

DOI: 10.31857/S0321039125010081

MILITARY LAND ALLOTMENTS IN ANCIENT EGYPT

Brian Muhs

The University of Chicago, Chicago (IL), the United States of America

E-mail: bpmuhs@uchicago.edu

The ancient Egyptians had a long tradition of allotting land to soldiers. From the beginning of the sixteenth century BC at the latest, land in Egypt and possibly in Nubia as well was sometimes given to demobilized Egyptian and foreign soldiers as a reward for service and possibly as a means of support between military campaigns. From the seventh century BC onwards, some land in Egypt appears to have carried an explicit obligation for its holders for military service when called for duty. These traditions are distinct from the Athenian system of cleruchies in the sixth through fourth centuries BC, in which the service obligation was linked to citizenship. Consequently, both the Egyptian traditions and the Athenian system may have informed and influenced the Ptolemaic system of cleruchies in Egypt in the fourth through second centuries BC, as Michael Rostovtzeff suggested already in 1941.

Keywords: Ancient Egypt, pharaonic period, land tenure, mercenaries, Athens, cleruchies, Ptolemaic kingdom, soldiers

РАЗДАЧА ЗЕМЛИ ЗА ВОИНСКУЮ СЛУЖБУ В ДРЕВНЕМ ЕГИПТЕ

Б. Мус

Чикагский университет, Чикаго (Иллинойс), США

E-mail: bpmuhs@uchicago.edu

Выделение земли солдатам существовало в древнем Египте долгое время. Уже с начала XVI в. до н.э., если не раньше, земля в Египте и, вероятно, также в Нубии иногда выдавалась демобилизованным египетским и иностранным солдатам в качестве награды за службу и, возможно, в качестве средства поддержки в период между военными кампаниями. Начиная с VII в. до н.э., некоторые земельные участки в Египте, по-видимому, содержали в себе прямое обязательство для их владельцев нести военную службу, когда объявлялся призыв. Эта система отличается от системы афинских

The author. Brian Muhs – Associate Professor in the Institute for the Study of Ancient Cultures, the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, and the College at the University of Chicago.

клерухий VI–IV вв. до н.э., в которой воинские обязанности были связаны с гражданством. Вероятно, как египетские традиции, так и афинская система оказали влияние на систему клерухий при Птолемах в Египте IV–II вв. до н.э., как предположил М. Ростовцев еще в 1941 г.

Ключевые слова: Древний Египет, фараоновский период, землевладение, наемники, Афины, клерухии, царство Птолемеев, солдаты

The Athenians developed a system in the late sixth, fifth and early fourth centuries BC, now known as cleruchies, whereby the Athenians confiscated lands outside of Attica from defeated states and assigned allotments therefrom to their own citizens, who were obliged as citizens to provide military service as needed. Then the Ptolemies applied a similar system to Egypt in the late fourth, third and second centuries BC, assigning allotments to veteran soldiers in return for an oath of loyalty and military service without the privilege of citizenship¹. The practice of providing soldiers with land in return for military service has a long history in ancient Egypt and the ancient Near East, however, which predates the Athenian and Ptolemaic cleruchies, and may have helped inspire them. Michael Rostovtzeff recognized this already in 1941, when he argued that the system of Ptolemaic cleruchies was “suggested partly by Egyptian traditions, partly by the practice of Alexander and the successors, and was framed to some extent on the model of Greek, especially Athenian, cleruchies”², and recent scholars continue to make similar proposals³.

This paper therefore diachronically reviews the evidence that soldiers were provided with land in ancient Egypt, from the New Kingdom when the practice first appears, through the Third Intermediate, Saite and Persian Periods. Distinctions are made between land grants given as rewards for service and those given with an ongoing service obligation, between land grants given to Egyptian soldiers and those made to foreigners serving Egyptian kings, and between land grants given in Egypt and those made in subject territories. Comparisons are then made between the ancient Egyptian examples of land grants to soldiers, and the Athenian and Ptolemaic cleruchies.

THE NEW KINGDOM: LAND ALLOTMENTS IN EGYPT FOR EGYPTIAN SOLDIERS

In the New Kingdom Egypt (c. 1600–1070 BC), the Egyptian army probably consisted of some soldiers on active service in the royal bodyguard and in garrisons⁴, periodically supplemented by additional soldiers who were called up to serve during campaigns⁵. Some of these additional soldiers were new recruits, but others were probably veterans recalled to service. The state seems to have supported soldiers while they served in the royal bodyguard, in garrisons or on campaigns, but it seems to have expected

¹ Fischer-Bovet 2014, 199–201.

² Rostovtzeff 1941, 284; Préaux 1939, 465–466 made a similar assertion.

³ Crawford 1971, 53–54; Fischer-Bovet 2014, 4–5, 199–201.

⁴ Gnirs 2013, 658–664.

⁵ Spalinger 2005, 150.

soldiers who were not on active service to support themselves⁶. There is considerable evidence that Egyptian kings rewarded Egyptian veterans after campaigns with land grants in Egypt, from which they could live while not on active service⁷. It is possible that there was a service obligation attached to such lands, but it is never explicitly stated, and it did not prevent women from inheriting such lands.

Hieroglyphic inscriptions in tombs provide some evidence that veterans were rewarded with land in the New Kingdom. The Autobiography of Ahmose son of Abana, dating to the sixteenth century BC, is an inscription in Ahmose's tomb chapel near El-Kab in Upper Egypt. It recounts how he became a ship-based marine in place of his father, and served on a number of campaigns under Kings Ahmose, Amenhotep I, and Thutmose I, first against the Hyksos in Lower Egypt, and then in Nubia and the Levant. Ahmose records that he received slaves as booty after most of the campaigns, and states that he twice received land grants measuring five arouras in his town after campaigns in Nubia under King Ahmose. Referring to one of the land grants, Ahmose says that the same was done for the entire crew of his ship⁸. Ahmose's biography concludes with a badly damaged list of land grants, of which only a grant of 60 arouras is preserved; and a list of 9 male and 10 female slaves received as booty⁹.

The Trial of Mose, dating to the reign of Ramesses II in the thirteenth century BC, is an inscription from Mose's tomb chapel from Saqqara near Memphis. It records an inheritance dispute about a land allotment that King Ahmose gave as a reward (*fk3*) to the Admiral (*imy-r ḥ3.w*) Neshi in the sixteenth century BC, presumably for military service. The estate was held by a series of individuals until the reign of King Horemheb in the thirteenth century BC, when several heirs, both male and female, initiated a series of lawsuits and court trials about who should administer the estate and who had rights to shares of the revenues. This suggests that multiple heirs could collectively inherit the estate, and that women as well as men could inherit lands given as rewards for military service. In one of the trials, the judges consulted land surveys kept in the royal treasury and granary in order to identify who was written in them. This suggests that the estate was located on royal rather than temple land, and that the estate holders were responsible for the harvest taxes¹⁰.

Hieroglyphic inscriptions on stelae provide further evidence that soldiers received land grants in the New Kingdom. Stela Berlin 14994, dated to King Thutmose I in the sixteenth century BC, probably from Thebes, says that it was intended to demarcate "the southern boundary of the *ihwty*-field given as royal praise (*ḥswt nt nswt*) to the charioteer of his majesty (*snn n ḥm.f*), Nekry, 150 arouras"¹¹. Stela Cairo JdE 88879, dated to King Ramesses III in the twelfth century BC, probably from Qantir, commemorates a land grant to a soldier: "Now his Majesty orders that one give 16 arouras of land as praise (*ḥsyw*) for the shield-bearer of foreign lands (*qrḥ ḥ3s.ty*), Usermare-Nakhtu, justified, in the district of the town of Kheriu (*ww n dmy.t Hr-iw*), its flowing well being the well of

⁶ Schulman 1964, 76–78, § 193–198.

⁷ O'Connor 1972, 694–695; Katary 1999, 77.

⁸ Loret 1910, 1–6; Lichtheim 1976, 12–15.

⁹ *Urk.* IV, 1–11.

¹⁰ Gardiner 1905, 7–11, 23–39.

¹¹ Schulman 1964, 98, Text 80; Helck 1975, 116, no. 129; Meeks 1979, 661–662, Text 18.3.0a.

Smentawy”¹². Stela Stuttgart private collection, dated to King Ramesses III in the twelfth century BC, records the donation to a statue of land held by a soldier: “His Majesty has decreed that a donation field (*3ht hnk*) be demarcated, consisting of *qdbw*-fields and *smw*-fields for pasturing cattle, for the statue of King Ramesses III Heqaiunu Son of Ptah, Beloved like Seth. His Majesty has proceeded to the temple of Ramesses II Meryamun Beloved of His Army, it being in the divine-offering under the chief of foreign mercenaries (*ʕ3 n thrw*) Amunkhau of the fortress of Ramesses III Heqaiunu Beloved of His Army, in the possession of his wife the chantress of Ptah, Isis, (from) son to son, heir to heir”¹³. This stela primarily records the royal donation of land to the endowment of a statue cult of the reigning king, but it incidentally also notes that the land was in the hereditary possession of a soldier, who would presumably henceforth pay his harvest taxes to the statue cult.

Hieratic papyri also contain evidence for rewarding veterans with plots in temple endowment lands. The Wilbour Papyrus, dating to Year 4 of the reign of King Ramesses V in the twelfth century BC, is a land survey of Middle Egypt, presumably like those described in the Trial of Mose, but for temple rather than royal land. It records about 2800 plots of land, of which 550 plots owed all of their harvest to temples, and thus presumably represent institutionally cultivated land. The remaining 2250 plots were assigned to individuals who owed part of their harvest to temples. These individuals, both male and female, could represent tenant farmers cultivating institutional land, or owner-cultivators who owed a harvest tax to an institution. Some of the plots are assigned to individuals described as deceased, and the plots are said to be in the possession of their children, indicating that they could be inherited, arguing for some form of ownership¹⁴. Male plot holders were identified by name and title, and military occupations were common. Of the 2250 plots held by individuals, 471 or 21,0% were assigned to stablemasters (*hry-ihw*) who provided horses for charioteers, 253 or 11,3% were assigned to soldiers (*wʕw*), 59 or 2,6% to Sherden soldiers (*šrdn*), 47 or 2,1% to charioteers (*kt*), and 49 or 2,2% to other military title holders such as 24 standard-bearers (*ʕ3y sryt*), 7 shield-bearers (*qrʕ*), 6 Tjuk (*Tk*), 5 chiefs of foreign mercenaries (*ʕ3 n thrw*), 4 sword-bearers (*hpsy*), 2 adjutants of chariotry (*idnw n tnt-ht*), and 1 captain of shield-bearers (*hry qrʕ*). Female plot holders were simply identified as townspeople (*ʕnh-n-niwt*), and held an additional 228 or 10,2% of the plots¹⁵. Plot size sometimes correlated with occupations. Stablemasters (*hry-ihw*) held plots of 5 arouras in 337 of 471 cases, and soldiers (*wʕw*) held plots of 3 arouras in 195 of 253 cases. The limited variation in size supports the impression of the Trial of Mose that plots given to veterans were not divided among multiple heirs. Women (*ʕnh-n-niwt*) held plots of 5 arouras in 84 cases and plots of 3 arouras in 39 cases out of 228 total. This suggests that some of the female plot holders may have been wives or daughters of stablemasters and soldiers, since these are also the most common plot sizes for those occupations. It also fits the evidence of the Trial of Mose that plots given to veterans could pass to women¹⁶.

¹² Habachi 1954, 507–514, pl. 29; Meeks 1979, 664, Text 20.2.0.

¹³ Kessler 1975, 103–117, pl. 2; Helck 1976, 115–116; Meeks 1979, 664, Text 20.2.00.

¹⁴ Gardiner 1948, 76; Katary 1989, 16–17.

¹⁵ Katary 1989, 299–301; 1999, 69 provides slightly different percentages; Antoine 2014, 25–27 offers negligibly different numbers.

¹⁶ Katary 1989, 133–134; 1999, 75–77.

THE NEW KINGDOM: LAND ALLOTMENTS
OUTSIDE EGYPT FOR EGYPTIAN SOLDIERS?

In the early New Kingdom, Egyptian kings frequently campaigned abroad, and had conquered most of Nubia to the south of Egypt by the end of the sixteenth century BC, and the southern and central Levant to the northeast of Egypt by the end of the fifteenth century BC. There is no evidence, however, that Egyptian kings gave land grants in Egyptian controlled territories outside of Egypt to Egyptian veterans during the New Kingdom.

In Nubia, Egyptian residences and garrisons were often established in new fortified planned towns with Egyptian-style temples¹⁷. In the Levant, however, Egyptian residences and garrisons were usually stationed in existing towns with some new Egyptian-style buildings and hybrid-style shrines¹⁸, which could reflect either Egyptian presence¹⁹, or local imitations of Egyptian style²⁰. Some lands were confiscated and assigned to Egyptian residences and garrisons, and later to Egyptian temples and shrines as well, especially in Nubia, but to a lesser extent in the Levant as well²¹. At the same time, many local rulers were left in place and were required to pay tribute to Egyptian residences and garrisons or to Egypt proper, especially in the Levant, but also in Nubia²².

High-ranking Egyptian administrators in Nubia and the Levant were often posted there after service elsewhere²³, but garrison soldiers apparently could serve for extended periods, and may have had families from whom new garrison soldiers could have been recruited. There is no surviving evidence that garrison soldiers were assigned individual plots of land outside of Egypt for their upkeep and as a reward for their service, but given the limited amount of evidence for such plots from Egypt proper, the lack of evidence from abroad is not decisive. In Nubia, there is definite evidence that administrators and priests received plots of land from among those assigned to temples and shrines²⁴, which suggests that garrison soldiers could also have received such plots in Nubia, as veterans did in Egypt as described above.

THE NEW KINGDOM: LAND ALLOTMENTS
IN EGYPT FOR FOREIGN SOLDIERS

The Egyptian kings had to mobilize large armies several times in the late New Kingdom, in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC, to defend the frontiers of the empire and ultimately of Egypt itself against incursions from the Hittite Empire, the ‘Sea Peoples’, and the Libyans. Two Egyptian kings, Ramesses II and Ramesses III,

¹⁷ Morris 2005, 68–113, 180–211, 310–342, 645–682, 782–799.

¹⁸ Morris 2005, 27–67, 116–180, 217–310, 343–611, 691–773.

¹⁹ Morris 2005, 112–113, 211–215, 339–342, 682–690, 799–800.

²⁰ Higginbotham 2000, 1–16, 129–142.

²¹ Na’aman 1981, 177–181; Morkot 1995, 176–180; Gnirs 2013, 695–705; Morris 2015, 170–175, 184–186.

²² Na’aman 1981, 174–177; Morkot 1991; 1995, 181–184; 2013, 914–919, 944–950; Gnirs 2013, 681–682.

²³ Gnirs 2013, 676–700, 708–713; Morkot 2013, 919–923.

²⁴ Meeks 1979, 662–665, Texts 18.8.0a; 19.00.00; 19.3.0a and b; 19.3.00; 19.3.63; 20.5.0.

augmented their armies with new recruits from some of their recently defeated foreign enemies, namely the Sherden and the Meshwesh, and there is good evidence that these kings gave land grants in Egypt to the foreign veterans who fought for them on these campaigns.

Ancient sources describe the Sherden as sea-faring and locate them in the eastern Mediterranean, while modern scholars often describe them as one of the ‘Sea Peoples’²⁵. In the thirteenth century BC, King Ramesses II defeated an incursion of ship-bourne Sherden in his Year 2, and he brought them to Egypt, according to a stela found at Tanis²⁶. He evidently incorporated some of these captives into his army by his Year 5 for use against the Hittite Empire, because he states in his Kadesh Inscriptions that he had defeated and captured Sherden soldiers in his army at the battle of Kadesh²⁷. In the twelfth century BC, the Sherden and other ‘Sea Peoples’ helped overthrow the Hittite Empire, overran the Egyptian empire in the Levant, and threatened Egypt itself. King Ramesses III defeated the Sherden and other ‘Sea Peoples’ in his Year 8, according to the Harris Papyrus and the texts and scenes on the walls of his mortuary temple at Medinet Habu²⁸. The Harris Papyrus adds that he then settled the Sherden and other ‘Sea Peoples’ in fortresses, and supplied them with clothes and rations from the treasuries and granaries²⁹. At least some Sherden were no longer on active service by Year 4 of the reign of Ramesses V, because 59 of them appear as plot holders in the Wilbour Papyrus, as described above, and in other texts from Middle Egypt³⁰. Some Sherden or their descendants, however, were called to active service in the reign of King Ramesses XI in the eleventh century BC, when general Paiankh campaigned in Nubia in an unsuccessful attempt to prevent its loss³¹.

The Meshwesh were a pastoral nomadic ethnic group from Libya, probably from what is now known as Cyrenaica³². King Ramesses III also defeated the Meshwesh twice, once in his Year 5, and again in his Year 11, again according to the Harris Papyrus and the texts and scenes on the walls of Medinet Habu³³. The Harris Papyrus again adds that he settled the Meshwesh in fortresses in his name, and appointed their commanders³⁴. An inscription in a chapel at Deir el-Medina further adds that Ramesses III made the Meshwesh “hear the language of people (i.e. Egyptians), he abolished their language, and changed their tongue”³⁵; in other words, he forced the Meshwesh to learn and speak the Egyptian language. The sources do not however state whether the Meshwesh were eventually demobilized and settled on plots of land like the Sherden.

²⁵ Emanuel 2013, 14–15.

²⁶ Tanis II Stela, l. 13–16 = KRI II, 290, 1–4.

²⁷ Kadesh Inscriptions, the Poem, § 26 = KRI II, 11, 5–10; Lichtheim 1976, 63.

²⁸ *P. Harris* 76, 6–8 = Grandet 1994, I, 336–337; Medinet Habu = KRI V, 27, 10–43, 2.

²⁹ *P. Harris* 76, 8–9 = Grandet 1994, I, 337; II, 243, n. 919–920.

³⁰ Cavillier 2002, 74–79; 2015, 635–637.

³¹ Cavillier 2010; 2015, 637–638.

³² O’Connor 1990; Leahy 1985, 53–59; Ritner 2009a, 327–338; 2009b, 47–48.

³³ *P. Harris* 77, 2–4 = Grandet 1994, I, 337; Medinet Habu, Year 5 = KRI V, 10, 1–27, 9; Year 11 = KRI V, 43, 3–71, 15.

³⁴ *P. Harris* 77, 4–6 = Grandet 1994, I, 337; II, 252–254, n. 929; Medinet Habu = KRI V, 24, 2–3.

³⁵ Deir el-Medina, Chapel C, Rhetorical Stela = KRI V, 91, 6–8.

THE THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD:
LAND ALLOTMENTS IN EGYPT FOR SOLDIERS?

During the Third Intermediate Period (c. 1070–664 BC), the Egyptian state fragmented into several contemporary royal dynasties and multiple dynasties of autonomous officials. Many of the highest offices in Egypt, including the kingship, came to be held by individuals and families with Libyan names, and who often also bore the title Great Chief of the Meshwesh (*wr ʿ3 n Mšwš*) or its abbreviated form Great Chief of the Ma (*wr ʿ3 n Mʿ*). Consequently, many scholars believe that the Meshwesh Libyans that King Ramesses III settled in Egypt were eventually given military land allotments like the Sherden, that the Egyptian army was increasingly recruited from descendants of these military allotment holders, and that their leaders were therefore able to rise to the highest ranks of the Egyptian army and society³⁶.

There is very little direct evidence for soldiers receiving or holding military land allotments in the Third Intermediate Period, however. One possible exception is the hieroglyphic Apanage Stela, dated to Year 10 of King Osorkon I in the ninth century BC, from the temple of Amun at Thebes. The stela records an oracular consultation with the god Amun confirming that the high priest of Amun, Iuwelot, purchased sixteen plots of land measuring together 556 arouras. The owners of each of the plots are named, along with the amount of silver paid for them, in order to establish Iuwelot's title to the properties. Iuwelot acquired two of the plots (12,5%) from shield-bearers (*qrʿ*), measuring 30 arouras and 10 arouras respectively (7,2% of the total area). The ability of the shield-bearers to sell their plots, however, argues that these particular plots did not bear a military service obligation, and that the plots may have had no relationship at all to military service.

THE SAITE AND PERSIAN PERIODS:
LAND ALLOTMENTS IN EGYPT FOR EGYPTIAN SOLDIERS

The Saite Dynasty (664–525 BC) reunified Egypt after the Third Intermediate Period, and briefly attempted to reestablish an empire in Nubia, the Levant and Cyprus. The Persians then conquered them and added Egypt to their empire (525–332 BC), though some native kings temporarily made Egypt independent again (c. 521 BC, 486/485 BC, 404–343 BC). There is strong evidence that the Saite, Persian and native kings continued or revived the practice of recruiting Egyptian soldiers from holders of plots of land bearing a military service obligation.

Much of this evidence derives from Herodotus, who described Egyptian society in the Saite Period as being divided into seven classes. One of these classes was known as *machimoi* (Gk. μάχιμοι) or 'warriors', and was subdivided into Kalasiries (Gk. Καλασίριες) and Hermotybies (Ἑρμοτύβιες). The Hermotybies were drawn from the provinces of the western Egyptian Delta, and numbered up to 160,000, while the Kalasiries were drawn from the provinces of the eastern Egyptian Delta and the Nile Valley, and numbered up to 250,000. Both types of *machimoi* were forbidden any profession other than the military,

³⁶ Lloyd 1988, 184–185.

and their sons inherited their positions from their fathers (Hdt. II. 164–166)³⁷. Herodotus added that each *machimos* or ‘warrior’ received plots of land totaling 12 arouras, which were tax-exempt, and which were reassigned each year (Hdt. II. 168)³⁸. The *machimoi* appear to have survived from the Saite Period into the Persian Period, because Herodotus mentioned that both the Kalasiries and the Hermotybies served with the Persians at the battle of Plataea in 479 BC (Hdt. IX. 32)³⁹. Herodotus’ descriptions are thought to be influenced by and filtered through Greek social theories and models, and hence are thought to be not entirely reliable⁴⁰. His numbers too seem improbably large⁴¹.

There are also Egyptian sources for the *machimoi*, the Hermotybies and the Kalasiries, however, confirming that these groups existed. Fischer-Bovet argues that Herodotus’ *machimoi* or ‘warriors’ is a translation of Egyptian *rmt-qnqn.w*, ‘fighting men’, a generic term for soldiers. It appears as a synonym for the Egyptian word for Kalasiries (*gl-šr.w*) in the Demotic petition of Petiese from el-Hibeh, dated to Darius I (513 BC)⁴², and in a Demotic letter to the Persian garrison commander at Elephantine, dated to Year 36 of Darius I (486 BC)⁴³, as well as in many Egyptian literary texts from the later first millennium BC⁴⁴.

The Egyptian identity of Herodotus’ Hermotybies was long uncertain⁴⁵, until Thissen showed that they corresponded to Egyptian *rmt-dm.w*, a formal title applied to some soldiers in the Saite and Persian Periods⁴⁶. A Demotic account from Elephantine, dated to Year 41 of Amasis (530 BC), records some Hermotybies as participants in a campaign to Nubia⁴⁷. A Demotic letter from Meidum, dated to Year 1 of King Seheribre Petubasis III (c. 521 BC), records an order from the treasurer that that three Hermotybies each be allotted 30 arouras at 44 sacks of emmer wheat in the province of Herakleopolis (*p3 tš n Hw.t-nn-nswt*). The 30 arouras at 44 sacks probably refers to the plot size and the harvest tax rate, indicating that the plots were not a standard 12 arouras and were not tax-free, contrary to Herodotus⁴⁸. The Demotic petition of Petiese from el-Hibeh, dated to Darius I (513 BC), records that a Hermotybis delivered a letter to a general⁴⁹. Two Demotic sales contracts from Hou, dated to c. 495 and c. 489 BC, record two Hermotybies as contractors in sales of a cow and a donkey⁵⁰. A Demotic lease contract, dated to Year 4 of King Hakoris (384 BC), mentions a Hermotybis involved in leasing a field of 30 ½ arouras, whose neighbors included the fields of another Hermotybis⁵¹.

³⁷ Fischer-Bovet 2013, 210–211.

³⁸ Fischer-Bovet 2013, 211–212.

³⁹ Fischer-Bovet 2013, 210.

⁴⁰ Lloyd 1988, 182–183.

⁴¹ Fischer-Bovet 2013, 215–219.

⁴² *P. Rylands* 9, col. 12, l. 9 (*rmt n qnqn s 50*), paraphrasing *P. Rylands* 9, col. 11, l. 11–12 (*n3 gl-šr.w*), see Vittmann 1998, 154–155, 150–151.

⁴³ *P. Loeb* 1 recto, l. 11, see Spiegelberg 1931, 1–2, pls. 1–2.

⁴⁴ Fischer-Bovet 2013, 214–215.

⁴⁵ Lloyd 1988, 187.

⁴⁶ Thissen 1994, 89–91; Fischer-Bovet 2013, 213.

⁴⁷ *P. Berlin* 13615, col. 1, l. 4a; 2, 20; 3, 5; 7, 17; see Erichsen 1941; Zauzich 1992, 361.

⁴⁸ *P. Ashmolean* 1984.87, see Vittmann 2015, 433–443.

⁴⁹ *P. Rylands* 9, col. 19, l. 13, see Vittmann 1998, 182–183.

⁵⁰ *P. Loeb* 51 (Hou 9), l. 2; *P. Loeb* 44+49 (Hou 6), l. 2, see Vleeming 1991, 144–145, 96–97.

⁵¹ *P. Cairo* 50098+50102+50097a, see Spiegelberg 1932, 72–74; Vleeming 1991, 78, n. 17.

The Egyptian identity of Herodotus' Kalasiries, on the other hand, has long been known to be Egyptian *gl-šr.w*, another formal title applied to some soldiers⁵². The Egyptian term is attested already in the late New Kingdom. A portion of the Demotic petition of Petiese from el-Hibeh describing events in the reign of Psammetichus I mentions Kalasiries of a place called *T3-qhy* (*n3 gl-šr.w n T3-qhy*) who served under a Chief of the Ma of *T3-qhy* (*hry M^c n T3-qhy*)⁵³. Ritner takes this to show that the Kalasiries were the descendants of the Meshwesh Libyans that Ramesses III settled in Egypt⁵⁴. Winnicki argues that at least some Kalasiries in Egyptian sources from the Saite and Persian Periods were organized by province, as Herodotus describes⁵⁵. Three Demotic contracts, one from Hou, dated to Year 2 of Psammetichus IV (486/485 BC)⁵⁶, one from Thebes, dated to Year 29 of Darius I (493/492 BC)⁵⁷, and one from Thebes, dated to Year 31 of Darius I (491/490 BC)⁵⁸, mention Kalasiries of the province. A Demotic papyrus from the fourth century BC mentions 2200 Kalasiries who were registered for food in the province (*nty sp i ʿq n p3 tš*), and who serve under a provincial governor (*p3 hry n p3 tš*)⁵⁹. Winnicki notes, however, that other Kalasiries in Egyptian sources were assigned to temples⁶⁰. A Demotic contract dated to Year 3 of Hakoris (385 BC) records the sale of a cow by a Kalasiris of the temple of Amun (*gl-šr n pr-Imn*)⁶¹.

THE SAITE AND PERSIAN PERIODS: LAND ALLOTMENTS IN EGYPT FOR FOREIGN SOLDIERS?

During the Saite and Persian Periods, a significant proportion of the army consisted of foreigners and their descendants settled in garrisons. Herodotus reports that the Saite King Psammetichus I settled Ionians and Carians in camps (στρατόπεδα) in the eastern Nile Delta, and gave them land in which to dwell. It is unclear, however, whether they received land to cultivate, or stipends (Hdt. II. 154)⁶². Later, King Apries raised an army of 30,000 descendants of the Ionians and Carians, whom Herodotus describes as foreign mercenaries (ἐπίλοιποι), to try to suppress a revolt of Egyptian soldiers led by a general Amasis (Hdt. II. 163). Amasis was victorious, however, and after he made himself king, Herodotus says that he moved the Ionians and Carians to the capital at Memphis to serve as a guard against the Egyptians (Hdt. II. 154). In Memphis they presumably lived in town and received stipends rather than land to cultivate. The presence of Carians in Memphis is confirmed by numerous funerary stelai inscribed in Carian from the neighboring necropolis of Saqqara⁶³.

⁵² Lloyd 1988, 187; Fischer-Bovet 2013, 213–214.

⁵³ *P. Rylands* 9, col. 11, l. 11–12; see Vittmann 1998, 150–151.

⁵⁴ Ritner 1990, 107; but see Vittmann 1999, 120–124.

⁵⁵ Winnicki 1986, 18–19.

⁵⁶ *P. Loeb* 41, (Hou 7), see Vleeming 1991, 114–115.

⁵⁷ *P. Louvre* 9292 (Cattle 7), see Cruz-Urbe 1985, 14–15.

⁵⁸ *P. Turin* 2127 (Tsenhor 16), see Pestman 1994, 88–89.

⁵⁹ *P. Meermannno-Westreenianum* 44, l. 2, see Vleeming 1984, 257–259.

⁶⁰ Winnicki 1986, 23–24.

⁶¹ *P. BM* 10846 (Cattle 15), see Kaplony-Heckel 1973, 5–20; Cruz-Urbe 1985, 32.

⁶² Fischer-Bovet 2014, 31 n. 69, assumes that they received plots of land larger than those of the *machimoi*, because Herodotus (II. 161–162) says the *machimoi* were jealous of them.

⁶³ Masson 1978, v–viii, 5–7; Ray 1982, 181–198; Vittmann 2003, 155–179.

Herodotus also wrote that King Psammetichus I established garrisons at three border fortresses, at Elephantine in the south, Daphnae in the northeast, and Marea in the northwest. He adds that the garrison at Elephantine revolted under King Psammetichus I when it was not relieved for three years, implying that rotation was the ideal if not the norm (Hdt. II. 30). By the reign of Apries, the garrison at Elephantine may have included foreigners, who may have revolted as well according to an inscription on Statue Louvre A 90 of general Neshor⁶⁴.

Herodotus notes that the Persians also maintained garrisons at Elephantine in the south and Daphnae in the northeast (Hdt. II. 30), and at their satrapal capital at Memphis, whose garrison consisted of foreign mercenaries (ἐπίκουροι), and whose grain rations were part of the tribute collected from Egypt (Hdt. III. 91). Aramaic papyri from the Persian garrison at Elephantine confirm Herodotus and reveal that the mercenaries were predominantly Aramaic-speakers who lived in the town and received monthly stipends of rations and silver⁶⁵. These rations may have come from fields designated to support the garrison, but there is no evidence that the garrison soldiers individually cultivated their own plots⁶⁶. Aramaic wooden dockets from the Palace of Apries at Memphis support the presence of a Persian garrison there as well, presumably replacing the Ionians and Carians employed by Amasis⁶⁷.

COMPARISON WITH ATHENIAN AND PTOLEMAIC CLERUCHIES

Comparison of ancient Egyptian military land allotments with Athenian and Ptolemaic cleruchies is instructive. In the New Kingdom, land grants to Egyptian soldiers were primarily represented as rewards for past service, and inheritance of such grants by women argues against an ongoing military service requirement. By the Saite and Persian Periods, however, possession of military allotments seems to be related to military service obligations. Athenian and Ptolemaic cleruchies also carried military service obligations, paralleling the Saite and Persian Period practices in Egypt⁶⁸.

During the New Kingdom, Egyptian military land allotments were also given to foreign soldiers who served in Egyptian armies and helped to integrate them into the Egyptian military and society. In the Saite and Persian Periods, however, foreign soldiers were for the most part settled in garrisons and maintained with rations and salaries rather than land grants. Athenian cleruchies were likewise given to Athenian citizens, but not to foreign mercenaries. Ptolemaic cleruchies however were offered not just to Macedonian and Greek veterans who had followed Alexander and Ptolemy I to Egypt, but also to defeated soldiers who had previously served the Ptolemies' enemies, and soldiers recruited abroad to serve in Egypt, thereby paralleling Egyptian practices in the New Kingdom rather than those in the Saite and Persian Periods⁶⁹.

Finally, ancient Egyptian military land allotments were usually located within Egypt, and possibly also in Lower Nubia when it was treated as an extension of Egypt in the

⁶⁴ Schäfer 1904, 155–162; Bassir 2016;

⁶⁵ Porten 1968, 72–73; Schütze 2016, 42–43.

⁶⁶ Porten 1968, 35.

⁶⁷ Vittmann 2003, 145.

⁶⁸ Fischer-Bovet 2014, 199–201.

⁶⁹ Fischer-Bovet 2014, 52–55, 166–177.

New Kingdom. Athenian cleruchies, in contrast, were by definition located outside of Attica. The Ptolemies established military settlements throughout their possessions, but cleruchs are primarily associated with Egypt. Clearly, Rostovtzeff's assertion that Ptolemaic cleruchies were only partly inspired by Egyptian traditions was correct. The Ptolemies demonstrably also drew on Athenian terminology, and they may well also have been influenced by Mesopotamian, Persian and Macedonian traditions of providing soldiers with land for military service. That possibility lies beyond the scope of this paper, however.

References

- Antoine, J.-C. 2014: Social Position and the Organization of Landholding in Ramesside Egypt: An Analysis of the Wilbour Papyrus. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 43, 17–41.
- Bassir, H. 2016: Neshor at Elephantine in Late Saite Egypt. *Journal of Egyptian History* 9/1, 66–95.
- Cavillier, G. 2002: Gli Shardana dell'Egitto o l'Egitto degli Shardana? La visione del mercenario nell'Egitto Ramesside. *Aegyptus* 82, 67–80.
- Cavillier, G. 2010: The Sherden in Nubia at the End of the Ramesside Age: New Perspectives and Researches. In: W. Godlewski, A. Łajtar (eds.), *Between the Cataracts: Proceedings of the 11th Conference for Nubian Studies, Warsaw University, 27 August–2 September 2006*. Pt. 2. *Session Papers*. Warsaw, 461–463.
- Cavillier, G. 2015: From the Mediterranean Sea to the Nile: New Perspectives and Researches on the Sherden in Egypt. In: P. Kousoulis, N. Lazaridis (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Egyptologists: University of the Aegean, Rhodes. 22–29 May 2008*. Vol. I. Leuven, 631–638.
- Crawford, D.J. 1971: *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*. Cambridge.
- Cruz-Uribe, E. 1985: *Saite and Persian Demotic Cattle Document. A Study in Legal Forms and Principles in Ancient Egypt*. Chico (CA).
- Emanuel, J.P. 2013: Sherden from the Sea: The Arrival, Integration, and Acculturation of a Sea People. *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 5/1, 14–27.
- Erichsen, W. 1941: Erwähnung eines Zuges nach Nubien unter Amasis in einem demotischen Text. *Klio* 34, 56–61.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. 2013: Egyptian Warriors: The *machimoi* of Herodotus and the Ptolemaic Army. *Classical Quarterly* 63/1, 209–236.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. 2014: *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Cambridge.
- Gardiner, A.H. 1905: *The Inscription of Mes. A Contribution to the Study of Egyptian Juridical Procedure*. Leipzig.
- Gardiner, A.H. 1948: *The Wilbour Papyrus*. Vol. II. *Commentary*. Oxford.
- Gnirs, A.M. 2013: Coping with the Army: The Military and the State in the New Kingdom. In: J.C. Moreno García (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Administration*. Leiden, 639–717.
- Grandet, P. 1994: *Le Papyrus Harris I*. T. I–II. Cairo.
- Habachi, L. 1954: Khatâ'na-Qantîr: Importance. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 52, 443–562.
- Helck, W. 1975: *Historisch-Biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und Neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*. Wiesbaden.
- Helck, W. 1976: Einige Bemerkungen zu Artikeln in SAK 2. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 4, 115–124.
- Higginbotham, C.R. 2000: *Egyptianization and Elite Emulation in Ramesside Palestine. Governance and Accommodation on the Imperial Periphery*. Leiden.
- Kaplony-Heckel, U. 1973: Ein neuer demotischer Papyrus aus der Zeit des Königs Hakoris (Sammlung Michaelides). *Enchoria* 3, 5–20.
- Katary, S.L.D. 1989: *Land Tenure in the Ramesside Period*. London–New York.
- Katary, S.L.D. 1999: Land-tenure in the New Kingdom: The Role of Women Smallholders and the Military. In: A.K. Bowman, E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*. Oxford, 61–82.

- Kessler, D. 1975: Eine Landschenkung Ramses III. Zugunsten eines 'Grossen der *Thrw*' aus *Mr-ms^c.f*. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 2, 103–134.
- Leahy, A.M. 1985: The Libyan Period in Egypt: An Essay in Interpretation. *Libyan Studies* 16, 51–65.
- Lichtheim, M. 1976: *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Vol. II. *The New Kingdom*. Berkeley.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1988: *Herodotus, Book II: Commentary 99–182*. Leiden.
- Loret, V. 1910: *L'inscription d'Ahmès fils d'Abana*. Cairo.
- Masson, O. 1978: *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen*. London.
- Meeks, D. 1979: Les donations aux temples dans l'Égypte du I^{er} millénaire avant J.-C. In: E. Lipiński (ed.), *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East*. Vol. II. Leuven, 605–687.
- Morkot, R. 1991: Nubia in the New Kingdom: The Limits of Egyptian Control. In: W.V. Davies (ed.), *Egypt and Africa: Nubia from Prehistory to Islam*. London, 294–301.
- Morkot, R. 1995: The Economy of Nubia in the New Kingdom. *Société Urbaines en Égypte et au Soudan. Cahier de recherches de l'Institut de papyrologie et d'égyptologie de Lille* 17, 175–190.
- Morkot, R. 2013: From Conquered to Conqueror: The Organization of Nubia in the New Kingdom and the Kushite Administration of Egypt. In: J.-C. Moreno García (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Administration*. Leiden, 911–963.
- Morris, E.F. 2005: *The Architecture of Imperialism: Military Bases and the Evolution of Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom*. Leiden–Boston.
- Morris, E.F. 2015: Exchange, Extraction, and the Politics of Ideological Money Laundering in Egypt's New Kingdom Empire. In: B. Eder, R. Pruzsinszky (eds.), *Policies of Exchange: Political Systems and Modes of Interaction in the Aegean and the Near East in the 2nd Millennium B.C.E. Proceedings of the International Symposium at the University of Freiburg Institute for Archaeological Studies, 30th May – 2nd June 2012*. Vienna, 167–190.
- Na'aman, N. 1981: Economic Aspects of the Egyptian Occupation of Canaan. *Israel Exploration Journal* 31, 172–185.
- O'Connor, D. 1972: The Geography of Settlement in Ancient Egypt. In: P. Ucko, R. Tringham, G.W. Dimbleby (eds.), *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*. London, 681–698.
- O'Connor, D. 1990: The Nature of Tjemhu (Libyan) Society in the Later New Kingdom. In: A.M. Leahy (ed.), *Libya and Egypt: c 1300–750 BC*. London, 29–113
- Pestman, P.W. 1994: *Les papyrus démotiques de Tsenhor (P. Tsenhor): les archives privées d'une femme égyptienne du temps de Darius I^{er}*. Leuven.
- Porten, B. 1968: *Archives From Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Berkeley.
- Préaux, C. 1939: *L'économie royale des Lagides*. Brussels.
- Ray, J.D. 1982: The Carian Inscriptions from Egypt. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68, 181–198.
- Ritner, R.K. 1990: The End of the Libyan Anarchy in Egypt: P. Rylands IX. Cols. 11–12. *Enchoria* 17, 101–108.
- Ritner, R.K. 2009a: Fragmentation and Re-integration in the Third Intermediate Period. In: G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demaree, O.E. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007*. Leiden–Leuven, 327–340.
- Ritner, R.K., 2009b: Egypt and the Vanishing Libyan: Institutional Responses to a Nomadic People. In: J. Szuchman (ed.), *Nomads, Tribes, and the State in the Ancient Near East: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Chicago, 43–56.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1941: *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Vol. I–III. Oxford.
- Schäfer, H. 1904: Die Auswanderung der Krieger unter Psammetich I. und der Söldneraufstand in Elephantine unter Apries. *Klio* 4, 152–163.
- Schulman, A.R. 1964: *Military Rank, Title, and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom*. Berlin.
- Schütze, A. 2016: The Standard of Living of the Judean Military Colony at Elephantine in Persian Period Egypt. *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 12, 41–49.
- Spalinger, A.J. 2005: *War in Ancient Egypt: The New Kingdom*. Oxford.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1931: *Die demotischen papyri* Loeb. Munich.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1932: *Die demotischen Denkmäler 3: Demotische Inschriften und Papyri (Fortsetzung: 50023 – 50165)*. Berlin.
- Thissen, H.J. 1994: Varia onomastica. *Göttinger Miszellen* 141, 89–95.
- Vittmann, G. 1998: *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands* 9. Teil 1. *Text und Übersetzung*. Wiesbaden.
- Vittmann, G. 1999: Kursivhieratische und frühdemotische Miszellen. *Enchoria* 25, 111–127.

-
-
- Vittmann, G. 2003: *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*. Mainz.
- Vittmann, G. 2015: Two Administrative Letters from Meidum (P. Ashmolean 1984.87 and 1984.89). In: F. Haikal (éd.), *Mélanges offerts à Ola el-Aguizy*. Cairo, 433–450.
- Vleeming, S.P. 1984: P. Meermannno-Westreenianum 44. In: H.-J. Thissen, K.-T. Zauzich (Hrsg.), *Grammata Demotika, Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*. Würzburg, 257–269.
- Vleeming, S.P. 1991: *The Gooseherds of Hou (Pap. Hou)*. Leuven.
- Winnicki, J.K. 1986: Zwei Studien über die Kalasirier. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 17, 17–32.
- Zauzich, K.T. 1992: Ein Zug nach Nubien unter Amasis. In: J.H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond*. Chicago, 361–364.