



Official Identity and Ethnicity: Comparing Ptolemaic and Early Roman Egypt

Christelle Fischer-Bovet*

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Departments of Classics and History

fischerb@usc.edu

Abstract

The study of ancient states brings a historical perspective to the creation of official identities. By looking at legal and fiscal documents preserved on papyri from Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt (323 BCE to c. 70 CE), this study compares how the Ptolemies and then the Romans established official identities, that is, what priorities they gave to occupation, social status, citizenship, and/or ethnicity in order to construct legal and fiscal identities. It explores how these different priorities created overlaps between the categories, for instance, by an occupation permitting some flexibility with ethnicity, in order to include those in service of the state into privileged official categories. First, it shows that the fiscal and cleruchic policies of the Ptolemies partially reshaped societies so that social status became preeminent and ethnicity did no longer matter to the state already *before* the Roman annexation. Second, it compares how the demographic and social configuration in Egypt at the time of each conquest stimulated slightly different priorities when constructing official identities.

Keywords

Hellenistic Egypt – Roman Egypt – legal identity – ethnicity – taxation

* A shorter and different version of this article was announced as “Ethnic identity and status: comparing Ptolemaic and Early Roman Egypt” in *Identity and Identification in Antiquity*, 2012 (H. Ziche, ed.), but the volume was never published. I thank Saskia Hin, Claudia Moatti, Andrew Monson and Sofie Waebens for their comments on earlier drafts.

1 Introduction

The study of ancient states brings a historical perspective to the creation of official identities. Hellenistic rulers and the Roman government were already exposed to the issue of identifying people for juridical and fiscal purposes and the systems that were used in Egypt in both periods have been variously interpreted and often contrasted.¹ By looking at legal and fiscal documents preserved on papyri, this study aims first to compare how these two states established official identities, that is, what priorities they gave to occupation, social status, citizenship, and/or ethnicity in order to construct legal and fiscal identities. Second, it explores how these different priorities then created overlaps between the categories, for instance, by an occupation permitting some flexibility with ethnicity, or opportunity to attain a greater social status. It tries to explain how—and partly why—the Ptolemaic government took into consideration non-Egyptian origins when it created legal and fiscal official identities in the Early Ptolemaic Period (c. 300 to c. 200 BCE), how this evolved down to the Mid and Late Ptolemaic Periods (c. 200 to 30 BCE) and finally how the Romans adapted themselves to the situation they found in Egypt. While both the Ptolemies and the Romans had similar agendas when creating legal and fiscal categories, as certainly many other states throughout history did, *i.e.* to single out and reward the most useful population groups for achieving good governance and maintaining power, the comparison shows how the demographic and social configuration in Egypt at the time of each conquest stimulated slightly different priorities when constructing official identities.

2 The Identification Systems of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt and Modern Terminology

To record someone's official identity, states select a variable number of identifiers in addition to the individual's name, which serve to divide the population into different categories of persons.² The Ptolemaic tax-lists and the Roman census declarations used identifiers that recorded occupations, such as priest, teacher, soldier, or less prestigious professions such as camel-driver, baker, or

¹ For a recent description and a survey of past approaches, see Coussement, *Because I am Greek*, 145–59 and Broux, *Double Names*, 29–55.

² Depauw and Coussement, *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World*.

swineherd.³ The legal documents of both states also employed identifiers that indicated, when applicable, citizenship. Finally, place of origin also served as an identifier but from a different perspective in each case: in the Early Ptolemaic Period, hundreds of different geographical labels served to indicate someone's alleged place of origin in Greek legal documents, under the Romans, place of origin mattered in that inhabitants of Egypt who were neither Roman citizens nor citizens of one of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt counted legally and fiscally as Egyptians. There were no socio-economic identifiers but professions and army ranks were *indicia* of someone's economic and social status, while citizenship and place of origin could allude to someone's ethnicity. This concept, as well as the modern terminology used to describe the ancient terms in the case of the Ptolemies, deserve some preliminary remarks.

The priorities of the Ptolemaic identification system were clearly established in a decree stipulating how different categories of persons needed to identify themselves in contracts and indirectly preserved in two 3rd century BCE documents (see text 1 examined in the next section). Unless someone was a citizen of a *polis* in Egypt and provided his *demos*, he/she needed to indicate his/her *patris*, best translated as "place of origin, homeland." In a 1927 study on the so-called *Heimatsvermerk*, Bickermann proposed to distinguish between the geographical labels that referred to a place of origin (region or city) outside Egypt as *Ethnika* ("markers of ethnicity"), and the rarer labels that referred to places in Egypt as *Herkunftszeichen* ("markers of origin"), for example *Memphites* and from the 2nd century BCE almost always expressed as τῶν ἀπὸ Μεμφίτης ("of those from Memphis").⁴ Since then, the historians of Ptolemaic Egypt have conventionally called the non-Egyptian geographical labels "ethnics," "ethnic designations," and "ethnic labels." Yet, this has created at least two problems. First, an artificial modern distinction between *Ethnika* and *Herkunftszeichen* while the Ptolemaic administration considered them all as *patridas*. Second, the term *Ethnikon* imposed the preconception that geographical labels referring to a place of origin were a direct indication of (self-ascribed) ethnicity. This led La'da, for instance, to collect only "foreign ethnics" in his fundamental prosopography and to explain that by "ethnic terms" he means:

³ For Ptolemaic Egypt, see Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, esp. 650–54, 690–92, Appendix for the summary of tax-lists indicating occupations; for Roman Egypt, see Bagnall and Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt*, e.g. 22.

⁴ Bickermann, "Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte. 1."

those designations having either an explicit, or at least an implicit, ethnic meaning, signifying, in their literal sense, individuals from various different peoples, countries (e.g. Θράκις and Σύρα), geographical regions (e.g. Βοιωτίος and Θεσσαλή) and cities (e.g. Ἀσπάτης and Κυρηναΐα).⁵

He excluded complex designations constructed with a preposition, such as τῶν ἀπὸ + place name.

With the modern term *Ethnika*, Bikermann had connected the geographical labels to the question of ethnicity but our understanding of ethnicity and its definition has dramatically changed from the essentialist view of the 1920s. Rejecting such a conception in his influential 1969 article, the anthropologist Barth advocated a constructivist approach to ethnicity, which has been generally accepted since the 1990s, with some nuances.⁶ Thus ethnicity is broadly defined here as being about “descent and culture” while “ethnic groups can be thought of as ‘descent and culture communities.’”⁷ Ethnicity may in this case both refer to social constructions and, for some members of the group, to some reality regarding their shared ancestors and origins.⁸ Individuals can claim to belong to one or several ethnic groups at the same time and each group can develop and modify its ethnic communal or collective identity (*emic* point of view), while such a claim can be accepted or rejected by others (*etic* point of view). When looking at the documents from Greco-Roman Egypt, as recently stressed by Vandorpe and Rowlandson, it is useful to distinguish between

(a) ethnic labelling by government ('I am an Egyptian by law'), (b) ethnic labelling by the group itself (ethnic self-ascription: 'I consider myself a Greek') and (c) ethnic labelling of particular religious and cultural features ('she has a Roman hairstyle').⁹

⁵ La'da, *Foreign ethnics*, xxxv.

⁶ Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, 9–38 and Smith, *The ethnic origins of nations*; Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek antiquity* and Malkin, *Ancient perceptions of Greek ethnicity*; on ethnicity in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, see Goudriaan, *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt*, and more recently Mairs, “Intersecting identities” and Coussement, *Because I am Greek*, esp. 4–18.

⁷ Fenton, *Ethnicity*, 3; on the definitions of ethnicity and its use by ancient historians, see McInerney, *A Companion to Ethnicity*, 1–16 and Malkin and Müller, “Vingt ans d’ethnicité.”

⁸ Fenton, *Ethnicity*, 4: “Even where these ethnic labels are rather loose categories of diffuse identifications, there are nevertheless real blocs of the population who correspond to these labels.”

⁹ Vandorpe, “Identity,” 268; Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 213–15.

(c) expresses a cultural identity, while (b) refers to ethnic identity as usually conceived in the scholarship on ethnicity. Ethnic labelling by government (a) refers to one single individual's legal identity, which has an official or administrative value. It is referred to as *patris* by papyrologists specialized in law, but Vandorpe proposed "legal ethnic labelling," both terms being used here as synonyms. While Mairs, for instance, has recently focused on the intersections of identities in three case studies from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, the present investigation focuses on labelling by governments, its purpose, and the state's shifting priorities it betrays over time.¹⁰

3 The Identification System of the Early Ptolemaic Period (3rd Century BCE)

Between the late 4th and the mid 3rd century BCE, many immigrants from the eastern Mediterranean came to settle down in Egypt, attracted, among other things, by financial opportunities. The Ptolemies employed a large number of soldiers and officials, and allotted land to certain groups of soldiers to secure their loyalty and increase their revenue on the land.¹¹ Immigrants represented about 5% of the population and came from Cyrenaica, Greece, the Aegean, Macedonia, the Balkans, Asia Minor, and Judea, with a few others from the Levant and the western Mediterranean.¹² The greatest variety of ethnic labelling by government was found in legal contracts and petitions while in tax-lists only a few of them were used.¹³ To a lesser extent official correspondence concerning land allotments to individual soldiers identified each man with his individual legal ethnic label.

The Early Ptolemaic identification system was specified in an ordinance (*prostagma*), dated to around 275 BCE, stating how people were required to specify their official identity in a specific type of contract (the double documents) and in complaints to engage in litigation (έγκλήματα).¹⁴ The ordinance

¹⁰ Mairs, "Intersecting identities."

¹¹ Scheuble-Reiter, *Die Katōkenreiter*; Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society*.

¹² Fischer-Bovet, "Counting the Greeks."

¹³ For Greek legal documents see the online databank by Yiftach-Firanko, *Synallagma. Greek Contracts in Contexts*, <http://synallagma.tau.ac.il/ArtlidHomepage.aspx>.

¹⁴ Yiftach-Firanko, "BGU III 2367," 106–07 shows that the ordinance started being applied between 284 BCE (P.Eleph. 2) and 274/3 BCE (P.Cair.Zen. I 59,000) and suggests it may belong to the *diagramma* postulated by Wolff, *Das Recht*, 144–54 concerning the court system.

is lost but its content is partly preserved in two documents used by officials or notaries, which spell out how three legal categories of persons must indicate their legal identity (Text 1).¹⁵ Modern scholars usually refer to these rules of identification as the *Nomenklaturregel*. The information that each individual needed to provide according to his/her category, namely the soldiers, the citizens, and the others, is marked by an x in Table 1 below. The “others” can be understood literally as anybody identified in a legal document written in Greek who is neither a soldier nor a citizen of one of the cities of Egypt.¹⁶

Text 1: Rules of identification in Early Ptolemaic Egypt

P.Hamb. II 168, l. 5–10 mid 3rd century BCE, unknown provenance Translation by C. Fischer-Bovet

[οἱ μὲν στρατιῶται ἀπογραφέσθωσαν τά τε ὄνόματα [αὐτ]ῶν καὶ τὰς πατρίδας καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἀν ταγμάτων ὥστι [καὶ δὲ]ς ἀν ἔχωσιν ἐπιφοράς· οἱ δὲ πολῖται τούς τε πατέρας[ς] [καὶ το]ὺς δήμους, ἀν δὲ καὶ ἐγ τῷ στρατιωτικῷ ὥστιν [καὶ τὰ τ]άχηματα καὶ τὰς ἐπιφοράς· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι τοὺς [πατέρας] καὶ τὰς πατρίδας καὶ ἐν ὧι ἀν γένει ὥστιν.

May the soldiers write their names (ὄνόματα), places of origin (πατρίδας), units (ἐξ ὧν ταγμάτων), and the ranks (ἐπιφοράς) they hold; the citizens (πολῖται) their fathers' names (τοὺς πατέρας), their demes (δήμους), and when they are in the army, their units and ranks; for the others, their [fathers'names], their places of origin (πατρίδας), and their category (ἐν ὧι γένει).

¹⁵ P.Hamb. II 168 (mid 3rd century BCE). About ἐγχλήματα see Text 1 and BGU XIV 2367 (Alexandria (?), late 3rd century BCE), about double documents, see Bagnall and Derow, *The Hellenistic Period*, no 125; Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens*, 11–13; Kramer, *Griechische Texte XIII*, 63–77; Clarysse, *The Petrie papyri*, 47–49; Thompson, *Hellenistic Hellenes*, 304–05.

¹⁶ See also Yiftach-Firanko, “BGU III 2367,” 104 *contra* El-Abbad, “The Alexandrian citizenship,” 109 for whom they are the inhabitants of Alexandria who were not citizens; for Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens*, 11, n. 3 they are the inhabitants of the *chora* engaged in litigation in Alexandria (and nowhere else).

TABLE 1 Nomenklaturregel

| | Name | Father's name | <i>Patris</i> | <i>deme</i> | Unit | Rank | <i>Genos</i> |
|---------------------------------|------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------|------|--------------|
| Soldiers | x | | | x | | x | x |
| Citizens | x | x | | | x | | |
| Citizens serving in the army | x | x | | | x | x | x |
| Others | x | x | | x | | | x |

Fathers' names were not required in the case of soldiers, unless they were also citizens of one of the three Greek *poleis* in Egypt: Alexandria, Naukratis, and Ptolemais in Upper Egypt.¹⁷ Except in the case of citizens, information related to someone's occupation was always mandatory, either the units and ranks in the cases of soldiers or the *genos* in the cases of other individuals.¹⁸ The broad term *genos* "category" referred in this context to an occupation, while a high proportion of individuals in these contracts are related to the service of the state.¹⁹ The Revenue Laws, which enumerate the regulations established by Ptolemy II concerning the political economy of Egypt around the same time (259–258 BCE), reflects the same "organizational thinking" on the part of the Ptolemaic administration.²⁰ The tax-farmers needed to indicate their patronymic, their *patris* and "what each is doing" (*περὶ τί ἔκαστος [προγόνου] εἰται*.)

It appears immediately that the Early Ptolemaic administration gave priority to occupation (or rank in the army) and to citizenship in one of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt and valued it since these cities had their own laws and civic institutions.²¹ Access to citizenship was hereditary: the young male citizen

¹⁷ There is no reason to believe that the *πολῖται* referred only to the citizens of Alexandria, as the editor of P.Hamb. II 168 does. His argument relies on the mention of *diaitetai* and *criteria* that are also found in another text, P.Hal. 1 (Apollonopolite, after 259 BCE), which records a selection of Alexandrian laws. Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens*, II, note 3 already contested the editor's view and that of El-Abbadie, "The Alexandrian citizenship," 109.

¹⁸ *Epiphora* can be translated by "rank" or "pay category," obviously two close realities. Bagnall and Derow, *The Hellenistic Period*, no. 125 translate *genos* by "category" in BGU XIV 2367; see also Mélèze Modrzejewski, "Le statut des Hellènes," 265, n. 72.

¹⁹ Yitach-Firanko, "BGU III 2367," 104, note 6 with Bickermann, "Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte. I," 232–33.

²⁰ P.Rev. 7, l. 3–4 with Véisse, "L'usage des ethniques," 44.

²¹ Almost nothing is known about the laws of the *poleis*: for Alexandria, P.Hal. 1 (Apollonopolite, after 259 BCE), Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 112–15, and Rovira-Guardiola, "Alexandria," 311–12. It is generally assumed that Alexandria's constitution was very similar

had to be inscribed into his father's *deme* and he provided his *deme* as an identifier instead of a *patris*, as specified in P.Hamb. II 168. The Greek cities of Egypt shared the same type of organization as the Greek *poleis* outside Egypt. Marriages, for instance, between citizens and Egyptians were forbidden in Naukratis and it was probably also the case in Alexandria and Ptolemais.²² Thus the mother of a citizen had to be a citizen, if not of the same city, at least of one of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt in order to pass on to the children this official legal identity or legal status. Accordingly it has been suggested that holders of the legal ethnic labels "Alexandrians not yet registered in a *deme*" might be the children of Alexandrians with non-citizens.²³ Depending on the type of text and context, the legal ethnic "Alexandrian" may refer to actual citizenship in documents from outside Alexandria that are not the double document contracts and the ἔγχλήματα, or may refer to an inhabitant of the city without the legal status of citizen.²⁴

The Early Ptolemaic administration was not only establishing legal categories but also fiscal ones. During the period from 265 to 217 BCE, the main money taxes collected were the salt-tax, around one drachma per male or female adult per year, and (until sometime in the reign of Ptolemy III) the obol-tax, both sorts of poll taxes on men and women.²⁵ Tax-lists consisted either of detailed lists of people (*kat' andra*) recorded house-by-house (*kat' oikian*) or by occupation (*kat' ethnos*), of lists with information on taxpayers, or of summary records.²⁶ These two annual taxes were rather low in comparison to a soldier's wage of about one drachma per day at that time, yet a few categories of people were exempted and this reflects "the values and priorities of the Ptolemaic

to that of Athens, see El-Abbadı, "The Alexandrian citizenship," 112–13, also on the basis of P.Oxy. XVIII 2177, l. 13–14 and among other indications, the official called γυναικονόμος (P.Hib. II 196 = SB VI 9559, 280–250 BCE), who also existed in Athens; Plauman, *Ptolemaës in Oberägypten*.

²² The constitution of Antinoopolis in the Roman Period followed that of Naukratis except for the ban on intermarriage, see WChr. 27, l. 20–24 (Antinoopolis, after 161 CE). On Naukratis, see Redon, "L'identité grecque de Naucratis," 61–63 with I.Delta 751, 15.2.

²³ Clarysse, *The Petrie papyri*, 46–47 and Kramer, *Griechische Texte XIII*, 73–74 modifying Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens*, 8–11.

²⁴ It has been debated whether the ethnic "Alexandrian" means inhabitant of Alexandria or implies citizenship, see El-Abbadı, "The Alexandrian citizenship" and Delia, *Alexandrian citizenship*, esp. 7–47 and 53–56. For Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 47–49, "Alexandrian" designates a "second-rate" citizen.

²⁵ The salt-tax rates varied by gender and over time, see Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 44–52.

²⁶ Fifty-four tax-lists have been published by Clarysse and Thompson *Counting the People*, who offer a thorough analysis on which this section is based.

state," as stressed by Clarysse and Thompson.²⁷ Tax-exemptions and other similar privileges, even if only symbolic, are commonly attributed to population groups whose loyalty is essential to the state or who are valuable for their contribution to the governance of the state. The Ptolemaic tax-lists were especially keen at recording the occupational category, called *ethnos* in the fiscal context, and not *genos* as in the legal context.²⁸ The Greek and Demotic tax-lists record more than one hundred different *ethne*, mostly referring to occupational categories but at least fourteen were official ethnic labels, the most common being that of "Greek" ("Ελλην, Demotic *Wynn*) and "Persian" (Πέρσης, Demotic *Mdy*). The name of the categories suggests that ethnicity mattered to the state in the definition of individuals' fiscal identities but the situation was more complex, because all the members of the household of a tax-*Hellen* or of a tax-Persian (to use the terminology of modern historians) automatically benefitted from the same fiscal identity, whether they were the descendants of immigrants or of Egyptians. In addition, individuals with particular occupations such as some fullers, barbers, and border-police and the members of their household were also considered tax-*Hellenes*, whether or not they were of Greek descent.²⁹ Finally, it is notable that tax-Persians were mostly not of Persian descent but rather, in the 3rd century, the descendants of Greeks who settled in Egypt during the Persian occupation.³⁰ Yet these groups, as well as individuals with the ethnic label "Arab," were only exempted from the symbolic obol-tax.³¹

By contrast, groups exempted both from the salt-tax and the obol-tax were clearly occupational but initially their professions implied a strong connection with Greek culture, therefore in the Early Ptolemaic Period they were mostly immigrants and descendants of immigrants: "the [teachers] of letters, the athletic coaches (*paidotribai*), th[ose practicing] the affairs of Dionysus, and victors at the games in Alexandria (...) both these individuals and [their household members]."³² These were considered the most useful occupations from the Ptolemies' point of view for expanding the learning of Greek and for

²⁷ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 71.

²⁸ For this equivalence, see Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 146, n. 115, and Thompson, "Hellenistic *Hellenes*," 305, 308–09.

²⁹ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 57, 164–65.

³⁰ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 158–59, who also note that these individuals mostly bear Egyptian names in tax-lists whereas those with the legal ethnic label Persian bear more commonly Greek names; already suggested by Samuel (1970) 448 note 12.

³¹ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 57–58, 154–61; Thompson, "Hellenistic *Hellenes*," 307–12.

³² P.Hal.1, l. 260–265 (Alexandria, after 259 BCE) translated by Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 52.

enhancing Greek cultural values.³³ Although this was only one side of their policy, to display marks of Greek culture was also socially valued and was a distinctive element.³⁴ For instance, some “Greek teachers” in a demotic tax-list appeared as “Egyptian teachers” in a district record in Greek, leading Clarysse and Thompson to suggest that they were teachers of Egyptian origin teaching Greek, and benefitted from the tax-*Hellenes* status in addition to their exemption from the salt-tax.³⁵ Policemen, often of Egyptian origin, were also of concern to the rulers and benefitted from an exemption from the salt-tax, even if this was deducted from their wages.³⁶ Soldiers were also listed separately but did not benefit from tax exemptions for these taxes but later on enjoyed lower rates.³⁷ Under Ptolemy III, exemption from the salt-tax was expanded to doctors and to at least some Egyptian priests and priestesses, while other priestly groups were only exempted from trade taxes or taxes attached to their functions.³⁸ However, individuals exempted from the salt-tax represented an extremely small section of the population (certainly less than 1%) and thus did not reduce the state revenues in any perceptible way.

As tax-lists were employed for collecting several taxes, they could also serve several purposes.³⁹ The record of occupations in fact betrays these other uses. For instance, many categories exempted from the dyke-work in the Theban area were also singled out in the tax-lists, above all the *Hellenes*, always at the top of the lists *kat'ethnos*, as well as some priests and soldiers.⁴⁰ In addition, groups whose *ethnos* was an official ethnic label were also exempted from trade taxes and other taxes or confiscations because they did not have to provide their occupation.⁴¹ By escaping this kind of treatment, the tax-*Hellenes*,

³³ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 49, note 83, 52–59, 124–38, 162–86; Thompson, “Language and Literacy,” esp. 48.

³⁴ On Greek culture as a mark of Early Ptolemaic legal and fiscal policy, see Thompson, “Hellenistic Hellenes” and Burkhalter, “Les Grecs en Égypte au IIIe siècle av. J.-C.”

³⁵ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 127–29 with P.Count. 2, l. 492 and 3, l. 32–33, 86–88 (229 BCE).

³⁶ See introduction to P.Count. 4 and P.Count. 12, and commentary on l. 146–52.

³⁷ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 148–54 and 87–88 on lower rates.

³⁸ P.Count 8, ll. 6–13, P.Count. 16, l. 3–7 with Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 56, 162–64, 177–86 and Clarysse and Thompson, “P.Count. 2 continued.”

³⁹ Other taxes appear on receipts for the salt-tax, indicating that, as for the obol-tax, they were jointly collected by the administration managing the salt-tax. On at least one occasion, remission from the salt-tax was granted in exchange for corvée work, which emphasizes the close relationship between the capitulation tax in cash and “labor tax”; see Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 42–43.

⁴⁰ UPZ II 157 (Thebes, 241 BCE); Véïsse, “Statut et identité,” 285, 288 and 291.

⁴¹ Thompson, “Hellenistic Hellenes,” 307; Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 58.

were even more privileged. That Alexandrian citizens belonged to the tax-*Hellenes* remains an assumption because we have no tax-lists from Alexandria and lists from the *chora* do not include the category Alexandrian.⁴² Yet in legal documents, Alexandrians did not have to record their occupation (see Text 1 and Table 1), similarly to the tax-*Hellenes* in the tax-lists.

The Early Ptolemaic legal and fiscal systems of identification may not seem to match perfectly because there was no legal ethnic label for “Greek” but, instead, more specific labels. Yet they were sufficiently comparable to form a rather coherent system which could identify individuals that would serve the state the best, assuming at that time that immigrants formed an obvious group.⁴³ The legal system gave a priority to citizenship in one of the three *poleis* of Egypt, which was entangled with ethnicity. It also singled out soldiers, recorded occupations, and distinguished foreigners with a legal ethnic label indicating the name of the *polis* or larger political entity outside Egypt from which their ancestors had emigrated. The fiscal system focused on occupations and created official ethnic labels such as *Hellenes*, Persians, Arabs, and Judeans—the latter two being rarely used—to complement occupational categories.⁴⁴ Individuals with legal ethnic labels pointing to an origin outside Egypt were qualified in the fiscal context as tax-*Hellenes* and so were probably the citizens.⁴⁵ In sum, both the legal and fiscal systems suggest that the state priorities were citizenship and occupation, as well as ethnicity, which was conceived as non-Egyptian *versus* Egyptian.⁴⁶

Thus, from the beginning, the category of tax-*Hellenes* did not imply that its members would automatically ascribe to themselves a Greek ethnic identity, in the way modern scholarship speaks of ethnicity. Indeed, all members of a household belonged to the same fiscal category, and, for example, Judeans or “men of Philae” were found among the tax-*Hellenes*, while some may have primarily perceived themselves as the members of Judean or Nubian ethnic communities, respectively.⁴⁷ In the last third of the 3rd century BCE, these

42 Thompson, “Hellenistic Hellenes,” 310–11 and P.Count. 4, l. 61 on Monimos.

43 See also Coussement, *Because I am Greek*, 149, La’dā, “Ethnicity, occupation and tax-status,” and Thompson, “Literacy and power.”

44 See Honigman, “Les divers sens de l’ethnique Αραψ” and Clarysse and Thompson, “P.Count. 2 continued”; on the translation of *Ioudaioi* as Judeans rather than “Jews” until the mid 1st century CE, see Honigman, “Judean Communal Identity in Egypt,” 29.

45 Thompson, “Hellenistic Hellenes,” 304.

46 The term *Aigyptioi* appears only in one tax-list to qualify doctors, teachers, and an unknown occupation, see P.Count. 3, l. 76, 87, 118.

47 Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 147–48 for Jews (Judeans) as tax-*Hellenes* and Clarysse (1994) with P.Count. 26, l. 109–211 (254–231 BCE) that records 89 tax-*Hellenes*, 34 of them with Semitic names, the rest with Greek names favored by Judean

different state priorities created overlaps between the categories, since certain occupations could permit some flexibility with ethnicity. Indeed, the onomastic analysis of the tax-lists shows that Egyptians working in the administration or men with particular occupations, as mentioned above, could enter the fiscal category of the tax-*Hellenes* and thus benefit from Hellenic status.⁴⁸ At the same period, Egyptian priests also started to benefit from exemption (see above).

These developments of the last third of the 3rd century can be explained by demographic and social changes: massive immigration had stopped, many immigrant families had settled down in Egypt generations before, some, especially in the countryside, had married local women then registered as tax-*Hellenes*, and more Egyptians were serving the Ptolemies by entering the army and the administration. Nevertheless, this flexibility did not exclude that tensions—imperceptible in the tax-lists—could occur between individuals and the state about the attribution of an official identity.

In view of the partial flexibility of the early system, it seems excessive to consider that the Ptolemaic administration had an ethnic policy, as Coussement does, even if she stresses that ethnicity, of which origin is only one component, was only one criterion.⁴⁹ From a legal point of view, the indications given in contracts seem to have served to identify the petitioners or the parties of a contract and not to favor immigrants in legal decisions.⁵⁰ In addition, Egyptian tribunals were maintained and the newly established Greek tribunals did not take over their jurisdiction.⁵¹ Presumably both juridical systems were accessible to Greeks and Egyptians although the members of these tribunals were not always able to read both languages and translations were needed. Yet, occupation (or rank in the army) and citizenship in one of the three *poleis* of Egypt largely overlapped with ethnicity in the 3rd century BCE. Immigrants and soldiers from the Greek world who settled in one of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt, whether they were previously citizens of a *polis* outside Egypt or belonged to a

communities; P.Count. 15, l. 4 (late 3rd or early 2nd century BCE, Boubastos (?)) is the only attestation of *Ioudaioi* (partly restituted) as a separate group in the tax-list; Honigman, “Judean Communal Identity in Egypt,” esp. 36–37; on “men of Philae” and similar expressions, see La’da (2007) with P.Count. 2, l. 501–05.

48 Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 145.

49 Coussement, *Because I am Greek*, 142.

50 For instance, Agut-Labordère and Véisse, “Grecques et Égyptiennes dans les contrats de prêt,” show that ethnicity had no bearing on women involved in loaning contracts; in contrast, Coussement, *Because I am Greek*, 140–41 reports four cases where petitioners may make an ethnic argument, but their number remains very small in view of our documentation, a point already made by Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 217–18, 232.

51 Brief survey in Manning, “Historical Framework,” 17–19.

larger political entity, would normally obtain citizenship in the new city if they settled there at the time of its early development, but we know too little about the citizens of the three cities to offer a definitive answer.⁵²

In the 3rd century, the motivations of the Early Ptolemaic state for shaping their identification system was to please groups from whom support or loyalty was needed. This is confirmed by the extension of exemptions or lower rates to new groups, including soldiers.⁵³ The benefits mainly went to immigrants and their descendants, who often were soldiers or had become tax-*Hellenes* or citizens of one of the Greek cities in Egypt. But in the following two centuries, ethnicity gradually vanished as a priority thanks to the flexibility of the system regarding social changes in the countryside (by opposition to the *poleis*).

4 The Identification System of the Mid and Late Ptolemaic Periods (2nd and 1st Centuries BCE)

This section examines how the different categories of official identities created in the 3rd century BCE and their identifiers developed. By the late 3rd century, the salt-tax used as a form of poll tax had disappeared and was probably incorporated into another tax called *syntaxis*.⁵⁴ Even if we are not able to trace the evolution of the fiscal categories in the 2nd century BCE, there is no reason to believe that they disappeared since evidence from the 1st century BCE shows that they still existed, though in a simplified form, which is examined at the end of this section. The investigation of official identities during the 2nd century thus relies on documents where legal ethnic labels were used. Their diversity diminished and their overall use decreased slowly throughout the 2nd and 1st century BCE.⁵⁵ In the 3rd century BCE, legal ethnic labels are known for 8% of the 22,000 people recorded with an occupation in the online *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* (1,765 out of 21,730), for 7.3% in the 2nd century (1,604 out of 22,003) and finally only for 3.6% in the 1st century (235 out of

⁵² See P.Hal. 1, l. 156–65 (mid 3rd century BCE) on soldiers admitted to Alexandrian citizenship during the first decades of Ptolemaic rule; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 38–92.

⁵³ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, vol. 2, 87–88.

⁵⁴ Clarysse, “Salt Tax”; still a handful of tax-lists of the kind preserved for the 3rd century survived, notably P.Count. 51 (181/0 or 157/6 BCE) mentioning the salt-tax, and are dated to the first half of the 2nd century.

⁵⁵ If the designations “Persian,” “Persian (by descent),” and “Macedonian” are omitted, the number of contracts indicating a legal ethnic label decreases from the 3rd century to the 1st century BCE, as it can be assessed through the databank *Synallagma. Greek Contracts in Contexts*, developed by Yiftach-Firanko at <http://synallagma.tau.ac.il/ArtlidHomepage.aspx>.

6,574), when the availability of sources diminishes.⁵⁶ The 3rd century regulations discussed above as the *Nomenklaturregel* were followed in the double document contracts and ἐγκλήματα until the end of the Ptolemaic Period but from the mid 2nd century onwards soldiers added their father's names, whereas it was not required.⁵⁷ Above all, a few legal ethnic labels became overly employed and at the same time no longer even alluded to the personal ethnic origin and identity of their holders. Persian, Persian of the Epigone ("Persian by descent"), and Macedonian are the clearest examples.⁵⁸ By the mid 2nd century these labels generally corresponded to soldiers' statuses within the army and are considered by modern historians as "pseudo-ethnics."⁵⁹ The term is somehow misleading because one should talk of "legal ethnic labels marking occupation and/or social status but not related to ethnicity" in order to define them accurately. Social status is understood here as founded mainly on lifestyle, education, and hereditary or occupational prestige.⁶⁰

The sudden peak in the use of these specific legal ethnic labels employed as status markers reflects demographic and social changes in the Egyptian countryside in the 2nd century. More Egyptians and offspring of Greco-Egyptian families joined the army and the administration and gained access to the privileges attached to them. The phenomenon is particularly clear in the army. Some became *misthophoroi* (professional soldiers paid in cash, in Demotic *rmt iw=f šp hbs* "man receiving pay"), others became cleruchs, either as *machimoi* with small or middle size plots of land (5, 7, 10 arouras, or 20 arouras for cavalry-*machimoi*) or as cavalry-cleruchs with larger *kleroi*.⁶¹ At the same time the organization of the army was going through a series of reforms in the first decades of the 2nd century. The new cavalry-cleruchs were usually granted 40 or 50 arouras rather than the 80 or 100-aroura plots given in the 3rd century and the policemen and soldiers transferred into this category now called

⁵⁶ Peremans and Van 't Dack, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, collected the names of all people whose occupation is known. These statistics are based on the online beta version of Trismegistos consulted in 2009, which Bart Van Beek adapted in order to make these calculations possible, while the current online version at <http://www.trismegistos.org> displays personal names attested in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt but not the legal ethnic labels.

⁵⁷ Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens*, 12–13; Yiftach-Firanko, "BGU III 2367," 108.

⁵⁸ Vandorpe, "Persian soldiers."

⁵⁹ La'da, "Ethnicity, occupation and tax-status"; Thompson, "Hellenistic Hellenes," 306; Vandorpe, "Persian soldiers"; this may also be true for the far less attested legal ethnic label Arab, see Honigman, "Les divers sens de l'éthnicité Αραβοί"; Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society*, 177–91 on pseudo-ethnics in the army, with Figure 5.3 and Table 5.3.

⁶⁰ Such a definition of social status is close to that given by Max Weber in his *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (1922), which inspired Finley, see Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, xiii–xix.

⁶¹ Vleeming, "Man receiving pay"; on *machimoi*, Fischer-Bovet, "Egyptian warriors."

the *katoikia* (grouping the *katoikoi hippeis*, i.e. the cavalry-cleruchs) often had smaller plots.⁶² The result was that the army, even the soldiers belonging to the *katoikia*, was a more ethnically mixed group and that the *katoikoi* formed a more economically mixed group too, yet maintained a social prestige and organized themselves to defend their privileges.⁶³

The integration of these newcomers is visible through the use of the legal ethnic labels Macedonian or Persian for describing their official identities, though the exact process of attribution still escapes us. Vandorpe has shown that the *misthophoroi* in late 2nd century Pathyris in Upper Egypt switched from Persian to Persian of the Epigone whether they were mobilized or not.⁶⁴ These labels were translated into Demotic as *Mdy* (Persian) and *Wynn ms n Kmy* (literally “Greek born in Egypt” for Persian of the Epigone). It is thus conceivable that these soldiers were fiscally considered by then as *tax-Hellenes* (tax-Persians probably no longer existed) but the fiscal documentation is missing. In some cases, soldiers could move up from the status of Persian to that of Macedonian, as Dionysios son of Kephalas in Akoris in Middle Egypt.⁶⁵ A few months before his first attestation as a Macedonian, he was already identified as a *Wynn* (Greek) in a Demotic contract, a translation which suggests a connection between the terminology used for legal and fiscal official identities.⁶⁶ This new official identity and the social status attached to it was sometimes marked by the use of a Greek name in addition to an Egyptian name, for instance Dionysios’ Egyptian name was Plenis (and also Paueris), either given at birth by parents or chosen by the individual to accompany a change of status, though this was not compulsory.⁶⁷ The causal link between the reforms described above and double bilingual names is striking despite

62 Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society*, 212–16 and Scheuble-Reiter, *Die Katōkenreiter*, esp. 199–206.

63 Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society*, 216–21, 252–55 and Scheuble-Reiter, *Die Katōkenreiter*, 112–41; see the petition of the *katoikoi* in P.Lips. II 124 (137 BCE, Herakleopolite or Arsinoite).

64 Vandorpe, “Persian soldiers.”

65 Boswinkel and Pestman, *Les archives privées de Dionysios* with Vandorpe, “Persian soldiers,” 106; Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society*, 189.

66 P.Dion. 7, l. 6 (106 BCE); the only other attestation of *Wynn* in that archive is found in a contract made by Kollouthes son of Ptolemaios (a recruit), P.Dion. 6, l. 3 (106 BCE); Vandorpe and Waebens *Reconstructing Pathyris’ archives*, on the legal ethnic label Cyrenean as reflecting the status of *hellen*.

67 Clarysse, “Greeks and Egyptians”; Coussemeyer, *Because I am Greek*, 184–86, catalogue #86 for a detailed analysis of Dionysios; Scheuble, “Griechen und Ägypter im ptolemäischen Heer,” 552, 555–56 for names favored by Egyptian families and possibly guidelines provided by the state; for names favored by the descendants of these groups, see also Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 226.

their underrepresentation in our documentation, since bearers of double bilingual names did not always employ them together. Bearers of bilingual Greek-Egyptian names strongly increased in the 2nd century and a large proportion of these individuals were in the military or the administration and also bore a legal ethnic label, more than half of them being Persians or Persians of the Epigones.⁶⁸ Bearers of bilingual double names were also more frequent in the Fayyum, which is to be expected according to Coussemant, since the region had a high percentage of tax-*Hellenes* in the 3rd century.⁶⁹ To sum up, as more Egyptians and Greco-Egyptians entered the army and the administration, the flexibility of the identification system increased by following its logical principle of including those in service of the state into privileged official categories. Their privileges could be sometimes hardly more than symbolic but carried with them a social status that distinguished their bearers from the mass of the population.

From the point of view of the state in the 2nd century BCE, thus, those who held a Greek official identity were not selected on the basis of ethnic criteria. Some individuals were privately active within the Greek ethnic sphere and others in the Egyptian or Judean ethnic spheres, or in several at the same time, with all the variations of degrees that our sources do not allow us to see, but the state did not care, otherwise it would have created clear ethnic barriers.⁷⁰ Yet it cared about handling justice smoothly and avoiding the costly translation of documents during trials, as can be seen in a royal decree dated to 118 BCE.⁷¹ Its interpretation has been debated at length but the *opinio communis* now follows Pestman's analysis showing that the language of the documents brought to court would determine the tribunal when Greeks and Egyptians engaged in litigation.⁷² Consequently, previous studies of ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt have emphasized an absence of ethnic discrimination in Egypt since the main criterion was the language.⁷³ In any case, the labels Greeks and Egyptians probably referred to official identities or statuses rather than to ethnic groups, as by then it would no longer be possible to locate

⁶⁸ Coussemant, *Because I am Greek*, 38–39, 105–11.

⁶⁹ Coussemant, *Because I am Greek*, 82–84 notes that they are not visible in the 3rd century tax-lists since double names were never recorded in this type of document.

⁷⁰ See for instance the warning of Coussemant, *Because I am Greek*, 213 about making generalizations when analyzing the motivations for bearing double bilingual names.

⁷¹ PTebt. 1 5, l. 207–20.

⁷² Pestman, "The competence of Greek and Egyptian tribunals"; more recently Thompson, "Hellenistic Hellenes," 302–03 and Véissé, "Statut et identité," 281–82.

⁷³ Goudrian, *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 116–19 and "Ethnical strategies in Graeco-Roman Egypt," 94; La'da, "Ethnicity, occupation and tax-status."

individuals such as Dionysios son of Kephalas within strict ethnic boundaries. Even if they represented the upper and middle strata of the villages and towns, they formed the group that produced legal documents that was targeted by the decree.⁷⁴ The weight of the legal context was so strong on the label Persian of the Epigone that by the 1st century CE, it took on a strictly legal sense (special type of debtor), a good reminder of the changing meaning of official labels and titles over time.⁷⁵

The division of the population into two broad categories in the Late Ptolemaic Period is also suggested by a few fiscal documents of the 1st century. As mentioned above, the salt-tax was probably incorporated into the *syntaxis* by the end of the 3rd century BCE and by the 1st century BCE, the *syntaxis* and other taxes (*sitonion*, *epistatikon*) were still the equivalent of poll taxes or capitation taxes, as shown by Monson, but by then the fiscal categories had been simplified.⁷⁶ There were only two fiscal categories, the first one paid a reduced rate and its members were called *katoikoi* or *hellenes*, depending on the texts, while the second group paid the full rate and were sometimes called *laoi* (commoners).⁷⁷ Moreover, only males paid these capitation taxes,

74 Mélèze Modrzejewski, "Le Statut des Hellènes," 255–57 considers Dionysios son of Kephalas and similar individuals as too small a group to be representative and thus interprets the term Greeks and Egyptians in P. Tebt. 1 5, l. 207–20 as ethnic groups; however, Mélèze Modrzejewski, "The judicial system in theory and practice. 10.1. Ptolemaic justice," 476–77 translates one of the occurrences of *hellenes* as "litigants who have a Greek status." One may even wonder if Ptolemaios the recluse of the Memphite Serapeum (160s–150s), Macedonian, son of the soldier Glaukias, did not also refer to his official identity when he claimed that he was assaulted because he was Greek, see UPZ 1 7, 8, and 15. His brother Apollonios, while he wrote "I am a Macedonian" on a papyrus with Euripides' *Telephus*, could read and write Demotic and may well have borne the name Peteharenpi, the Egyptian equivalent of Apollonios, see Rowlandson, "Dissing the Egyptians," 218 with bibliography. However, Ptolemaios' sentence is usually interpreted as an expression of personal ethnic identity, see most recently Coussement, *Because I am Greek*, 142–45 with former bibliography.

75 Vandorpe, "Persian soldiers," 106, shows it did not happen in the 2nd century BCE and suggests a Roman development *contra* Boswinkel and Pestman, *Les archives privées de Dionysios*, 56–63 who argue for a change already in the 2nd century BCE.

76 Monson, "Late Ptolemaic capitation taxes"; Monson, "Receipts for *sitōnion*."

77 BGU XIV 2429 (94–92 or 63–61 BCE) and BGU VIII 1779 (50 BCE) analyzed by Monson, "Late Ptolemaic capitation taxes," 148–49; BGU XVI 2577, l. 215 (19 BCE), a tax list from the Herakleopolite nome, mentions the *katoikoi*, *Hellenes* and *Aigyptioi*, the last attestation of the Ptolemaic classification according to Rowlandson, "Dissing the Egyptians," 221. Yet the term *Aigyptioi* may be the Roman interpretation of *laoi*.

whose rates were far higher than those of the 3rd century salt-tax and were similar or superior to those of the Roman poll tax.⁷⁸

It is striking at first that the labels of the privileged fiscal categories still alluded to the Greek settlers and immigrants. The groups who were privileged according to their occupation and ethnicity in the 3rd century established and/or strengthened their higher social status over time but because of the partial flexibility of the earlier system, they became an ethnically mixed group in the 2nd and the 1st century BCE. The cleruchic and fiscal policies of the Ptolemies reshaped the meaning of *katoikoi* and *hellenes*, which lost their initial meaning and became markers of social status. They were the well-to-do in contrast to the rest of the population called commoners (*laoi*)—and not called “Egyptians,” at least not in these Ptolemaic texts that came to us. Many members of these middle and upper strata at the village and town levels participated in the development of what could be coined a Greco-Egyptian culture.⁷⁹

Finally, an unpublished papyrus may imply that the inhabitants of the nome-capitals, where larger numbers of well-to-do families lived, had become a fiscal identity under Cleopatra VII, in a similar way as the metropolite category in Roman Egypt.⁸⁰ The text stipulates that both the metropolis and the entire Herakleopolite nome had to pay the *staterismos* tax, which suggests that by then the inhabitants of a *metropolis* formed a fiscal entity different from the rest of the nome. Otherwise, one wonders why the text would specify “metropolis” instead of simply mentioning “all the inhabitants of the nome.”

5 Transition to the Identification System in Early Roman Egypt (30 BCE–70s CE)

The Egyptian documentation allows us to examine institutional continuities and changes over a period of political transition such as the annexation of Egypt by the emperor-to-be, Octavian, in 30 CE. This section examines the transition of the system of legal and fiscal identification from Late Ptolemaic

⁷⁸ If one accepts the calculations in wheat equivalent between the Ptolemaic and Roman capitation taxes made by Monson, “Late Ptolemaic capitation taxes,” 157 and table 5 on the basis that payments for two months can be multiplied by six to represent the annual amount. New material could challenge these calculations since there is a possibility that these taxes were not paid every month or that the amounts varied throughout the year.

⁷⁹ The dedications of former ephesbes to local crocodile gods are good examples of this, see I.Fayoum III 200–02.

⁸⁰ P.Berol. 16.250, l. 11–12 unpublished but mentioned by Kramer in her commentary of BGU XX 3845, 54–55. I thank Andrew Monson for his suggestion.

times to the 1st century of Roman rule in Egypt, while the final section compares the implementation of the Early Ptolemaic system with that of the early Roman system. These two different approaches to comparison answer two different questions.

Since the article of Lewis in 1970 and Bowman and Rathbone in 1994, the scholarship on Roman Egypt has emphasized the rupture caused by the Roman annexation of Egypt, but in the last decade several studies have nuanced it and considered areas where continuities are perceptible.⁸¹ Yet the general view is that the Ptolemaic system of identification was abandoned by the Romans, though Yiftach-Firanko notes that two elements of the identification mechanism were still present.⁸² First, the combination, down to the early 1st century in the Fayyum, of the legal ethnic label "Macedonian" with the designation "of the *katoikoi hippeis*" and second, down to the mid 2nd century, the legal ethnic label Persian of the Epigone, now with a technical legal meaning (see above).

The Roman official identities in the provinces were based on Roman legal criteria, the city (*civitas*) and larger population groups (*populi*, *gentes*, or *nationes*).⁸³ These basic criteria were used in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, a sort of guide (γνώμων) that quoted and summarized decisions of the Roman senate taken under Augustus and under later emperors, as well as decisions of the prefects of Egypt, and was employed by the magistrate called the *idios logos*, by now a Roman procurator.⁸⁴ It largely concerned the regulation of marriages between the holders of different official identities, as well as inheritance and manumission. Various fees as well as sums of money extracted from inheritance that were not permitted by the state went to the *Idios Logos*, literally the "private treasury" of the emperor, which was managed by the *idios logos*. The most comprehensive copy preserved is dated to after 149 CE and includes post-Augustan modifications that are however difficult to distinguish from

⁸¹ Lewis, "Graeco-Roman Egypt"; Bowman and Rathbone, "Cities and administration in Roman Egypt"; Lewis' view is supported, for instance, by McCoskey, *Race: Antiquity and its Legacy*, 112–13; in contrast, a more balanced view of changes and continuities has been recently advocated by Haensch, "Die Provinz Aegyptus: Kontinuitäten und Brüche zum ptolemäischen Ägypten," esp. 85–86.

⁸² Yiftach-Firanko, "BGU III 2367," 112–13; on the abandon of the Ptolemaic system of identification, e.g. Jördens, "Status and identity," 249 and Mairs, "Intersecting Identities," 182–86 who emphasize new strict barriers; Vandorpe, "Identity," 268 and Rowlandson, "Dissing the Egyptians," 221.

⁸³ Legras, *L'Egypte grecque et romaine*, 72.

⁸⁴ The bibliography is enormous: for a brief survey, see Mélèze Modrzejewski, "Entre la cité et le fisc," 257–62; Rowlandson, *Women and Society*, 175–77; Capponi, *Augustan Egypt*, 53–55; Harter-Uibopuu and Kruse, *Studien zum Gnomon des Idios Logos*.

its lost original version.⁸⁵ Three main categories are found in these laws: first the Roman citizens (*cives Romani*), second the *astoi* and *astai*, that is the citizens of the three Greek cities in Egypt (*cives peregrini*), to which the new *polis* of Antinoopolis was added in 130 CE by the emperor Hadrian, and third the Egyptians (*peregrini Aegyptii*). In addition, some other groups, partly defined by their occupation, had special rights or were subject to particular interdictions: soldiers, Egyptian priests, freedmen, and finally slaves. The situation of the latter two did not fundamentally change, while that of the priests was less favorable over time but in practice many priests were subsumed to special categories of *Aegyptii* (see below).⁸⁶ In contrast, soldiers discharged from the *auxilia* and the fleets received Roman citizenship as did their children born after service from *peregrinae* thanks to the grant of a legal union (*conubium*).⁸⁷ However, any children born previously were not granted Roman citizenship after 140 CE.⁸⁸ The regulation in §54 (below) shows that children of discharged soldiers could obtain Roman citizenship but that could imply some financial drawbacks regarding inheritance from a mother who was a *peregrina*. In any case, the army was a means to move up within the legal and fiscal categories even more than under the Ptolemies, where soldiers did not become citizens of one of the Greek *poleis*.

In terms of continuity, the most striking element of the identification system concerns the priority given to citizenship in one of the four *poleis*. Roman citizenship was obviously added as the top layer but the converging principles of the two facilitated continuity. Beyond the legal context, both types of citizenship brought fiscal privileges and a higher social status. The rules 38–39 and 46–47 concerning the transmission of citizenship allows us to evaluate the weight given to hereditary principles and social status as well as some flexibility that the Romans added to these principles (see below).

⁸⁵ BGU V 1210; P.Oxy XLII 3014 preserves only rules §35 to §41 newly re-dated to the same period as BGU V 1210 rather than the 1st century CE, see Dolganov, “A New Date for the ‘Gnomon of the Idios Logos.’” On Augustan laws in Egypt, see Dolganov, “Imperialism and Social Engineering.”

⁸⁶ On Egyptian priests in Ptolemaic and Early Roman Egypt, see Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans*, 212–27; Meyer, “Freedmen in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*.”

⁸⁷ Dietze-Mager, “Der Erwerb römischen Bürgerrechts in Ägypten.”

⁸⁸ For the most recent analysis of the change of 140 CE, see Waebens, “Imperial policy” and “Reflecting the ‘change in AD 140’”

Text 2: Extracts from the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*

BGU V 1210

Translation by C. Fischer-Bovet

Λη· οἱ ἔξ ἀστῆς καὶ Αἰγυπτίου γενόμενοι μένουσι μὲν Αἰγύπτιοι, [ἀ]μφοτέρους δὲ κληρονομοῦσι τοὺς γονεῖς.

Λθ· Ῥωμαίου ἢ Ῥωμαίας {κατ' ἄγνοιαν} συνελθόντων ἢ ἀστοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις τὰ τέκνα ἡττονι γένει ἀκολουθεῖ.

μ[ζ]· Ῥωμαίοις καὶ ἀστοῖς κατ' ἄ[γνοι]αν Ἀιγυπτίας συνελθοῦσι [[αις]] συνεχωρήθη μετὰ τοῦ ἀγευθυγ[ους] εῖναι καὶ τ[ἀ] τέκνα τῷ πατρικῷ γένει ἀκολουθεῖ.

μζ· Ἀστὴ συνελθοῦσα Αἰ[γ]υ[πτιώ] κατ' ἄγνοιαν ως ἀστῷ ἀνεύθυνος ἐστιν. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ οὐ πὸ ἀμφοτέρων [ων ἀπ]αρχὴ τέκνων τεθῇ, τηρεῖται τοῖς τέκνοις ἡ πολιτεία.

§ 54: θυγατρὶ μ[ι]στικίου Ῥωμαίᾳ γεν[ομ]ένῃ Οὐρσος οὐκ [ἐπέτρε]ψε κληρον[ομ]ῆσαι τὴν μητέραν Αἰγ[υ]πτίαν οὖσαν.

§ 38: Those born from a female citizen (of a Greek *polis*) and an Egyptian remain Egyptians but they inherit from both parents.

§ 39: If a Roman man or woman marries {by ignorance} a citizen (of a Greek city) or an Egyptian, the children receive the lower status.

§ 46: It has been granted to Roman (male) citizens and (male) citizens (of a Greek *polis*) who have married an Egyptian woman by ignorance, to be exempt from liability and for the children to follow the father's status.

§ 47: A female citizen (of a Greek *polis*) who marries an Egyptian by ignorance, believing he is a citizen (of a Greek *polis*), is not responsible. And if both give a declaration of birth, the citizenship is granted to their children.

§ 54: A discharged soldier's daughter who had become a Roman citizen was not allowed by Ursus⁸⁹ to inherit from her mother who was an Egyptian.

Paragraph 39 states the usual rule according to which both parents needed to have Roman citizenship to transmit it to their children.⁹⁰ Paragraph 38 makes clear that the rule was the same for citizens of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt. The same principle was certainly applied in Ptolemaic Egypt since paragraph 37 states explicitly that the *Gnomon* also takes into consideration the edicts of

89 Egyptian prefect in 84–85 CE.

90 Papyrologists usually consider {κατ' ἄγνοιαν} as a mistake, see Bagnall, "Egypt and the Lex Minicia," who accepts the argument of Riccobono, *Il Gnomon dell' Idios Logos*, 175–77, whereas legal historians usually maintain "by ignorance" and assume it is by ignorance of the law, see e.g. Coleman-Norton, *et al.*, *Ancient Roman Statutes*, Document 256 and Winkel, "Gnomon Id. § 39 und § 46."

the kings ($\pi\rhoοστάγματα \betaασιλέων$).⁹¹ Paragraph 38 is likewise in agreement with the ban on marriages between citizens and Egyptians in Naukratis in the Hellenistic Period.⁹² On the other hand, paragraph 46 is an adjustment—which Bagnall calls a “humane” concession—for specific cases, that is, when the individual from the highest category did not know that the other belonged to another category.⁹³ The same concession was made for the female citizen of a Greek *polis* in paragraph 47 but the case of a Roman female citizen is not considered, although this is probably an omission by negligence, as argued by Bagnall.⁹⁴ Because of the hereditary transmission of citizenship, some of the citizens of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt may have still perceived themselves as belonging to a Greek ethnic community, but this was not the way the Romans conceived citizenship. A good example is the so-called *boulē*-papyrus, where the Alexandrians, in the 1st century CE, argue that if they were granted a *boulē* (council), it would “take care that the pure ($\alpha\kappaέρων?$) citizen body of Alexandria is not corrupted by men who are uncultured and uneducated.” The Romans do not seem to have been sensitive to the argument since they did not grant them a council.⁹⁵

In terms of changes, citizenship seems to have been more accessible under the Romans. First, Roman citizenship was in many cases obtainable through the army, as mentioned above, and more rarely through Alexandrian citizenship.⁹⁶ Pliny, famously, asked the emperor to grant his doctor Alexandrian citizenship so that he may receive Roman citizenship.⁹⁷ Second, there was place for negotiations and case-by-case adjustment, giving more importance to social status in the case of ignorance of the spouse’s status (Text 2, paragraphs 46 and 47). Yet, if paragraph 38 is a remnant of the rules used by the Ptolemaic official called *idios logos*, then children of a female citizen (of a Greek *polis* in Egypt)

⁹¹ For a detailed analysis of these paragraphs, see Fischer-Bovet, “Gnomon of the Idios Logos.”

⁹² WChr. 27, l. 20–24 (Antinoopolis, after 161 CE) refers to the laws of Naukratis.

⁹³ Bagnall, “Egypt and the Lex Minicia,” 26 shows that paragraph 39 is the application of the *Lex Minicia* and paragraph § 46 of a *senatus consultum* that modifies the *Lex Minicia* under special circumstances *contra* Cherry, “The Minician Law.”

⁹⁴ Bagnall, “Egypt and the Lex Minicia.”

⁹⁵ PSI X 1160 = CPJ II 150 (end 1st century BCE–1st century CE, perhaps 20/19 BCE?); it is now accepted that the *boulē* had disappeared by the mid 2nd century, *contra* El-Abbadî, “The Problem of the Council of Alexandria,” with bibliography and Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 94–95, for whom it was not removed by Augustus.

⁹⁶ Whitehorne, “Soldiers and Veterans”; see also Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 221–22, 230.

⁹⁷ Pliny (*Letters* x, 5, 6 and 7); Jördens, “Status and identity,” 252.

with an Egyptian could inherit from their parents already in the Hellenistic Period, though they remained Egyptians.

Tax-exemptions and tax-reductions can also be good indicators of continuity and change, as they single out those groups on which states rely or with whom they negotiate power. From a macro perspective, there was continuity, as both the citizens of the Greek *poleis* in Egypt and the upper-strata of the population in the nomes were granted some fiscal privileges. From a micro perspective, there seem to be small variations. For instance, citizens of the Greek cities in Egypt were exempted from the Roman poll tax (*laographia*), like any Roman citizens in the empire, while we can only suppose that in the Late Ptolemaic Period the citizens were tax-*Hellenes* and thus benefitted, at least, from a lower rate. In both the Late Ptolemaic and Roman Periods the amount was rather high and paid only by adult males (see previous section). We are better informed on two subgroups among the *Aegyptii* who benefitted from a lower rate on the Roman poll tax and who represented both a strong continuity with the Late Ptolemaic Period (if the interpretation of the *metropolitai* under Cleopatra VII, proposed in the previous section, is accepted).⁹⁸ They were called *metropolitai* in the first case, and in the second “those of the gymnasium” (*apo tou gymnasiou*) or in the Arsinoite nome “the *katoikoi* from the total of 6,475 *Greek men (andres hellenes)*,” as recorded in many census declarations.⁹⁹ Some individuals were even members of both groups.¹⁰⁰ The existence of the gymnasial group can be explained as a way to maintain fiscal privileges for those belonging to the Late Ptolemaic category of *hellenes*/

⁹⁸ The rates vary by nome, see Monson, “Late Ptolemaic capitation Taxes,” 156, Table 6 summarizes the rates preserved in O.Strass. II, 80–81: 40 dr. reduced to 20 dr. in the Arsinoite, 16 dr. reduced to 8 dr. in many other nomes.

⁹⁹ For recent critical assessments, see Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 221–26, esp. 225, for whom the 6,475 *Greek men* formed a less exclusive group than “those of the gymnasium” in other nomes, and Broux, *Double Names*, 25–62. There is a vast bibliography: Van Minnen, “ΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΟΥ” and Ruffini “Genealogy and the gymnasium” have shown that these two groups were not elite groups among the elites but were relatively large groups and partly overlapped; Yiftach-Firanko, “A Gymnasial Registration”; Broux, “Creating a new local elite”; see previously Nelson, *Status declarations in Roman Egypt*, 259–77.

¹⁰⁰ See P.Oxy. XII 1452 (127/8 CE), SB IV 7440 (132/3 CE), PSI XII 1240 (222 CE) with Broux, “Creating a new local elite,” 145; e.g. P.Meyer 8 (Arsinoite, 151 CE) for full name of the 6,475 *Hellenes*, which was often abbreviated, see Canducci, “I 6475 cateci greci dell’ Arsinoite,” 211–55; for Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 225 the 6,475 *Greek men* were all registered in the metropolis, though the term was not coterminous with the *metropolitai* of the Arisnoe; on gymnasial members moving only half time to the metropolis, see Langellotti, “Village elites in the early Roman Arsinoite.”

katoikoi and living in villages.¹⁰¹ Moreover, even the *metropolitai* may have their origin in the Late Ptolemaic Period, as suggested above. Yet a status examination called *epikrisis*, attesting that someone's parents were *metropolitai*, or that his male ancestors belonged to the list of members of the gymnasium, limited access to this fiscal category on the same model as access to citizenship.¹⁰² Because by the 70s CE one had to prove that both parents, or both patrilineal and matrilineal ancestors, belonged to these privileged groups, Vandorpe and Waebens have pointed out the decrease of opportunities for social mobility for women belonging to the category of *Aegyptii*, yet they stress that this happened only over time.¹⁰³ Until the 50s or 70s CE, when membership in these groups was restricted, there seems to have been space for flexibility and social mobility.¹⁰⁴

The rationale behind these distinct official identities (as citizens, *metropolitai*, or members of the gymnasial group) was to maintain or even increase the privileges of these groups, in particular in Alexandria, where the concentration of population and of a powerful elite facilitated riots.¹⁰⁵ Thus exemption from the poll tax or criminal law privileges aimed to secure smooth relationships.¹⁰⁶ In addition, the elite among the Alexandrians was considered fit for serving as *strategoi* in the nomes, and some became *praefecti* of Egypt, such as the Tiberius Claudius Balbillus Modestus (55–59 CE) and Tiberius Julius Alexander (66–69 CE).¹⁰⁷ Second, the Romans needed to rely on local elites throughout the country, as did the Ptolemies before them.¹⁰⁸ Liturgic officials, for instance

¹⁰¹ Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans*, 267–68 and Broux, “Creating a new local elite,” 148.

¹⁰² The exact rules before the closing of the order in the 70s CE are difficult to establish. Broux, “Creating a new local elite,” 147 has recently argued that *metropolitai* needed to prove metropolite descent from both parents since the creation of this category and Yiftach-Firanko, “BGU III 2367,” 57 has suggested that members of the gymnasial group did not systematically have to provide proof of their gymnasial descent during the 1st century, but only “as needed.”

¹⁰³ Vandorpe and Waebens, “Women and gender in Roman Egypt,” esp. 423–24.

¹⁰⁴ Broux, “Creating a new local elite,” 146; Yiftach-Firanko, “A Gymnasial Registration,” 56–58; on the closing of the gymnasial group for fiscal reasons, see Ruffini, “Genealogy and the gymnasium,” 85–86 criticized by Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 223, note 53, who sees a means to maintain an educated pool able to hold offices into a system of civic self-administration. The two views may in fact be complementary.

¹⁰⁵ On mob riots in Ptolemaic Alexandria, see Barry, “The crowd of Ptolemaic Alexandria.”

¹⁰⁶ On criminal law privileges, see Philo, *In Flacc.* 78.

¹⁰⁷ Bowman and Rathbone, “Cities and administration in Roman Egypt,” 125–26.

¹⁰⁸ See also Broux and Coussemont, “Double names,” 130.

tax-collectors or *sitologoi*, were *metropolitai* or members of the gymnasial group.¹⁰⁹

The label *apo tou gymnasioru* marked an attachment to an institution culturally connoted as Greek, but none of these groups had a clear ethnic basis.¹¹⁰ If anything, these labels could participate in the “social and cultural snobbery,” to quote Rowlandson’s expression, attested in only a few texts.¹¹¹ In the Arsinoite nome, the label “*katoikoi* from the total of 6,475 *Greek men (andres hellenes)*” reflected perhaps, for some members, a desire to emphasize Greek ancestry, whether real or imagined, yet the upper strata of the population of the nome saw themselves as both Greek and Egyptian, as well established by Bagnall.¹¹² In a community prayer dated to the reign of Hadrian and found in the village of Karanis, the expression the “Ptolemaians of the Arsinoite nome” refers to the “citizens” of the metropolis of the Arsinoite, called Ptolemais Evergetis, as proposed by the editors, or perhaps more precisely to the upper strata of the nome, that is the *metropolitai*, and to some members of the gymnasial group who lived in villages.¹¹³ Broux has recently argued that Greek double names, popular among them, also aimed at emphasizing (real or imagined) decent from Greek settlers back in the Ptolemaic Period but above all at demarcating themselves socially and as a creative imitation of the Roman naming system, forbidden to non-citizens until the *Constitutio Antoniniana* (212 CE).¹¹⁴

To sum up, the Romans did not try to distinguish Greeks and Egyptians from an ethnic point of view. It was a pointless task in many places in Egypt already by the late 2nd century BCE, as suggested in the section devoted to changes during that period. In fact, as recently argued by Rowlandson, ethnicity was almost completely absent from the sources from Roman Egypt.¹¹⁵ The Romans

¹⁰⁹ Bowman and Rathbone, “Cities and administration in Roman Egypt”, 126; Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 223–24; see also the family archives examined by Broux, *Double Names*, 195–232.

¹¹⁰ Broux, *Double Names*, 30 *contra* Mairs, “Intersecting Identities,” 187 for whom the term “from the gymnasium” was “loaded with ethnic symbolism.”

¹¹¹ Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” esp. 214–15, also warns us against the insidious assumption that the gymnasial group wanted to be seen as Greek because of a belief in the innate inferiority of the Egyptian. Yet on p. 236 she also reminds us, when looking at literary and subliterary sources such as the *Acta*, that “some people’s choice of reading-matter, in Greek and Egyptian, in both *metropoleis* and villages, did bear traces of ethnic vocabulary, juxtaposing Jews, Romans, Greeks and Egyptians.”

¹¹² Bagnall, “The Fayum and its People,” esp. 29; Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians,” 226.

¹¹³ Π[τ]ολεμα[ι]ς ἔωγ τῷ ἐν τ[ῷ] Ἀρτιγοίτην νομῷ, P.Mich. XXII 842, l. 38–39 with commentary of P. Heilporn and T. Gagos†.

¹¹⁴ Broux and Coussemeyer, “Double names,” 131; Broux, *Double Names*, esp. 272–85.

¹¹⁵ Rowlandson, “Dissing the Egyptians.”

extended the Late Ptolemaic fiscal category of the *hellenes/katoikoi* to inhabitants of the *metropoleis* or at least they standardized their privileges. They did not create a new elite because most of the families maintained their position within the official identification system, which was hereditary in character: the citizens of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt remained citizens, and the fiscal group of the *hellenes/katoikoi*, made up of civilian and military families of Greek, Egyptian and Greco-Egyptian origins, were *metropolitai* and/or members of the gymnasium. There was thus a high degree of continuity.¹¹⁶ Even some priests of Egyptian gods remained fiscally privileged, and since many priests were landowners, they benefitted from the Roman fiscal regime on land, despite degradation of the economic situation of Egyptian temples.¹¹⁷ Yet after a century of Roman rule new strategies emerged, the most obvious being the acquisition of Roman citizenship, so that passing from one category to another, already restricted under the Ptolemies, was not completely abolished by the Romans.

6 Conclusion: Comparing the Two Identification Systems at the Time of Their Implementation

The last section compares the implementation of each identification system after the conquest, or more precisely of few decades afterwards, once our documentation starts. The previous sections have established that the fundamental logic was the same for both states, *i.e.* granting some privileges to population groups whose loyalty was particularly needed or who could serve the state, certainly a common point to many states across history. The Egyptian documentation allows us to compare how this principle motivated slightly different priorities and overlaps between categories at two moments of Egyptian history, and to offer reasons for it.

The pattern of immigration partly explains variations of the weight given to ethnicity in the elaboration of the legal and fiscal official identities. The early Ptolemaic Period was a time of massive immigration to Egypt. The migrants represented the smaller section of the population (*c.* 5%) but were not

¹¹⁶ In contrast, Mélèze Modrzejewski' underlines many changes caused by the Romans, see Mélèze Modrzejewski, "Entre la cité et le fisc," esp. 252–57.

¹¹⁷ Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans*, 212–27; the grant of fiscal privileges to select group of priests in villages goes back to the 3rd century BCE, see above with Clarysse and Thompson, "P.Count. 2 continued," and goes back at least to Cleopatra regarding the *laographia*, according to the petition of four priests, see BGU IV 1198 (5/4 BC, Bousiris, Herakleopolite) with discussion by Monson, "Late Ptolemaic capitulation taxes," 150–51.

a minority in the modern sense of the term, as rightly noted by Honigman, who focused on the case of Judean migrants in Egypt and the development of their communal identity, from an ethnic identity under the Ptolemies to a religious identity by the 40s CE.¹¹⁸ Immigrants from all origins came to serve the Ptolemies in exchange for money, land, and new opportunities and benefitted from strong power relations vis-à-vis the rest of the population. In order to maintain the loyalty of these newcomers, the Ptolemies created a new identification system and gave priority to occupation and ethnicity, initially singling them out as non-Egyptians, and had no particular interest in assessing the various personal ethnic feelings of individuals. As noted above, the priority given by the Ptolemies to occupational categories can partly be explained by adapting to Egyptian traditions, which converged particularly well with their needs.¹¹⁹ When tax-lists appear in the papyrological documentation, by the 250s BCE, we observe that Egyptians serving the Ptolemies are gradually integrated into the system, *i.e.* their official identities put them in the privileged groups. The situation was very different in the first decades of Augustus' reign as there was very little immigration to Egypt and almost all migrants were Roman officials and their followers.¹²⁰ Therefore, the ethnic component was not relevant to the state in order to identify useful groups in Egypt. Rather, the Romans built on previous categories elaborated by the Ptolemies, by now mostly based on social status, and adapted their system to them.

When Ptolemy I secured Egypt for himself, citizenship in Egypt existed only in Naucratis and Alexandria, which was under construction. The details of how citizenship was granted in Alexandria and in the new foundation of Ptolemais to the first citizens are lost to us but many migrants received citizenship, and it is clear from the *Nomenklaturregel* that some were soldiers.¹²¹ Priority went to citizenship but this created an overlap with ethnicity. In contrast, with the arrival of the Romans, nothing changed regarding access to citizenship in one of the existing Greek *poleis* and the attempt of the Alexandrians to obtain a council failed.¹²² What is a more surprising contrast is that soldiers in the Ptolemaic army would not receive citizenship at the end of their service, while soldiers serving in the Roman *auxilia* could become Roman citizens. This may reflect some differences in the conceptualization of Roman citizenship in

¹¹⁸ Honigman, "Judean Communal Identity in Egypt," 28, 56–59.

¹¹⁹ Clarysse and Thompson, *Counting the People*, 203–04; Mairs, "Intersecting identities," 172–73.

¹²⁰ Rowlandson, "Dissing the Egyptians," 220.

¹²¹ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 38–92; on possible demographic models for Alexandria, see Scheidel "Creating a metropolis"; Plauman, *Ptolemais in Oberägypten*.

¹²² See the so-called *boulé*-papyrus, PSI X 1160 = CPJ II 150.

contrast to traditional citizenship in Greek *poleis*. The Ptolemies had no interest in gathering all their soldiers in their *poleis*—the reasonable outcome of citizenship in a Greek *polis*—but instead they granted land to cleruchs in the *chora* and offered other privileges to their soldiers.

In terms of taxation and fiscal official identities, the Ptolemies made a serious innovation by introducing a poll tax, called the salt-tax and coupled with the one obol-tax. However, probably because of its novelty and possible dissatisfaction on the part of the population, the amount was kept very low. Priority was given to occupations for creating categories exempted from the tax, notably that of teachers, and other occupations valued by the state benefitted from lower rates already in the mid 3rd century, notably Egyptian priests and soldiers. The Ptolemies also gave priority to ethnicity by creating the fiscal category of tax-*Hellenes*, for instance, to which citizens probably belonged, but as we saw, particular occupations could permit some flexibility with ethnicity.¹²³ Yet the tax-*Hellenes*, and thus the citizens, were not exempted from the salt-tax, only from the obol-tax. In contrast, when the Romans implemented fiscal categories, the citizens were completely exempted from the poll tax, making clear the priority they gave to citizenship, since the Roman poll tax was significantly higher than the Early Ptolemaic salt-tax, as it amounted to twelve to forty drachmas a year for an adult male depending on the nome, yet only adult males were liable.¹²⁴ From the Roman point of view, non-Romans living in the empire were all considered as *peregrini* (foreigners) and had to pay the poll tax—exemptions were exceptional. Since the Romans did not rely on the immigration of Roman citizens to Egypt, they relied on categories of persons already singled out as well-to-do, with a certain level of education, by the previous identification system, in particular the urban population and the local elite in the nomes. In other words, priority was given to social status, which had already gained precedence in the Late Ptolemaic Period. The implementation of the system of identification by the Romans required less innovation and change than that by the Ptolemies 300 years earlier.

For references to editions of papyri: *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets*, online at <http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>

¹²³ Yet the citizens in Ptolemaic Egypt had other fiscal privileges, see e.g. SB IV 7337 = C.Ord. Ptol. 75–76 with Bingen, *Hellenistic Egypt*, 141–54.

¹²⁴ For the complex question of the Alexandrian Jews and their liability to the poll tax, see Harker, *Loyalty and dissidence in Roman Egypt*, esp. 212–20.

Bibliography

- Agut-Labordère, D. and Véisse, A.-E. "Grecques et Égyptiennes dans les contrats de prêt aux IIIe et IIe s. a.C." In *Le myrte et la rose. Mélanges offerts à Françoise Dunand par ses élèves, collègues et amis*, G. Tallet and C. Zivie-Coche, eds., 415–423. ENIM 9. Montpellier: CNRS—Université Paul Valéry—Montpellier III, 2014.
- Bagnall, R.S. "Egypt and the Lex Minicia." *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 23 (1993): 25–28.
- Bagnall, R.S. "The Fayum and its People." In *Ancient Faces. Mummy Portraits from Roman Egypt*, S. Walker, ed., 26–29. Metropolitan Museum of Art Publications. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Bagnall, R.S. and P. Derow, *The Hellenistic Period: historical sources in translation*. Blackwell Sourcebooks in Ancient History 1. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Bagnall, R.S. and B.W. Frier. *The Demography of Roman Egypt*. Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy, and Society in Past Time 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Barry, W.D. "The crowd of Ptolemaic Alexandria and the riot of 203 B.C." *Échos du monde classique* 37 = n.s. 12 (1993): 415–431.
- Barth, F. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, F. Barth, ed., 9–38. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
- Bickermann, E.J. "Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte. 1. Der Heimatsvermerk und die staatsrechtliche Stellung der Hellenen im ptolemäischen Ägypten." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 8 (1927): 216–239.
- Bingen, J. *Hellenistic Egypt: monarchy, society, economy, culture*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 49. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Boswinkel, E. and P.W. Pestman. *Les archives privées de Dionysios, fils de Kephalaos. Textes grecs et démotiques*. Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 22 A–B. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Bowman, A.K. and D. Rathbone. "Cities and administration in Roman Egypt." *Journal of Roman Studies* 82 (1992): 107–217.
- Broux, Y. "Creating a new local elite: The establishment of the metropolitan orders of Roman Egypt." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 59 (2013): 143–153.
- Broux, Y. *Double Names and Elite Strategy in Roman Egypt*. Studia Hellenistica 54. Leuven: Peeters, 2015.
- Broux, Y. and S. Coussement. "Double names as indicators of social stratification in Graeco-Roman Egypt." In *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World: Legal Documents in Ancient Societies III*, M. Depauw and S. Coussement, eds., 119–140. OLA 229. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Burkhalter, F. "Les Grecs en Égypte au III^e siècle av. J.-C." In *Les diasporas grecques du VIII^e à la fin du III^e siècle av. J.-C. Actes du colloque de la Sophia, tenu à l'Université Charles-de-Gaulle-Lille 3, les 11 et 12 mai 2012 (Halma-Ipel-UMR 8164 / Lille 3 Learning Center Archéologie-Égyptologie) = Pallas* 89 (2012): 307–316.

- Canducci, D. "I 6475 cateci greci dell' Arsinoite." *Aegyptus* 70 (1990): 211–255.
- Capponi, L. *Augustan Egypt: the creation of a Roman province*. Studies in Classics 13. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Cherry, D. "The Minician Law: Marriage and the Roman Citizenship." *Phoenix* 44 (1990): 260–262.
- Clarysse, W. "Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic army and administration," *Aegyptus* 65 (1985): 57–66.
- Clarysse, W. *The Petrie papyri. Second Edition 1, the Wills*. Collectanea Hellenistica 2. Brussel: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, 1991.
- Clarysse, W. "Salt Tax." In *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, R.S. Bagnall, *et al.*, eds., 6023–6024. New York: Wiley, 2012.
- Clarysse, W. and D.J. Thompson. *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*. 2 volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Clarysse, W. and D.J. Thompson. "P.Count. 2 continued: a Ptolemaic population register from the Arsinoite nome." unpublished.
- Coussemant, S. *Because I am Greek: Polyonymy as an expression of ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Studia Hellenistica 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- Coleman-Norton, P.R., *et al.* *Ancient Roman Statutes: A Translation with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary, and Index*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.
- Delia, D. *Alexandrian citizenship during the Roman principate*. American Classical Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Depauw, M. and S. Coussemant, eds. *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World: Legal Documents in Ancient Societies III*. OLA 229. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Dietze-Mager, G. "Der Erwerb römischen Bürgerrechts in Ägypten: Legionare und Veteranen." *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 37 (2007): 31–123.
- Dolganov, A. "Imperialism and Social Engineering: Augustan Social Legislation in the Gnomon of the Idios Logos." In *Studien zum Gnomon des Idios Logos*, K. Harter-Uibopuu and T. Kruse, eds., forthcoming. Wiener Kolloquien zur Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 3. Vienna: Holzhausen Verlag.
- Dolganov, A. "A New Date for the 'Gnomon of the Idios Logos' (P. Oxy. XLII 3014, BGU V 1210) and its Implications." Unpublished.
- El-Abbadi, M.A.H. "The Alexandrian citizenship." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 48 (1962): 106–123.
- El-Abbadi, M.A.H. "The Problem of the Council of Alexandria: can a solution be found?" *Bulletin de la Société [Royale] d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie* 45 (1993): 1–6.
- Fenton, S. *Ethnicity*. Key Concepts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Armies of the Ancient World 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Fischer-Bovet, C. "Counting the Greeks in Egypt: immigration in the first century of Ptolemaic rule." In *Demographic influences on Graeco-Roman societies and economies*, C. Holleran and A. Pudsey, eds., 135–154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. "Egyptian warriors: the *machimoi* of Herodotus and the Ptolemaic army." *Classical Quarterly* 63 (2013): 209–236.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. "From the Ptolemies to the Romans: the categories of persons used in the Gnomon of the Idios Logos and in census related documents." In *Studien zum Gnomon des Idios Logos*, K. Harter-Uibopuu and T. Kruse, eds., forthcoming. Wiener Kolloquien zur Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 3. Vienna: Holzhausen Verlag.
- Fraser, P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Finley, M. *The Ancient Economy*. Updated edition with a preface by I. Morris. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Goudriaan, K. "Ethnical strategies in Graeco-Roman Egypt." In *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*, P. Bilde, et al., eds., 74–99. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 3. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press: 1992.
- Goudriaan, K. *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 5. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1988.
- Hall, J.M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Haensch, R. "Die Provinz Aegyptus: Kontinuitäten und Brüche zum ptolemäischen Ägypten. Das Beispiel des administrativen Personals." In *Die römischen Provinzen. Begriff und Gründung*, I. Piso, ed., 81–83. Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2008.
- Harker, A. *Loyalty and dissidence in Roman Egypt: the case of the Acta Alexandrinorum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. and T. Kruse, eds. *Studien zum Gnomon des Idios Logos*. Wiener Kolloquien zur Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 3. Vienna: Holzhausen Verlag, forthcoming.
- Honigman, S. "Les divers sens de l'éthnique Αραψ dans les sources documentaires grecques d'Égypte." *Ancient Society* 32 (2002): 43–74.
- Honigman, S. "The Ptolemaic and Roman Definitions of Social Categories and the Evolution of Judean Communal Identity in Egypt." In *Jewish and Christian Communal Identities in the Roman World*, Y. Furstenberg, ed., 25–74. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Jördens, A. "Status and identity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, C. Riggs, ed., 247–259. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Kramer, B. *Griechische Texte XIII: das Vertragsregister von Theogenis (P. Vindob. G 40618)*. 2 volumes. Corpus Papyrorum Raineri Archeducis Austriae 18. Wien: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 1991.

- La'da, C.A. "Ethnicity, occupation and tax-status in Ptolemaic Egypt." *Egitto e vicino Oriente* 17 (1994): 183–189.
- La'da, C.A. *Prosopographia ptolemaica. Volume X, Foreign ethnics in Hellenistic Egypt*. Studia Hellenistica 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Langellotti, M. "Village elites in the early Roman Arsinoite." *Quaderni del Museo del Papiro* 15 (2018): 293–312.
- Legras, B. *L'Egypte grecque et romaine*. Collection U. Histoire. Paris: Armand Colin 2004.
- Lewis, N. "Graeco-Roman Egypt: Fact or Fiction?" In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*, D.H. Samuel, ed., 3–14. Toronto: Hakkert, 1970.
- McInerney, J., ed. *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- McCoskey, D.E. *Race: Antiquity and its Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Mairs, R. "Intersecting Identities in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt." In *Egypt: Ancient Histories, Modern Archaeologies*, R.J. Dann and K. Exell, eds., 163–192. New York: Cambria Press, 2013.
- Malkin, I., ed. *Ancient perceptions of Greek ethnicity*. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Malkin, I. and C. Müller. "Vingt ans d'ethnicité: bilan historiographique et application du concept aux études anciennes," In *Mobilités grecques. Mouvements, réseaux, contacts en Méditerranée, de l'époque archaïque à l'époque hellénistique*, L. Capdetrey and J. Zurbach, eds., 25–37. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2012.
- Manning, J.G. "Historical Framework. 1.5. Law under the Ptolemies." In *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexandria to the Arab Conquest. A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation, with Introductions and Commentary*, J.G. Keenan, J.G. Manning, and U. Yiftach-Firanko, eds., 17–19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Mélèze Modrzejewski, J. "Entre la cité et le fisc: le statut grec dans l'Égypte romaine." In *Symposion 1982. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Santander, 1.–4. September 1982)*, F. Fernandez Nieto, ed., 241–280. Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte. 1. Köln, Vienna: Böhlau, 1989.
- Mélèze Modrzejewski, J. "The judicial system in theory and practice. 10.1. Ptolemaic justice." In *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexandria to the Arab Conquest. A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation, with Introductions and Commentary*, J.G. Keenan, J.G. Manning, and U. Yiftach-Firanko, eds., 471–477. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Mélèze Modrzejewski, J. "Le Statut des Hellènes dans l'Égypte Lagide: Bilan et Perspective de Recherches." *Revue des études grecques* 96 (1983): 241–268.
- Monson, A. *From the Ptolemies to the Romans: Political and Economic Change in Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

- Monson, A. "Late Ptolemaic capitation taxes and the poll tax in Roman Egypt." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 51 (2014a): 127–160.
- Monson, A. "Receipts for *sitōnion*, *syntaxis*, and *epistatikon* from Karanis: Evidence for fiscal reform in Augustan Egypt?" *ZPE* 191 (2014b): 207–230.
- Nelson, C.A. *Status declarations in Roman Egypt*. American Studies in Papyrology 19. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1979.
- Peremans, W. and E. Van 't Dack, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*. Studia Hellenistica 6, 8, 11–13, 17, 20–21, 25. Leuven: Peeters, 1950–1981.
- Pestman, P.W. "The competence of Greek and Egyptian tribunals according to the decree of 118 BC." *BASP* 22 (1985): 265–269.
- Plauman, G. *Ptolemaïs in Oberägypten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hellenismus in Ägypten*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1910.
- Riccobono, S.J. *Il Gnomon dell'Idios Logos*. Palermo: Palumbo, 1950.
- Rovira-Guardiola, C. "Alexandria (Egypt), city laws of." In *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, R.S. Bagnall, *et al.*, eds., 311–312. New York: Wiley, 2012.
- Rowlandson, J. "Dissing the Egyptians: Legal, Ethnic, and Cultural Identities in Roman Egypt." In *Creating Ethnicities and Identities in the Roman World*, A. Gardner, E. Herring, and K. Lomas, eds. 213–248. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2013.
- Rowlandson, J. *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Ruffini, G. "Genealogy and the gymnasium." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 43 (2006): 71–99.
- Scheidel, W. "Creating a metropolis: a comparative demographic perspective." In *Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece*, W. V. Harris and G. Ruffini, eds., 1–31. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Scheuble, S. "Griechen und Ägypter im ptolemäischen Heer – Bemerkungen zum Phänomen der Doppelnamen im ptolemäischen Ägypten." In *Interkulturalität in der Alten Welt. Vorderasien, Hellas, Ägypten und die vielfältigen Ebenen des Kontakts = Philipppika*, R. Rollinger, *et al.*, eds., 551–560. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Scheuble-Reiter, S. *Die Katōkenreiter im ptolemäischen Ägypten*. Munich: Beck, 2012.
- Smith, A.D. *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Uebel, F. *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst 3. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- Thompson, D.J. "Hellenistic Hellenes: the case of Ptolemaic Egypt." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, I. Malkin, ed., 301–322. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

- Thompson, D.J. "Language and literacy in Early Hellenistic Egypt." In *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*, P. Bilde, et al., eds., 39–52. Studies in Hellenistic civilization 3. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press: 1992.
- Thompson, D.J. "Literacy and power in Ptolemaic Egypt." In *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, A. Bowman and G. Woolf, eds., 67–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Vandorpe, K. "Identity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, C. Riggs, eds., 260–276. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Vandorpe, K. "Persian soldiers and Persians of the Epigone. Social mobility of soldiers-herdsmen in Upper Egypt." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 54 (2008): 87–108.
- Vandorpe, K. and S. Waebens. *Reconstructing Pathyris' archives. A Multicultural Community in Hellenistic Egypt*. Collectanea Hellenistica 3. Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, 2010.
- Vandorpe, K. and S. Waebens. "Women and gender in Roman Egypt: The impact of Roman rule." In *Tradition and transformation: Egypt under Roman rule. Proceedings of the International Conference, Hildesheim, Roemer- and Pelizaeus-Museum, 3–6 July 2008*, K. Lembke, M. Minas-Nerpel, and S. Pfeiffer, eds., 415–435. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Van Minnen, P. "ΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΟΥ: 'Greek' Women and the Greek 'Elite' in the Metropoleis of Roman Egypt." In *Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Egypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine: acts du colloque international, Bruxelles-Leuven, 27–29 novembre 1997*, H. Melaerts and L. Mooren, eds., 337–353. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Véïsse, A.-E. "L'usage des ethniques dans l'Égypte du IIIe siècle." In *Mobilités grecques. Mouvements, réseaux, contacts en Méditerranée, de l'époque archaïque à l'époque hellénistique*, L. Capdetrey and J. Zurbach, eds., 43–52. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2012.
- Véïsse, A.-E. "Statut et identité dans l'Égypte des Ptolémées: les désignations d'Hellènes' et d'Égyptiens." *Ktema* 32 (2007): 279–291.
- Vleeming, S.P. "The reading of the title 'man receiving pay'." In *Textes et études de papyrologie grecque, démotique et copte*, P.W. Pestman, ed., 204–207. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Wolff, H.J. *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaeer und des Prinzipats*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft; Rechtsgeschichte des Altertums 10.5. Munich: Beck, 1978.
- Waebens, S. "Imperial policy and changed composition of the auxilia: the 'change in A.D. 140' revisited." *Chiron* 42 (2012a): 1–23.
- Waebens, S. "Reflecting the 'change in A.D. 140': the veteran categories of the *epikrisis* documents revisited." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 180 (2012b): 267–277.
- Whitehorne, J.E.G. "Soldiers and Veterans in the Local Economy of First Century Oxyrhynchus." In *Miscellanea Papyrologica in occasione del bicentenario dell'edizione*

- della Charta Borgiana. II = Papyrologica Florentina. XIX, 2*, M. Capasso, G. Messeri Savorelli, and R. Pintaudi, eds., 543–557. Florence: Gonnelli, 1990.
- Winkel, L. “Gnomon Id. § 39 und § 46: neue oder althergebrachte Beurteilung des Rechtsirrtums in den römischen Provinzen?” In *Studien zum Gnomon des Idios Logos*, K. Harter-Uibopuu and T. Kruse, eds., forthcoming. Wiener Kolloquien zur Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 3. Vienna: Holzhausen Verlag.
- Yiftach-Firanko, U. “Did BGU III 2367 work?” In *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World: Legal Documents in Ancient Societies III*, M. Depauw and S. Coussement, eds., 103–118. OLA 229. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Yiftach-Firanko, U. “A Gymnasial Registration Report from Oxyrhynchus.” *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 47 (2010) 45–66.