Vestnik drevney istorii
85/1 (2025), 109–119

Вестник древней истории
85/1 (2025), 109–119

DOI: 10.31857/S0321039125010071

THE CLERUCHY IN HELLENISTIC EGYPT

Dorothy J. Thompson

Girton College of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, the United Kingdom

E-mail: djt17@cam.ac.uk

ORCID: 0000-0001-6205-3894

Information from recently published papyri is combined with papyrological and epigraphical data already known to examine the current state of knowledge of the role of cleruchic land in Hellenistic Egypt. Over time, a system that started as a means of rewarding elite Macedonian cavalry forces and of tying them to their new home was extended to the infantry and different ranks of the police force. Furthermore, as Ptolemaic concerns developed in the second century BC, the institution was opened up and key local Egyptian families are found as recipients of cleruchic land, at least in Upper Egypt where the regime was subject to on-going threat. Members of such well-established families are shown to have been important in administrative and religious, as well as in the military sphere. Finally, attention is drawn to changing local differences in the fiscal relationship of cleruchic land to the central royal treasury.

Keywords: cavalry, cleruchic land, cleruchy, Fayum, infantry, land surveys, police, Ptolemaic Egypt, Upper Egypt

КЛЕРУХИИ В ЭЛЛИНИСТИЧЕСКОМ ЕГИПТЕ

Д. Дж. Томпсон

Гиртон-колледж Кэмбриджского университета, Кэмбридж, Великобритания

E-mail: djt17@cam.ac.uk

В представленной статье данные из недавно опубликованных папирусов объединены со сведениями из уже известных папирологических и эпиграфических источников, чтобы оценить современное состояние знаний о клерухии в эллинистическом Египте. Постепенно система, которая начиналась как способ поощрения элитной македонской кавалерии и укрепления их связи с новым местом жительства, распространилась на пехоту и различные чины полиции. С расширением интересов династии Птолемеев во II в. до н.э. этот институт стал более открытым, и наиболее влиятельные

The author. Dorothy J. Thompson – Fellow of Girton College, University of Cambridge.

египетские семьи также стали получать наделы таким образом, по крайней мере, в Верхнем Египте, где царская власть постоянно находилась под угрозой. Мы видим, что члены таких статусных семей занимали важные посты не только в военной, но и в административной и религиозной сферах. Статья также обращает внимание на изменение локальных различий в фискальных отношениях между клерухиями и царской казной.

Keywords: кавалерия, клерухия, Фаюм, пехота, землеустройство, полиция, Египет времен Птолемеев, Верхний Египет

This study is presented as a coda to that of Alain Bresson. It represents an overview – a snapshot even – of recent changes in our understanding of the cleruchy in Hellenistic Egypt. For most of the twentieth century, the commonly accepted view of the role and status of cleruchs and their land was that outlined by the editors of the first volume of *The Tebtunis Papyri* (1902). This derived from papyrus texts that were written in Greek and came predominantly from the Fayum (the Arsinoite nome) in Lower Egypt[1]. Despite some earlier warning bells, it was the publication in 2002 of the second volume of the Leipzig papyri that finally forced a fuller reassessment of the situation[2]. It became increasingly clear that the earlier picture, based on sources that were limited both geographically and chronologically, was in need of revision; a far more nuanced version was required to take account of change within the system and regional differences. And, as more generally in Ptolemaic studies, it became increasingly recognised that texts written in Egyptian demotic, especially those from Upper Egypt up the Nile valley to the south, have the potential to modify the picture[3]. In what follows, therefore, I shall attempt to identify the most important of these changes and incorporate new insights into an account of the Ptolemaic cleruchy. The issues I shall particularly focus on are the identity of the cleruchs themselves, the size and status of their land and the relationship of both to the ruling power.

In outline, our understanding of the cleruchy in Hellenistic Egypt remains little changed; it is in the detail of allotments, their recipients, and their administration (especially in fiscal matters) that new texts are modifying the picture. The institution itself is still best viewed as a solution adopted by the first Ptolemy to the problem of keeping his troops loyal in the post-Alexander world of rival dynasts competing for military resources. In adapting a practice of land grants for troops that was already part of the experience of both Egypt and Greece[4], Ptolemy son of Lagos made allotments to members of

[1] *P. Tebt.* I, p. 545–548 with *P. Tebt.* IV, p. 10–12; cf., for example, Lesquier 1911; Rostovtzeff 1941, I, 284–287; Crawford 1971, 53–85. More recently: Scheuble-Reiter 2012; Thompson 2014; Fischer-Bovet 2014, 199–237; Monson 2016; Christensen *et al.* 2017, 17, 39–43. For all papyrus references, see the online version of the *Checklist* (Oates et al. 2001) at www.papyri.info.

[2] Duttenhöfer 2002, especially *P. Lips.* II 124 (after 137 BC), with commentary.

[3] Cf. Manning 2003; 2010.

[4] Hdt. II. 168; Diod. I. 73. 6–9, earlier Egyptian military land grants; earlier Greek cleruchy, see *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*[4], *s. v.* (Hornblower); Fischer-Bovet 2014, 200–201; cf. Plut. *Per.* 11, to provide φόβον δὲ καὶ φρουράν. The Macedonian experience is probably the most relevant; see n. 10 below.

his army, at first more specifically to his Macedonian cavalry troops, so providing them with an economic base and a home in the land where he hoped they would settle. This had the additional advantage that he would only need to pay them when actually under arms. The success of this system was illustrated in 307/306 BC when Ptolemaic troops were defeated and captured by Demetrius the Besieger at Salamis on Cyprus; the troops deserted back to their defeated commander rather than take up the offer of service under Demetrius. For it was in Egypt, Diodorus reports, that their goods and chattels (*aposkeuai*) lay (Diod. XX. 47. 4)[5].

The system evolved over time with extensions both in the degree of ownership and in the range of those in receipt of cleruchic allotments. Land grants were made by the king from land that was his to dispose of[6]. The relationship of cleruchs to their land, however, developed and changed, as has long been recognized. At first grants appear to have been lifetime grants, with plots reverting to the crown on the death of the original cleruch. This was still the case under Ptolemy III Euergetes, as may be seen from an official instruction to one Nikanor from 238 BC[7]:

> To Nikanor. The cavalry members listed below have died. Therefore take their *klēroi* back into the royal account.

Later, the situation was either modified or made clearer. Under Ptolemy IV Philopator the possibility of inheritance by sons on the death of the original cleruch is explicitly recorded in the course of some official correspondence concerning 30-aroura cleruchs. Land, we now learn, was granted to an individual and his descendants[8]. The process of succession was not, however, straightforward, and the registration of any sons was needed before they gained access to their father's land[9]:

> (instructions are given) to hold the *klēros* in the royal account together with the dues from the current crop until its registration to his sons, should he have any, within the days set down in the (royal) order...

So what in Ptolemaic Egypt was nominally an inheritable plot in practice still came under official surveillance. Such a retention of control by the crown is reminiscent of the situation in Macedon earlier. There a cleruchic grant originally made in the fourth century by Philip II to the grandfather and later to the father of Perdiccas as 'part of their hereditary estate, for them and their descendants, to own as theirs with rights of alienation and sale' in practice needed recognition and renewal by Cassander at a later date[10].

---

[5] On ἀποσκευή, see Holleaux 1942.

[6] *P. Rev.* 36. 11–14 (259 BC), ἐ]ν τοῖς κλήροις οἷς εἰλήφασι παρὰ τ[ο]ῦ βασιλέως.

[7] *P. Hib.* I 81.5–6 (238 BC), Νικάνορ[ι.] οἱ ὑπογεγραμμ[έ]νοι ἱππεῖς τετ[ε]λευτήκασιν. ἀνάλαβε οὖν αὐτῶν [τοὺ]ς κλήρους εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν.

[8] *W. Chrest.* 336. 26–27 (217 BC), ὧι ὑπῆρχεν ἡ γῆ \αὐτῶι/ καὶ ἐκγόνοις ('the one to whom and to whose descendants the land belonged').

[9] *W. Chrest.* 336. 30–33 (217 BC), κατέχειν τὸν κλῆρ[ο]ν ἐν τῶι βασιλικῶι σὺν τοῖς \ἐκ τοῦ/ ἐνεστηκότος σπόρο[υ] ἐκφορίοις ἕως τοῦ, ἐὰν ὑπάρχωσιν αὐτῶι υἱοί, ἐπιγραφῆναι ἐν ταῖς κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα ἡμέραις.

[10] *Syll.*[3] 332 = *SEG* 38.620.10–15 (306–297 BC), ἐμ πατρικοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκγόνοις, κυρίοις οὖσι κεκτῆσθαι καὶ ἀλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι. On the implications of this renewal, see Bresson 2016, 112–115.

In such a way, Hellenistic kings continued to exercise an ultimate right over land they had granted to others[11]. From Egypt, new texts have helped illuminate the problems inherent in such a tricky situation. Those left orphaned but already serving in the army could indeed expect to inherit a father's cleruchic land, but only when official recognition of their new status was granted. In the meantime, orphans needed others to protect and act for them in their somewhat vulnerable situation[12].

Over time, an individual cleruch's rights over his land seem to have strengthened further and by the first century BC even women could inherit (though in most cases a more direct link with military service still continued)[13]. A demotic text from 68 BC now provides details of the ways in which a plot could be divided among multiple offspring. In this contract from Panopolis (*P. Moscow* inv. 123) Hatres, a cavalryman or (in Greek) *katoikos hippeus*, divides his property among five of his six sons. His two older sons, who both have double Egyptian and Greek names, receive half each of 39 arouras, specified as 'land in release' and providing income for a *katoikos*; this land was made up of three plots in two different named locations[14]. A further four plots (also 'in release', so presumably cleruchic) are divided among the other three sons. The sixth son receives cash; his one daughter gets no land, just a regular food allowance and a dowry. It may perhaps be assumed that at least the two older sons, with their double names and separate inheritance, would follow their father into the ranks of the *katoikoi* and so into military service.

The rationale for the cleruchy in Egypt was, as already noted, the need to secure troops for the army, and in the first place these were immigrant cavalry troops. A consideration of the changing identity of the cleruchs involved in the system will allow us to incorporate new evidence into the picture. Cleruchs were known by names that signified the nominal size of their holdings; such a classification forms a gauge to the relative importance to the crown of different sections of the military or other security forces on whom the king relied. The earliest allotments were standardly 100-aroura grants made to members of the cavalry, who were now termed *hekatontarouroi* or 100-aroura cleruchs. With one aroura equivalent to 0.275 of a hectare their holdings were 27.5 hectares large, sometimes larger and sometimes a little less. Later, slightly smaller allotments were made – for 80-aroura (*ogdoēkontarouroi*), 70-aroura *hebdomēkontarouroi* cavalrymen, and so on[15]. The Greek names (with very few exceptions) of cavalry cleruchs indicate their background. Immigrant Greeks formed the core of the army and their privileged status as cleruchs was a measure of their standing. As a group, they later acquired

[11] The same treatment applied in Egypt to gift-estates (γῆ ἐν δωρεᾶι).

[12] In *SB* XVIII 13092. 38–41 (c. 143/142 BC), Arsinoite, an orphan's sponsors complain on his behalf of their fellow soldier's treatment by tax collectors and his threatened exclusion from cavalry membership, cf. SB XVIII 13095 (142/141 BC), Arsinoite, another orphan's guardian (l. 2, προεστηκώς) complains of excessive tax demands on his charge.

[13] *P. Tebt.* I 124. 25–27 = *C. Ord. Ptol.* 54. 3–5 (118 BC), with μένειν ... κυρίως, with Thompson 2014, 368–370, for translation and further discussion. For female holders of cleruchic land, see Fischer-Bovet 2014, 225, n. 140, 232.

[14] Translation in Thompson 2014, 371–373. On 'land in release', i.e. land freed by the king from charges due on other classes of land, see below n. 35; on *katoikoi hippeis*, see n. 16.

[15] See Uebel 1968, 355–377, with a still unparalleled listing of cleruchs until the reign of Ptolemy VI; Fisher-Bovet 2014, 120–123, the settlement of different groups; Scheuble-Reiter 2012, a detailed study of cavalry settlers.

the designation of cavalry settlers (*katoikoi hippeis*) and these remained the elite cleruchs throughout the Ptolemaic period[16].

Smaller holdings went to other military ranks and, from the time of Ptolemy III, the cleruchy was extended also to Egyptians. Again nomenclature is indicative of the background from which the different cleruchs came and the size of allotments indicative of status, with Egyptians holding smaller grants. Village names such as Ibion Eikosipentatouron or Ibion Pentarouron in the Arsinoite nome presumably reflect group settlements based around an ibis shrine of cleruchs with, respectively, 25 or 5 arouras apiece (i.e. grants of 6.9 or 1.4 hectares). Five-aroura cleruchs were generally Egyptian *machimoi* or infantrymen who might also be used for guard duty[17]. So, after an initial period when Greek cavalrymen were the only recipients, the scope of the cleruchy was broadened out from the second half of the third century BC.

The battle of Raphia in 217 BC, with the victory of Ptolemy IV over Antiochus III, was claimed by the Greek historian Polybius to have been a turning point for the Ptolemies in terms of their relations with the majority population of their realm (Polyb. V. 107. 2–3). Although this claim is not altogether borne out by events, some changes were afoot and some of these involved the Ptolemaic cleruchy. Not only, as noted above, were sons now able to inherit their fathers' *klēroi*, but cleruchic land was now granted not just to members of the army but also to members of the police and other security forces. And most of those benefitting from such grants, to judge from their names, were Egyptians rather than Greeks. In this development under Ptolemy IV and on into the second century, different branches of the ubiquitous security forces were incorporated into the cleruchic system with moderate grants of land. The mounted desert police (*chersephippoi*) were clearly a key force since they received grants of 30 arouras (8.25 hectares)[18]; itinerant policemen (*ephodoi*) received 24 arouras (6.6 hectares), while desert guards (*erēmophylakes*), regular policemen (*phylakitai*) and probably river guards (*potamophylakes*) received just 10 arouras (2.75 hectares) apiece[19]. And later, from the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor, some such cleruchs are even on occasion found elevated into the ranks of the cavalry settlers (the *katoikoi hippeis*)[20]. Not only was the cleruchy opened up but it was also becoming more flexible.

In the second century, following the great revolt in the Thebaid (206–186 BC) and in the context of further dynastic struggles and reforms in the army, the cleruchy was extended more widely to the infantry[21]. Once again, this represents an extension of this originally elite Greek institution to the majority population of Egypt. The extent of infantry grants in the Thebaid in the later second century is illustrated in a recently

---

[16] See Scheuble-Reiter 2012, 76.

[17] *Idion pentarouron*, CPR XVIII 3. 49–50; 5. 97–98 (231 BC), with p. 103–106, on both settlements; cf. *P. Grad.* 12 = *SB* III 6285 (228 BC), an individual *pentarouros*. For *machimoi pentarouroi* with Greek names, see *P. Petrie* III 100 (b). ii. 13–37 (third century BC) and Fischer-Bovet 2014, 162–164.

[18] In practice the *chersephippos* settled in Kerkeosiris (Arsinoite nome) under Ptolemy IV, described as a 30-aroura man (*triakontarouros*), received 34 $^{1}/_{16}$ $^{1}/_{32}$ arouras, *P. Tebt.* I 60. 21; 62. 34–35); his name, Pantauchos son of Pantauchos, was also not Egyptian.

[19] See Uebel 1968, 169, n. 4, with details; Kramer 1991, 103–104; Clarysse, Thompson 2006, II, 176–177; Fischer-Bovet 2014, 121, with n. 32 on 10-aroura cleruchs.

[20] E.g. *P. Tebt.* I 32, with Thompson 2014, 366–368.

[21] On army reforms, see Fischer-Bovet 2014, 132–133, cavalry; 142–148, infantry.

published Greek land survey from the Apollonopolite (or Edfu) nome. Generally, in Upper Egypt, cleruchic land was far less significant in extent than further north in the Arsinoite and other neighboring nomes. According to this newly published survey, in 119/118 BC cleruchic land accounted for just over one percent of all land in the Apollonopolite nome[22]. Grants there had been made to cavalry cleruchs from at least the third century BC, but in 138/137 BC, under Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, seventy-five infantrymen, known simply as men (*andres*), were introduced to the cleruchy. Their plots of 10 arouras were actually assigned to these new Egyptian cleruchs three years later[23]. Such large-scale settlement of infantrymen was a feature of this period. Five years after that in the Apollonopolite, immediately following the civil war between Ptolemy VIII and his two queens, a similar settlement of Egyptian cavalry and infantrymen was made in the village of Kerkeosiris in the Arsinoite nome. In Kerkeosiris 7-aroura grants were made to infantrymen termed *machimoi*.

In a further innovation, documented in these two particular cases of grants made to Egyptian soldiers, the allotments were also linked to the support and financing of local Egyptian cults. In the Apollonopolite nome, one aroura out of each nominal 10-aroura holding was ceded to Horus of Bakhthis, great god, lord of the sky, for the completion of work on his main temple in Edfu. At Kerkeosiris in the Fayum, Egyptian *machimoi* dedicated a small proportion of their land grants (possibly ½ aroura from each 7-aroura plot) to the temple of the crocodile god, Soknebtunis. In this way the king linked local cult to land grants for his Egyptian soldiers[24]. The information from the new Apollonopolite survey on the involvement of the cleruchy in financing local cult adds significance to the example from the Arsinoite that was already known.

In such ways, therefore, a system initiated to tie valued Macedonian and Greek troops to the country had, over a period of some two centuries, been successfully extended to different branches of the local police and to the Egyptian military forces who were now equally important to the Ptolemies. As part of a developing system of relations between Greeks and Egyptians and in recognition too of the importance for the population of local religion, cleruchic land played a significant role.

So far we have primarily been viewing the cleruchy as an institution closely connected to the military needs of Ptolemaic Egypt. Those who received grants were fighting men or, later, those involved in other aspects of law and order. As the range of those eligible for cleruchic allotments grew, so over time the grants themselves diminished in size; the size of a land grant remained a sure way of measuring status. There are, however, two further aspects to the cleruchy that are worth consideration. The first of these has been discussed before and is only sketched in here but the second is new.

First, is the agricultural role of cleruchic land and the question of the kind of land used for allotments. Over-population with resulting pressure on cultivable land seems not to have been a problem in pre-modern Egypt. Monson, however, has recently argued that

[22] Christensen *et al.* 2017, 13.

[23] *P. Haun*. IV 70. 93–215 (119/118 BC); 10-aroura plots in practice averaged out at 8.5 arouras each. When one group of 27 infantrymen failed to turn up to claim their land, this was later reclassified. 7-aroura plots in Kerkeosiris were standardly 6.5 arouras, Crawford 1971, 69–71, tab. 1; *P. Tebt.* IV, p. 15.

[24] See *P. Haun*. IV 70, p. 47–49, with references and further discussion.

the Nile valley already contained a higher density of population than did other areas in Ptolemaic Egypt, especially the Delta and the Fayum[25]. Nevertheless, good land is always at a premium and its allocation to immigrants could have given rise to tensions within the existing population. One way is which this was avoided by the early Ptolemies was by linking cleruchic settlement to a programme of land reclamation. Initiated under the first two Ptolemies, large-scale projects of reclamation took place, especially in the Fayum, where Macedonian expertise in drainage was combined with Egyptian expertise in irrigation[26]. With more land coming under cultivation, new settlers need not displace the old. Elsewhere too cleruchic allotments were increasingly made from what was potentially fertile land but land not currently under cultivation – with a view no doubt to its improvement[27]. There are many historical examples of this practice. The Roman emperor Pertinax tried it in both Italy and the provinces, as did Mohamed Ali in early nineteenth century Egypt[28]. In neither of these later examples were soldiers specifically involved but the principle is the same. Where there was land to bring under cultivation and manpower available to do so, the state could benefit from a ruler's generosity in granting this land to others. And since the king's wealth depended on the produce of the land, allotments for his soldiers that involved land reclamation served more than one end at the same time.

The second, further aspect to the cleruchy identified in new material is its use to reward not just army men but also members of influential local native families whose support, especially in Upper Egypt, was crucial to the Ptolemies. The new Edfu land survey *P. Haun*. IV 70 (119/118 BC), already mentioned in the context of infantry settlement in Upper Egypt, is important in bringing into focus this aspect of royal policy. What is relevant here is the cleruchic land allotted to cavalry cleruchs (258 arouras in total). In the year of the survey just over 40 arouras were recorded as belonging to unnamed *katoikoi hippeis* previously in the unit of Ptolemaios son of Apollodoros (not otherwise known), but all the rest – 218 arouras or 60 hectares – was held by a certain Ptolemaios son of Pasas.

Ptolemaios' holding was made up of different plots of various origins. 100 arouras went back to before the great revolt of the Thebaid and are described as land of cavalry settlers from the city (*politikoi katoikoi hippeis*), probably Edfu. Originally this particular plot belonged to one Sommounis, like Ptolemaios a member of this urban cavalry group. When exactly Ptolemaios acquired this land is unclear (the text is broken in l. 38) but it was in his hands by 142/141 BC, when the original *klēros* of 140 ¾ arouras was found to have been eroded by the Nile flood to the more standard 100-aroura size. A further 98 arouras came from his father Pasas son of Pasas, who had been granted the land in 167/166 BC following the invasion of Antiochus IV. Ptolemaios most probably inherited this on the death of Pasas and was enrolled in the cleruchy in 164/163 BC. All of this land was located in the two more fertile areas of the nome – in the toparchy of Apollonopolis itself and in the upper toparchy. In addition in 126/125 BC Ptolemaios

[25] Monson 2012, 32–69.
[26] Thompson 1999; cf. 2007.
[27] See Crawford 1971, 57–58, with details also for grants of both *sporimos* (fertile) and derelict (*chersos*) land in the third and second centuries BC.
[28] For more details, see Crawford 1971, 57–58.

personally acquired a further 20 arouras of dry cleruchic land, presumably in the expectation of its improvement or exploitation[29]. These 218 arouras belonging to Ptolemaios son of Pasas accounted for 85% of the land of the *katoikoi hippeis* in the nome. The landholder stands out as unusual.

The survey provides further details about the family of Ptolemaios son of Pasas. First, we may note their nomenclature. The name Ptolemaios is a loyal dynastic name, one often adopted by Egyptians, but Pasas, the name of both Ptolemaios' father and grandfather, is – like Sommounis – a good Egyptian name. It is certainly surprising to find such names for cavalry cleruchs, but this seems likely to be connected to the survey's Upper Egyptian provenance. It is possible that Pasas I was born before the great revolt of the Thebaid. If so, the family either backed the right side in this period of trouble or was rehabilitated later, since Ptolemaios' father Pasas is described as commander-in-chief in Apollonopolis[30]. Ptolemaios himself held the honorific title of chief bodyguard (l. 39, *archisōmatophylax*). Like his father before him, this *politikos katoikos hippeus* was clearly an important individual in the area.

The significance of this new information is in showing the use of the cleruchy, even before the great revolt of the Thebaid, to reward high-standing Egyptians for their service to the crown. Like Sommounis, Pasas son of Pasas formed part of an elite force of urban cavalry who could be expected loyally to play their part in upholding the regime. For this they were granted both responsibility and land. So too, in a later generation, Ptolemaios son of Pasas was important in both administrative and military spheres.

Ptolemaios son of Pasas, with all his cleruchic land, becomes still more interesting when the evidence of the Apollonopolite land survey, preserved on papyrus and written in Greek, is set alongside surviving information from Egyptian sources. From Bakhthis, the cemetery of Apollonopolis nearby, attention was drawn in 1969 by the French Egyptologist Jean Yoyotte to a fascinating set of epitaphs that survive in two versions, one written in Egyptian and one in Greek. The stones themselves, now on display in the Cairo museum, are quite small and not particularly impressive; the epitaphs are written in red on limestone, some of them Egyptian-style with hieroglyphs topped by the wings of Horus, and others with triangular-shaped tops carrying Greek verses in honour of the deceased. Recognising the Greek name Euagoras in hieroglyphs, Yoyotte convincingly argued that these formed a set of parallel epitaphs for members of an important local family, most of whose members carried double names, normally with their Egyptian names in hieroglyphs and Greek names in Greek. One of these family members was Pamenches son of Pasas, also known as Ptolemaios. And here, on these tombstones, we find our cleruch, now recorded not just as a cavalry settler with an important administrative role in the nome but, as detailed on the hieroglyphic tombstone of his son Pasas III/Apollonios (who held the same appointments), the holder too of many local priesthoods. For Ptolemaios/Pamenches son of Pasas held the following posts[31]:

> Great general and commander, sole friend (*sc*. of the king), chief of the cavalry, valiant in battle, first representative of his Majesty whose decisions he carries out in the territory of the south, third prophet, second prophet, prophet of

[29] *P. Haun*. IV 70. 33–92 (119/118 BC), with comm. *ad loc*. and tab. 7.
[30] *P. Haun*. IV 70. 75, προκαθηγούμενος.
[31] Kamal 1904–1905, 19–20, no. 22050, with Yoyotte 1969, 134.

> Osiris, prophet of Amon, prophet of Harsemtheus-the-child, the son of Hathor, prophet of Min, prophet of Horus of Bakhthis, the great god, lord of the sky, lord of Mesent, royal kinsman.

And in the Greek verse epitaph of his son, Ptolemaios/Pamenches is further described as bearer of the *mitra*, the special headdress which signified a later, still more honorific appointment as royal kinsman (*syngenēs*)[32].

What this identification reveals is a further, political use of the cleruchy. Men like Ptolemaios/Pamenches son of Pasas belonged to influential Egyptian families of the area, on whose cooperation the Ptolemies relied to retain control and to run their administration. Such men were also likely to hold important priestly appointments in their local cults, This Ptolemaic reliance on local grandees is indeed a distinctive feature of Upper Egypt, particularly in the period following the Theban revolt. And so, in the unsettled area of the south, where Ptolemaic interests were constantly under threat, the king extended the institution of the cleruchy in order to retain the support of leading families of the area[33].

Finally, we reach the question of the bottom line. How did the balance sheet work out for those involved, both the king and the recipients of cleruchic land, and how far has new evidence changed the picture? So far in this enquiry we have focused on the less tangible benefits for the crown – military service, security, loyalty, cooperation, support – but in return for their land cleruchs also acquired some fiscal obligations to the crown. This is another subject for which the publication of new texts has modified the prevailing picture. A degree of variability has entered the scene in terms of both geographical location and the level and nature of cleruchic dues. And with regard to the fiscal status of cleruchs, new data often raise more questions than they solve.

First, we should sketch in the prevailing picture which, as noted earlier, is based primarily on administrative texts preserved from the crocodile and other mummies from the cemeteries of Tebtunis in the south Fayum. From among these texts, the information contained in a series of local village land surveys, dating mainly from the late second century BC, provided the fairly clear picture which until recently dominated the interpretation of the fiscal status of cleruchic land. According to the Tebtunis papyri, such land belonged to the category of 'land in release', land that was freed by the king from taxes due on other classes of land[34]. Instead of *ekphoria* charged on royal land (*basilikē gē*), the Tebtunis records, many of them from the small village of Kerkeosiris, show cleruchic land as simply charged a one-artaba tax per aroura – an *artabieia* tax, which at different times and places might be doubled or halved by the crown. One artaba was far less than the standard *ekphorion* charged on crown land, which in the Fayum regularly stood at just under 5 artabas to the aroura[35]. Such was the situation here in the late second century BC. Earlier, however, we now know that things were not the same.

---

[32] *C. Jud. Syr. Eg.* p. 84–88, no. 2. 19–20 (103–101 BC); cf. Fischer-Bovet 2014, 370, no. 18 (with Apollonios numbered Pasas II). On the *mitra*, see Moyer 2011a.

[33] See Moyer 2011b; Fischer-Bovet 2014, 326–328.

[34] On 'land in release' (Greek: γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει; demotic: *nty sḫ wꜣy*), see most recently *P. Haun.* IV 70. 25, 247, with comm. and introduction p. 20–22.

[35] For *ekphorion* as either 'rent' or 'tax', see Monson 2012, 166–167; 2016, 1616–1617; *P. Haun.* IV 70. 283–284, with comm.

Some intriguing demotic texts, recently discussed by Andrew Monson, show that a group of thirty two cleruchs, most probably 25-aroura men and almost all with Greek names, from the Arsinoite nome in the late third century (Ptolemy III or IV) enjoyed a 'release' (demotic *pꜣwy*) or tax-free status on just 5 arouras of their individual plots; tax at the regular rate of 5 ¼ artabas to an aroura was charged on the rest of their land[36]. And a further demotic text from the same source records a cavalry cleruch with 110 arouras who paid tax on his full holding without any 'release' at all. It would now appear that the extension of 'release' to the whole of a cleruchic plot was a later development, at least in the Arsinoite nome, and that earlier cleruchs were liable for tax at a more standard rate on much if not all of their land. Just as in the course of the third century BC the rate of the salt tax was lowered on more than one occasion[37], so too it now appears that the king made increasing concessions to his cleruchs in respect of their fiscal obligations.

The Arsinoite, however, was only one nome among many and the degree of local difference is becoming clearer as more texts are published and studied. In Upper Egypt a somewhat different tax regime applied. The main tax there was a harvest tax (Greek: ἐπιγραφή; demotic: *šmw*), which was charged on land actually under cultivation at a rate similar to that for *ekphoria* in the contemporary Fayum[38]. In details provided for cleruchic land in the new Edfu land survey, figures are recorded for the harvest tax for all plots except for that of Sommounis, which as already noted predated the great Theban revolt (l. 33–54). On that land no tax rate is recorded. Whether the record of *epigraphē* for cleruchic land actually implies its charge (as opposed to an historic record from when earlier it was land *en phorologiai*, l. 280) is not entirely certain; the probability is that it does[39]. Furthermore, unlike the situation in the contemporary Fayum known from the Tebtunis land surveys, in the Apollonopolite nome cleruchic land was totalled together with 'land in release' but not actually included in that category. In this way too things were different.

The special status of the Thebaid is recognized in the Leipzig text that I mentioned at the start[40]. In the course of a record of various royal rulings and appeals on fiscal matters preserved in a text from that volume, a new system is outlined for raising revenue from cavalry settlers. In 158/157 BC the *dioikētēs* Dioskourides introduced an innovation to replace the harvest tax that was earlier paid into the cavalry account (l. 14, *hippikē prosodos*). An overall sum was now imposed and this was to be divided among all cleruchs except for those in the Thebaid, which in the ruling is explicitly excluded from the new system. Problems followed – of course – when those liable could not meet their dues. The text fills in some details; royal rulings, it appears, had precedence over those of the *dioikētēs*.

This outline of the state of our knowledge of the Ptolemaic cleruchy is merely provisional. As more and more texts – especially demotic texts – are published, the picture

[36] Monson 2016, 1621–1624; just occasionally the tax stood at two artabas.

[37] Clarysse, Thompson 2006, II, 44–52.

[38] See Vandorpe 2000, an important study based on ostraca with tax receipts, some in Greek but mainly in demotic.

[39] *P. Haun*. IV 70, introduction, p. 29–30.

[40] *P. Lips*. II 124. 21–25 (after 137 BC); cf. l. 36, 'those nomes in which the *epigraphē* is levied'. See the editor's discussion and Monson 2016, 1617–1618.

fills out. Complications are uncovered, as are changes in period and place. The fiscal demands of the crown continued, but more and more concessions seem to have been made as the cleruchs themselves became established on the land granted their forebears. The cleruchy in Hellenistic Egypt was an ever-changing institution and one that was important for the agricultural exploitation of the land and in many dimensions for the continued success of the Ptolemaic monarchy.

References

Bresson, A. 2016: *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy: Institutions, Markets and Growth in the City-States*. Princeton.

Christensen, Th., Thompson, D.J., Vandorpe, K. 2017: *Land and Taxes in Ptolemaic Egypt. An Edition, Translation and Commentary for the Edfu Land Survey (P. Haun. IV 70)*. Cambridge.

Clarysse, W., Thompson, D.J. 2006: *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*. Vol. I–II. Cambridge.

Crawford, D.J. 1971: *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*. Cambridge.

Duttenhöfer, R. 2002: *Griechische Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu Leipzig (P. Lips. II)*. Munich–Leipzig.

Fischer-Bovet, Chr. 2014: *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Cambridge.

Holleaux, M. 1942: 'Ceux qui sont dans le bagage'. *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* 3–4, 15–26.

Kamal, A. 1904–1905: *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. № 22001–22208. Stèles ptolémaïques et romaines*. T. I–II. Cairo.

Kramer, B. 1991: *Das Vertragsregister von Theogonis (P. Vindob. G 40618)*. (Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, XVIII). Vienna.

Lesquier, J. 1911: *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Paris.

Manning, J.G. 2003: *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Cambridge.

Manning, J.G. 2010: *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305–30 BC*. Princeton–Oxford.

Monson, A. 2012: *From the Ptolemies to the Romans: Political and Economic Change in Egypt*. Cambridge.

Monson, A. 2016: Harvest Taxes on Cleruchic Land in the Third Century BCE. In: T. Derda, A. Łajtar, J. Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology, Warsaw 29 July – 3 August 2013*. (Journal of Juristic Papyrology. Supplement, 28). Warsaw, 1615–1631.

Moyer, I.S. 2011a: Court, *chora*, and Culture in Late Ptolemaic Egypt. *American Journal of Philology* 132, 15–44.

Moyer, I.S. 2011b: Finding a Middle Ground: Culture and Politics in the Ptolemaic Thebaid. In: P.J. Dorman, B.M. Bryan (eds.), *Perspectives on Ptolemaic Thebes*. Chicago, 115–145.

Oates, J.F., Bagnall, R.S., Clackson, S.J., O'Brien, A., Sosin, J.D., Wilfong, T.G., Worp, K.A. 2001: *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*. 5th ed. (Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists. Supplement, 9). Oakville–Oxford.

Rostovtzeff, M. 1941: *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Vol. I–III. Oxford.

Scheuble-Reiter, S. 2012: *Die Katökenreiter im ptolemäischen Ägypten*. Munich.

Thompson, D.J. 1999: Irrigation and Drainage in the Early Ptolemaic Fayyum. In: A.K. Bowman, E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*. Oxford, 107–122.

Thompson, D.J. 2007: The Exceptionality of the Early Ptolemaic Fayum. In: M. Capasso, P. Davoli (eds.), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum. Proceedings of the International Meeting of Egyptology and Papyrology, Lecce, June 8th–10th 2005*. Lecce, 303–310.

Thompson, D.J. 2014: Kleruchic Land in the Ptolemaic Period. In: J.G. Keenan, J.G. Manning, U. Yiftach-Firanko (eds.), *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest: A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation with Introductions and Commentary*. Cambridge–New York, 363–373.

Uebel, F. 1968: *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*. Berlin.

Vandorpe, K. 2000: The Ptolemaic *epigraphe* or Harvest Tax (*shemu*). *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 46, 169–232.

Yoyotte, J. 1969: Bakhthis: religion égyptienne et culture grecque à Edfou. In: *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine. Colloque de Strasbourg 16–18 mai 1967*. Paris, 127–141.