XIV

The People of the Roman Fayum

The ethnic background of the people of the Roman Fayum, the subject on which I was invited to offer this contribution, offers a problem that someone looking at the mummy portraits will be tempted to phrase in the form "Who are these people, anyway?" If the scholarly literature is any guide, the question will then be rephrased "Are they Greeks or Egyptians?"[1] As this is not a suspense novel, I will reveal at the beginning that my answer to this question is "No."

This is an obviously irritating answer, but the reasons for it will become clearer. The difficulty is that answering an either-or question of this sort in any other way—responding "Greeks," for example—is possible only if one is confident that this society possessed a tolerably stable notion of what the ethnic designations in question meant, and if these designations represented a reasonably clear divide between identifiable groups. I am by no means confident that either of these conditions was met. In the end I shall set forth a sense in which it is possible to give another answer to the question, but it would be a mistake to get to that point too easily.

Most of what is written about Roman Egypt takes it for granted that the distinction between Greek and Egyptian was a straightforward one—a little fuzzy around the edges, maybe, but not really very difficult. That assumption is not without some basis. Most importantly, the Romans made some very clear distinctions in categorizing inhabitants of Egypt. They had a clear notion of what the difference between *Hellenes* and *Aigyptioi* was, and they used the distinction, along with others, in constructing the elaborate accumulation of rules about status, marriage, and property known as the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* and in differentiating the inhabitants of Egypt in their tax system. Some modern scholars have swallowed this opposition of *Hellenes* and *Aigyptioi*

[1] See, e.g. Montevecchi 1985, 239, who (like many others) sees Greek physiognomy in some of the mummy portraits. If such judgments are not purely subjective, even worthless, I would prefer to think of Mediterranean rather than specifically Greek features as a description. The question may be raised whether Romans might also be expected to appear in the portraits. 'Roman' is from a Roman point of view a legal status and no doubt some of those portrayed did hold Roman citizenship, particularly veterans. If by 'Roman' one means Roman citizens of non-Egyptian, particularly Italian, origin, that is much less likely; any such settlement in the Fayum under the Empire was probably very small in number, the military forces being recruited mostly inside Egypt after the early Roman period.

whole.[2] But on closer examination this binary categorization self-destructs, for *Hellenes* turn out to be a subcategory of *Aigyptioi*, not their opposite.[3]

The Roman class structure of Egypt contained several strata, corresponding to basic categories of Roman public law. At the top were the holders of Roman citizenship; below them were the citizens of the three, later four, Greek cities of Egypt: non-Romans, but citizens. Of these, Alexandria occupied a somewhat higher niche than Ptolemais, Naukratis, or Antinoopolis, but the citizens of all four were recognizably Greeks by any definition, even if the constitution of Antinoopolis looks more Roman than Greek. The Romans did not call these people *Hellenes*, however; they identified them collectively as "citizens," *astoi* in Greek.[4] The third stratum was composed of *Aigyptioi*, peregrine non-citizens in Roman terms, and it included all of the inhabitants of the country outside of the two citizen groups I have already mentioned.

This "flagrant divorce between social reality and juridical categories," as one scholar has called it,[5] called for further subcategorization. And so within the *Aigyptioi* the Romans distinguished a privileged group of residents of the metropoleis, or chief towns of the nomes, and these were variously called *metropolitai* or *Hellenes*. Their chief privilege was to pay poll tax at a lower rate than other "Egyptians," but they were not—unlike citizens—exempted altogether. They also emerged as the governing class of the metropoleis. But they were still "Egyptians." When the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* tells us, for example, that the freedmen of Alexandrians may not marry Egyptians (§ 49), the forbidden Egyptians include the *Hellenes*.[6] From the Roman point of view, then, *Hellenes* are only a subcategory of *Aigyptioi*.

This kind of "ethnicity" is obviously constructed, a creation of the Roman legal and administrative system. This may make us uncomfortable; certainly it raises hard questions about the nature of ethnicity and identity, particularly whether the inhabitants of Egypt saw matters, either initially or eventually, as the Romans did. This is what I shall mostly be talking about. But to do so we must step back a bit, for it is generally, and reasonably, supposed that the

[2] For example, Shaw 1992.

[3] See Mélèze Modrzejewski 1985 for the most recent and complete demonstration of this position. See also Bowman and Rathbone 1993 on the Roman reorganization of Egypt.

[4] See Delia 1991, 7–47, esp. 13–21.

[5] Mélèze Modrzejewski 1985, 259.

[6] In § 52 "Romans are permitted to marry Egyptians" is usually corrected by insertion of a "not," but this is a matter of controversy.

Romans had some rational basis in the late Ptolemaic situation for such a remarkable construction. When we look at the Ptolemaic picture, however, we find that there, too, ethnic categories are administratively and legally constructed: artifacts of public law.[7] They are in some respects much broader, but less significant, and this is true even when we look at the earliest stratum we can observe, the middle of the third century B.C.

The Ptolemaic system was different from the Roman. Almost all people were divided into two groups, Hellenes and Egyptians.[8] Hellenic—or "not Egyptian"—legal status was based on official national origin, and virtually all foreigners qualified as Hellenes: Thracians, Paeonians, Judaeans, Idumaeans—all sorts of people that an Athenian would be aghast to think of as Greeks.[9] For most purposes, the term meant "immigrant" or "foreign settler." There was a modest tax advantage to being a Hellene, but little other formal difference.[10] The study of the third-century census records by Willy Clarysse and Dorothy Thompson, currently underway, shows us a population in which ethnic designations apply not so much to individuals as to entire households. The wife of a Hellene is therefore a Hellene, no matter what her ancestry.[11] The official decision that underlies this fact probably did not rest on carefully thinking through the long-term consequences, but they were real all the same: official ethnicity had no rigorous or direct connection to ancestry, "blood," or the like. That is, one could become a Hellene.

As far back as we can look, then, Ptolemaic ethnicity looks a bit slippery.[12] That should not actually be surprising. Among the qualities of ethnicity that emerge from the study of modern societies are some very pertinent to Egypt:[13] ethnic terms and categories are not independent, universal, or agreed on in any society; they are *always* based in historical circumstances and forces,

[7] That is not to say that terms of ethnicity are *only* official categories, of course; cf. further below on the problem of perceived ethnicity.

[8] Arabs and Persians also occur as classifications, but their nature is not well understood. For my purposes here, the central fact is that they are treated like Hellenes for taxation purposes.

[9] Goudriaan 1988, 19 is wrong to suppose a lack of connection between the specific "ethnics" and the use of *Hellen*; he also (98) incorrectly imagines that the latter term can be viewed as an ethnic designation in contrast to the more specific terms of origin.

[10] Not as little as Goudriaan 1988, 119 supposes, however.

[11] Clarysse and Thompson, forthcoming.

[12] The same may well have been true of ethnic designations in Egypt before the Ptolemies. A more comprehensive treatment of ethnic designations in Ptolemaic Egypt is in preparation by Csaba La'da.

[13] The following is based largely on Comaroff and Comaroff 1992, 49–67. Naturally, the scholarly definition of ethnicity is itself hotly contested ground.

and people struggle to control them. Ethnicity is a form of relational classification, never existing in isolation from the relationship of one group to another; there is no consciousness of ethnicity except where one must talk about one group as against another. There may be, as in Ptolemaic Egypt, official definitions of ethnicity, and these are what we would find in official or legal documents; but we cannot assume that they are identical to the way categories were conceptualized or terms were used in private thought and discourse.[14] Certainly ethnicity is not simply equivalent to race (itself an elusive and perhaps illegitimate concept), to geographical origin, to language, or to culture. Finally, once an ethnic consciousness is in place, it may change its nature and form and may be perpetuated by different factors than those that gave rise to it.

The complex, contested, relational, and mutable character of ethnicity is undoubtedly at the root of our difficulty in speaking of the ethnicity of particular individuals or families.[15] When Dionysios alias Plenis entered the army around 105 B.C., he acquired the status of Macedonian instead of that of "Persian."[16] But at the same time that he bears the ethnic of the conquerors, he moves freely in the world of the Egyptian temples, and he is himself holder of a priestly office. Moreover, he is designated in some texts as a royal cultivator, *basilikos georgos*, a status generally regarded as the very definition of the purely Egyptian peasant.[17] He can write, and write with a high degree of competence, in both Demotic and Greek. There is absolutely no doubt that he was recorded in the royal accounts as holding the status of Hellene; that is, he occupies a position in the dominant class of Egypt, the royal system.[18] And yet his ethnicity can hardly be said to be exhausted by the official designation. The editors of this archive concluded that Dionysios

[14] Goudriaan 1988, 8–13 points rightly to the slipperiness and changeability of ethnicity, but he excludes official ethnicity from his purview by refusing to see legal status as relevant to the issue. Perceived social ethnicity and official ethnicity do not, however, exist in separate worlds but interact.

[15] Witness the much-argued case of the family of Apollonia alias Senmonthis, wife of the Cretan cavalryman Dryton, which I have discussed elsewhere (Bagnall 1988); my position is caricatured by Ritner 1992, who seems unable to understand the notion that an individual might not be simply Greek or simply Egyptian, and that ancestry is sometimes neither determinable nor central.

[16] On Dionysios see *P.Dion.*, introduction.

[17] For a nuanced study of this status, simultaneously hard-pressed for rents but protected, see Rowlandson 1985.

[18] See Bingen 1979, 94 n.2; Bingen 1983, 563.

came from a predominantly Egyptian background.[19] What he represents is a pattern brought to light particularly by the work of P. W. Pestman and Willy Clarysse in the last decade, in which individuals operate in multiple social roles. The roles each have their own official ethnicity—being a "Macedonian" soldier is Hellenic, being a priest of Pa-'š3 or a royal cultivator is Egyptian.[20]

We do not know what Dionysios alias Plenis thought of all this. But he and others managed to operate in two spheres. Clarysse has shown that Greek-Egyptian intermarriage and Greek involvement in Egyptian cults are both demonstrable for the third century, even in Alexandrian and cleruchic milieus once thought to be essentially exempt from them.[21] We do not have to suppose that this bicultural class was vast in numbers, but neither was it trivial. It is, in short, no longer a defensible position to imagine that later Ptolemaic Egypt is adequately described as a society divided tidily into Greeks and Egyptians; indeed, it never had been. The Greco-Macedonian cleruchs, now renamed *katoikoi*, civilians of Greek descent, official Greeks of Egyptian or mixed descent, and Egyptians untouched by the presence of foreigners all coexisted in the countryside. And we should remember that the Jews, too, were Hellenes.[22] Official ethnicity had moved from representing the national origin of the head of the household to being a heritable status, and from that to being an acquirable status. It is hardly surprising that the Romans found the official ethnicity they inherited too complex and unreliable to maintain.

The result was that the Romans drew the line between ethnic groups in a different place from that used by the Ptolemies. Legal ethnicity was altered. We will naturally ask if perceived ethnicity was changed along with it. Here the Jews serve as a valuable test case. The so-called Acts of the Pagan Martyrs preserve vignettes of Alexandrians speaking before the emperor. In one of them, Isidoros says, "I accuse them [the Jews] of wishing to stir up the entire world. . . . We must consider the entire mass. They are not of the same temperament as the Alexandrians, but live rather after the fashion of the Egyptians. Are they not on a level with those who pay the poll-tax."[23]

[19] *P.Dion.*, p. 3.

[20] See Clarysse 1985 and Clarysse 1992 for the phenomenon.

[21] In Clarysse 1992, 52 for Alexandrian-Egyptian intermarriage, long thought non-existent. For the earlier bibliography on intermarriage see particularly Peremans 1981 and Mélèze Modrzejewski 1984. Both of these articles were written before the impact of Clarysse's discoveries about the link between official position and names; they therefore suffer from the circularity of Peremans' argument that if the holders of a position have (e.g.) Greek names we may conclude that the position was mainly held by Greeks.

[22] See Mélèze Modrzejewski 1991, esp. 69–71, 133–34; Clarysse 1994.

[23] Musurillo 1954, 25–26.

Isidoros thus glides effortlessly from legal ethnicity, reflected here in subjection to the poll-tax, to way of life, or perceived ethnicity. Tendentious he is, of course; the Alexandrian citizens were the closest thing to winners in the Roman redesign of Egypt, and Isidoros had every interest in exaggerating the distinctions. But at least his words suggest that the Roman innovations produced a new zone in which ethnicity was contested.

Do we then have any means of asking how these newly created "Egyptians" saw themselves? Did they all "live after the fashion of the Egyptians" and see themselves as such, or did some of them see themselves as Greeks? This is the nub of the problem. There is little or no direct evidence for questions of self-perception in this population, except to the extent that the mummy portraits can be seen as such evidence. Sometimes it is possible to discern the ways in which a member of the village elite identified his interests with those of the ruling power, like local elites all over the Roman empire.[24] It would not be unreasonable to imagine that such people thought of themselves as both Greeks and Romans, perhaps even as Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans simultaneously. We cannot say if the notion of these as disjunctive categories even came into the thinking of such people.

It would be natural to suggest that language was still a basic discriminant of culture, and even of ethnicity. But we face here the basic problem that Greek very quickly became almost the only written language of Roman Egypt.[25] Those bastions of Egyptian identity the temples operated mainly in Greek, at least so far as written documentation is concerned, although they preserved much literature in Demotic for many decades. The mapping of spoken to written language is extremely complex in this society, and someone capable of operating in Greek might nonetheless have thought of it as an alien language—the language of foreigners.

We are forced back on names. The enterprise of looking at names for ethnicity is hazardous, and its answers are not necessarily any simpler than those we find elsewhere.[26] Jean Bingen has pointed out that the changes of

[24] A good example is Hanson 1989, on the tax collector Nemesion.

[25] Bagnall 1993, chapter 7.

[26] Scholarly discussion of names has mostly concerned the Ptolemaic period; a classic statement can be found in Peremans 1970, adopting a tripartite classification (Egyptian, Greek, perhaps Hellenized) and describing the swings of scholarly opinion between use of names as evidence for ethnicity and extreme skepticism about the reliability of such evidence. Clarysse 1985 brought an important corrective to the debate. The onomastic debate has centered on what lies between "pure Greek" and "pure Egyptian," including double names and people with name and patronymic of different origins.

the Roman period still leave us with a lot of information in the names about the composition of the population, because "the name conferred by the father or the master is a sign which integrates a person into a determined group, no matter how large it is. Even in the Byzantine period, these data remain precious, if not for defining with complete certainty an isolated individual, at least for situating with statistical probability the bearers of certain types of names."[27] A good illustration of Bingen's point can be found in Deborah Hobson's study of the Fayum village of Soknopaiou Nesos.[28] There she finds that of 327 property owners in this Roman-period village 313 have purely Egyptian names, and another 12 have names of Greek form but probably borne by Egyptians. Only 1 name is clearly Greek and 1 clearly Roman. Even if one may be less certain than she that Greeks and Egyptians are clear-cut categories, there is no doubt that her description of Soknopaiou Nesos as "a throughly Egyptian village in the Roman period" (Samuel 1981, 402) is unchallengeable.

Names are a matter of choice and of fashion, but those choices and fashions are not unconnected to cultural and ethnic identity of those giving them. They also have gender, usually unambiguous (unlike the situation in English, where what one might call common-gender names are widespread), and, as we shall see, the ethnicity of naming is itself gendered. Our inquiry will therefore turn to taking some soundings in the names of the people of the Roman Fayum.[29]

The logical beginning point is with the most Hellenic part of the population, those specifically designated as *Hellenes* by the Roman authorities. These are the members of the elite, the so-called 6475 "settlers" or *katoikoi*.[30] Fortunately, there is a recent listing of all known members of this group, making our task easier.[31] Here, if anywhere, we might expect a heavily Greek onomastic repertory. And this is what the compiler of the prosopography, Daniela Canducci, concludes: "From the onomastics the cultural Greekness of the category becomes evident: masculine names are Greek by a large

[27] Bingen 1983, 565.

[28] Samuel 1981.

[29] I shall not attempt to discuss the Roman army in this context. Veterans held Roman citizenship; their legal ethnicity was therefore Roman. But except at the very beginning of Roman rule, few of the veterans settling in Egypt are likely to have originated outside the country. The army represented, moreover, a tiny fraction of the population of Egypt, roughly a half of one percent. It does raise some interesting questions about the relationship of Greek and Roman, but these must be left aside here.

[30] For a general study see Canducci 1990.

[31] Canducci 1991.

majority; among them are noted some belonging to the mythic and epic tradition, and not a few deriving from the Macedonian tradition and that of the successors. . . . The feminine onomastic is also predominantly Greek, even though containing a larger number of individuals with Egyptian names compared with males and displaying a certain repetitiveness."[32] These observations, however, seem to me to mask rather than display the real situation. We must dig a little deeper.

First, we must ask what it means to say a name is Greek.[33] *All* of the names in question are written in Greek characters and embedded in Greek texts. So that is not the decisive point. All of them are furnished with Greek declensional endings, so they are grammatically Greek. But what Canducci means by her statement must be that the names are formed according to Greek rules and etymology, not according to Egyptian. By way of example, suppose that parents want to give their child a name meaning "gift of Isis." There are in principle three possibilities open to members of the population we are concerned with: a purely Greek formation, with the name of Isis joined to the Greek root for gift, δωρ-, to form Isidoros; an Egyptian formation, with the definite article (*p3*), the verb to give (*ỉr*), and Isis's name, yielding Peteese, which does not decline in Greek; or using the Egyptian formation but adding Greek declensional endings, getting Peteesis and its oblique cases. Isidoros is obviously a "Greek" name in this sense, Peteese obviously "Egyptian" and Peteesis Egyptian by formation but Greek by form.[34] No undeclinable names of an Egyptian type appear in the katoikic population. For that matter, only a handful of Egyptian formations with Greek declension appear, and most of these are, as Canducci observed, names of women.

So most of the names are Greek by formation. But what are they formed *from*? If one looks at the number of individuals represented, it becomes clear that this is not old Greek. Of the masculine names, only a little under one-

[32] Canducci 1991, 214.

[33] This question has received little systematic attention; scholars have tended to assume that the answer is self-evident. See Montevecchi 1985, 235 for a characteristic example.

[34] Peteese and Peteesis are obviously the same name in a way that Peteesis and Isidoros are not, the difference in writing (or, irrecoverably, in speech) resulting only from the language being spoken or written and the scribal habits of the period or the individual. In the Ptolemaic period the difference reflects the scribe's background more than anything else. Undeclined forms are rare in the Roman period, and when they reemerge in force in late antiquity it is no longer a matter of the individual scribe but of the larger cultural context.

fifth are Greek names commonly found outside Egypt and with no special Egyptian connection.[35] Another 24 percent are Macedonian names or otherwise linked to the initial settlement of the Fayum. A handful (5 percent) are of Roman origin. But the largest block, some 47 percent, are theophoric names, and almost all of these are either clearly or possibly Greek renderings of Egyptian theophoric names or else Greek formations on the names of Egyptian gods. In many cases, of course, it is impossible to know if a particular individual's name—Aphrodisios, say—reflects a purely Greek cult of Aphrodite or rather a Greek rendering of Hathor. But the overall character of this onomastic repertory is unmistakably rooted in Egyptian religion, and Greek divinities with no local equivalents, like Poseidon, are absent from the list of names.[36]

Looked at from another angle, more than two-thirds of the men in this group have names deriving not so much from a connection to Greece as from their heritage of conquest and settlement in Egypt. The onomastic repertory stamps them unmistakably as Greeks *of Egypt*, not Greeks of Greece. For women, the percentage is even higher, three-quarters. These people announce their identity above all in terms of the gods of their adopted land, not in terms of foreignness.

The elite of the metropolis may then be taken to establish one end of the spectrum of onomastic ethnicity in the Fayum. Soknopaiou Nesos, with an unrelieved diet of names of Egyptian etymology (but Greek terminations), may be placed at the other end. The question is then where the rest of the population was situated. Already you can see the likelihood that the answer was highly variable by place. I cannot in the compass of an article enter into the kind of detailed investigation that would answer the question with as fine a resolution as I should like, so I shall confine myself to a test trench into the soil of two of the villages where we have abundant and representative evidence, Karanis and Ptolemais Hormou.[37]

[35] This is an upper limit, giving (as it were) maximum credit for Greek character; I have included all Greek names for which I have not yet found an Egyptian connection or any other reason to classify the name in another category. For this and the other categories used here, see the more detailed explanation in the appendix.

[36] This is recognized by Montevecchi 1985, 239, but she supposes that religion was the only area in which the Greeks did not maintain their own culture, taking on instead that of the country in which they had settled.

[37] I have left aside for the present the case of Herakleia, for which a prosopography has been published by Hobson 1986, mainly because the documentation for that village derives almost entirely from Soknopaiou Nesos (as Hobson 1985, 112 observes) and thus is an unlikely source for a representative sample.

As a sample for Karanis I have used the register of poll-tax payers (thus only men) listed in the index volume (*P.Mich.* IV, 2) to the extensive second-century tax rolls. Excluding some entries for which it was impossible to establish that they represent a distinct individual, I counted some 600 payers. The results are very different from those of the *katoikoi*. The largest group is those with theophoric Egyptian names, that is, with Egyptian etymologies, who make up 40 percent of the total (compared to less than 3 percent of the *katoikoi*). Theophoric names with Greek formation are 26 percent. But 'common Greek' names decline to 11 percent from 18, and dynastic from 24 to 13.

There are various ways one can slice things up. Here are three of them: the villagers are more often named after their gods: 66 percent vs. 47 percent. The *katoikoi* have a much higher percentage of Greek and Roman names, 92 percent vs. 55 percent for the Karanis villagers. And the two are fairly close in total percentage of names that, as I characterized it earlier, have to do with residence in Egypt, that is, theophoric plus dynastic: 71 percent for *katoikoi*, 79 percent for villagers. The groups might thus be described as almost equally Egyptian but not equally Greek.

Karanis is generally viewed as an atypical village, much more Greek than average, even by the standards of the Fayum. It would take a much more ambitious investigation to say how true this is. Our second test case suggests that although Karanis was more Greek than average, it may not have been radically more Greek. The name index to the Petaus archive, a late second-century body of material from the village of Ptolemais Hormou, allows us to see some 1027 identifiable individuals.[38] Of these, Greek theophoric names are 26%, Egyptian theophoric names 53%, other Greek just 8%, dynastic only 5%, and small amounts of others. Total Greek and Roman come to 41%, total theophoric, 79%, and total theophoric plus dynastic, 84%. It is clearly more Egyptian and more dominated by theophoric names than either the *katoikoi* or Karanis, but it is far from the almost entirely Egyptian world of Soknopaiou Nesos.

The investigation can be carried further. Theadelphia, Tebtunis and Philadelphia all certainly offer the scope for similar studies. These are, of course, like Karanis and Ptolemais Hormou, all villages along the perimeter of the nome, which are known to have had heavy Greco-Macedonian settlement in the Ptolemaic period. The center of the nome, the land of villages that

[38] *P.Petaus*, index. The subject population is essentially those males with patronymics or other distinguishing identities that allow them to be given a separate index entry.

never dried up and left us papyri, is much more difficult, perhaps impossible, to assess.

By now it is evident why the response to any question that seeks to treat the ethnicity of the inhabitants of the Roman Fayum in binary terms, Greek *or* Egyptian, can only be guarded, ambiguous, and questioning of the question. Some of these people may indeed have seen matters in such terms, but the way they named their children suggests something much more complex. When we move from the elite to the villages, the degree of overall connection to Egypt changes very slightly, but the Greekness of that connection declines. It seems reasonable to conclude that most of the Greek-speaking inhabitants of the region saw themselves as *both* Greek and Egyptian. And it is these people, I believe, who commissioned the mummy portraits, with their striking combination of Graeco-Roman hairstyles, clothing, jewels, everything we date them by, in fact, and the Egyptian—the entire funerary context. Being representative both of a local culture and of the empire's metropolitan culture is the normal trait of local elites under the empire, and the *katoikoi* of Roman Egypt were no exception.[39]

[39] I am grateful to the British Museum for the invitation to present this paper at the colloquium on which this volume is based, to Morris Bierbrier for facilitating my stay in London, and to Alan Bowman, Willy Clarysse, and Dorothy Thompson for commenting on drafts of the published version.

XIV

Naming in three populations

	Katoikoi	*Karanis*	*Ptol. Hormou*
Greek theophoric	44%	26%	26%
Egyptian theophoric	3%	40%	53%
Macedonian/settler	24%	13%	5%
'Common Greek'	18%	11%	8%
Roman	5%	5%	3%
Other/unknown	5%	5%	5%
Greek and Roman	92%	55%	42%
Theophoric	47%	66%	79%
Theophoric + Macedonian	71%	79%	84%

Bibliography

Bagnall, Roger S. (1988). "Greeks and Egyptians: Ethnicity, Status, and Culture," *Cleopatra's Egypt: Age of the Ptolemies* (Brooklyn) 21–27.

— (1993). *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton).

Bingen, Jean (1979). "Kerkéosiris et ses Grecs au II^{e} siècle avant notre ère," *Actes du XV^{e} Congrès International de Papyrologie* IV (Pap.Brux. 19, Brussels) 87–94.

— (1983). "Critique et exploitation de l'onomastique: Le cas de l'Égypte gréco-romaine," *Actes du VII^{e} Congrès de la F.I.E.C.* (Budapest) 2: 557–65.

Canducci, Daniela (1990). "I 6475 cateci greci dell'Arsinoite," *Aegyptus* 70: 211–55.

— (1991). "I 6475 cateci greci dell'Arsinoite. Prosopografia," *Aegyptus* 71: 121–216.

Clarysse, Willy (1985). "Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic Army and Administration," *Aegyptus* 65: 57–66.

— (1992). "Some Greeks in Egypt," *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society. Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond*, ed. J. H. Johnson (SAOC 51, Chicago) 51–56.

— (1994). "Jews in Trikomia," *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrology* (Copenhagen) 193–203.

Clarysse, Willy, and Thompson, Dorothy J. (forthcoming). *Counting the People* (Collectanea Hellenistica, Leuven).

Comaroff, John, and Comaroff, Jean (1992). *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination* (Boulder, Colorado).

Delia, Diana (1991). *Alexandrian Citizenship During the Roman Principate* (American Classical Studies 23, Atlanta).

Goudriaan, Koen (1988). *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 5, Amsterdam).

Hanson, Ann Ellis (1989). "Village Officials at Philadelphia: A Model of Romanization in the Julio-Claudian Period," *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto*, ed. L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci (Bologna) 429–40.

Hobson, Deborah W. (1985). "The Village of Heraklia in the Arsinoite Nome," *BASP* 22: 101–15.

— (1986). "The Inhabitants of Heraklia," *BASP* 23: 99–123.

Mélèze Modrzejewski, Joseph (1984). "Dryton le crétois et sa famille, ou les mariages mixtes dans l'Égypte hellénistique," *Aux origines de l'hellénisme—la Crète et la Grèce. Hommage à Henri van Effenterre* (Paris) 353–76 = *Statut personnel et liens de famille dans les droits de l'antiquité* (Aldershot 1993), chapter VIII.

— (1985). "Entre la cité et le fisc: le statut grec dans l'Égypte romaine," *Symposion 1982* (Valencia) 241–80 = *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Egypte romaine* (Aldershot 1990), chapter I.

— (1991). *Les Juifs d'Égypte de Ramsès II à Hadrien* (Paris).

Montevecchi, Orsolina (1985). "Egiziani e greci: la coesistenza delle due culture nell'Egitto romano," *Egitto e società antica* (Milan) 233–45.

Musurillo, Herbert (1954). *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford).

Peremans, Willy (1970). "Ethnies et classes dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque," *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique* (Paris) 213–223.

— (1981). "Les mariages mixtes dans l'Égypte des Lagides," *Scritti in onore di Orsolina Montevecchi* (Bologna) 273–81.

Ritner, Robert K. (1992). "Implicit Models of Cross-Cultural Interaction: A Question of Noses, Soap, and Prejudice," *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society. Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond*, ed. J. H. Johnson (SAOC 51, Chicago) 283–90.

Rowlandson, Jane L. (1985). "Freedom and Subordination in Ancient Agriculture: The Case of the Basilikoi Georgoi of Ptolemaic Egypt," in P. A. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey, eds., *Crux: Essays Presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th Birthday* (*History of Political Thought* 6.1/2, 1985) 327–47.

Samuel, Deborah H. (1981). "Greeks and Romans at Soknopaiou Nesos," *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology* (Chico) 289–403.

Shaw, Brent D. (1992). "Explaining Incest: Brother-Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt," *Man: Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* n.s. 27: 267–99.

Appendix
The Names of the Arsinoite *Katoikoi*

These lists categorize the names of Arsinoite *katoikoi*, as drawn from the prosopography of D. Canducci, *Aegyptus* 71 (1991) 121–216 and form the basis of the analysis above. Only the actual names of *katoikoi*, including their aliases, have been used; patronymics and metronymics are not included. A brief description of the categories used is necessary. First, however, must come two general caveats: (1) Names are not always univocal. (2) Namegivers may not always be fully aware of the reasons that particular names are part of the onomastic community to which they belong. The most important example of (1) in our population is Herakleides, for which at least three possible sources can be offered: Herakles as one of the gods of the gymnasium (Hermes is the other); Herakles as supposed ancestor of the Macedonian royal family; and Herakles as a Greek calque for an Egyptian god. Although much less common, Maron is also illuminating: a good Greek name, it was probably popular in part because it suggested the Egyptian name Marres. It is impossible in this appendix to provide a detailed discussion of the reasons for the classification of each name; a few notes have been appended, but onomastics remains an area needing systematic study.

1. Theophoric names and potential calques. These include names of Egyptian formation (marked with an *) and names of Greek formation, the latter being overwhelmingly predominant. Here particularly I regret the impossibility of giving a detailed analysis of the cults of Egypt in this period, which would be necessary to justify the inclusion here of many Greek names which I believe to have been popular in the Fayum in this period because they gave an acceptable Hellenic rendering of a name derived from the cult of a local Egyptian divinity. The list includes, however, few names for which an Egyptian explanation cannot be given or is not probable; it also includes names based on the Thracian rider god Heron (for whom see J. Bingen, "Le dieu Hèrôn et les Hèrôn du Fayoum," *Hommages à Jean Leclant* 3, *Études Isiaques* (Bibl. d'Étude 106/3, Cairo 1994) 41–50), and names probably derived from constellations of the Zodiac.

2. Macedonian, dynastic names and early settlers. These include Alexander, the Successors, and members of Alexander's Macedonian military leadership. Derivatives like Ptollarion and Ptollas (both from Ptolemaios), and feminine cognates of masculine names, are included. One may wonder at the inclusion

of some names not directly connected to Egypt, but Ptolemy I was trying to depict himself as the proper successor to Alexander, and in his history of the conqueror he tried to pick up a bit of the prestige attaching to the other companions, as well as to Philip. I have classed Herakleides here on the grounds that two of the three possible reasons for its popularity (gymnasium, Macedonian dynastic pretensions) are integral parts of the cleruchs' sense of self as a Macedonian military elite; in the Herakleopolite nome, on the other hand, the theophoric side was certainly dominant.

3. 'Common' Greek names. This category includes names adequately attested in the Greek world outside Egypt and not assignable to categories 1 and 2. Almost all of them are represented in both volume I and volume II of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Some of these are relatively uncommon, but none is truly rare and most are attested over a fair span of time and space. There are some curious phenomena as yet unexplained, such as names much rarer in the Greek world than among the *katoikoi*; such, for example, is Epimachos. There are probably local explanations for these. The category includes several names for which Egyptian connections probably explain the popularity of the name (e.g. Maron, Pasion); transferring them to the theophoric section would perhaps unduly prejudice the question of the Hellenism of the onomastic repertory.

4. Roman and Latinate names. Some of these are actual Roman names, others Greek formations on Latin stems (e.g. Gaion).

5. Other and unknown. Some of these are clearly Greek in formation but are given here because they are not listed in the *LGPN* and I have not found a reason to include them among the theophoric names. A few are clearly semitic, mainly Jewish (e.g. Sambatheios). And the origins of a few are simply unknown to me.

No doubt further investigation would allow the categorization of further names; but I believe that these would not have any material effect on the numbers or the argument here.

XIV

Theophoric and potential calques (including astrological) (216 M, 108 F)

Akousilaos[40]	10	Ammonarion	1
Ammonios	6[41]	Ammonia	3
Anoubion	1	Aphrodisia	1
Aphrodisios	4	Aphrodite	3
Apion	5	Aphrodous	1
Apollonides	1	Apia	4
Apollonios	20	Apollonia	3
Areios	2	Areia	1
Artemidoros	1	Artemidora	1
Asklepiades	9	Athenarion	1
D(e)ios	4	Athenais	1
Didas	12	Besous	1
Didymas	1	Didymarion	5
Didymos	26	Didyme	9
Diogenes	4	Dionysia	1
Diodoros	7	Eudaimonis	2
Dionysammon	2	Harpokratiaina	1
Dionysios	4[42]	Helene	5
Dionysodoros	2	Herais	3
Dioskoros	8	Herakla	1
Eudaimon	1	Herakleia	8
Harpasion	1	Herodiaina	1
Harpokration	3	Herois	3
Heliodoros	2	Ischyriaina	1
Hephaistion	1	Isidora	11
Heraklas	1	Kroniaina	1
Hermes	1	Kronous	1
Hermias	2	Sarap[	1
Hermon	1	Sarapias	6
Heron	6	Sarapous	3
Heroninos	1	Tamystha	8*
Horigenes	6	Tanouphis	1*
Horion	1	Taorsis	1*

[40] On this, Mystharion, Mysthes, and Tamystha, see J. Quaegebeur, G. Wagner, *BIFAO* 73 (1973) 41–60.

[41] A difficult case; this form with double mu (and its feminine cognates) is probably derived in most cases from Libyan Ammon, not Theban Amoun, and may reflect Cyrenaean origin; an argument could therefore be made for classifying it with settler-related names.

[42] Perhaps reflecting devotion to Osiris, but Dionysos was very popular with the Ptolemaic dynasty.

Ischyrion	3	Tapetsiris	2*
Isidoros	6	Tasoucharion	2
Ision	1	Thaesis	1*
Kastor	3	Thaisarion	1
Kronion	6	Thasos	1*
Kronios	1	Thaubarion	2
Mareis (= Marres?)	1*	Thermoutharion	5
Marsisouchos	1*		
Mystharion	4		
Mysthes	4*		
Neilammon	1		
Neilos	1		
Nemesianos	1		
Orsenouphis	3*		
Petearios	1*		
Philosarapis	2		
Polydeukes	2		
Psenkebkis	1*		
Sarapammon	4		
Sarapion	11		
Souchos	1*		
Spotous	1*		
Titoeth[	1		

Common Greek (84 M, 17 F)

Achilleus	1	Charition	4
Andreas	2	Demo	1
Antenor	1	Eirene	1
Bion	2	Hermione	2
Chairemon	2	Myrtis	1
Chares	1	Nike	1
Doras	3	Philoumene	4
Epimachos	6	Theano	1
Euangelos	1	Tyrannis	1
Euboulos	3	Zosime	1
Euhemeros	1		
Herodes	4		
Heuremon	1		
Kephalon	1		
Komon	2		
Leonidas	1		
Lysanias	2		

Maron	3
Melanos	1
Menelaos	1
Moles	2
Olympos	3
Onesimos	1
Onomastos	1
Palamedes	2
Pankrates	4
Pappos	1
Pasion	2
Patron	7
Phanias	2
Philon	1
Ploution	1
Polykrates	1
Pyrion	1
Satyros	1
Sokrates	1
Sotas	2
Syros	1
Telephos	1
Themison	1
Theon	4
Timon	2
Zenon	1
Zoilos	2

Dynastic/Early Settlers (111 M, 11 F)
(Includes later formations from these names)[43]

Aiakidas	1		
Alexandros	1	Alexous	1
Antigonos	3	Arsinoe	1
Demetrios	3	Berenike	2
Herakleides	37	Demetria	1
Lysimachos	22	Philippiaina	1
Nikanor	1	Ptolemais	3
Philippos	3	Ptollarous	1
Philotas	2	Tryphaina	1

[43] For derivatives of Ptolemaios, see O. Masson, *ZPE* 98 (1993) 157–67, esp. 164–65.

Ptolemaios	31
Ptollarion	4
Tryphon	3

Roman/Latinate (23 M, 7 F)

Amatios	2	Herennia	1
Apollinarius	2	Apollinarion	3
Gaion	2	Sabina	2
Geminus	2	Tertia	1
Iulius	1		
Kapiton	1		
Lourios	1		
Oualerios	3		
Paulinos	1		
Philantinoos	2		
Piso	2		
Pompeius	2		
Sabinos	1		
Satorneilos	1		
Tourbon	1		

Other/Uncertain (23 M, 8 F)

Atarias	2	Chairous	1
Bokmos	1	Charmia	1
Chaireis	1	Chousarion	1
Geoumthas	1	Ninnarous	1
Kopreios	1	Philarion	1
Marion	2	Rhodous	1
Niboitas	2	Sambous	1
Sambas	5	Zoidous	1
Sambatheios	1		
Sideros	1		
Syrion	1		
Teboulos	2		
Thrakion	1		
Titoeth[	1		
Toreus	1		