

The Wages of Effeminacy?: *Kinaidoi* in Greek Documents from Egypt

TOM SAPSFORD¹
University of Southern California
sapsford@usc.edu

Κίναυδος/*cinaedus* is a term used both in Greek and Latin sources for a figure most commonly noted for his effeminate gender display and sexual degeneracy whether expressed through a willingness to be anally penetrated or as a more general insatiability. Several scholars writing on the *kinaidos/cinaedus* have invoked this 'deviant' figure as the antithesis of acceptable ancient masculinity, the antitype of either the Athenian hoplite or the Roman *sodalis*². Thus looking towards classical Greece John Winkler revealed the power which the figure of the *kinaidos* occupied in the Athenian imaginary when it came to socially acceptable displays of masculinity. Whilst doing so he also called into question the existence of such individuals by saying: 'it is quite another question whether outside

1 — I would like to thank Christelle Fischer-Bovet, Deborah Kamen, and *EuGeStA*'s anonymous readers for their generous comments on this article. I would also like to express my thanks to Eva Anagnostou-Laoutides and Daniel Orrells organizers of 'The Little Torch of Cypris: Gender and Sexuality in Hellenistic Alexandria and Beyond' (Prato, Italy 2-4 September 2013) where an early version of this article was presented. Abbreviations for papyri come from the online *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*: <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist_papyri.html> accessed 4/5/2015 at 8:32am.

2 — Winkler 1990: 45-6; Habinek 2005: 2, 6, 189-91.

of the amusing or vituperative arenas of discourse where the image of the *kinaidos* is found there were any real-life *kinaidoi*?³ In examining the evidence for *cinaedi* at Rome Amy Richlin likewise questioned how such individuals' actual lives can be accurately understood when 'a historian might doubt their very existence, attested as it is only by hostile sources'⁴. And whereas in the literary texts from Athens and Rome, as both Winkler and Richlin point out, mentions of the *kinaidos/cinaedus* are of a pejorative nature, outside of these ancient cultural centers there are mentions of 'real-life' men who do identify and are identified as *kinaidoi* in more neutral terms.

At least one pair of individuals in antiquity did consider themselves to be *kinaidoi* and inscribed their names as such at the temple of the goddess Isis on the island of Philae in the first century BCE:

Τρύφων δις, [θ]εοῦ κίναιδος ἦκ[ω] παρὰ τὴν Ἴσιν τὴν ἐν
Φ[ιλ]αίαις· (ἔτους) λξ', Θαὐθ ια'.

Στρούθειν ὁ κίναιδος ἦκω μετ<ὰ> Νικολάου⁵.

Tryphon son of the same, the god's *kinaidos* I came to Isis of
Philae; Year 35, 11th day of Thoth.

Strouthion the *kinaidos* I came with Nikolaos (I.Philae II 154-55)⁶.

These two inscriptions are the only attestation of self-identified *kinaidoi* in the extant evidence; yet alongside these inscriptions from Philae there are a number of other Greek documentary sources from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt which also mention *kinaidoi*⁷. This article will discuss these sources and examine how the mention of *kinaidoi* in these texts might contribute to our understanding of this term more widely.

Although mentions of *kinaidoi* in Greek documentary sources from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt are in no way as extensive as the Greek and Latin literary sources, neither are they an insignificant contribution to an understanding of this figure. This evidence consists of one ostrakon and six papyri. Also included in this study is a letter, P.Hibeh I 54, which does

3 — Winkler 1990: 46.

4 — Richlin 1993: 524.

5 — The adverb δις as Bernard (1969: 118) points out is commonly used in the imperial era to signify that its bearer has the same name as his father. For Στρούθειν as 'une graphie' of Strouthion see Bernard (1969: 121).

6 — All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

7 — Williams (2010: 256) writes that the 'absence of a significant body of relevant, unambiguous first-person utterances in the surviving material' makes the recovery of 'other voices' such as the Roman *cinaedus* too difficult, but also mentions in brief the sources from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt omitted from his study (2010: 385 n.80) which this present article argues can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of this figure's significance in antiquity.

not use the word *kinaidos* but does seemingly describe one by the actions and attributes which are ascribed to *kinaidoi* by ancient authors. Lastly this study also includes a discussion of a list of objects which features a *hapax legomenon* derived from the word κίναϊδος. The chronological and geographical spread of this evidence is contingent on the survival of the papyri, therefore the presence of *kinaidoi* at any one place or time cannot be generalized. Five of these documents date to the mid to late third century BCE (O.Camb. 1, P.Col.Zen. II 94, PSI V 483, P.Hibeh I 54, P.Enteux. 26) with one account of contributions securely dated to the second century CE (P.Fouad I 68), and a papyrus (P.Dubl. 14) dated to the second or third century CE. *Kinaidoi* are attested in three main types of document: first, those which record payments made by *kinaidoi*; second, accounts which specify payments made to *kinaidoi*; and third, correspondence in which they appear as named individuals.

In his discussion of the Philae inscriptions Étienne Bernand remarks that dancers and pantomimes often adopted expressive names and consequently reads Tryphon and Strouthion as ‘speaking names’ which signify their bearers’ profession as performers⁸. Tryphon or ‘Precious’ (formed from τρυφή, luxury), although apt perhaps for a *kinaidos*, is a relatively common name in the papyrological sources⁹; Strouthion or ‘Birdy’ (formed from στρουθός, sparrow) is more notable. For, as Jean Antoine Letronne first pointed out, the association of the *kinaidos* with the ἰυγξ bird (known also as both σεισπυγίς and κιναιδίον) and its tail-wagging motions is made by more than one ancient commentator which makes it more than likely that Strouthion’s name reflects his performance style¹⁰. Letronne also noted that proper names ending -ιον such as Strouthion are most often assigned to women but that Strouthion’s gender is confirmed by the male article ὁ (κίναϊδος) in the subsequent text of the inscription¹¹. Letronne’s observation raises the possibility that Strouthion’s name not only references his professional performance but his effeminate gender performance also. Louis Robert has subsequently argued that the feminine name form, -ιον, is used in inscriptions both here and elsewhere as a diminutive applied to young boys and that rather than signaling

8 — Bernand 1969: 118, 121-22. For ‘speaking names’ see Kanavou (2011: 2-4); for ‘speaking names’ and *kinaidoi* in literary sources see Harmon, Kilburn, and Macleod (1967: 109), Hijmans (1985: 221), and Zanker (2009: 61 n.75-6).

9 — Trismegistos records 539 attestations of Tryphon <<http://www.trismegistos.org/nam/detail.php?record=6335>> accessed 26/07/2015 at 8:56am.

10 — Letronne (1848:102) mentions *Hesychius s.v.*; *Schol. Theocr.* 2.17; Pollux *Onom.* IV.99. See too *Plat. Schol. Vet.* 494e.

11 — Letronne 1848: 100.

effeminacy *per se* it is a name given to Strouthion by his admirers as a form of endearment¹².

The adoption of such ‘speaking names’ is absent in the other documentary mentions of named *kinaidoi*. For although in PSI V 483 the name Kallianax, either ‘Pretty-prince’ or ‘Lovely-lord,’ could be read as describing some form of extravagant behavior, the use of the term *kinaidos* in Kallianax’s specific case (see below) rules out the possibility that he, like the two *kinaidoi* at Philae, had such an occupational ‘speaking name’. Rather the remaining six papyri and one ostrakon present a mixture of Egyptian and Greek names: Psenamounis and Hatres are Egyptian names (O.Camb. 1; P.Fouad I 68) whereas Kallianax and Dionysios are Greek names (PSI V 483; P.Enteux. 26). Caution needs to be applied, however, as in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt names are not always reliable markers of ethnic identities¹³. For instance Psenamounis clearly is an Egyptian theophoric name, ‘son of Amun’, yet the collector of his salt-tax payment, Dorion, has a Greek name also borne by Egyptians¹⁴.

Payments made by kinaidoi

O.Camb. 1 and P.Fouad I 68 record payments made by *kinaidoi*: the first by an individual called Psenamounis in 250 BCE and the second by Hatres in 180 CE. Whilst O.Camb.1 is clearly a receipt for payment of the salt tax, ἀλικῆς, the context for P.Fouad I 68 is unclear.

O.Camb. 1 (250 BCE)

(ἔτους) λε Φαμενώθ γ
ἀλικῆς διὰ Δωρί-
ωνος
Ψεναμοῦνις
κίναϊδος (δραχμῆ) α

(Year) 35 on the 3rd day of Phamenoth
for the salt-tax (issued) by Dori-
on.
Psenamounis
kinaidos, 1 (drachma)

This receipt written on a ceramic fragment shows that Psenamounis has paid the standard amount for males during this period, 1 drachma¹⁵.

12 — Robert in Firatli 1964: 185.

13 — McCoskey 2002: 23-24.

14 — For Psenamounis see Pestman (1994: 44-5); for Dorion see Crawford (1971: 198) and Clarysse and Thompson (2006: volume I, 216 n.256, volume II, 326).

15 — Thompson 1997: 246.

This ostrakon follows a fairly standard formula for such receipts and κίναϊδος in this document is in a position more commonly occupied in other salt tax receipts by a patronym¹⁶. Without any other *comparanda* for receipts issued by Dorion which likewise distinguish individuals by occupation rather than by patronym it is not possible to say whether κίναϊδος can assuredly be read as an occupational category here; however, the term as used in this receipt certainly serves as a means of distinguishing this Psenamounis from any other individual in the vicinity with the same name.

W.G. Waddell describes P.Fouad I 68 as a list of ‘Tax-Payments’ in his *editio princeps* but, unlike in O.Camb. 1, the papyrus gives no indication of what tax exactly is being recorded or indeed if this is beyond doubt a list of tax contributions¹⁷. Yet even with such an uncertain context the text does provide some useful information about the categorization of *kinaidoi*. P.Fouad I 68 begins with the date on which this group of individuals was recorded then each entry follows more or less the same formula: name, patronym, sometimes a further qualification (*i.e.* mother, grandfather), occupation, and amount¹⁸. The *kinaidos* Hatres is mentioned in line 23.

P.Fouad I 68 (180 CE) (lines 21-23)

/ Τεφορσ[οῦ]ς Ἑριέως βουκ(όλος) (δραχμαὶ) δ
/ Κρονίω(ν) δοῦλ(ος) Ἡρακ() Παῶ κουταλ() . . α ἄ
/ Ἀτρῆς Πακηβ() κίναϊ[δ]ος (δραχμαὶ(?)) δ

/ Tephors(ou)s son of Herieus cowh(erd) 4 (drachmas)
/ Kronio(n) slav(e) of Herac() (son of) Pao() ...¹⁹ . . 1 1/2 [drachmas]
/ Hatres son of Pakeb(kis) *kinai(d)os* 4 (drachmas)

The formula used to record individuals shows that κίναϊ[δ]ος is an occupation in the same manner as cowherd (βουκ(όλος)) in line 21. If the document indeed records the payment of taxes, the fact that Hatres pays an amount equal to the other occupations on the list also suggests that a *kinaidos* had the same fiscal status as a number of other occupations such as tinker (κασιτεροπιός) line 3), tavernkeeper, (κάπηλ(ος) line 5), and fuller, (γναφεύ(ς) line 12). In P.Fouad I 68 Hatres appears to sit within a humble social stratum. The system of government in place

16 — Muhs 2005: 41.

17 — ‘With this list of tax-payments *cf.* P.Columbia 1 recto, l.2, in which the entries are fuller. Payments of 4 drachmas and multiples of 4 are common: the amount alone is not enough to determine which tax it is’ (Waddell 1939: 148).

18 — P.Fouad I 68 records 26 individuals who contribute payment. 12 of these (excluding Hatres) have occupational designations.

19 — ‘perhaps -κουταλ()’ (Waddell 1939: 150).

in Roman Egypt openly acknowledges him as a legitimate individual and furthermore collects profit from his 'kinaidic' activity rather than attempting to prohibit it²⁰.

P.Fouad I 68 does not present all of its recorded individuals as being equals since it mentions a slave who is liable for a considerably smaller payment in line 22. This entry emphasizes the socioeconomic position of the *kinaidos* within a fiscal hierarchy whereby Hatres is equal to a number of other individuals yet above the standing of Kronion the slave. Thus P.Fouad I 68 presents Hatres the *kinaidos* not as a stigmatized individual (at least not fiscally), but rather as someone on an equal standing to individuals with a range of occupations and thus liable for the same amount of monetary contribution. O.Camb. 1 and P.Fouad I 68 confirm that the *kinaidos* was a recognizable identity in both Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. Furthermore the prevalence of other occupations in P.Fouad I 68 strongly suggests that *kinaidos* was likewise an occupational category. P.Fouad I 68, however, gives no indication as to exactly what forms of activity a *kinaidos* was indeed recognizable for. This question is perhaps better answered by the three documents which record payments made to *kinaidoi*.

Payments made to kinaidoi

Unlike the previous documents P.Col.Zen. II 94, C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91, and P.Tebt. I 208 recto contain no internal means of dating the exact year in which they were written. Approximate dates for these examples are possible since P.Col.Zen. II 94 comes from the Zenon archive whose documents date from 261 to 229, and the accounts in C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91 are entered in bronze drachmas which indicates that it comes from the later Ptolemaic period²¹. P.Tebt. I 208 recto is ascribed the dates of either of 95 or 62 BCE. P.Col.Zen. II 94 is the only document in which the monetary amount paid to *kinaidoi* can be ascertained. All three documents come from a similarly rural setting: P.Tebt. I 208 recto and P.Col.Zen. II 94 are accounts of agricultural expenses whereas C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91 records the accounts of a village club. Furthermore in each example it is possible to connect these *kinaidoi* with a performative context by the additional mention of flute players.

20 — That the term *kinaidos* may signify an occupational designation in Roman Egypt rather than denoting a sexual identity in this context is contrary to the interpretations of both Rabun Taylor and Amy Richlin in their discussions of *cinaedi* at Rome; these, they argue, belonged to an illicit or illegal homosexual subculture (Richlin 1993: 541; Taylor 1997: 320, 322-3, 327-8). For the opposite view to Taylor and Richlin see Williams (2010: 239-45).

21 — Edgar 1925: 369.

The most fragmentary text is P.Tebt. I 208 recto which contains the words κιναιδοις μουσικ(οῖς) who receive most likely as payment, a measure of barley.

P.Tebt. I 208 recto (95/62 BCE)

εἰς τὸ Τρίστομον . . .
κιναιδοις μουσικ(οῖς) γε Πετῆσου(χου) θεοῦ μεγάλου κρι(θῆς)
(ἀρτάβαι) . . .

for Tristomon²² . . .
for the musical *kinaidoi* of the great god Petesuchus²³
(artabas) of barley...

Although it can be surmised that on this occasion the *kinaidoi* were employed as some kind of performers, the adjective μουσικ(οῖς) may refer either to performers of music or to individuals performing to musical accompaniment²⁴. This matter is made clearer in P.Col.Zen. II 94 in which a *kinaidos* and a flute player are accounted for separately which suggests that, whether the *kinaidos* sang, danced, or did both simultaneously, he did so with some form of accompaniment²⁵.

P.Col.Zen. II 94 (III BCE) trans. Westermann (lines 2-5)

κιναιδῶφι ἰλ[αρωῖ(?)]	(δραχμαὶ) γ (τετράβολον)
ἐργάταις τοῖς τομ(εὔσι) κδ	ς
ἐργ(άτη) βο(τανίζοντι) αη .	(τριώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς)
εἰς κερμάτι(ον) τοῦ ἀλλ(ητοῦ)	τέ(ταρτον ὀβολοῦ)

For <i>kinaidos</i> ²⁶	3 drachmas 4 obols
For 24 workers at cutting	6
For worker at weeding ____	3 obols 1 chalkous
For cash for the flute player	1/4 obol.

Alongside the performers, the *kinaidos* (line 2) and the *auletes* (line 5), P.Col.Zen. II 94 records various agricultural workers as well as a tax collector (line 8). Notably the *kinaidos* receives the highest amount paid to any of these individuals – 3 drachmas and 4 obols. This is more than each of twelve workers at cutting received and the difference between the

22 — A toponym (cf. <<http://www.trismegistos.org/place/2475>> accessed 4/5/2015 at 11:47am).

23 — Πετῆσουχου θεοῦ κροκοδῖλου, P.Tebt. I 62 l.14.

24 — Montserrat (1996: 117) reads the performance context as ‘someone’s birthday’; however, the amount of blank spaces will not admit γενεθλίοις (Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly 1902: 530).

25 — *Cinaedi* are described by Nonius as being either *saltatores* or *pantomimi* (see Williams 2010: 193-4); both Strabo (14.1.41) and Athenaeus (14.620d) describe *kinaidoi* as verbal performers.

26 — I have avoided Westermann’s translation of κιναιδῶφι ἰλ[αρωῖ(?)] as ‘public dancer’.

amount paid to the *kinaidos* and the flute player is great indeed. One reason suggested by Reinhold Scholl for an economic imbalance between *auletai* and *kinaidoi* is that flute playing was not a full-time occupation²⁷. Indeed a flautist is recorded as having other forms of income, namely livestock in P.Tebt. III 882 l.22: flute player Iakoubis, son of Iakoubis 13 sheep, 7 lambs, and 1 goat (ἀύλητῆς Ἰακοῦβις Ἰακοῦβιος πρ(όβατα) ιγ, ἄρ(νες) ζ, αἶξ α).

A *kinaidos* and an *auletes* are again found together in what appears to be the fragmentary minutes of some form of social association (C.Ptol. Sklav. I 91) which gathered regularly in various locations such as a store-room and the harness-room of a stable and which sometimes entertained invited guests²⁸.

C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91 frag. 5 = SB III 7182

Χοία[]κ[
 ἐν τῇ σ[κεοθήκη
 - ἱεροπ[ο]ι[ο]ῦ [Δ]ι[καίου]
 Ἑρμίας
 Βάχ[χος]
 Θίβρων
 Δημᾶς
 Κάρπος
 Κάμαξ
 Ψαμμῆτιχος
 Δίκαιος
 (γίνονται) η, (τούτων)
 ἀσύμβολος Ἑρμίας
 λ(οιποὶ) ζ
 εἰς οὓς ἀνήλωται
 παρὰ τὸν ἀφιη[
 οἴνου Μεμφί(του) κ[
 Ἑλλανίκῳ ἀύλητῇ [
 καὶ τῷ κιναιίδῳ [

Choiak][assembled]
 in the h[arness room
 with Dikaios as leader of sacrifices:
 Hermias
 Bak[chos]
 Thibron

27 — Scholl 1990: 341. In addition to P.Tebt. III 882 Scholl erroneously cites SB 1900 l.131 where he says a flute player is a member of a cooperative lease.

28 — ἐν τῷ [θησαυρῷ (fr.1 col.2, l.2), ἐν τῷ ἵπποκοιναρίῳ|ἐν τῇ σχεοθήκη (fr.4 col.2, l.3-4); ξένοι (fr.1 col.2, l.14), [ἀ]λλου ξένου (fr.4 col.2, l.5).

Demas
 Karpos
 Kamax
 Psammetichos
 Dikaios
 (total) 8 (of them)
 Hermias noncontributing
 leaving 7
 for whom was expended
 excepting the one exempted^[29]
 wine from Memph(is) .[
 for Hellanikos the flute player[
 and the *kinaidos* [

C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91 is made up of five fragments and the document records at least five separate occasions on which the club assembled. There are three separate mentions of payments made to flute players: first Demetrios from Krokodilopolis (frag.1 col. 3, l.1), second an unspecified flautist (frag.2, l.3), and lastly the flautist named Hellanikos (frag.5, l.18). From what survives of this document it seems that a *kinaidos* was engaged on a single occasion only, which suggests that as in P.Col.Zen. II 94 the one *kinaidos* cost significantly more to hire than the various *auletai*. All three documents confirm that *kinaidoi* were participating in performances in Hellenistic Egypt. The higher price paid to the *kinaidos* in P.Col.Zen. II 94 and the single documented appearance of a *kinaidos* in the village club (C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91) further suggest that the performance of a *kinaidos* was not of equal value to that of flute players. In light of these documents it might be inferred that for mixed audiences of villagers in the chora, including slaves, it was a special event to see a *kinaidos* perform³⁰.

Correspondence and a petition concerning kinaidoi

The earliest example of correspondence mentioning a *kinaidos* (PSI V 483) comes like P.Col.Zen. II 94 from the Zenon archive. This letter is addressed to Zenon, the estate agent of Ptolemy Philadelphus' *dioiketes* Apollonios, by Amyntas, an important member of Apollonios' household at Alexandria³¹. It begins.

29 — Edgar 1925: 376.

30 — It has been variously argued that the club in C.Ptol.Sklav. I 91 was comprised of slaves, freedmen, or a combination of both (Edgar 1925: 369-70; Westermann 1932: 21; Scholl 1990: 338-9). Whichever the case may be, as C.C. Edgar points out in his *editio princeps*, the total amount recorded for one evening's festivities, 1590 bronze drachmas (just over 3 silver drachmas) on frag.2, l.7, was a considerable expense 'to men who were earning about five drachmas a month' (1925: 371).

31 — Pestman 1981: 284.

PSI V 483 (258/7 BCE)

Ἀμύντας Ζήνωνι χαίρειν. Καλλιάν[α]ξ [δ] τέκτων ὁ κίναιδος παροινήσ[ας...(?)]
κλίνας αἷς κατεσκεύακεν Ἀπολλων[ί]ωι.

Amyntas to Zenon greetings. Kallianax the carpenter, behaved (like a)
kinaidos in a drunken manner [... with/on/towards (?)]
the couches which he made for Apollonios (lines 1-2).

Here κίναιδος is used in apposition as an insult – Kallianax ... the drunk *kinaidos*. Unfortunately as there is a break in the papyrus at παροινήσ[ας...(?)] and therefore a textual gap until the mention of the couches in the following line of the letter it is impossible to ascertain precisely what Kallianax has done to provoke Amyntas' displeasure. Amyntas does, however, end the letter with some advice to Zenon regarding Kallianax which again a break in the papyrus makes difficult to interpret exactly.

ἐὰν οὖν που παραβάλῃ, καλῶς ἔχει μὴ ἀγνοεῖν ὑ[μᾶς(?)]
Ἀπολλωνίωι ἐμφανίζειν μηθὲν αὐτῶ[ι] π[ι]στεύειν.

If then he ventures something, it is well [that you] not ignore [...] to make clear to Apollonios not to trust him in any way (lines 5-6).

Kallianax's bad behavior is attested in another document from the archive. In PSI V 495 a certain Herakleitos writes to complain that the same Kallianax has been talking idly, κατηδολεσχηκέναι³², and has not been doing or saying what he claims to have said and done, ἐ[β]ε[β]αιώσατο μήτε πεπραχέναι Κα]λλιάνακτα μήτε εἰρηκέναι μηθὲν τοιοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τοῦναντίον ἔφη³³. PSI V 483 is particularly notable as it serves as the only documentary source where κίναιδος is not used as an occupational category but rather as a pejorative term. Indeed this is evident since Kallianax's occupation, carpenter (τέκτων), has already been stated and the results of his work, couches (κλίνας), are then mentioned³⁴. From what remains of the fragmentary correspondence concerning Kallianax the overall sense is that he is someone to beware of and that it is his behavior rather than his occupation which earns him the particular title of *kinaidos*.

32 — PSI V 495 l.3; *LSJ* 'chatter at, weary by chatting'.

33 — PSI V 495 l.5-6 with restitutions following n.5.

34 — Kallianax is mentioned specifically as a carpenter in another letter from the Zenon archive, P.Cair.Zen I 59027: συντάξαντος ἡμῖν Ἀμύντου δεδώκαμεν ὀψώνιον τοῖς σώμασιν τοῖς ἀπολελειμμένοις διμήνου, καὶ Καλλιάνακτι δὲ τῷ τέκτονι τριμήνου.

... to you ... and 1 band ... and 2 anklets of cymbal-players ... and 1 shuttle and a *kinaidarion* cased in iron ... and a hanging earring and a bag and ... of jars ... a mirror with an inscription ... and a cloak. If anyone lays information ... to -thion.

P.Dubl. 14 is the latest Greek document from Egypt that can be associated with the word *kinaidos*, if not conclusively with the personage. The document's context is as unclear as its text is fragmentary: Brian McGing proposes that this may be a list of stolen objects. It is dated by its neat and widely spaced script to either the second century or perhaps early third century CE³⁷. The κιναιδάριον περ[ι]σίδ[ηρον] is some sort of iron-cased object. This *hapax legomenon*, McGing suggests, could be some type of musical instrument, just like the accompanying noun κερκίδιον which can mean not only weaver's shuttle but also tympanum³⁸. Thus the κιναιδάριον might be imagined as being some kind of iron-edged instrument like, for instance, a tambourine. Such a suggestion also gains support by the inclusion in the list of περ[ε]ρ[ι]σκελίδες β κυμβαλωτῶν, a pair of cymbal-player's anklets. More importantly, P.Dubl. 14 suggests that the performance tradition of the *kinaidos* evident in Egypt during the Ptolemaic era continued well into the Roman period: a suggestion which P.Fouad I 68, dated to the reign of Marcus Aurelius, helps to corroborate with its inclusion of Hatres the *kinaidos*. Moreover, both the fragmentary nature of P.Dubl. 14 and its *hapax legomenon* are good reminders of the limits of the extant evidence – be it literary, epigraphic, or documentary – and its ability to uncover truly any full picture of a *kinaidos*' daily existence.

A comparison with other sources

It is not so much the *kinaidos/cinaedus*' position as performer which has drawn modern scholarly attention but rather the term's tendency to denote a more totalizing conception of identity: 'a "life-form" all to himself' as Maud Gleason puts it³⁹. And whereas the evidence discussed above suggests that κιναιδος in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt is mostly an occupational term for a performer, as PSI V 483 shows, it was not always used in this way. Notably, the sense of *kinaidos* as passive homosexual is

37 — McGing 1995: 77.

38 — McGing (1995: 79) quotes Palmer (1945: 83-2) in regards to the suffix -αριον for forms of technical words 'such as the name of instruments and utensils.' A similarity can be seen here between this particular adjectival form κιναιδάριον, and κιναιδίον. For example the *Cyranides* (I 10.28 ff. and 10.49 ff.) mentions a type of fish, bird, and stone called *kinaidios/kinaidion*, each of which is associated with the *kinaidos* in some way (Montserrat 1996: 149-50).

39 — Gleason 1990: 411; cf. Winkler 1990: 45-6.

completely absent from the papyrological sources⁴⁰. The remaining part of this article will therefore explore how the *kinaidos* in Greek documentary sources from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt relates to other comparable evidence.

Craig Williams in particular has argued that it is the *kinaidos/cinaedus*' effeminate gender display rather than his sexual proclivities that is this figure's constitutive feature⁴¹. And although the documentary evidence discussed so far neither confirms nor denies such a proposition, a letter that concerns an effeminate performer has been read as referring to a *kinaidos*:

P.Hibeh I 54 (245 BCE) trans. Bagnall and Derow (lines 1-17)

Δημοφῶν Πτολε-
μαίωι χαίρειν. ἀπό[σ-
τειλον ἡμῖν ἐκ παν-
τὸς τρόπου τὸν αὐ-
λητὴν Πετωῦν ἔχοντ[α
τούς τε Φρυγίους αὐ-
λ[ο]ύς καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς, κ[αὶ]
ἐάν τι δέηι ἀνηλώσαι
δός, παρὰ δὲ ἡμ[ῶ]ν κομι-
εῖ. ἀπόστειλον δὲ ἡ[μ]ῖν
καὶ Ζηνόβιον τὸν μαλα-
κὸν ἔχοντα τύμπανον καὶ
κύμβαλα καὶ κρόταλα, χρεῖ-
α γάρ ἐστι ταῖς γυναιξίν πρὸς
τὴν θυσίαν· ἐχέτω δὲ
καὶ ἱματισμὸν ὡς ἀσ-
τειότατον⁴²...

Demophon to Ptolemaios, greeting. Make every effort to send me the flute-player Petoüs with both the Phrygian flutes and the rest; and if any expense is necessary pay it and you shall recover it from me. Send also for Zenobios the effeminate (*malakon*) with a drum and cymbals and castanets, for he is wanted by the women for the sacrifice; and let him wear as fine clothes as possible...

This document was first read as referring to a *kinaidos* by J. G. Smyly in the *editio princeps*, who drew a parallel with a mention of an effeminate *cinaedus* in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*: *tum ad saltandum non cinaedus*

40 — For this meaning of the word in Latin sources see Richlin (1993: 530ff.).

41 — Williams 2010: 177, 238; cf. Winkler 1990: 50 for a similar understanding of the Greek evidence.

42 — One reader of the article points out that the emphasis of ἀστειότατον here is of city – as opposed to country – garb.

malacus aequet atque ego (668)⁴³. Indeed further details from the letter support such a reading when compared to other literary sources. Thus the mentions of the percussive instruments carried by Zenobios, the style of his musical accompaniment, and the kind of garments in which he is requested to perform all have multiple literary parallels⁴⁴.

P.Hibeh I 54 raises, however, some of the difficulties in comparing documentary sources with the extant literary evidence. For instance *malacus* is used by Plautus as a term which describes not only a *cinaedus* dancer but also an adulterer of women, the *moechus malacus* who appears in the *Truculentus* (609-10) and who, like Zenobios in P. Hibeh I 54, carries a tambourine, *tympanotribam* (611)⁴⁵. Κίναϊδος and μαλακός are not synonymous terms in the speeches of Aeschines which notably provide the most detailed evidence for the *kinaidos* in fourth century Athens. For example in *On the Embassy* Aeschines uses *kinaidos* as a pejorative term against Demosthenes (2.88, 151) but quotes an assembly speech in which Demosthenes calls himself μαλακός without this word carrying the former term's same opprobrious sense (2.106)⁴⁶.

Three further Greek papyri from Roman Egypt also use the word μαλακός in a performative context: P.Oxy. III 413 and P.Oxy. LXXIX 5189 appear to be scripts for mimes which feature characters with this name; P.Berol. inv. 13927 is a list of performance titles and props which mentions 'the one of the effeminates', τὸ τῶν μαλακῶν, as one of its performance titles⁴⁷. Since the central character from Herodas' second mimiamb is a *kinaidos* (2.35) and a Megarian bowl from the Louvre (C.A. 936) also shows a group of men labelled *kinaidoi*, in a scene most likely depicting a mime, it is certainly possible to view *malakos* and *kinaidos* as two distinct character types in this genre of drama⁴⁸. Therefore the extant evidence suggests that *kinaidos* and *malakos* are terms which are best considered as similar but not necessarily synonymous. Furthermore Athenaeus' account of other categories of effeminate performers (14.620d-621d), such as the *magoidos*, *lusioidos*, and *hilaroidos*, attests a richer and more varied tradition of effeminate performers than the extant evidence can sufficiently flesh out.

43 — Grenfell and Hunt 1906: 201; Edgar 1925: 370-1; Perpillou-Thomas 1995: 229.

44 — For musical accompaniment see Apuleius *Met.* 8.30, [Lucian] *Asinus* 37; for attire see Petronius, *Sat.* 21, Juvenal 2.70-1, 96-7, Apuleius *Met.* 8.27.

45 — The mosaic of the 'Villa of Cicero' signed by Dioskourides of Samos similarly depicts a pair of arguably effeminate male performers with tympanum and cymbals. Like P.Hibeh I 54, but unlike C.A. 936 with its accompanying title '*kinaidoi*', the mosaic cannot assuredly be read as representing *cinaedi*.

46 — Cf. Demosthenes 8.68.

47 — Perrone 2011: 136.

48 — Rostovtzeff 1937: 90.

Although a comparison between documentary and literary sources poses many methodological issues (not least of differences in genre, date, purpose, audience, and cultural context) two points are starkly evident: first, the performative valence present in the documentary sources is also present in the literary sources; second, the particular homoerotic aspect of the *kinaidos* present in literary sources is absent from the documentary papyri. Plautus, Macrobius, Pliny the Younger, and Petronius all refer to the *cinaedi* in performative contexts such as dinner parties, dancing schools, and a priapic ritual⁴⁹. Apuleius' *Metamorphosis* and the novel *The Ass* attributed to Lucian both contain an episode in which a band of *kinaidoi* travel through the countryside performing spectacular flagellations to raise money for the *dea Syria*⁵⁰. Yet in both Apuleius and Petronius the *kinaidoi* are also depicted as voracious in their desire to be sexually penetrated (both orally and anally)⁵¹. Catullus 16 begins with the poet threatening two of his rivals Aurelius and Furius, *pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo, | Aureli pathice et cinaede Furi* (1-2), 'I will bugger and face fuck you, Aurelius pathic and Furius *cinaedus*'. In this example the connotations of *cinaedus* are of sexual passivity rather than a non-elite performer of song and dance since both men are described in 11.1 as social equals of the poet (*comites Catulli*). Martial's epigrams feature numerous examples of the sexual proclivities of the *cinaedi* and he goes so far as to claim that one *cinaedus* called Charinus has been sodomized so frequently that he has worn away his asshole⁵².

The discrepancy between *kinaidos/cinaedus* as a sexually loaded term in literary sources and as a sexually neutral term in documentary sources creates the impression that whereas Greek and Roman authors tend to portray the *kinaidos/cinaedus* as being abject in their respective home loci of Athens and Rome, the appearance of the *kinaidos* in the territory of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt does not elicit similar concerns. Winkler's suggestion that in fourth century Athens the *kinaidos* was a discursive and imaginary stereotype is complicated by the case in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, where the texts which Winkler draws from (Plato's *Gorgias* and the speeches of Aeschines) do appear to have been in circulation⁵³. As Dominic Montserrat points out, the Platonic dialogues were a central feature of the Alexandrian education and, as more than one scholar has suggested, Herodas' second mimiamb, written in Alexandria, alludes to

49 — Plautus *Stichus* 769-75; Pliny *Ep.* 9.17; Macrobius *Sat.* 3.14; Petronius *Sat.* 24.

50 — Apuleius *Met.* 8.24-9.10; [Lucian] *Asinus* 35-41.

51 — Apuleius *Met.* 8.26, 29; Petronius *Sat.* 23-24.

52 — *Secti podicis usque ad umbilicum | nullas reliquias habet Charinus | et prurit tamen usque ad umbilicum* (6.37.1-3).

53 — For the numerous literary papyri found in Egypt containing extracts of the *Gorgias* and the speeches of Aeschines see Dodds 1959 and Dils 1997.

Attic forensic oratory. In particular there is a striking similarity between the name of the *kinaidos*, Battaros, in this mime (2.35) and the two names which Aeschines inveighs against Demosthenes: the nickname Batalos (1.126, 131, 164) and the slur *kinaidos*⁵⁴.

The absence of any link between homoerotic behavior and the *kinaidos* in Greek documentary sources from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt cannot be explained by the generic conventions of each type of evidence. For instance several documentary sources do mention homoeroticism, just not in connection with *kinaidoi*. Five marriage contracts from the Ptolemaic period specify that the husband may not support a younger male lover (παιδικόν)⁵⁵. In P.Zen.Pestm. 51 (another letter from the Zenon Archive) a certain Hierocles writes to a doctor called Artemidoros. Hierocles is concerned that if he takes charge of a *palaestra* in which he has a financial share then he will consequently be accused of doing so in order to gain sexual access to the youths who train there⁵⁶. More sexually explicit references can be found in P.Oxy. XLII 3070, a letter from the 1st century CE in which two individuals named Apion and Epimachus write that they will sodomize a third party called Epaphroditos⁵⁷. A graffito (c. second century BCE) from the temple of Amun-Re in Karnak (SEG 8 662-3) threatens to anally penetrate (ἐπυγίζουσιν) its addressee Ptolemaios in the street⁵⁸.

The attitudes to homoeroticism shown in these sources have not been understood unanimously: Bernard Legras concludes that hostility to homoerotic practices in all of its forms, whether pederastic or coeval, increases during the Roman period; Dominic Montserrat argues that the evidence does not demonstrate a single prevailing attitude⁵⁹. Both scholars are in agreement, however, that homoerotic practices are on the whole understood in terms similar to earlier Greek pederastic protocols: thus a younger beloved is the desired object of an elder lover (as evidenced by the marriage contracts and P.Zen.Pestm. 51); and that for a male to be penetrated by another is shameful (as evidenced by P.Oxy. XLII 3070 and

54 — Montserrat 1996: 145; Hall 2006: 362; Lambin 1982: 259.

55 — P. Giss. 2 l.21; P.Gen. 21 l.4; P.Tebt. III 974 l.5-6; P.Tebt. I 104 l.20 discussed in Legras (2001: 270-74).

56 — Montserrat 1996: 150.

57 — λέγει Ἀπίων καὶ Ἐπιμάς Ἐπαφροδίτῳ τῷ φιλάτῳ ὅτι ἡδιδύς ἡμεῖν τὸ πυγίσαι. See Montserrat (1996: 136-38).

58 — <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.libproxy.usc.edu/entries/supplementum-epigraphicum-graecum/karnak-in-templo-ammonis-descripsit-pillet-ann-serv-ant-eg-xxiii-1923-108-8-661-663-a8_661_663> accessed 8/5/2015 at 1:37pm. Montserrat (1996: 154-5) does believe this inscription addresses Ptolemaios as a *kinaidos*. The word, however, is not used in the inscription itself and Montserrat's reasoning is circular in that a *kinaidos* is inferred solely because the inscription mentions anal penetration.

59 — Legras 2001: 282; Montserrat 1996: 162.

SEG 8 662-3)⁶⁰. Yet whereas the discourse of sexual practices between males shares some commonality across Greek, Roman, and the Greco-Roman cultures that developed in Egypt, the *kinaidos* who is so often a marker for the abject penetrated male in sources from outside of Egypt is notably absent from similar discourses in Greek documentary sources from within Egypt.

It lastly remains to discuss mentions of the *kinaidos/cinaedus* in Greek and Latin epigraphic sources from outside of Egypt. Such a comparison is helpful in determining to what extent either the occupational (as performer) or ontological (as sex/gender deviant) sense of *kinaidos/cinaedus* predominates. Only one inscription from Apollonia, modern day Pojan in Albania, from the second century CE, specifically mentions the performative valence of *kinaidos*. This epitaph (I.Apollonia 226) is dedicated to Proklos by his father who calls his deceased son a *kinaidologos*: a performer of kinaidic speech⁶¹. Most other epigraphic sources, however, conform to the use of the word as a pejorative term. The majority of these are graffiti from Pompeii which in more than one instance connect the individuals mentioned with homoerotic behavior: so for example CIL IV 2319b reads ‘Vesbinus [is a] *cinaedus*, Vitalio butt-fucked him’ and CIL IV 1825 has been read as ‘Cosmus slave of Equitia is a great *cinaedus* and a cocksucker who keeps his legs apart’⁶².

Whereas *kinaidos* when used as a pejorative form of abuse at Pompeii clearly has sexual connotations, these connotations are noticeably absent from PSI V 483. An inscribed tomb tile from Rhegium (SEG 39 1062) perhaps serves as a more useful comparison with the case of untrustworthy Kallianax. This ‘speaking-tile’ calls out an individual named Soterichos as both a *kinaidos* and a ‘pseudo-potter’, Σωτήριχε κίναιδε ψευδοκαμινάρι⁶³. In this instance the negative sense of *kinaidos*, as with Kallianax, appears to refer more to the individual’s deceptiveness than to any form of sexual licentiousness⁶⁴. The word κίναιδος is also applied in both PSI V 483 and SEG 39 1062 to a type of craftsman – a carpenter and a potter respectively – which seems strikingly contrary to the more typical image of the effeminate *kinaidos* found in other sources. Indeed it

60 — Legras 2001: 272-3; Montserrat 1996: 138-9, 145, 154.

61 — <Π>ρόκλω · κιναιδολόγῳ <π>ατήρ · ἀνέθηκε μνήμης χάριν, ἐτῶν · κα’ · χαιρε. See Kroll 1921: 460.

62 — *Vesbinus cinaedus, Vitalio pedicavit* (Williams 2010: 428-9, n.29); *Cosmus Equitiae mag-nus cinaedus et fellator est suris apertis mari* (Varone 2002: 62); cf. SEG 53 1005. It is worth noting that in spite of their sexually explicit tone neither inscription comes from Pompeii’s brothel at the intersection of Vicolo del Lupanare and Vicolo del Balcone Pensile.

63 — <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/libproxy.usc.edu/entries/supplementum-epi-graphicum-graecum/rhegion-area-of-occhio-di-pellaro-10-km-from-rhegium-inscribed-tile-end-1st-cent-bcbeginning-1st-cent-ad-39-1062-a39_1062> accessed 08/05/2015 at 1:44pm.

64 — For a literary example of a duplicitous *kinaidos* see Phaedrus *Fab. App.* 10.

could be precisely this incongruity between the handler of hard wood or fired clay and the dissimulating performer of soft dance and music which arguably lies at the root of the pejorative force in these two instances.

A comparison of documentary, literary, and epigraphic evidence inevitably raise more questions than it answers in regards to the semantic range of the word κίναϊδος/*cinaedus* across different genres and cultural contexts. This analysis is nevertheless useful for understanding the function and uses of the word. In each genre of evidence the word can be used either to denote a kind of performer or as a pejorative term with connotations of some form of unacceptable behavior. While the performative character of the *kinaidos* seems to have some continuity across all of the different types of evidence, the connotations of the term's pejorative use appear to vary. They are predominantly sexual in the literary evidence (*i.e.* Cat. 16.1-2), both sexual and non-sexual in the epigraphic record (*i.e.* CIL IV 2319b; SEG 39 1062), and non-sexual in the one pejorative use from the papyrological evidence (*i.e.* Καλλιᾶγ[α]ξ ... ὁ κίναϊδος).

In conclusion, κίναϊδος in Greek documents from Egypt refers on the whole to a category of professionals who, from their close association with flute players in the papyri, can be understood as performers of some description. Only a little can be said to sum up the status of the performers and what they actually performed. The financial evidence shows that they are liable for contributions equal to a number of other occupations (P.Fouad I 68), yet are not exempt from the salt tax (O.Camb 1) as other more esteemed performers reportedly are⁶⁵. They appear to be in a more advantageous position than the flautists who accompany them (P.Col. Zen II 94) and may be part of a wider tradition of effeminate performers (P.Hibeh I 54). Two further points are notable: first, that *kinaidos* is used as an occupational designation over a considerable period of time – the third century BCE until the second century CE, or possibly later; and second, that one cache of documents, the Zenon archive, demonstrates that κίναϊδος was used in the third century BCE both as an occupational designation and as a pejorative term in the same cultural context. These points in turn raise the more far-reaching question of whether the performative valence of the *kinaidos/cinaedus* has more significance than scholars have previously accepted. The *cinaedus* as a performer at Rome has been discussed, but this significance has become secondary to discussions of its broader ontological force⁶⁶. The discussion of this figure in fourth

65 — P.Hal 1 l. 260-66 (c.256 BCE) mentions an exemption for artists of Dionysus alongside other practitioners of esteemed Greek cultural activities; for further discussion see Thompson (1997: 247).

66 — Williams 2010: 193-194; Habinek 2005: 196-9.

century Athens in no way takes the importance of this performative aspect into account.

Bibliography

- Bagnall R. S. and Derow P., (2004), *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bagnall R. S., (1995), *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*, London: Routledge.
- Bataille A., Guéraud O., Jouguet P., Lewis N., Marrou H., Scherer J. and Waddell W. G. (eds.), (1939), *Les Papyrus Fouad I*, Cairo: Publ.Soc. Fouad III.
- Bernand E., (1969), *Les Inscriptions grecques et latines de Philae Tome II*, Paris: Éditions du Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique.
- Clarysse W. and Thompson D. J. (eds.), (2006), *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford D. J., (1971), *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson J., (1997), *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Davidson J., (2007), *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Dilts M. R. (ed.), (1997), *Aeschinis Orationes*, Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Dodds E. R., (1959), *Plato: Gorgias*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Edgar C. C., (1925), "Records of a Village Club", *Raccolta di scritti in onore di G. Lumbroso*, Milan: Aegyptus. 369-76.
- Firatli N., (1964), *Les Siècles funéraires de Byzance, gréco-romaine, avec l'édition et l'index commenté des épitaphes par Louis Robert*, Paris: Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul 15.
- Gleason M., (1990), "The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-fashioning in the Second Century C.E.", in Halperin D., Winkler J. and Zeitlin F. (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press. 398-415.
- Grenfell B. P., Hunt A. S. and Smyly J. G. (eds.), (1902), *The Tebtunis Papyri I*, London: Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 4.
- Grenfell B. P. and Hunt A. S. (eds.), (1906), *The Hibeh Papyri I*, London: Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 7.
- Guéraud O. (ed.), (1931-1932), *ENTEΥΞΕΙΣ: Requêtes et plaintes adressées au Roi d'Égypte au III^e siècle avant J.-C.*, Cairo: Publ.Soc.Fouad I.
- Habinek T., (2005), *The World of Roman Song*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Hall E., (2006), *The Theatrical Cast of Athens*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Halperin D., (1990), *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and other essays on Greek Love*, New York: Routledge.
- Harmon A. M., Kilburn K. and Macleod D. M., (1967), *Lucian: Vol. 8*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hijmans B. L., Van Der Paardt R. T., Schmidt V., Settels C. B., Wesseling B. and Westendorp Boerma R. E. H. (eds.), (1985), *Apuleius, Lucius, Madaurensis: Metamorphoses: book VIII, text, introduction and commentary*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Hondius J. J. E., (2015), “Karnak (in templo Ammonis). Descripsit M. Pillet, Ann. Serv. Ant. Eg. XXIII 1923, 108 (8-661-663)”, in A. Chaniotis, T. Corsten, R. S. Stroud and R. A. Tybout (eds.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Brill Online.
- Kanovou N., (2011), *Aristophanes’ Comedy of Names: a Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*, Sozomena: Studies in the Recovery of Ancient Texts 8, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kroll W., (1921), “Kinaidos” *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Munich 11: 459-62.
- Lambin G., (1982), “Le Surnom BATALOS et mots de cette famille”, *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d’Histoire Anciennes* 56: 249-63.
- Legras B., (2001), “L’homosexualité masculine à travers les papyrus grecs d’Égypte: droit et morale”, in Cantarella E. and Thür G. (eds.), *Symposion 1997. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte = Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte*, 13: 269-284.
- Letronne J.-A., (1848), *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latine de L’Égypte Tome 2*, Paris: A L’Imprimerie Royale.
- McCoskey D. E., (2002), “Race Before ‘Whiteness’: Studying Identity in Ptolemaic Egypt”, *Critical Sociology* 28: 13-39.
- McGing B. C. (ed.), (1995), *Greek Papyri from Dublin*, Bonn: Pap.Texte Abh. XLII.
- Montserrat D., (1996), *Sex and Society in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, London: Kegan Paul International.
- Muhs B., (2005), *Tax Receipts, Taxpayers, and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Palmer L. R., (1945), *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Perpillou-Thomas F., (1995), “Artistes et athlètes dans les papyrus grec d’Égypte”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 108: 225-251.
- Perrone S., (2011), “Back to the Backstage: the papyrus P.Berol. inv. 13927”, *Trends in Classics* 3:126-153.
- Pestman P. W., (1981), *A Guide to the Zenon Archive* (P.L. Bat. 21) Leiden: Brill.
- Pestman P. W., (1994), *The New Papyrological Primer*, 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.

- Pleket H. W. and Stroud R. S., (2015), "Rhegion (area of Occhio di Pellaro, 10 km. from Rhegium), Inscribed tile, end 1st cent. B.C./beginning 1st cent. A.D. (39-1062)", in A. Chaniotis, T. Corsten, R. S. Stroud and R. A. Tybout (eds.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Brill Online.
- Richlin A., (1993), "Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law Against Love Between Men", *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3: 523-73.
- Rostovtzeff M., (1937), "Two Homeric Bowls in the Louvre", *American Journal of Archaeology* 41: 86-96.
- Scholl R. (ed.), (1990), *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte*, Stuttgart: Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, Beiheft 1.
- Tait J. G. (ed.), (1930), *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and Various Other Collections I*, London: Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 21.
- Taylor R., (1997), "Two Pathic Subcultures in Ancient Rome", *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7: 319-71.
- Thompson D. J., (1997), "The Infrastructure of Splendor: Census and Taxes in Ptolemaic Egypt", in Cartledge P., Garnsey P. and Gruen E. (eds.), *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vandoni M. (ed.), (1964), *Feste pubbliche e private nei documenti greci*, Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 8, Serie Papyrologica I, Milan; Varese: Istituto editoriale cisalpino.
- Varone A., (2002), *Erotica Pompeiana: Love Inscriptions on the Walls of Pompeii*, Trans. by Ria P. Berg, with revisions by David Harwood and Roger Ling, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Vitelli G. and Norsia M., (1917), *Papiri greci e latini vol. v.*, Florence: Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto.
- Westermann W. L., (1932), "Entertainment in the Villages of Graeco-Roman Egypt", *JEA* 18: 16-27.
- Westermann W. L., Keyes C. W. and Liebesny H. (eds.), (1940), *Columbia Papyri IV (P.Col.Zen. II)*, New York: Cisalpino-La Goliardica.
- Williams C., (2010), *Roman Homosexuality*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winkler J., (1990), *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, New York: Routledge.
- Zanker G., (2009), *Herodas: Mimiambos*, Oxford: Oxbow Books.