

Patterns of the Greek Settlement in Egypt during the Ptolemaic Period: “Old Settlers” in the Herakleopolite Nome

Land surveys can tell us quite a lot about the history of the Greek settlement in, or occupation of Egypt during the Ptolemaic period. This has been shown for the documents relating to the Arsinoite village of Kerkeosiris first by Dorothy Thompson¹ and, more recently, by Arthur Verhoogt². An attempt in a similar direction will be made here on the basis of some documents that were published in 1980 by William Brashear as part of the fourteenth volume of the BGU. An article by Jean Bingen³ has contributed much to their understanding.

1. Land Categories

BGU XIV 2441–2448 and 2449–2450 preserve portions⁴ of a survey list of landholders (and crop report)⁵ in various villages of the Herakleopolite nome. Because of several references to the temple of Eseph (i. e. Arsaphes, whom the Greeks equated to Herakles), it may be safely assumed that all of these villages were in, or very near the Tekmi toparchy. This survey was compiled at some point between the '80s and the '40s of the first century B.C.⁶ BGU XIV 2441 contains the longest and best preserved fragment of the survey: ll. 19–262 deal with the village of Pyrgotos, one of the few Herakleopolite places bearing a Greek name (“made like a tower”). The surveyor proceeded by land categories (garden land comprising vineyards and orchards, land of the Idios Logos, the Queen’s land, sacred land, and land granted to the κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς), as shown in the Table below.

Table 1: Land at Πυργωτός (BGU XIV 2441, 19–262)

ll.	Land category	Amount of land (in arourae)
20–60	vineyards	65 3/4 1/32
61–81	orchards	26 1/2 1/8 1/16 1/32
82–99	ἴδιος λόγος	109 1/2 + ⁷
100–107	Queen’s land (βασιλίσσης)	69 1/2 1/4 (+ two more fractions)
108–109	sacred land “of the great gods Stotoetis and (?) Herakles” ⁸	4 + 5 +
110–134	land surrounding (the temple) and transferred to κάτοικοι ⁹	207
135–262	catoecic land (τῶν ἐν τῷ νομῷ κατοίκων ἰππέων)	866

¹ Dorothy J. Crawford (Thompson), *Kerkeosiris. An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*, Cambridge 1971.

² A. M. F. W. Verhoogt, *Menches, komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris*, Leiden, New York, Köln 1998.

³ Jean Bingen, *Les cavaliers catoeques de l’Héracléopolite au I^{er} siècle*, in: *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*. Proceedings of the International Colloquium. Leuven, 24–26 May 1982, Leuven 1983, 1–11.

⁴ BGU XIV 2447–2448 and 2450 are *Sammelnummern*, collecting small fragments whose place in relation to the larger ones has yet to be established.

⁵ On this form of cadastral survey: Crawford, *Kerkeosiris* (s. n. 1), 15; Verhoogt, *Menches* (s. n. 2), 115 with n. 29.

⁶ Cfr. M. R. Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome. A Catalogue of the Toponyms with Introduction and Commentary* (ASP 37), Atlanta 1998, 22–23. Some further thinking may eventually lead to a more precise dating of this survey: it would however make no difference for our present purposes.

⁷ 109 1/2 + (?) = 36 1/2 (l. 84) + 15 (l. 85) + 22 1/2 (l. 86) + 25 (l. 89) + 10 1/2 (l. 99) + (? *passim*: the total amount might be definitely larger).

⁸ Reading uncertain: ἱερά τῶν Σττοτή[ι]ος κα.α[.]λειους θε(ῶν) με(γίστων). It seems unlikely that the actual total may have differed much from the attested 4 + 5 arourae.

The same land categories, in the same basic sequence, are found in BGU XIV 2444, where land surrounding the village of Peensemtheus is surveyed.

Table 2: Land at Πεενσεμθεύς (BGU XIV 2444, 6–141)

ll.	Land category	Amount of land (in arourae)
7–48	vineyards and orchards	192 1/32
49–(?) 63	ἴδιος λόγος	(?) 225 1/2
(?) 64–(?) 80	[Queen's land?]	595 + ¹⁰
81–82	sacred land ¹¹	10
83–91	land surrounding (the temple) and transferred to κάτοικοι ¹²	65 1/16
92–141 ¹³	catoecic land (τῶν ἐν τῷ νομῷ κατοίκων	
ἰπέων)	343 1/2 + ¹⁴	

BGU XIV 2449 is written by a different hand (or perhaps just more cursively), but still preserves a portion from a survey of exactly the same kind as is found in the previous fragments, and relating to a village in the same toparchy¹⁵.

Table 3: Unknown village (BGU XIV 2449, 1–166)

ll.	Land category	Amount of land (in arourae)
(?)–54 ¹⁶	vineyards and orchards	218 1/8 1/18 1/32 1/64
55–63	ἴδιος λόγος	57
64–81	Queen's land (βασιλίσσης)	289 1/2 ¹⁷
82–91 (?)	sacred land (?)	?
92 (?)–(?)	land surrounding (the temple) and transferred to κάτοικοι ¹⁸	232 + ¹⁹
117 (?)–166 ²⁰	catoecic land	?

The first three entries in the same sequence of land categories are probably found in yet another fragment (BGU XIV 2442), which deals with a village whose name is also lost. On l. 3, one may well expect to read παραδείσου, which elsewhere precedes the land of the Idios Logos, even though the amounts of land are

⁹ Brashear's reading can, I think, be resolved to *περὶ (αὐτὸν) φερο(μένου) ἐν τῇ κα(τοικίᾳ)*: for the meaning of this expression, cf. P.Tebt. I 79, 41 (*οὐ φέρεται ἐν τῇ κατοικίᾳ*, "not included among the catoeci"). The land surrounding the temple, as distinguished from the sacred land proper (presumably that on which it actually stood), had been assigned to katoikoi. An altogether similar treatment of a temple holding is attested at Kerkeosiris in 118/117 (P.Tebt. I 61b, 207–209) and again in 114/113 (P.Tebt. I 72, 128–131): P.Tebt. I 74 and 75 (of 114/113 and 112 B.C., respectively) relate to the same case; cf. John Shelton, P.Tebt. IV, p. 3.

¹⁰ 595 + (?) = 91 1/2 1/4 1/8 (l. 66) + 389 1/4 1/16 (ll. 72, 74) + 114 1/4 + (?) (ll. 75–80).

¹¹ Brashear's reading: *ἱερὸν τοῦ Εσηφοκομῶν θε(οῦ) με(γίστου) τοῦ ἐν Τεκμῖ ἱεροῦ ἐν Τεκμῖ· ἱερά* perhaps to be read, or at least understood, at the beginning. The double *ἐν Τεκμῖ* may otherwise indicate that some of the land surveyed in this section actually was in Tekmi; or it may be just an erroneous repetition on the part of the scribe.

¹² On l. 83, read perhaps: *περὶ (αὐτὸ) φερομένου ἐν τῇ κατοικίᾳ*. See n. 9.

¹³ The papyrus breaks off here.

¹⁴ 343 1/2 + (?) = 30 (l. 96) + 74 1/4 (l. 102) + 30 (l. 106) + 10 (l. 107) + 20 (l. 110) + 88 1/2 1/4 [= 10 1/2 1/4 1/8 (l. 112) + 16 1/2 (ll. 112–113) + 23 1/2 (l. 113) + 37 1/2 1/4 1/8 (l. 114); one kleros] + 62 1/2 [= 10 (l. 120) + 15 (l. 129) + 12 1/2 (l. 131) + 8 (l. 132) + 17 (l. 136); various kleroi].

¹⁵ As shown by the entry for sacred land of the temple of Eseph at Tekmi toparchy on ll. 39–40. There is also a reference to an Ἰβίων on l. 25.

¹⁶ Papyrus incomplete at the beginning.

¹⁷ Total given on l. 77; actually: 68 3/4 (l. 65) + 39 (ll. 67, 69) + 55 3/4 (l. 70) + 83 5/8 (l. 73) + 39 (l. 75) = 286 1/8.

¹⁸ *περὶ α(ὐτὸν) φερο(μεν-)* (l. 92) may have marked either the beginning or the end of this section. For the resolutions of the abbreviations see n. 5.

¹⁹ 232 + (?) = 30 (l. 118) + 10 (l. 119) + 10 (l. 121) + 10 (l. 127) + 1 (l. 129?) + 5 (l. 130) + 10 (l. 133) + 19 (ll. 139, 140) + 10 (l. 141) + 10 1/2 (l. 144) + 10 1/2 (l. 145) + 96 (l. 166).

²⁰ The papyrus breaks off here.

very large, and there is no reference to the ἀπόμοιρα (the 1/6 tax on fruit and vegetables normally due on the products of garden land).

Table 4: Unknown Village (BGU XIV 2442)

ll.	Land-category	Amount of land (in arourae)
3–16	...ρα ()	400 +
17–19	ἴδιος λόγος	13 1/2
20–21	land surrounding (?) and transferred to κάτοικοι ²¹ (?)	

Finally, BGU XIV 2446 deals with a village called Σ.ον (reading uncertain): after the name of the village, fr. 1 records vineyards, as usual, but the papyrus breaks off before the surveyor moves on to the next land category: ll. 2–14 and 15–23 record payments due, respectively, in kind and in money; some of the land-lots are in fact the same, evidently subject to payments in both currencies.

A comparison with the Kerkeosiris documents makes it apparent that the land under consideration in the Herakleopolites survey was, in each of the villages under review, the local land ἐκτὸς μισθώσεως, which the Crown did not lease directly to farmers²²; instead, it was found more profitable to assign it to holders who were on various grounds deemed suitable for, or entitled to a grant of land: these included the temples, the *klerouchoi* (envisaged in the first place as a whole, i. e. as a class or social group), members of the court (including of course the royal family: in the present case, the Queen) and of the administration (including local officials²³). The amounts of land assigned, and the conditions under which they were granted (basically: crops to be grown and taxes to be paid on the land), varied much and therefore needed specification.

2. Land Subcategories

In the BGU XIV surveys, each land category is further partitioned into a varying number of subcategories, again recurring in a fixed order within the section for each category. This is especially evident in the subdivisions which articulate the sections devoted to land assigned to the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς in each village.

Table 5: Land granted to the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς. Subcategories.

κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς: sub-categories	BGU 2441 (Πυργωτός)	BGU 2444 (Πεενσεμθεύς)	BGU 2449 (unknown village)	BGU 2443 (unknown village)
ἀρχαίων	135–148			1–22 (?) ²⁴
δι' Ἐξά(κονος)	149–179	92–123	117 (?)–	23–27
ἀπὸ προσ() ²⁵	180–185	124–141		28–34
ἐξ ἐφόδων	186–217		156–166	35–39
ἐκ φυλα(κιτῶν)	218–224			40–
ἐκ πο(ταμο)φυ(λάκων)	225–228			
ἐκ ἐ(ρημο)φυ(λάκων)	229–244			
διὰ Τοθείους	245–(?)			
ἐωνημένη	(?)–259			

²¹ L. 20: περὶ α(ὐτὸν) φερο(μεν-) εἰς τ... (Brashear): ἐν τῇ κατοικίᾳ seems the most likely reading (see above, n. 9). The land being transferred to katoikoi was apparently located around a kleros previously granted to somebody called A... (l. 16), and then confiscated to the Idios Logos: it may in fact have been part of that holding, before being included in the κατοικία.

²² Verhoogt, *Menches* (s. n. 2), 109–111.

²³ A τοπογραφματικὸς κλῆρος is several times referred to in BGU XIV 2437, and once in BGU XIV 2438.

²⁴ L. 22: ἐξ [ε()] Brashear: this presumably concerns a partial total being drawn, rather than being an overall reference to the land category dealt with in the section that comes to an end at this line; as in BGU 2441 the δι' Ἐξάκονος category is preceded by the ἀρχαῖοι κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς it seems safe enough to assume that this was the case here, too.

²⁵ ἀπὸ .ρο() Brashear: but cf. BGU XIV 2443, 28; 2444, 124. “Eine befriedigende Auflösung ... steht noch aus. Evtl. ἀπὸ (κεχωρισμένης) προσ(όδου)?” (Brashear *ad* BGU XIV 2441, 17).

As shown in Table 5, the subcategories employed in BGU XIV 2443 overlap those found in BGU XIV 2441 up to the section labelled in BGU XIV 2443 ἐκ φυ(λακιτῶν) (l. 40): this section probably came to an end on l. 47, where the total was given for land granted to φυλακίται (the whole line is now lost, except for the initial γίνοντ[αι]). There followed, on the next line, another total (l. 48: again, only the initial γίνονται is preserved): in my opinion, this can only have been a larger total than the immediately preceding one, i. e. the total for the whole land-category, to which ll. 1–49 of this fragment referred: and this category — because of the subcategories it included — can only have been that of land assigned to the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς (compare BGU XIV 2441, ll. 259 and 260; BGU XIV 2443 dealt of course with a different village). It follows that the next section in BGU XIV 2443 (ll. 50ff.) must have related to another land category, and a different social group than the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς. That is to say that what little is left of the third column luckily preserves a link otherwise missing in the three portions of the land survey represented by BGU XIV 2441, 2444 and 2449: these other fragments in fact, though larger, happen to stop before reaching the point of transition from one category (land of the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς) to the next. It remains to be established which category would be the next one.

In the scanty remains of BGU XIV 2443, 50ff., the overlapping of subcategories with yet another portion of the same land-survey (BGU XIV 2445) enables us to reconstruct the procedure followed by the surveyor in recording land, village by village.

Table 6: Land granted to other cleruchs. Subcategories.

Other cleruchs: subcategories	BGU XIV 2443	BGU XIV 2444	BGU XIV 2445
ἐπτάρουροι ἀρχαῖοι ὑπὸ Διον(υσίω) ἡγε(μόνι) ἀ(ρχαίων) φυ(λακιτῶν)	51–53 ²⁶		1–2 3–23 (?)
φυλα(κιτῶν)	54–62 (?)		
διὰ Λόχου	63–65		24–26
π[ο]ταμοφυλάκων τῶν ἐν ἀποδερ()		1–3	
κλ(ηρούχων) φυ(λακιτῶν)		4–5	27–32
ἕτεροι			33–42

The fact that the (rather doubtful) sub-category τῶν ἐν ἀποδερ . . . κλ(ηρούχων) φυ(λακιτῶν)²⁷ appears in BGU XIV 2444, 4, at the very end of the survey for the village preceding Peensemtheus, makes us certain that by the time the surveyor had come to recording holdings that fall under this category, he had also come to the end of his job for a certain village, according to the pattern he had to follow in surveying land for each village in turn. There remained for him the possibility to add a few left-over and last-minute entries (if any were to be appended) under the convenient heading ἕτεροι, as in fact happens in BGU XIV 2445 (ll. 33ff.). A blank then marked the transition from one village to the next, as in BGU XIV 2444, between ll. 5 and 6. Once this pattern has been recognized, it becomes easy to see which parts of the land survey, as it is now preserved, are related to the category following the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς (and preceding the ἕτεροι): these are BGU XIV 2441, 1–18; BGU XIV 2443, 50–65; BGU XIV 2444, 1–5; BGU XIV 2445, 1–32. It is also apparent that the names of the land-grantees recorded under this category are almost exclusively Egyptian. This is all the more remarkable, as Egyptian names are otherwise almost entirely absent among the land-grantees appearing in this survey as it has come down to us²⁸, except (but in any case not with such a high incidence) in the sections devoted to garden land. There is in fact just one obviously Egyptian name

²⁶ φυλα(κιτῶν) ἀρ[χ]αί[ων] BGU 2443, 51. On l. 50, what appears an abbreviation for (γίνεται) is all that is left.

²⁷ τῶν ἐν ἀποδερ() κλ(ηρούχων) φυ(λακιτῶν) Brashear, who commented (*ad* BGU XIV 2445, 27): “Was sie bedeuten soll, ist völlig unklar”. This is the only occurrence of the term κλ(ηρούχος) in our land-survey (it is only supplied in BGU XIV 2445, 27): Egyptian land-grantees only are dealt with in this section.

²⁸ It is indeed likely that Egyptians may “hide” behind Greek names, such as Herakleides (an obvious Greek name to take for a hellenising Egyptian living in the Herakleopolites) or Ptolemaios: but what matters here is the difference between Greeks and hellenising Egyptians, on the one hand, and non-hellenising (therefore Egyptian-named) Egyptians, on the other.

in all that is left of the sections devoted to the *κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς*: in BGU XIV 2443 (l. 40), Semtheus is the name of both the father and the grandfather of the *φυλακίτης* Herakleides; the father, however, also bore an apparently Greek name²⁹, and his hellenising must certainly have helped his son in moving further up the social scale, from police-man to cavalry-man.

In sum: the Egyptian cleruchs were recorded after the *κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς* in this Herakleopolite land-survey, and were granted land in smaller lots than the Graeco-Macedonian cavalrymen. These two categories of land-grantees follow each other in what amounts to a chronological order, i. e. they represent different stages in the process of land distribution in Ptolemaic Egypt. It is thus possible, by combining the rather sparse fragments relating to several villages, to retrieve the pattern according to which the land survey was produced. Furthermore, a principle of chronological order may also apply to the subdivisions within each category³⁰. At its fullest, a section devoted to one and each village in this kind of survey should conform, with the occasional omission or addition, to the following scheme.

Table 7: Scheme for the survey of land surrounding one village.

Village name	<i>Land categories</i>	<i>Subcategories</i>
Vineyards		
Orchards		
Special Account (ἴδιος λόγος)		
Crown land		
Sacred land		
Land transferred to other <i>κάτοικοι</i>		
Cavalrymen (<i>κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς</i>)		“Old” cavalrymen (<i>ἀρχαῖοι κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς</i>) “Those who became cavalrymen through Exakon” (<i>δι’ Ἐξάκονος</i>) “Those who became cavalrymen <i>ἀπὸ προσ()</i> ” “Those who were promoted to the rank of cavalrymen from the rank of road inspectors” (<i>ἐξ ἐφόδων</i>) “Those who were promoted to the rank of cavalrymen from the rank of policemen” (<i>ἐκ φυλακιστῶν</i>) “Those who were promoted to the rank of cavalrymen from the rank of river guards” (<i>ἐκ ποταμοφυλάκων</i>) “Those who were promoted to the rank of cavalrymen from the rank of river guards” (<i>ἐκ ἐρημοφυλάκων</i>) “Those who became cavalrymen through Tothes” (<i>διὰ Τοθείους</i>)
<Egyptian cleruchs>		“Old” seven-arourae holders (<i>ἀρχαῖοι ἐπτάρουροι</i>) “Old” policemen (appointed) by the commander Dionysios (<i>ὑπὸ Διον(υσίῳ) ἡγε(μόνι) ἀρχαῖοι φυλακίται</i>) “Those who became <Egyptian cleruchs> through Lochos” (<i>διὰ Λόχου</i>) ³¹ Policemen (?) (<i>φυλακίται ἐν ἀποδερ . . .</i>)
Additional entries (ἕτεροι)		

The denominations of these land categories and subcategories may provide us with helpful clues in recognizing successive stages in the process of the Greek settlement in the Herakleopolite nome and, more generally, in the system of land distribution during the Ptolemaic period.

²⁹ Perhaps he was himself a *φυλακίτης*: as shown in Table 6, there were in fact *φυλακίται* also among the Egyptian cleruchs.

³⁰ The very same process can be detected in the Menches archive: see P. W. Pestman, *The Papyrological Primer*, Leiden, New York, København, Köln 1990, 9.

³¹ Or perhaps: “through enrolment in the 6th unit of the army” (*λόχος ζ’*; cf. BGU XIV 2441, 86 and BGU XIV 2449, 61 (just ζ’ on ll. 59 and 74).

3. Οἱ Ἀρχαῖοι

The ἀρχαῖοι form the first subset within the class of the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς, and the two largest catoecic land-holdings (105 and 100 ar., respectively) at Pyrgotos are entered under the heading ἀρχαῖοι (BGU XIV 2441, 135³² and 147): at the time when the survey was compiled they were recorded under the names of, respectively, Ptolemaios son of Philon, and Apollonios son of Theodoros (BGU XIV 2441, 135–148). Both *kleroi* included some orchard land, which is described in more detail at ll. 61–64: Ptolemaios' orchard comprised 5 ar., all of them “in his own kleros” (ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ κλήρῳ); Apollonios' consists of 2 1/2 ar. ἐν ἱπ(πικῆ) γῆ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ κλή(ρῳ), and about one aroura “from Philotas” (fossil *kleros*)³³. These were *their own kleroi* (ἴδιοι κληροί), in the very specific sense that they had “remained in the family” over successive generations, since they had been first granted to their forefathers, “old cavalrymen”, in the land specially destined to cavalrymen (ἱππικῆ γῆ)³⁴.

At Pyrgotos, the *kleroi* of Apollonios son of Theodoros and Ptolemaios son of Philon were the only ones left of the ἀρχαῖοι³⁵, but we know the names of many more “cavalrymen of old”, beginning with Philotas, whose “old kleros” once comprised one aroura of what is now Apollonios' orchard. In fact, all holdings entered after those of Ptolemaios and Apollonios in the Pyrgotos survey are identified by reference to such “old kleroi” (I have elsewhere called them “fossil kleroi”³⁶). As shown in Table 7, by the first century B.C. most *kleroi* of the “old cavalrymen” had been reapportioned, in smaller lots, to new grantees, who upon taking them up entered the privileged rank of the κάτοικοι ἱππεῖς. But the old names stayed as topographical indications, a remnant of the first mapping of the newly conquered land by the Greek administration: the officials in charge of the survey and re-distribution of land (an on-going process) evidently found it expedient to keep referring to them³⁷, even if the new holdings were often made up of parcels taken from different old, and by now “fossil” *kleroi*. The *kleroi* of Ptolemaios son of Philon, and of Apollonios son of Theodoros, are included in Table 8: although not yet “fossil”, they certainly belong to the “old”. Together with Skiron's “fossil kleros” (which comprises more than 143 arourae), theirs appear to be the largest “old kleroi” in the Pyrgotos area, though we must of course allow for old *kleroi* that were split over more than one village.

Table 8: “Old” or “fossil kleroi” at Pyrgotos

“Old” or “fossil kleros” ³⁸	BGU XIV 2441, ll.	Arourae
Agathokles	213, 241	28
Apollonios son of Theodoros	143–146	100
Archeopolis	218, 229, 248	12 1/2
Asandros	176, 222	8
Empedokles	236, 243, 250	ca. 22
Korragos	190, 199, 225, 233, 235	31
Mend()	232	1

³² On l. 135, a sign of punctuation is needed, I think, separating the more general heading (category: τῶν ἐν τῷ νομῷ κα(τοίκων ἱππέων) from the subcategory (ἀρχαῖοι).

³³ Cf. Bingen, *Les cavaliers catoeques* (s. n. 3), 6–7; see also n. 23, where Bingen points out that on ll. 62–63 Apollonios has been “appelé, par erreur, comme je le crois, fils de Théodotos”.

³⁴ Ἴδιοι κληροί in ἱππικῆ γῆ also appear in BGU XIV 2447, 24, 32 and BGU XIV 2450, 48. Ἱππικῆ γῆ in the Πέρων toparchy: P.Hels. I 11.

³⁵ They were themselves in the process of being dismantled: our land-survey records the cession of 40 out of 105 arourae of Ptolemaios, apparently effected by the next generation, and there is the possibility that the overall 19 arourae of the fossil kleros Πτολεμαίου that are referred to on ll. 198 and 258 were at a more or less distant stage part of the same “old” kleros, whose original holder was called Ptolemaios. As for Apollonios, he is ceding 20 out of his 100 arourae, while 77 1/2 are not cultivated.

³⁶ Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome* (s. n. 6), 273.

³⁷ As already hinted at in the Introduction to P.Hib. I 39 (p. 181: “It is evident that the government frequently resumed possession of land which had been granted to military settlers, after whose names it nevertheless continued to be called”; italics mine), with further reference to P.Hib. I 52, 26 n., and P.Hib. I 81. For the (all-important) details of this on-going process at Kerkeosiris, cf. Crawford, *Kerkeosiris* (s. n. 1), 5–38.

³⁸ A few names of fossil *kleroi* (which may or may not have coincided with some of those listed below) are lost in lacunae on ll. 182 (8 arourae); 199 (5 ar.); 202 (6 ar.); 209 (6 ar.); 229 (15 1/1 ar.); 231 (7 ar.); 238 (figure lost); 254 (5 ar.).

Nikaios	204, 221, 227, 247, 249, 255	43 3/4
Ptolemaios	198, 258	19
Ptolemaios son of Philon ³⁹	136–142	105
Skiron	150, 153, 159, 175, 177, 180, 187, 191, 193, 195, 196, 201, 204, 206, 216, 239, 240, 258	143 1/2 + (figures lost at ll. 187, 239)
Sophokles and Areios	155, 158, 165, 219, 246	41 + (figures lost at ll. 158, 165)
Philippos	212, 223, 233, 242, 247, 256	51 1/4
Philotas	154	6
Philo() [= Philotas?]	172, 174	15

But how old were these “old kleroi”? or, which amounts to the same question: how ancient were Ptolemaios’ and Apollonios’ forefathers, and all other cavalymen “of old times”, by the first century B.C.?

The BGU XIV land survey documents were extracted from cartonnages found at Abu Sir al Maleq, and originate from the same archive (dating from the middle of the first century B.C.) as the documents published in BGU VIII and BGU X⁴⁰. They were all produced at the level of the nome, or at least of the toparchy administration. BGU VIII 1771, a document dated to 63/62 B.C., relates to the transfer of sixteen arourae located ἐν τοῖς Ἀρχαίοις, near a village called Πενέσωμις, besides forty arourae ἐν τοῖς περὶ Αὐλήν, near Βιχινθωσθ: the topogrammateis of the respective toparchies (Ἄγημα and περὶ Τέκμι) are asked to take the appropriate measures. The denomination οἱ Ἀρχαῖοι (in the Ἄγημα toparchy) refers, I think, to the same class of “old” settlers as the ἀρχαῖοι κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς of BGU XIV 2441: it designates an area originally destined to the kleroi assigned to them which were, by the first century B.C., mostly “fossil”. This may be confirmed by P.Cair. Zen. III 59347 (dated December 19, 246 B.C.): here somebody called [E]ῦδημος (or [E]ῦθ[ύ]δημος)⁴¹ gives testimony in favour of Antipatros in a case of alleged usury and illegal detention⁴². The document is dated to December the 19th, 246 B.C., and Eu(thy)demos’ occupation is indicated: he is ὁ τοῦ ἀρχ[α]ίου ἀγήματος ἰππάρχης, residing somewhere in the Herakleopolite nome⁴³. If the reading ἀρχ[α]ίου is correct, at the time he would have been at the head of the ἀρχαῖοι κάτοικοι ἰππεῖς of the Ἄγημα, stationed in the Herakleopolite nome⁴⁴. In the mid-third century B.C. both τὸ ἄγημα and οἱ ἀρχαῖοι would be understood as referring to definite groups of actual people, but both expressions eventually came to be used as topographical indications, as was indeed the case for the names of each and all of the first settlers. Ἄγημα in particular came to refer (by metonymy?) to the whole district where οἱ ἀρχαῖοι had been settled. If we pursue our argument along these lines, οἱ περὶ Αὐλήν (in the περὶ Τέκμι), must again originally have been a denomination referring to land-holders who were identified as a group, or class enjoying a special relation with the Court, and therefore entitled to land, like οἱ ἀρχαῖοι and in fact near them. The place-name Πυργωτός (under whose heading two ἀρχαῖοι are still recorded in BGU XIV 2441) even recurs in connection with the indication περὶ Αὐλήν⁴⁵ in another document from Abu Sir al Maleq (BGU XIV 2437, 12–14⁴⁶).

³⁹ See note 34.

⁴⁰ Published in 1933 and 1970, respectively.

⁴¹ Son of Εὐθυγένης, Νειλεύς (reference to an Alexandrian deme): cf. P. W. Pestman (et alii), *A Guide to the Zenon Archive* (P.L.Bat. XXI), Leiden 1981, vol. I, 329 (*Prosopography*, by W. Clarysse), 329.

⁴² In P.Col. Zen. II 83 (the central document in the dossier relating to this case) Antipatros, who is from Philadelphia, complains that Nikon, from whom Antipatros’ wife borrowed money, has placed their boy in detention at Herakleopolis, and is still holding him as a pledge for their debt towards him. A third document pertaining to the same case is P.L.Bat. XX 21 (re-edition of SB III 6762 = P.Edgar 56), which is dated November 20, 246 B.C.

⁴³ P.Cair. Zen. III 59347, 2 (restored e. g. by the editor as [οἰκῶ ἐμ Βουσίρει τῆι ὑπὲρ Μέ]μριν; ἐν Ἡρακλ(έου)ς πόλ(ει) is, I think, an equally likely supplement).

⁴⁴ Libanos, sitologos of the Ἄγημα appears in P.Hib. I 101 and BGU XIV 2392, both of the mid-third century B.C.: the second document must, like the former, originate from Al Hiba cartonnage. Further occurrences of the term ἄγημα in documents of the third century B.C.: P.Petrie III 11 and 12 (already noted by Grenfell and Hunt *ad* P.Hib. I 101, 2–3).

⁴⁵ Possibly also οἱ Ἀρχαῖοι (l. 13), a very difficult reading: περὶ Ἀσκαίατας (Brashear).

⁴⁶ Entry for land (103 arourae) of one Heliodoros: he could be the same person as Heliodoros in BGU XIV 2441, 116ff. (in both cases we are dealing with land around Pyrgotos).

Ours is one of those cases in which *la longue durée et la brève se rencontrent*: a prestigious literary source provides us with information that both clarifies, and is made more perspicuous by our papyrological sources. The terms ἄγημα and οἱ περὶ Αὐλήν are found in a couple of well-known passages in Polybius⁴⁷, referring to the bodyguard and the immediate entourage of the king in Alexander's army, as well as in the armies of his διάδοχοι. On the ἄγημα in particular, other historians have something to say: Arrianus, for instance, informs us that there were both ἰππεῖς and πεζοί in Alexander's ἄγημα⁴⁸, and this piece of information can in fact be verified against data obtainable from the documents of the royal bank at Thebes⁴⁹. A passage in Polybius (XV 25, 17) has deserved special attention⁵⁰: this is where Agathokles is said to have sent τοὺς ἀρχαίους καὶ προὔπαρχοντας ξένους ἐπὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν χώραν φρούρια καὶ τὰς κατοικίας. It is worth pointing out that the words employed by the ancient historian faithfully retrace the terminology adopted by the Ptolemaic administration: the ἀρχαῖοι καὶ προὔπαρχοντες, “the first to have come”, the veterans among the “foreign immigrants”, i. e. mercenaries (ξένοι⁵¹) are sent away into the interior of Egypt (κατὰ τὴν χώραν) to man the guard-posts (ἐπὶ τὰ φρούρια, fortified places like Pyrgotos⁵²), and settlements in the country: καὶ (ἐπὶ) τὰς κατοικίας.

Pyrgotos, “made like a tower, fortified”, must have been an entirely new Greek foundation, and part of a cluster of places bearing Greek names with a markedly military character (Πυργωτός, οἱ Ἀρχαῖοι, οἱ περὶ Αὐλήν, ἄγημα)⁵³: these names are a reminder of the initial stage of the Greek occupation of an area located across the border between the Tekmi and Agema toparchies⁵⁴, which must have been crucial in controlling access from the South into the Arsinoite nome, the privileged area for Greek settlement⁵⁵. The Crown would have a double interest both in securing the allegiance of his best men, and in militarizing and controlling this part of the land. It is these first settlers or veteran soldiers who are called οἱ ἀρχαῖοι but also, in other documents, οἱ πρῶτοι⁵⁶ or οἱ πρεσβύτεροι⁵⁷. They were indeed — to recall Roger Bagnall's words — “the founding fathers of the Ptolemaic state, after a fashion ... a distinctly privileged class, holders of much fine farmland in the richest agricultural state of Mediterranean antiquity”⁵⁸.

⁴⁷ Plb. V 65, 2; 82, 2 (ἄγημα); XXXVI 1 (οἱ περὶ τὴν Αὐλήν). According to BGU IV 1216, 67–72, οἱ περὶ Αὐλήν κάτοικοι were not only in the Herakleopolites, but also in the Memphite nome.

⁴⁸ Arr. I 1, 11 and 4, 24, 1 (ἰππεῖς); II 8, 3 (πεζοί). Other historians on the ἄγημα: Plut., *Eum.* 7; App. *Syr.* 32 (cf. Ael. Dion. fr. 8; see also P.Petrie III, p. 22); some or even all of these may of course go back to the same source.

⁴⁹ *Actenstücke aus der königlichen Bank zu Theben in den Museen zu Berlin, London, Paris*, ed. U. Wilcken, Berlin 1887 (the relevant *Actenstücke* are 11, 11a and 11b, republished as UPZ II 217).

⁵⁰ This passage was already discussed by Jean Lesquier, *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, Paris 1911, 18. See also Marcel Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, Paris 1950, vol. I, 316–317.

⁵¹ The same wording is found in Arr. III 12, 2 (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καλούμενοι ξένοι in Alexander's army); these were of course not just Greek and Macedonians: there were for instance many Thracian mercenaries in Ptolemy's army (another Herakleopolite toponym, also appearing in documents from Abu Sir al Maleq, probably designated a place where Thracians had settled: see Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome* (s. n. 6) s. v. Σαδαλεῖον).

⁵² A number of φρούρια are attested in the Herakleopolites: cf. P.Berl. Zill. 1 and 2; CPG II 77; and see Falivene, *The Herakleopolite nome* (s. n. 6) s. v. Τεχθώ.

⁵³ The possible presence of Herakles, on the side of Stotoetis, at Pyrgotos would be significant in this military context.

⁵⁴ Cf. BGU VIII 1771, 14 adn. (“ἐν τοῖς Ἀρχαίοις ist ebenso wie τοῦ Ἀγήματος als Ortsbezeichnung zu verstehen: ursprünglich geschlossene Siedlung eines Altregiments”) and P.Hib. I 101, 2–3 n. (“perhaps a large grant had been made in this neighbourhood to members of the bodyguard”).

⁵⁵ The identification of a few village-names with modern Arabic names enables us to locate the Agema and Tekmi toparchies in the north-western part of the Herakleopolites: see the *Map* in Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome* (s. n. 6), at the end of the volume.

⁵⁶ Earliest attestation for οἱ πρῶτοι: P.Hib. I 110 (259/247 B.C.); latest one: P.Tebt. III 819 (171 B.C.); see the very clear picture drawn by B. Kramer, CPR XVIII, *Einleitung*, pp. 74–80 (p. 78 esp. on οἱ πρῶτοι). Both these documents may well originate from the Herakleopolite nome. W.O. II 323 (an ostrakon dated by its Editor *etwa* in the first century B.C.) also refers to ἀρχαῖοι ἰππεῖς.

⁵⁷ Cf. E. Van 't Dack, *Une lettre d'Onnophris à Zénon (PSI VI 639 et P.Col. Zen. II 114 j)*, CdÉ 36 (1961) 182–183. This document has been re-edited, with the further addition of P.Col. Zen. II 78, as P.L. Bat. XX 38.

⁵⁸ R. S. Bagnall, *The Origins of Ptolemaic Cleruchs*, BASP 21 (1984) 18.