



THE ORIGINS OF PTOLEMAIC CLERUCHS

Author(s): ROGER S. BAGNALL

Source: *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, Vol. 21, No. 1/4 (1984), pp. 7-20

Published by: American Society of Papyrologists

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24519342>

Accessed: 14-04-2017 21:09 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



American Society of Papyrologists is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*

THE ORIGINS OF PTOLEMAIC CLERUCHS*

From the point of view of Greek history, perhaps the most important result of the career of Alexander the Great was the large-scale settlement of Greeks in what we loosely call the East--the Levant, Egypt, parts of Asia Minor which had earlier seen little Greek settlement, and lands further to the East. A full understanding of how the Greeks of the Hellenistic period viewed the world would demand knowledge of who emigrated and why, where they came from, where they went, what they did when they got there, how permanently they stayed, what the effect of their presence was on the lands where they settled, and what the result of their absence was for the places from which they emigrated.

Despite the increase in attention paid in recent years to the indigenous peoples in whose lands the Greeks settled,¹ the condition of the settlers themselves has been one of the principal topics of scholarship in the last couple of decades.² One scarcely need say that we do not have the evidence even to begin to answer these questions properly for most of the East; as often, it is only for Egypt that even the sketch of an answer can be attempted. The papyri have, in fact, been the basis of most of the views expressed about Hellenistic emigration in synthetic works. To no small degree, this is the influence of Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* and his earlier *Large Estate*, as well as various works of other authors. Even when the influence of the papyri is indirect, it is substantial.

The papyri, in combination with other evidence, notably the inscriptions, have yielded a picture of an age in motion: the Hellenistic world has long been seen as one in which the presence of the Greeks in the Orient was an aspect of a more fundamental characteristic--the increased movement of people, under which rubric one may include travel, military service abroad, emigration,

* This article is based on a lecture given at the University of Cincinnati and at Columbia University. I am grateful to Getzel Cohen for the invitation which prompted its writing.

1 For a summary of recent work, see my remarks on "Papyrology and Ptolemaic History: 1956-1980," in *CW* 76 (1982) 13-21.

2 A bibliographic essay is given by J. Modrzejewski in *REG* 96 (1983) 241-68.

embassies, commerce, and so forth. This constant movement appears at the culmination of centuries of development from the very local and constrained societies out of which--and into which--the Greek cities emerged amid the insecurity of conditions of travel in the Dark Ages and the archaic period. Historians have generally regarded military service, of one sort or another, as the most heavily travelled of these routes away from home, to the point that it is common for any person attested abroad (very often dead) to be viewed as a soldier or a soldier's dependent, if there is not concrete evidence to the contrary. In fact, we find indications of military status in enough such cases to lend a certain verisimilitude to this assumption.³

Not all of these soldiers stayed abroad permanently. Though for lack of evidence we are in no position to offer any statistics, scholars have assumed that most mercenary soldiers--employees more often than not of the kings--eventually returned home with their savings. Equally, however, attention has been drawn to those who stayed, a group described tersely by Marcel Launey: "A Greek leaves his city to go and take service under a Ptolemy, a Seleucid, an Attalid. There, this new life suits him; he settles in, remaining a mercenary on long-term contract or, more often, passing into the class of military settlers."⁴ It is to this group, and particularly to the settlers of Ptolemaic Egypt, that this article is devoted.

The investigation begins with a question: where did the cleruchs come from? It is easy enough to give some statistics, derived from the list of cleruchs given by the late Fritz Uebel in his great work on this subject.⁵ The chronological divisions

³ This assumption is explicitly adopted by the editors of *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* VI (Louvain 1968) xxx, with full recognition that in any given case it may be wrong. Cf. also Rey-Coquais (infra n. 18).

⁴ M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (BEFAR 169, Paris 1949) I 675.

⁵ *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern* (Abh. Berlin 1968, 3). Uebel was of course not the first to compile such lists, and previous scholars have derived conclusions from their own lists, but these are all superseded so far as cleruchs go. Uebel's list is now more than a decade and a half old, to be sure, and some new material has appeared in the interval. But the information from *P. Lond.* VII (Zenon material) and *BGU X* (the very important documents from Tholthis in the Oxyrhynchite Nome) was already available to Uebel and incorporated, while *P. Tebt.* IV deals with a period after Uebel's terminus, which I have adopted, of 145 B.C. I have counted only those persons whose ethnic identity was regarded by Uebel as fairly certain.

selected here correspond to historical periods with a bearing on the matter, namely: (a) the first section runs down to Ptolemy III Euergetes' conquests in the Third Syrian War, which should have opened up significant new areas of recruiting for the Ptolemies in the North Aegean and Asia Minor. (b) The second part runs from this point to the death of Ptolemy IV Philopator, which was followed almost immediately by the loss of most of the Ptolemies' possessions in the ensuing weakness of the monarchy. (c) The third period then goes to the death of Ptolemy VI Philometor, at which point all external possessions except Cyprus and Cyrene had been lost.⁶

Something must be said here about the usability of these statistics for our purposes. The population dealt with in the following tables comprises 453 men attested over a period of about 140 years. This group amounts to something under a third of the total list of cleruchs in Uebel: the remainder either do not give an ethnic, or give one which cannot be assigned with certainty to one city, or else give one which is damaged or lost. As we do not know the total number of cleruchs there were in this period, we cannot assess what proportion of the total our sample represents. The problem, however, lies in the representativeness of the sample. Now it is obvious that papyrus finds are by no means a random affair; the archival character of our documentation has been repeatedly stressed by historians of the period and must be given full weight.⁷ If we ask, however, in what way the distribution of texts is distorted by the circumstances of their finding, the principal answer is that the Arsinoite Nome is grossly overrepresented compared to other nomes. Now this may not in itself be very significant, for if one judges from the degree of Hellenic population in the nomes in Roman times, the Arsinoite and Oxyrhynchite were very heavily settled indeed; at the least, Lower and Middle Egypt were more heavily settled with Greeks than Upper Egypt.

6 The computations are not taken beyond this point because Uebel's list does not go beyond it and because there is serious and increasing doubt about the meaning of the use of ethnics in the later period. For these periods in the Ptolemaic empire and the fluctuations in their external possessions, see R. S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Col. Stud. Class. Trad. 4, Leiden 1976).

7 The discussion of sources in Cl. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique*, 2 vols. (Paris 1978) 102-06, provides a good treatment of this point.

Even so, we must take account of a possible bias in our source material. Now the Fayum was partly reclaimed land, and it is generally agreed--on good grounds--that much of this reclamation took place under Philadelphos. It would, therefore, stand to reason that the settlement of cleruchs in the Arsinoite Nome was principally a phenomenon of the middle third of the third century; in other words, that those cleruchs whom the king had to settle newly in this century might well be overrepresented compared to the total population of cleruchs. Newcomers may well, therefore, form a *larger* share of the Arsinoite cleruchs than they do elsewhere.

CLERUCHS IN EGYPT TO 145 B.C.

<u>Place/Ethnic</u>	<u>To 242</u>	<u>242-205</u>	<u>205-145</u>	<u>Total</u>
MACEDONIANS	17	60	30	107
BALKAN PEOPLES	21	39	17	79
Thracians	20	33	16	69
Agrianes		1		1
Paeonians	1	3	1	5
Illyrians		2		2
GREEKS OF N. AEGEAN	1	9		10
Olynthos	1			1
Amphipolis		3		3
Ainos		2		2
Lysimacheia		2		2
Kardia		2		2
GREEK ISLANDS	1	13	5	19
Lesbos	1	2		3
Chios		2		2
Samos		1	1	2
Kos		2		2
Naxos		1		1
Crete		5	4	9
N. & CENTRAL GREECE	14	35	8	57
Magnesia		2		2
Thessaly	2	10	1	13
Ainianes		4		4
Dolopes	1			1
Oetaeans		2		2

<u>Place/Ethnic</u>	<u>To 242</u>	<u>242-205</u>	<u>205-145</u>	<u>Total</u>
Larissa	1	1	1	3
Boeotia	2	3		5
Locris		1		1
Phocis		1		1
Megara		2		2
Athens	4	5	3	12
Chalkis	3	3	3	9
Kephallenia	1	1		2
PELOPONNESOS	9	15	1	25
Corinth/Kromna	2	3	1	6
Sikyon	1			1
Achaea	1	6		7
Arcadia	1	5		6
Elis	1			1
Laconia	1			1
Argos	1	1		2
Asine	1			1
ASIA MINOR/PROPONTIS	15	23	10	48
Kalchedon			1	1
Kyzikos		1		1
Kios			1	1
Selymbria	1			1
Perinthos	1	1		2
Priene		1		1
Myous		1	1	2
Miletos		1		1
Erythrai	1			1
Ephesos	1			1
Carians		2		2
Halikarnassos			2	2
Kaunos	1			1
Lycians	2	1		3
Arsinoe in Lycia			1	1
Aspendos	1		1	2
Perge		2		2
Selge	1			1
Pisidians	1	1		2
Nagidos		1		1
Soloi		2		2

<u>Place/Ethnic</u>	<u>To 242</u>	<u>242-205</u>	<u>205-145</u>	<u>Total</u>
Salamis (Cyprus)		2		2
Mysia	5	3	1	9
Bithynia		1		1
Paphlagonia		1	1	2
Sinope			1	1
Tios		1		1
Mesembria		1		1
CYRENAICA	29	49	7	85
Barca	2	2	1	5
Euhesperis	2	1		3
Cyrene	24	43	6	73
Libyans	1	3		4
OCCIDENT	2	5	2	9
Iapygia		1		1
Campania		1		1
Syracuse	1	3	2	6
Tarentum	1			1
LEVANT		3	11	14
Idumaeans		1		1
Jews		2	10	12
Sidon			1	1

We notice at once that the middle period, though the shortest, is almost throughout the best documented. A perusal of Uebel's lists will persuade one that this is in fact the effect of the documentation itself; our sources for this period are numerous and heavily concerned with cleruchs, notably the Petrie papyri, the Enteuxeis, and the earlier lot of Tebtunis papyri. The same chronological distribution is found for each geographical area of origin, more or less, if one allows for the relatively small size of the sample. The period 241-205 accounts, in each category with forty or more total individuals, for between 47.9 and 61.4 percent of the persons, while the period to 242 takes in 15.9 to 34.1 percent, and that from 201 to 145, 8.2 to 28 percent. If we compare major categories, we find the following:

	<u>To 242</u>	<u>242-205</u>	<u>205-145</u>
Macedonians	15.7%	56.1%	28%
Balkans	26.6%	49.4%	21.5%
Greeks ⁸	23.6%	62.6%	13.8%
Cyrenaica	34.1%	57.6%	8.2%

Now it is clear that the Greek contingents appear less commonly in the last period, but the archival nature of our evidence and the smallness of the sample make me deeply suspicious of any attempt to put much stress on these fluctuations. In particular, Launey's attempt⁹ to see a "brutal weakening of the Hellenic element" and in the end "the rapid disappearance of the Greek population, the maintenance of the Macedonian population, the increase of the barbarian element, notably Semitic" seems to me quite mistaken. It was based on a computation which also included soldiers attested on active duty in Egypt but not evidently cleruchs, and in which Launey included as Semites an enormous number of soldiers (or presumed soldiers--in some cases there is no real evidence¹⁰) in stelai from Hermopolis, whose ethnic identification is based *solely* on nomenclature. But this method is illegitimate and distortionary by nature, for Greeks can normally not be assigned in this way because most of their names are not sufficiently localizable, while non-Greeks (Semites and Thracians, for example) often are. In other words, a method using analysis of nomenclature inevitably weights statistics against the Greek element, and the Hermopolite stelai have so many names that they overwhelm the other evidence, to the detriment of meaningful statistics.

It is, therefore, not necessary to resort to Launey's racial stereotypes, of the "rather vigorous" Balkan types, the "greater vitality and fecundity of the race" of the Macedonians set against the comparative weakness and "physical decline of the race" in Egypt attributed to the Greeks.¹¹ If we lumped in all cleruchs

8 In this term I include the Greek cities of the north coast of the Aegean, the islands, north and central Greece, the Peloponnesos, and the Greek cities of the west coast of Asia Minor and the Propontis.

9 Launey (*supra*, n. 4) 93-94.

10 They are in cases of uncertainty omitted from *Pros. Ptol.* II and not taken up in the addenda and corrigenda to that volume in *Pros. Ptol.* VIII.

11 Launey (*supra*, n. 4) 90, 103.

with Greek names but no preserved ethnics, the situation would be drastically reversed. In sum, while long residence in Egypt may have contributed to a less frequent using of ethnics from individual cities left behind generations back, there is no reason to consider that the number of Greeks among the cleruchs declined significantly.

As to the distribution of the barbarous Semites in our list of cleruchs, on examination we discover that what we are dealing with is a bulge caused by a group of nine people in one papyrus, *P. Tebt.* III 818 (174 B.C.). We cannot place much reliance in a statistical variation in a small sample produced by a single document. In any case, the Semitic presence in Egypt was scarcely new in the second century, nor even in the Ptolemaic period as a whole.

It may therefore be taken as probable that the distribution of documents and unevenness of evidence are themselves sufficient explanations for what variations we do find in the chronological distribution of cleruchs, and that no wide discrepancies are reliably documentable between different ethnic groups from one period to another. There is no reason to accept Launey's gloomy scenario of "barbarization"; the cleruchs of the period down to 145 may be treated largely as belonging to a single chronological horizon: what was true in the 250s and 240s so far as the ethnic composition of the cleruchic population was concerned was still true a half-century later.

A second point is equally interesting: very little of the cleruchic population comes from areas where the Ptolemies can ever have had the ability to recruit.¹² A relatively small number of persons from areas closed to Ptolemaic recruiting would not surprise, as they might have been abroad when recruited. But we find that the following come from areas the Ptolemies did not control either at the time at which the cleruchs are attested or at an earlier time:

Macedonia	23.6%
Balkans	17.4%
N. Coast (part)	.9%
Greece	12.6%
Peloponnesos	5.5%
Asia Minor (part)	4.6%
West	2.0%
Total	66.0%

¹² Launey (*supra*, n. 4) 25-42; G. T. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge 1935) 254-63.

Two thirds of the cleruchs, in other words, come from areas that the Ptolemies did not control; the Macedonians and the Thracians, from lands controlled by usually hostile kings, are particularly telling.¹³ It is quite impossible that any significant number of these peoples entered Ptolemaic service after the time of Ptolemy I, and in fact the defeat of Perdikkas and absorption of part of his army, plus some desertion from Antigonos' army in 305, are the only occasions when the Ptolemies are known to have acquired Macedonian troops in any real quantity.¹⁴ Such an ethnic composition as we find among the cleruchs would be impossible to find in a Ptolemaic army recruited wholly or substantially at a later date.

One could of course argue that the Macedonian and Thracian element was recruited earlier than the Greek. But the relatively even chronological distribution does not on the whole support this escape route either.¹⁵ Nor will it do to suppose that the soldiers were recruited at a gathering place like Cape Taenarum, where all nationalities might be found; as Griffith points out, "This function of Taenarum disappears in the third century, nor is it possible to cite any other town or locality as a parallel in that period."¹⁶ In fact, this conception of Taenarum has been called into question for earlier periods as well, and it may have functioned in this role only for a rather short time.¹⁷

Some confirmation of this point is provided by an examination of Ptolemaic mercenary soldiers stationed outside Egypt.

13 One could argue that Euergetes *did* take the coastal cities in Thrace in the Third Syrian War; but the chronological distribution of the Thracians and their ilk throw this explanation out: the element was strong well before that war. J. Lesquier's explanation (*Les institutions militaires de l'Egypte sous les Lagides* [Paris 1911] 113) that Macedonians continued to emigrate to mercenary service in the third century, is not much supported by the evidence of non-cleruchic soldiers (discussed below), and Griffith (*supra*, n. 12) 114, rightly argues that the Ptolemies can never have recruited from Macedonia.

14 See Griffith (*supra*, n. 12) 109-11.

15 Lesquier (*supra*, n. 13) 46, 47, considers that cleruchies were opened to mercenaries only later than to Macedonians, but the evidence is insufficient to support such a contention, and Lesquier himself says that the opening to mercenaries happened "probablement assez tôt."

16 He rightly rejects the notion that Aspendos was such a place. The quotation is from p. 260.

17 See E. Badian, *JHS* 81 (1961) 25-26.

A tabulation of the soldiers listed in *Pros. Ptol.* VI 15276-15711¹⁸ for whom the ethnic is known, some 110 in all, yields the following percentages (those for cleruchs are given for comparison):

	<u>Soldiers</u>	<u>Cleruchs</u>
Macedonians	1.8%	23.6%
Balkans	5.5%	17.4%
N. Coast Greeks	3.5%	2.2%
Islands	10.0%	4.2%
Greek mainland	19.1%	12.6%
Peloponnesos	5.5%	5.5%
Asia Minor (incl. Cyprus)	44.5%	10.6%
Cyrenaica	5.5%	18.8%
Occident	--	2.0%
Levant	4.5%	3.1%

The contrast is overwhelming: Macedonians and other Balkan groups are hardly significant among the soldiers. Areas that contribute 41% of the cleruchs provide only 7.3% of the soldiers. The areas where the Ptolemies had control or influence in the third century (i.e. the islands, Asia Minor, especially the south coast, Cyrenaica, the Levant) provide about two-thirds of the soldiers; the reverse is true with cleruchs. It is clear that the Ptolemies recruited their active soldiers on mercenary service above all from their empire, especially south Asia Minor--another reason why the empire was so essential to Ptolemaic power--but not their military settlers.

It should be obvious what conclusion is to be drawn from these figures. Ptolemaic cleruchs are the descendants of those soldiers in the army formed by Ptolemy I Soter during his first couple of decades of satrapal rule. We know only a modest amount about this army, but a brief review of this evidence may help shed some light on the situation. No source tells us whether Ptolemy received troops in Babylon at the division of the empire after Alexander's death, but it is surely likely; he was influential in arranging

18 These persons come largely from four sources: stelai at Sidon, a list on Samos, and inscriptions from Cyprus (all listed in *Pros. Ptol.*), plus a new inscription from North Syria published by J.-P. Rey-Coquais, "Inscription grecque découverte à Ras Ibn Hani: Stèle de mercénaires Lagides sur la côte Syrienne," 55 (1978) 313-25. Not all are certainly soldiers, but I believe that the editors of *Pros. Ptol.* VI are correct in including these in the list of probable soldiers, and that Rey-Coquais is similarly correct in so designating the men on his list.

the compromise which was adopted there.¹⁹

There was a satrapal army in Egypt, left there as a garrison in 332/1, some 4,000 troops whose composition is not recorded (Curtius 4.8.4); Griffith²⁰ thinks they were all mercenaries; Lesquier²¹ thinks there were Macedonians. Ptolemy recruited energetically immediately on arrival in Egypt²² and his Cyrenaean involvement in the first few years probably gave him an opportunity to recruit there, in the only Greek land he controlled. When Perdiccas assailed him in 321, Ptolemy recruited beforehand (Diodorus 18.28.5) and, when Perdiccas' attack floundered, large numbers of men deserted to Ptolemy, both Greeks and Macedonians (Diod. 18.33-37).²³

At Gaza in 312, Ptolemy had 18,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry, including both Macedonians and mercenaries; he captured 8,000 prisoners in the battle, mostly mercenaries, and he must have had garrisons at the time in Cyprus and Cyrene.²⁴ The losses in Cyprus of some 16,000 men may have affected mainly the mercenary force,²⁵ but there is no doubt that Ptolemy was substantially weaker than Antigonos when the latter tried to invade Egypt in 305. Here again, however, Ptolemy's success led to serious desertion from his opponent's army (Diod. 20.75.1ff.; 76.7).

We do not hear of any further chances for Ptolemy to have acquired significant numbers of Macedonians or Thracians, and in general the occasions I have mentioned do not add up to a very large number of Macedonians, let alone Thracians, who are nowhere

19 In favor of no troops from the division: Griffith (supra, n. 12) 109; Lesquier (supra, n. 13) 1. Ptolemy took some troops: C. B. Welles, *Alexander and the Hellenistic World* (Toronto 1970) 52. It is not likely that anyone so successful in the negotiations as to get one of the richest provinces would fail to get some Macedonians as well. It is clear that we lack the evidence to say just how many Macedonians Alexander had at his death or who got them: cf. N.G.L. Hammond, *GRBS* 25 (1984) 58 with n. 21.

20 Op. cit. (supra, n. 12) 29-30.

21 Op. cit. (supra, n. 13) 2.

22 Diod. 18.14.1; cf. Griffith (supra, n. 12) 109.

23 Not the whole army, though, as it left for Syria after Perdiccas' death, Diod. 18.39.1. This desertion is not taken into account by Hammond (supra, n. 19) 57-58.

24 See Diod. 19.80.4; Griffith (supra, n. 12) 10.

25 So Griffith (supra, n. 12) 110-11.

mentioned. Griffith²⁶ supposed that the maximum number of Macedonians involved was about 5,000, but this conclusion was arrived at under the influence of his belief that there were only 5,000 in the Macedonian phalanx at Raphia (p. 123); still, the number may not be too far wrong. All of the above considerations suggest that Ptolemy got a significant number of Macedonians and Thracians in the division in Babylon in June, 323.

One need not go so far as to assert that the Ptolemies admitted no new settlers, created no new cleruchs. This is certainly not the case. Some captives from the Third Syrian War were given *kleroi*, at least temporarily.²⁷ But fundamentally, the cleruchs seem to have been almost a closed class, the founding fathers of the Ptolemaic state, after a fashion, and their descendants. These military settlers were a distinctly privileged class, holders of much fine farmland in the richest agricultural state of Mediterranean antiquity; they appear thus to be also a rather fixed class, remaining fairly stable from generation to generation.

If this is so, it is evident that becoming a military settler was not a very realistic expectation for a third- or second-century Ptolemaic mercenary. Launey is not alone in assuming that substantial immigration of soldiers who became cleruchs continued in this period. This view, endorsed also by Lesquier²⁸ and Griffith,²⁹ may be taken to be the prevailing dogma. But it is evident that it does not agree with the evidence of the papyri set out above. A mercenary in the third century might sign on for a long hitch, but it is not very likely that he would end up as a landed settler in Egypt. The Ptolemies' attempt to create a national army on the Macedonian model was evidently the work of Ptolemy I, even if much of its realization dates only to the reign of his successor Philadelphos, and its foundation was Soter's body of soldiers collected in his earlier years.

The implications of the conclusions reached about the cleruchs are interesting also for the general problem of emigration in the Hellenistic period. The undifferentiated idea of large quantities

26 Ibid., 114.

27 See Uebel (*supra*, n. 5) 18-21; the case is problematic and perhaps exceptional.

28 *Op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 13) 113, 134.

29 *Op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 12) 117.

of Greeks and near-Greeks swarming to Egypt for opportunities of every kind needs rethinking and clarification. The opportunities for soldiers were limited and probably involved service outside Egypt. Many of these men were from semi-Hellenized areas of Asia Minor, and the Ptolemaic garrisons (many in Hellenic cities) may have been a path to higher social status. But in Egypt itself, the opportunities in fact seem to have been different.

On the one hand, there was a demand for administrative staff for the bureaucracy. We see signs that the Ptolemies faced a perennial shortage of skilled administrators and could not afford to fire the incompetent or recalcitrant.³⁰ These offices provided steady incomes (from whatever source), and opportunities for advancement must have been fairly good. Like all civil services, however, this one offered real wealth only through dishonesty, whether embezzlement or, more likely, extortion.

The more enterprising types might find a good income in acting as middlemen in managing the lands of cleruchs who did not live on them,³¹ as tax-farmers (a high-risk business, but one whose rewards clearly could be substantial), or in a variety of commercial pursuits which to some degree centered on Alexandria.

The cleruchs clearly formed an important part of the foreign population of Ptolemaic Egypt; but it is now clear that though they were the first immigrants of Ptolemaic Egypt, they came originally as professional soldiers (I do not think that is an unfair characterization of the Macedonian veterans of Alexander's army, not to speak of Ptolemy's own mercenaries), not as intended immigrants. They have no real successors in that sense except for later mercenaries, many if not most of whom were used outside Egypt. The third-century immigrants of whom we see so much in the Zenon archive had a different experience and outlook; they were deliberate emigrants, men who sought out better opportunities in a wealthy kingdom, and their views and plans were not of the same sort as those of the soldiers (the Macedonians among whom at least

30 On the gap between ideal officialdom and the reality, see Dorothy J. Crawford, "The Good Official of Ptolemaic Egypt," *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*, ed. H. Maehler and V. M. Strocka (Mainz 1978) 195-202. For the problems of bureaucratic manpower, see A. E. Samuel in *Essays Welles* (Am. Stud. Pap. 1, New Haven 1966) 228-30. *P. Tebt.* I 27 shows graphically the extent to which official sanctions consisted more of threats of removal and punishment than in any actual consequences for the incompetent and dishonest bureaucrat in question.

31 See J. Bingen, *Ill. Class. Stud.* 3 (1978) 74-80.

must have had the characteristic exploitative attitude toward natives which made Alexander collide with his men on some occasions). A realistic social history of Ptolemaic Egypt--and of the Hellenistic world generally--must take account of this differentiation, must examine the different groups on their own terms and consider their interaction. The Greeks of Egypt were a heterogeneous people.³²

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ROGER S. BAGNALL

³² See the penetrating study of J. Bingen, *Le Papyrus Revenue Laws--Tradition grecque et adaptation hellénistique* (Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *Vorträge G* 231, Opladen 1978).