10] The law does not, to be sure, indicate on what basis the status of Greek or of Egyptian is recognized. And the tenor of the law shows that Egyptians and Greeks were making contracts with one another both in Greek and Demotic Egyptian, and that Greeks might even make contracts with Greeks in Demotic. From this it is clear that for the early second century B. C., if not considerably earlier, a definition of ethnicity which rests upon use of language is hopelessly inadequate to the situation.[11] Upon what did ethnic identity rest? In an external, objective sense the answer is easy, at least for men. It was an official status, such as one had been required to give in all legal contexts since at least the time of Ptolemy II.[12] How one came by such status, however, and what it meant subjectively for the individuals, particularly women, at an unofficial level, are much harder questions.

The use of the double name, mentioned above as a symptomatic difficulty of interpretation, is central to our investigation. Recent work has shown that explicit instances of double names are only the tip of the iceberg: we usually cannot detect people who had double names because they generally used only one name at a time – the Greek one in certain contexts, the Egyptian one in others. (One might go so far as to say that they conceived of themselves as having two names, not a "double name" as we term it.) Willy Clarysse has argued that the choice of names depended on the function; that is, the Greek name is used virtually exclusively in the context of documents concerned with official duties or status as a royal functionary, whether administrative or military, while the Egyptian name is used in almost all private acts, particularly in Demotic.[13] For example, Clarysse notes that the "well-known village-scribe of Kerkeosiris [in the Faiyum; perhaps modern Gharaq] in the late 2nd cent., Menches son of Petesouchos, has a proper Egyptian name, just as one would expect from a komogrammateus [village secretary]. Thanks to a single private document in his extensive archives, however, we happen to know that Menches also had a Greek name, Asklepiades, which he never used when acting as village scribe. ... On the other hand, the village epistates** of Kerkeosiris in the same period was a Greek, as was indeed usual during the whole Ptolemaic Period, and as were his predecessors and successors in the village. The funny thing about all this, however, is that the epistates with the Greek name Polemon was probably the father of the village scribe with the Egyptian name Petesouchos (alias Polemon) and the brother of Menches."[14] The *agoranomoi* (notaries) of Pathyris (modern Gebelein) and Krokodilopolis (near Pathyris; perhaps modern Rizagat) all have Greek names, but where we have any evidence for them unrelated to their function as *agoranomoi*, the names of other members of their family are Egyptian. Two of their wives are "endowed wives," *s.ḥm.t sᶜnḫ*, a status which can have been established only by a Demotic act under Egyptian law (and which elsewhere is always connected to priestly families).[15]

* All references to papyri follow J. Oates, R. Bagnall, W. Willis, K. Worp, *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca* 3rd ed. (*BASP* Suppl. 4, Atlanta, 1985).

** The term epistates is employed for a local magistrate whose authority encompasses, but is not limited to, matters of security comparable to those of a police force.

Another example of the working of double names is found in the archives of Dionysios son of Kephalas.[16] Over the course of his attested career (117/116 to after 104), Dionysios was a soldier, a priest and a cultivator. He was one of three children of a marriage between Demetria and Kephalas, both good Greek names. Kephalas himself was one of four children, the others being Peteharpochrates, Tothoes, and Petenouphis, children of Dionysios and Senobastis. His brothers thus all had Egyptian names. There were no attested aliases on this side of the family, but that may be only a matter of the type of documents preserved. Demetria used the aliases Sarapias and Senabellis and was the daughter of Heliodoros alias Herieus and of Senamounis. Dionysios uses two aliases, Plenis and *Pa-ᶜš3*, and he married Isidora alias Taesis (the Greek name being a translation of the Egyptian), daughter of Hermophilos alias Pachois and of Tetosiris. When Dionysios' brother referred to him in a Greek text, he called him "my brother Plenis." And his Greek name is found only once in his Demotic documents – and that time, tellingly, he calls himself a Greek, with reference to his military status.

More evidence could be cited, but it all points to the validity of Clarysse's conclusions. Double names are found mainly for persons with an official status;[17] they occur as such only occasionally, with the use of one name sufficient in most contexts; the name chosen is the Greek one in official contexts, the Egyptian in private ones. The evidence for this cluster of phenomena comes predominantly from the second half of the second century. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that at least in the sense of language we are dealing with a context which is Egyptian by choice, Greek only for official purposes. In the case of Dionysios son of Kephalas, Pestman concludes as follows: "Dionysios could write Greek as well as Demotic; he was thus bilingual. This indicates, in our opinion, that he came from an Egyptian cultural sphere, for it was rare that Greeks by origin learned Egyptian and were capable of writing Demotic. On a social level, the reverse situation was more logical, and moreover, learning Demotic writing was so arduous in practice that it was much easier for someone who could already write in Demotic to learn Greek writing as well, than the reverse."[18]

And yet, things are not quite so simple; some people used dual names without holding any official position, and some Greeks probably learned Egyptian. It was, of course, not necessary to master the difficult Demotic script in order to pick up a reasonable spoken command of Egyptian; and scribes could be paid to draft documents.[19] Moreover, cases where our evidence for a particular family is not as extensive as in the examples just cited may leave us unable to determine the "primary" cultural milieu of an individual or a family, let alone original ethnic background. Where an individual functions in both Greek and Egyptian roles, using both languages, can we be confident that some Greek ancestor did not learn Egyptian? In a case like that of Menches' family, one may well be forced to confess that in the later second century neither name nor official ethnic designation tells us much about origins. Each situation must be examined separately, even if we admit that Pestman's presumption is correct.

We return now to Apollonia, wife of the Cretan cavalryman Dryton. Her father's family (we know nothing of her mother) is made up on our family tree[20] almost entirely of double-named men and of women with Egyptian names. The oldest ancestor about whom we know anything is Hermokrates alias Panas, a soldier at Pathyris (attested in 161), the paternal grandfather of Apollonia. Her three sisters, however, all had double names, and her five daughters by Dryton all had double names too. This family, taken by itself, has (as already mentioned) struck some as Hellenic in origin but Egyptianized,[21] others as Egyptian in origin but Hellenized.[22] Clarysse's insight about the use of double names seems to me to show at least that the Greek names are used mainly as a function of military rank in this family, and secondarily as part of the society of such military men. They are usually dropped when no official context is at hand. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the milieu is predominantly Egyptian in speech, law, and culture: as *persons* these are Egyptians, as *functionaries* they act as Greeks. What their ancestry is, we cannot tell, and the double names as far back as the 180s cannot tell us: they show only that the use of Greek names for official contexts must go back that far.

And yet Apollonia and her sisters insist that they are Greeks; for example, the papyrus *SB* I 4638 tells us that Apollonia and her sisters are Cyrenaeans. Men in military service have Greek or pseudo-Greek ethnic designations.[23] They could have claimed to be Greeks in the terms in which the decree of Ptolemy VIII cited earlier uses the word, and they did operate in both languages. In the case of the women, we cannot detect any motive other than social for the claim of Greek status, which was

for them higher and more prestigious. Despite all attempts by the kings to preserve the *laokritai* (native Egyptian judges), they eventually disappeared, while standard Egyptian transactions, increasingly written in Greek, were brought before the *chrematistai* (Greek circuit judges).[24] If the Romans could not tell such people apart from the descendants of Macedonian settlers who knew some Egyptian, it is hardly surprising: Apollonia and her family would not have wanted such a distinction. Nor should we be surprised that the breadth of the possible definitions of Hellenism and indeed the cultural character of Hellenism itself under the later Ptolemies had the ultimate effect of making the term "Hellene" useless. The same thing happened later with Roman citizenship. The point of any mark of distinction, *qua* distinction, is to exclude most people from it; the lowering of barriers does not remove the urge to differentiate oneself from the common herd; it merely creates the need for new barriers. Some other means of distinguishing oneself from others emerges. One does not acquire prestige from being like everyone else.

That, however, is a matter of legal status. When we turn back to social and cultural realities of the Ptolemaic Period, the breakdown of distinctions needs to be examined to see what degree of integration in society we can discern. In Egyptian society, the large mass of peasants was certainly unaffected by Hellenism except as its objects. The propertied class, which we have been discussing,[25] was no doubt a relatively small group, though proportionately very productive of papyrus documents. A significant number among the Egyptian propertied class were priests;[26] we will return to them later. Integration in the reverse direction is almost as difficult to assess: what impact did Egypt have on the Greeks? How "Egyptianized" did the Greeks of Egypt become? In general, the Greek attitude toward Egypt and Egyptians appears to have been an exploitative one, in both the neutral and the negative senses of that word.[27] Even those who have tried to make a strong case for Egyptian influence on the Ptolemies themselves have depicted in essence a use of Egyptian material for royal purposes, not an Egyptianization of the royal family.[28] The Greeks were certainly receptive to the traditions of other countries, and they seem to have absorbed material from Egyptian medicine and wisdom literature, for example.[29]

We must be wary of assuming that such things point to the "Egyptianization" of Greeks. What would such a term mean? At the most superficial level, we have some direct evidence of Greeks learning Egyptian, as has already been pointed out. Dryton, long before he married an Egyptian woman in 150 (an event which is often viewed as an act of "Egyptianizing"), was lending money via Demotic contracts. And the long residence of Ptolemaios the *katochos* in the Sarapieion at Memphis (along with, some of the time, his brother and other Hellenes) certainly led to his deep involvement in the life of an Egyptian temple.[30] That temple milieu, however, was itself increasingly not a purely Egyptian world, but rather one in which Greeks and Greek language and culture were making inroads.

But there is a more important point at stake: Hellenism had always, as far back as we can tell, been local, particularistic, and receptive. The reverse side of the exploitativeness of the Greeks faced with a foreign culture is their ability to adapt and adopt words, products, learning, and gods from foreigners without becoming less Hellenic in the process. Indeed, that openness, combined with deep resistance to absorption, is precisely a mark of Greek culture when compared to Egyptian, which was extremely resistant and yet, by that fact, less able to resist in the long run. The ability of the Greeks to adapt to new circumstances without fundamental cultural alteration, along with their position of power in Egypt, enabled them to take whatever they wished from Egypt without ceasing to become Greeks. It is not obvious that the Egyptians could do the same.

In fact, the almost total lack of visible impact of Greek occupation on Egyptian culture has often been noted, to the point that when two faint echoes (one of Homer, *Iliad* 22, the other of Greek sacrificial customs) were detected in the texts on the walls of the Temple at Edfu, they were greeted with a veritable fanfare.[31] As Claire Préaux pointed out,[32] Egyptian civilization was very closely linked to religion in almost every respect, and Egyptian religion remained essentially closed to foreign influence and persons, even if Greeks might turn up at local temples for festivals. The Egyptian cults remained virtually closed to any novelty not internally generated. In fact, the old cults continued in this hermetic mode right up to their extinction in Late Antiquity, when Christianity (which united an outside influence with a resurgence of the Egyptian language) came to dominate the scene.[33]

There is one curious aspect to this closedness, however. The architects of this policy (if that is not too intentional a word to use) were surely the priests who controlled the

cults. And yet we find the priests also represented in the class of the "Hellenizers" – those who turn up with double names and royal functions, and work in Greek. Two instances of this phenomenon have already been cited. Dionysios son of Kephalas is attested as a priest in the period before he enters the army,[34] and the *agoranomoi* use an institution (that of the endowed woman) otherwise found in priestly circles.[35] But the most interesting case is found at a much higher level. A series of Greek metrical epitaphs from the necropolis of Hassaia, near Apollinopolis Magna (Edfu),[36] introduces us to a family holding high military rank in the later second century. Basically these poems come clearly from the Greek poetic tradition, but J. Yoyotte has shown that they incorporate significant Egyptian religious elements.[37] The people involved can, moreover, be convincingly identified with people having Egyptian tombstones on which they bear Egyptian names. One is a *syngenes* (kinsman of the king), and the men are high army officials or, in one case, supervise a granary; but they also are priests of local Egyptian temples (Prophet of Osiris, of Horus, of Harsomtous). The military offices are listed in the hieroglyphic texts as well as in the Greek, but the priestly ones are not listed in the Greek texts. Just like the common soldiers or lower officials, these men turn up with Greek names when acting in an official capacity, but in private life they have Egyptian tombstones, Egyptian names, and Egyptian priesthoods. And they belong to the highest stratum of Egyptian society.

Was Egyptian culture, in its traditional modes of religion and learning, in fact essentially impermeable to foreign influence as is generally thought?[38] Egyptian literature influenced Greek writing, Egyptian gods were worshiped by foreigners (not always in the manner the Egyptians worshiped them, to be sure), Egyptian art eventually acquired popularity with Greek urban populations.[39] Were none of these reciprocally influenced by the Greeks? On one level, they clearly were not. Demotic – a written language largely controlled by priests – was very resistant to borrowing Greek words. Almost all Greek words in Ptolemaic Demotic documents come from a few categories: honorific titles of kings and gods, Greek proper adjectives, official titles (and those only rarely – they were usually translated into Demotic), some technical administrative or military terms, and a few objects of daily life.[40] Demotic literature was essentially free of Greek words altogether; but there is a salient exception in the scientific and medical texts, which borrow very large numbers of Greek words.[41] Broader Greek literary influence is seen in the Demotic literature of the Roman Period;[42] and that influence came from somewhere. Apart from scientific and medical texts, late Ptolemaic Demotic wisdom literature shows clear signs of influence from the contemporary milieu, both Greek and Semitic.[43]

Despite the limits of this cultural borrowing, the people were not untouched by the Greek presence. Even the peasants found their lives affected by the development of a Greek-style market economy and the more generalized use of coinage, among other economic changes, and by the gradual development of the administration from traditional Egyptian models to Greek and then Roman conceptions. The upper classes among the Egyptians underwent the process of at least partial Hellenization described above, which might include some familiarity with Greek poetry on the part of the wealthier, who presumably mixed more with those with a Greek education in the course of their work. (By the Roman Period, the priests needed Greek to function, and even the oracles operated in Greek.) The difference between what happened to the people and what happened to their traditional culture may help to explain the eventual loss of vitality and wide appeal which seems to have afflicted Egyptian culture in the Roman Period; it may even help explain the swiftness with which most of Egypt converted to Christianity. But that is a subject of its own.[44]

All references to papyri follow J. Oates, R. Bagnall, W. Willis, and K. Worp, *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca* 3rd ed. (*BASP* Suppl. 4, Atlanta, 1985).

[1] Préaux 1978, vol. II: 543-86.

[2] The date of the marriage is now secure; see Clarysse 1986: 99-103.

[3] See below, pp. 23-24, for discussion of this case.

[4] One example: Clarysse 1985: 64 note 21 contrasts the views of Swinnen (1973) and Koenen (1983; discussed below, note 28). But Swinnen is talking about the religious policies of Ptolemy I, Koenen mainly about the penetration of Egyptian motifs into the propaganda of Ptolemy II and later kings.

[5] An honorable exception has been J. Bingen; see the references given in Bagnall 1982: 16 notes 20, 22. And, as references below will show, the work of Pestman, Clarysse, and Thompson has pointed the way to a more sophisticated understanding of this complex society.

[6] See, e.g., Lewis 1983: 33-35.

[7] On this question, see Modrzejewski 1985, with extensive bibliography.

[8] A fact nowhere clearer than in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* (*BGU* V), translated in Lewis/Reinhold 1968: 379-83.

[9] For a summary and bibliography of the literature, one may consult the posthumous article of Peremans (1987).

[10] Pestman (1985) argues that the law's specification that courts are to be used according to the language of agreements shows that ethnicity was no longer determinable. This goes too far and ignores the fact that the edict itself speaks of ethnic groups.

[11] This papyrus is a famous source of controversy. A review with comprehensive bibliography can be found in Modrzejewski 1975, who rejects all of the proposed emendations to the text and argues that the legislator intends all cases involving Egyptians to be tried before the *laokritai* (native Egyptian judges), with language to decide venue in other cases. A different approach, involving major emendation by insertion, is offered by Pestman (above, note 10). Although my view of the social situation is close to Pestman's, I think Modrzejewski is more nearly correct about the essence of the text: Egyptians who make contracts with Greeks in Greek appear before the *chrematistai* (Greek circuit judges); Greeks who make contracts with Greeks in Egyptian appear before the *laokritai*; Egyptians who make contracts with Egyptians in Greek also appear before the *laokritai*. There was no need to talk about Greek vs. Greek in Greek (always *chrematistai*) or Egyptian vs. Egyptian in Egyptian (always *laokritai*); and even Greek vs. Egyptian in Egyptian (*laokritai*). The decree deals with the newer situations, not clearly handled before this time.

[12] Uebel 1968: 11-13; see also Oates 1963: 63, with references. It is impossible to enter here into the complexities of the problems of status designations, particularly the much controverted *Perses tes epigones*. This designation is, however, in my view a question which closer attention to time and place might make it possible to solve in a manner that reconciles the various insights about its use, which have been offered in a spirit of contradiction.

[13] Clarysse 1985.

[14] *Ibid.*, 59.

[15] Pestman in *Das ptol. Äg.*: 203-10.

[16] *Pap-Lugd. Bat.* 22=*P.Dion.*

[17] Archives of persons without such status may have no double names at all, as in the papers of Totoes, for which see Pestman, *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* 23, 145-48, with stemma on 144: not one Greek or double name.

[18] *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* 22, p. 3. "Dionysios pouvait aussi bien écrire le grec que le démotique, il était donc bilingue. Ce qui indique, à notre avis, qu'il était issu de la sphère culturelle égyptienne, car il était rare que les Grecs d'origine apprissent l'égyptien et fussent capables d'écrire le démotique. Sur le plan social, la situation inverse était plus logique, et en outre, l'apprentissage de l'écriture démotique était si ardue en pratique, qu'il était bien plus facile pour quelqu'un, qui pouvait déjà écrire en démotique, d'apprendre aussi l'écriture grecque, que l'inverse."

[19] It would be hard for a Greek who operated a retail trade, even under government monopoly, in an Egyptian village to avoid learning some Egyptian. On the other hand, anyone dealing with the government needed to know Greek. No matter what the ethnic background, then, both spoken languages were necessary for such people. Clarysse will treat this subject in a future volume of the Lille Demotic papyri.

[20] Ritner 1984: 171-84, stemma on pl. 30. Ritner, 185, seems to date the two Mainz papyri concerning the dispute to year 21 of Ptolemy VI, which is incorrect; they belong to Ptolemy V, in 184; see Zauzich 1968: 37, no. 30 and 85, no. 115, with notes.

[21] Ritner 1984: 187: "The papyri of the families of Hermocrates and Dryton provide an unparalleled view of the Egyptianization of Greek colonists under the Ptolemies. The genealogical revisions made possible by the OI papyrus indicate the early date of this assimilation, as the first attested generation of the family already bears a double name (Apollonios/Nakhthor). [This generation is undatable. The next, Hermokrates, is attested in 161, so the phenomenon cannot really be pushed back before the 180s if that far, since a man taking a new or double name might rename his father; cf. *P. Tebt.* I 61a.40.] With the removal of the single instance of the problematic ethnic designation of 'Persian' from the archive's family, there seems no reason to suspect with Oates that the reverse process is documented – the Hellenization of Egyptians. Rather, the stated Cyrenaic and Cretan ethnic designations of Apollonia et al. and Dryton, respectively, should be taken seriously, and the family's use of Demotic legal instruments is all the more striking. The provincial setting of Pathyris, subject to political instabilities and lacking in Greek speakers, must be largely responsible." See also Pomeroy 1984: 103-24, a rather muddled treatment, but essentially in agreement with Ritner on this issue.

[22] Hobson 1987: 72, reviewing Pomeroy 1984: "Are we dealing here with hellenized Egyptians or with egyptianized Greeks? P. inclines toward the latter view and indeed concludes (p. 124) that there is a tendency for women to become more egyptianized and men more hellenized. This is an intriguing hypothesis and well worth further investigation. However, in the present case it would seem more likely that Apollonia was an Egyptian assuming a Greek name because she was married to a Greek (a possibility suggested by Naphtali Lewis when this material was presented by P. at a colloquium on Social History and the Papyri at Columbia University in 1983)." Pestman, *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XIX, p. 33: "a woman who, while describing herself as 'Cyrenaean,' belongs to a mixed Graeco-Egyptian family all the members of which bear a Greek name and an Egyptian name. The Egyptian element is strongly represented in this family" ("une femme qui, tout en se qualifiant de 'Cyrénéenne,' appartient à une famille mixte gréco-égyptienne dont tous les membres portent un nom grec et un nom égyptien. L'élément égyptien est fortement représenté dans cette famille"). Pestman notes that the witnesses in 126 who sign Dryton's third will sign in Demotic, even though they are military men.

[23] For example, Dionysios son of Kephalas calls himself variously Persian, Macedonian, and *Wjnn* (in Demotic: literally: "Ionian," the Demotic word for Greek), and calls his brother a Libyan.

[24] See Modrzejewski 1975: 708.

[25] See Bingen's discussion (1970) of the archaic lack of political structure in the peasantry, which reduced its options in coping with Greek innovations to acquiescence, refusal, or flight.

[26] On the difficulties of interpreting this fact, see Bagnall 1982: 15.

[27] I have touched on this point briefly: 1981: 21.

[28] Koenen 1983. He describes, 144, his interest as the "mixture of the Egyptian and Greek cultures" ("Vermischung der ägyptischen und der

griechischen Kulturen"). But he admits that the influences he describes run almost entirely one way, from Egyptian to Greek, and his conclusions, 190, describe a purely exploitative attitude on the part of the Ptolemies toward the Egyptian royal ideology, which they used to help justify themselves in the eyes of the Greeks.

[29] Reymond 1976 and 1977.

[30] See D. J. Thompson 1988: chapter 7, "Between Two Worlds: the Sarapieion." This chapter is the most extensive and nuanced discussion known to me of the interactions among Greek and Egyptian people, languages, religion, and culture in a particular setting.

[31] Derchain 1974. Both "reminiscences" of Greek culture are subjectively apprehended rather than clearly demonstrable.

[32] Préaux 1978, vol. II: 550-52.

[33] Koenen 1983: 144.

[34] *P.Dion.*, p. 6.

[35] Moreover, the Egyptian scribal class traditionally was priestly and connected to temples. We do not know the background of the *agoranomoi* very well, but it seems likely enough that they came from the only known body of literate men experienced in writing contracts in Demotic.

[36] Now Bernand 1969: nos. 5-7, 35, and maybe also 8.

[37] Yoyotte 1969.

[38] A somewhat different question is the supposed hostility of the priesthoods to Ptolemaic rule; for a cogent rejection of this hostile attitude, see Johnson 1984. See also Johnson's article on the continued prosperity – indeed, domination of native-held wealth – of the priests in the Ptolemaic Period (Johnson 1986).

[39] Reymond 1976: 62 (not quite agreeing with her own earlier remarks): "The earlier theory was that Greek texts were translated into the Demotic because the question was approached through the study of Greek documents. It is true that our text includes a good number of Greek words; this, however, was an implementation of late date which did not effect [*sic*] the original character of the writing. The essentially Egyptian character of the whole composition is prominent and manifest. New elements incorporated did not break its original and essential features." On the art, see Koenen 1983: 144-45 note 3.

[40] This information comes from Clarysse 1987.

[41] See above, note 29. Coptic, of course, is full of Greek loan-words.

[42] Lichtheim 1980: 8-10, 125, 151-59, 184.

[43] Lichtheim 1983.

[44] Apart from my visible indebtedness to those whose works I have cited, I am grateful to Willy Clarysse and Dorothy J. Thompson for the use of unpublished material and for their comments in conversation and correspondence.