

MICHELE FARAGUNA

Università degli Studi di Milano

ORCID: 0000-0002-6202-6543

michele.faraguna@unimi.it

Land and Citizenship in the Greek *Polis*: Real Property, Public Control, and Institutionalisation*

Terra e cittadinanza nella *polis* greca: beni immobili, controllo pubblico e processi di istituzionalizzazione

Abstract

The aim of this article is to show how an approach focusing on the dynamics of the relationship between land and *politeia* – an aspect not often adequately considered in recent studies on the conceptualisation of citizenship as “sharing (*metechein*) in the *polis*” – can offer new elements for the analysis of institutionalisation within the Greek city. After pointing out that in Homeric society land ownership is much less exclusive than in the *polis* of the classical age, the first part of the essay examines, through a substantial number of epigraphic documents, aspects such as arbitration concerning the boundaries of the *polis*, land distributions, confiscations and expropriations of real properties, the protection of boundaries, as well as various forms of legal limitation of property rights, that all together reflect, since the sixth century BCE, the intervention of public institutions in regulating property relations within the territory of the Greek city. As a parallel and complementary phenomenon, the second part of the article looks into the various forms of property registers and records and, in particular, concentrates on the need for archival lists of citizens and properties as a prerequisite for the institutional functioning of the *polis*.

* This essay was written as a part of the PRIN 2020 research project ““Sharing in the Community”: Citizenship and Society in the Greek World (VII-II Century BC)”. I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their stimulating comments and helpful suggestions.

Il fine di questo articolo è quello di mostrare come un approccio incentrato sulle dinamiche del rapporto tra terra e *politeia* – un tema non sempre adeguatamente valorizzato negli studi recenti sulla concettualizzazione della cittadinanza come “essere partecipi (*metechein*) della città” – possa offrire nuovi elementi per l’analisi dei processi di istituzionalizzazione della *polis*. Dopo avere evidenziato come nella società descritta nei poemi omerici il possesso della terra risulti alquanto meno esclusivo di quanto non avvenga nella città di età classica, la prima parte del saggio esamina, attraverso un numero consistente di documenti epigrafici, aspetti come gli arbitrati relativi ai confini della *polis*, le distribuzioni di terre a gruppi e individui, le confische e le espropriazioni di proprietà immobiliari, la protezione dei confini e varie forme di limitazione giuridica dei diritti di proprietà, che nel loro insieme riflettono, a partire dal VI secolo a.C., l’intervento delle istituzioni pubbliche della città greca nel regolare i rapporti di proprietà all’interno del suo territorio. Nella seconda parte dell’articolo ci si concentra, come fenomeno parallelo e complementare, sulle registrazioni fondiari e, in particolare, sulla necessità di disporre, secondo i casi, in una varietà di tipologie diverse, di liste dei cittadini e delle proprietà, come presupposto per il funzionamento istituzionale della *polis*.

Keywords: citizenship, *polis*, land, *enktesis*, institutions, property, legislation

Parole chiave: cittadinanza, *polis*, terra, *enktesis*, istituzioni, proprietà, legislazione

1. Introduction: Property relations and the regulatory power of the *polis*

The aim of this essay is to address some of the dynamics governing the interplay between property and civic status in the archaic and classical *polis* and, especially, to restate the foundational role of land ownership as one of the key-elements in the conceptualisation of citizenship as “having a share in the *polis*”¹. Recent works on the Greek notion of *politeia* have primarily underlined its social – rather than politico-institutional – meaning, by identifying its essence in religious participation or, with an emphasis on its performative aspect, in lifestyle and collective practices. According to Josine Blok, once the *polis* is conceived “as a network of reciprocal relationships between human and divine”, it can be argued that “in archaic Greece citizenship was shaped by three interlocking frameworks, shared cult, shared descent, and shared laws, in which cult was the *primary* domain of all citizens’ participation” (italics are mine)². Similarly, in the *Conclusion* of his book on

¹ On the notion of citizenship as “sharing in the *polis*” see now Filonik 2023.

² Blok 2018, 85. One of the consequences of such an approach is obviously to

Construire la cité, Alain Duplouy stresses that each community in archaic Greece was the product of complex mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion whereby mutual recognition among citizens was achieved “en adoptant le mode de vie et les mœurs correspondant aux valeurs reconnues et attendues par le groupe”, especially in public spaces such as places of cult, places of burial and the agora³. In neither model is there any scope for the role of property, which to the contrary worked as a powerful factor of inclusion or exclusion within the community and should hardly be ignored while examining the development of the institutional framework of the *polis* and the emergence of a set of criteria defining citizen status and, more generally, the idea of belonging in the citizens’ group. As underlined by Moses I. Finley in his *Introduction to Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, “la terre, the space of the *polis*, is dialectically bound up with every aspect of Greek society, its institutional behaviour and its values and beliefs”⁴.

At this point, for the sake of my argument, it would be helpful, as a preliminary step, to be able to pinpoint the development of the concept of ownership in Greek society, which, however, is notoriously an extremely difficult and thorny topic⁵. For our purposes, it is sufficient to stress that,

downplay the importance of status distinctions: cf. the survey of recent scholarship in Guicharrousse 2022, 11-36. For a critique of Blok’s too narrow approach to Greek citizenship cf. Faraguna forthcoming (a) and forthcoming (b). See also Filonik 2023, esp. 267.

³ Duplouy 2019, 280; cf. also Duplouy 2023, esp. 52: “in ancient Greece, the ways of being and behaving were not mere representations of social and political statuses defined in other instances. They were themselves structuring the community. In ancient Greek cities, because of the absence of a register certifying one’s legal status, the quality of a citizen had to be permanently demonstrated in order to be acknowledged and accepted by others. Adopting the normative behaviour of the citizens in all aspects of one’s lifestyle, therefore, provided a good means of being acknowledged as a fellow citizen”.

⁴ Finley 1973, 10. See also Link 1991a, 11-2.

⁵ For some good brief overviews of the problem see Martini 2005, 103-7; Stolfi 2010, 240-5. Kränzlein 1963, though focusing on the fifth and fourth centuries BCE and deferring the problem of the origins of the idea of ownership in Greek society to a later study (5), remains fundamental (see the reviews, quite different in their assessment of the merits and demerits of the book, by H.-J. Wolff, in *ZSS-RA* 81 (1964), 333-40; C.B. Wells, in *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 63-7; D.M. MacDowell, in *CQ* 15 (1965) 80-2; J. Triantaphyllopoulos, in *RHD* 44 (1966) 79-80; F. Càssola, in *Labeo* 14 (1968) 96-9). Harris 2021, drawing from the work of A.M. Honoré, follows the latter in defining property as “the greatest possible interest in a thing which a mature system of law recognizes” and in accepting the connected view that such definition,

after the notion that landed property in Greece was originally collective, or hereditarily belonged to a closed number of aristocratic γένη, was exploded and shown to be merely a construct of modern historiography, it can safely be said that “private ‘ownership’ in the form of permanent possession by a lineage of the land that it traditionally worked was in existence generations before Homer”⁶. In particular, a conceptual (and functional) distinction between private, public and sacred spaces was already in operation as one

“which can be divided into ten incidents”, cuts across most legal systems, regardless of the juridical tradition they belong to (Honoré 1961, 107-10). Foxhall 1989, 25, to the contrary, describes “ownership” as a “collection of rights, privileges, duties and other relationships between people and property” and underlines that “[t]hese are, of course, culture specific”, so that “[o]ver the whole range of human societies there are, potentially, an enormous number of relationships which may be an integral part of or attached in some way to the idea of ownership, e.g. possession, management, kinship attachments, patronage attachments, right of disposal and usufruct” and “the *conditions* of ownership vary greatly from culture to culture”; see also MacDowell 1978, 133-4; Todd 1993, 240-8 (as we will see, his idea that “what is perhaps most surprising about Athenian land law was the low level of state interference overall” is however untenable). In the same line of thought, Harrison 1968, 52, quoted with approval by Foxhall, regards the concept of ownership in Greek thought as “extremely fluid” (or “blurred”, p. 204) and supports the theory, expounded in the most systematic fashion by Kaser 1944, that the Greeks had a *relative*, not absolute concept of ownership, whereby “[t]he Roman citizen asserts a claim against all the world, based on an act of his own will”, whereas “[t]he Athenian in claiming a right to a thing seems to have been merely asserting a better right than A or B or C”, but not a right *erga omnes*; cf. Kaser 1944, 136-7: in Greece and in early Rome (but evidently not in classical Roman law) “wird die Frage, ob einer zum Besitz berechtigt ist, nicht absolut beantwortet, sondern immer nur in Verhältnis zu einer bestimmten anderen Person, man stellt fest, daß der eine besser zum Haben berechtigt ist als die andere, und läßt dabei die Frage offen, ob nicht ein Dritter einen noch stärkeren Rechtsgrund für sich beanspruchen könnte”. For a critique of Kaser’s theory with regard to early Rome, which to some extent applies also to the case of Greek law, see Capogrossi Colognesi 1969, esp. 396-405. Mackil 2017, 71-2, has the rather extreme claim – which is in fact tantamount to denying that the Greeks had a concept of ownership – that “[t]he Greek laws themselves are remarkably indifferent to the ‘things’, with only a few exceptions; instead, they reflect the concern to regulate relations between people as they arise over things, from land to houses to moveable goods. Yet even the Roman legal definition obscures the role that property plays in the construction of both society and state. While the Roman legal tradition defines property as a series of rights with regard to a thing, including, most importantly, usufruct and alienation..., each of these rights is actually a description of the relationship between the owner and other people with regard to the object owned”.

⁶ Donlan 1997, 657-8; cf. also Jones 1965, 200: “But private ownership in land as well as in movables can be found however far back we go in the history of Greece”.

of the characteristic features of the early, emerging *polis*⁷.

At the same time, also the dogma of the inalienability of land in archaic Greece was proved to be a scholarly myth⁸. In the Homeric epics, the term ὄνος occurs several times, both with the meaning of “purchase” (*Od.* 15.445) and, in the formulaic expression ὄνον ἔδωκε, of “price paid”, always with reference to the purchase of a slave (*Il.* 21.41; 23.746; *Od.* 15.338, 429)⁹. Land, on the other hand, is apparently never “purchased”¹⁰. As we shall see below (§ 3), it can however be acquired in other ways, and either be received as a gift, or, in the case of marginal, “empty” (ἔρημος) land, simply be occupied and turned into farmland. Being πολύκληρος, in other words having more than a single *klēros* (*Od.* 14.211), is a positive, and clearly desirable, quality¹¹, whereas, if we trust Hesiod, the risk of losing one’s *klēros* and being forced to sell it to somebody else was an ever-present possibility to be dreaded (*Hes. Op.* 341: ὄφρ’ ἄλλων ὠνῆ κληρον, μὴ τὸν τεὸν ἄλλος)¹². An acquisitive mentality is thus inbuilt in the economic behaviour portrayed by early Greek poetry¹³. It is worth emphasising that, on a more theoretical level, in a much-discussed locus of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* the right of disposal (ἀπαλλωτριώσις) of one’s property through gift and sale is precisely singled out as the most significant aspects of “ownership”, which in the passage is indicated with the expressions τὰ οἰκεῖα εἶναι and κτήσις (1361a19-22: ὄρος δὲ ἀσφαλείας μὲν τὸ ἐνταῦθα καὶ οὕτω κεκτῆσθαι ὥστ’ ἐφ’ αὐτῷ εἶναι τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτῶν, τοῦ δὲ οἰκεῖα εἶναι ἢ μὴ ὅταν ἐφ’ αὐτῷ ἢ ἀπαλλωτριῶσαι· λέγω δὲ ἀπαλλωτριώσιν δόσιν καὶ πρᾶσιν, “security may be defined as possession of property in such places and such conditions that the use of it is in our own hands; a possession is one’s own

⁷ Faraguna 2023, 215-6.

⁸ Càssola 1965; Finley 1968; see also Todd 1993, 245-6 with note 13.

⁹ See Mele 1979, 61, noting that “la vendita o al contrario la compra degli schiavi costituisce nei poemi omerici l’attività di gran lunga più documentata... tale commercio, se ha un passato, ha soprattutto un presente molto articolato e vario”. On the legal status of slaves in Homeric society, where “[t]he masters... exercise all the rights of ownership over individuals referred to as *dmoes*, *dmoai*, and *douloi*” (354), cf. Harris 2012, followed by Lewis 2018, 110-7.

¹⁰ Zurbach 2017, I, 231, observing that “[s]i rien n’indique que le *klēros* peut être échangé entre vifs, on ne saurait interpréter cette absence comme un indice positif du contraire”.

¹¹ Ulf 1990, 181-2.

¹² Donlan 1997, 658-9; Zurbach 2017, I, 281-2.

¹³ Ulf 1990, 177-83.

when it is entirely up to him to alienate it or not; by alienation I mean both gift and sale”¹⁴. The essential components of the definition of ownership we find in the sources of the classical age are therefore already embedded in Homeric society.

Moreover, competing claims over the boundaries of two adjoining plots of land could arise and be referred to in a simile as a reflection of daily social interactions (*Il.* 12.421-423; see § 8). We simply ignore in what way, or by means of what procedures, such disputes were meant to be settled, but the question brings us to the core of the problem analysed in this article, the fundamental role played by property and property relations in the growth of the regulatory power of the *polis* as a determining factor in the process of state formation. In a recent essay, Emily Mackil has focused on the relationships between “property relations, territoriality and legislation” and their significance as an essential component in the development of “infrastructural power” – in Michael Mann’s words, “the power of the state to penetrate and centrally co-ordinate the activities of civil society through its infrastructure” – in the Greek world¹⁵. I will to some extent build on her analysis and, while taking stock of the contribution some new or long-known epigraphic documents can provide to illuminate the problem, explore some of the forms “infrastructural power”, in other words the regulatory power of institutions, took with regard to land and real property in the Greek *polis*.

2. Land ownership and civic status in Greek institutional practice and political thought

A recently published late archaic law from Himera in Sicily (*SEG* 47.1427 = *I.dial. Sicile* II, 15; cf. also *SEG* 61.745) aptly introduces us to the topic of this essay by emphasising the tight, organic connection between the right to own real property and full membership in the *polis* community. The document is unfortunately fragmentary and a continuous text cannot be established with a sufficient degree of certainty but the law surely concerned,

¹⁴ For an insightful analysis of Aristotle’s passage see Stolfi 2020, 241-5. For the philological problems underlying the interpretation of the text cf. Grimaldi 1980, 111-3.

¹⁵ Mackil 2017. For the notion of “infrastructural power” (as opposed to “despotic power”, an expression that in Mann’s view “denotes power of the state elite itself *over* civil society”) see Mann 1984 (the definitions here and in the text are taken from p. 190). Cf. also Ando 2017.

on the one hand, the creation of (two?) new tribes following the arrival of a group of settlers from Zankle and, on the other hand, a distribution of land including building plots (οἰκόπεδα) and, although this is admittedly inferential, agricultural parcels¹⁶. Interestingly, the phratries are also mentioned in a clause where, as a preliminary action, they are in charge of displaying τὰ καταγεγραμμένα, “the written things”, possibly a list (or lists) of the new settlers to be incorporated into the civic body (ll. 4-5: ἄ[φ]αρ ἔ̃ ἡαὶ φρατρίαὶ ἀ[ν]έδειξαν τὰ καταγεγραμμένα)¹⁷. In particular, reference appears to be made to “good-quality or bad-quality plots” (μ<ο>ῖρα) (or, in Olga Tribulato’s reconstruction of the text, “good-quality or bad-quality land” [ἔ̃ κακῆ[ν] ἔ̃] ἀγαθῆ[ν] γῆ[ν]). The context is not clear. It probably featured in a clause where the ban on assigning or dividing land, whether good or bad, is to be understood, as in *IG IX* 1², 609, ll. 9-14, as an instrument aimed at preventing changes to land tenure originated by the law itself¹⁸. The mention of a good or a bad plot is nonetheless intriguing in so far as it evokes the model of territorial organisation developed by both Plato and Aristotle in their respective ideal cities.

In the *Laws* Plato divides the *chōra*, including the city, into twelve sections and distributes the population into twelve tribes, each allotted to one of the twelve parts of the territory (760b: δώδεκα μὲν ἡμῖν χώρα πᾶσα εἰς δύνάμιν ἴσα μέρη νενέμηται, φυλὴ δὲ μία τῶ μορίῳ ἐκάστῳ ἐπικληρωθεῖσα). The ideal number of citizens for his model city (746b: παράδειγμα) is set for heuristic purposes (737d: σχήματος ἕνεκα καὶ ὑπογραφῆς) at 5,040 in-

¹⁶ For a new revised – albeit not autoptical – edition of the document, representing a step forward in our understanding of the text, cf. Tribulato 2019. For a recent in-depth analysis of the document see also Zurbach 2017, II, 639-43, esp. 640.

¹⁷ Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 165-7; cf. also Cordano 1999, 150-1.

¹⁸ I cannot follow Tribulato 2019, 185, in her view that “[I]a lamina imerese... non è una legge sulla distribuzione della terra” (2019, 185). However one restores and interprets ll. 5-14, what follows at ll. 15-18 can only refer to the allocation of land plots; cf. A. Magnetto, in *BE* 2021, 577. In a similar perspective, De Vido 2023, 37: “la parte centrale del testo conservato suggerisce che il processo descritto nelle prime linee potesse coinvolgere anche divisione e proprietà della *chora*, attraverso l’assegnazione contestuale di lotti rurali... Questa lamina, in sintesi, potrebbe attestare due aspetti diversi e convergenti: da un lato l’immissione di nuovi cittadini attraverso un processo istituzionale (la formazione di nuove tribù e l’iscrizione e la pubblicazione degli elenchi da parte delle fratrie), dall’altro, non sappiamo in che forma e in che tempi, l’assegnazione di lotti sia urbani che rurali”. For the use of μοῖρα in a territorial sense cf. Her. 5.57.1: οἴκειον δὲ τῆς χώρας ταύτης ἀπολαχόντες τὴν Ταναγρικὴν μοῖραν, “of this region they inhabited the district of Tanagra which had been allotted to them”.

dividuals (737c-738b, 740d-741a, 745c-d, 746d-e)¹⁹. Each colonist is to receive a *klēros*, consisting of two parcels of land located, in concentric zones, one near the *polis* and the other farther away, “close to the borders” (745b-c: πρὸς τοῖς ἐσχάτοις). Equality in the distribution of land and houses, which is the ultimate objective of Plato’s theoretical construction (737c: ὅτι μάλιστα ἴσας ἐπινεμητέον), is to be achieved not according to size but in terms of productivity and varying quality of the soil (745d). In Plato’s view (740b), it was at any rate essential that the number of 5,040 *klēroi* should remain the same “for the rest of time” (εἰς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον), and never be altered²⁰. For this reason, the allotted houses and plots of land could not be sold or purchased, and appropriate penalties were set for those contravening the law (741b-c: τὸν πριάμενον ἢ ἀποδοσόμενον ὧν ἔλαχεν οἰκοπέδων ἢ γηπέδων τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις πρέποντα πάσχειν πάθη)²¹. To this end, moreover, written records of the original allotment of land were to be inscribed on tablets of cypress-wood, to be kept for future memory “in the shrines” (741c: γράψαντες δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς θήσουσι κυπαριττίνας μνήμας εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον καταγεγραμμένας)²².

Likewise, in book 7 of *Politics* Aristotle proposes for his ideal *polis*, the *polis* “according to prayer”, the *polis* “we wish for” (κατ’ ἐὺχήν; 1260b27-29; 1265a17-18; 1288b22-24; 1295a28-29; 1325b35-36)²³, that “the land must be... divided into two parts, one public and the other private” and that “of the private land, one part should be near the border (πρὸς τὰς ἐσχατίας) and the other next to the city (πρὸς πόλιν), in order that two plots may be assigned to each citizen and all may have a share in both districts (ἵνα δύο κλήρων ἐκάστῳ νεμηθέντων ἀμφοτέρων τῶν τόπων πάντες μετέχωσιν)”²⁴. Again, the goal underlying this binary system is equality since “this arrangement satisfies equity and justice” (τό τε γὰρ ἴσον οὕτως ἔχει καὶ τὸ

¹⁹ On the criteria underlying Plato’s choice of the number 5,040 see Ampolo 1985; Korff 1986; see also Hoffmann 1996, 192-3; Pradeau 2000. For Magnesia as a theoretical *model* for the project of a *polis* that could be practically implemented cf. Faraguna 2015a, 141-3.

²⁰ Schrieffl 2013, 113-5.

²¹ For the meaning of *oikopedon* and *gēpedon* in this context, “a measured allotment of land” respectively for dwelling and for agriculture, see Nenci 1993, with qualifications in Daniel 2007; Whitehead 2019, 118-20.

²² Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 293-6.

²³ Bertelli, Canevaro, Curnis 2022, 7-17.

²⁴ Faraguna 2023, 228-30.

δικαίον), while, as argued by Aristotle, such a scheme is also more efficient with regard to border wars (1330a9-18).

The explicit assumption in both cases is that only citizens-to-be could participate in the distribution of land²⁵, and, conversely, citizenship being otherwise not clearly defined²⁶, that it was ownership of land, in Plato's terms being a *geōmoros* (737e), that identified the *politēs*²⁷. It therefore comes as no surprise that one of the connecting threads in Aristotle's analysis of "other constitutions, both such as actually exist in well-governed states, and any theoretical forms which are held in esteem" (1260b29-32) in *Politics* book 2, which, as is generally recognized, lays the foundations for the *politeia aristē*, "the best form of state", of books 7 and 8, is represented by property (κτησίς) and, in particular, by land tenure. It is also in this context that we hear about the ancient laws of Pheidon of Corinth (1265b12-16), Philolaos of Corinth (1274b2-5), Solon, Phaleas of Chalkedon, Hippodamos of Mile-

²⁵ Pl. *Leg.* 737e: γῆ δὲ καὶ οἰκῆσεις ὡσαύτως τὰ αὐτὰ μέρη διανεμηθῆτων, γινόμενα ἀνὴρ καὶ κληῖρος συννομή, "and let the land and houses be likewise divided in the same number of parts – the man and his allotment *being a joint affair*"; Arist. *Pol.* 1329a17-20: ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰς κτήσεις δεῖ εἶναι περὶ τούτους. ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ εὐπορίαν ὑπάρχειν τοῖς πολίταις, πολῖται δὲ οὔτοι. τὸ γὰρ βάνασσον οὐ μετέχει τῆς πόλεως, οὐδ' ἄλλο οὐθὲν γένος ὃ μὴ τῆς ἀρετῆς δημιουργόν ἐστιν, "Moreover the ownership of properties also must be centred round these, for the citizens must necessarily possess plentiful means, and they are the citizens. For the artisan class has no share in the *polis*, nor has any other class that is not 'an artificer of virtue'; 1329b 36-37: ὅτι δεῖ τὴν χώραν εἶναι τῶν ὄπλα κεκτημένων καὶ τῶν τῆς πολιτείας μετεχόντων, εἰρηται πρότερον, "it has been stated before that the land ought to be owned by those who possess arms and those who share in the constitution".

²⁶ Piérart 2008, 50-9, pointing out that "Platon ne définit pas la citoyenneté" and that in fact "la citoyenneté s'acquiert par l'appartenance à l'un des 5.040 foyers de la cité"; see also Pradeau 2000, 25 and 31: "être propriétaire, pour un groupe familial (une maison regroupée autour d'un citoyen), c'est être une partie de la cité, lui appartenir... C'est donc la possession du lot qui rend *ipso facto* citoyen". Cf. Pl. *Leg.* 877d: οὐδεὶς οἶκος τῶν τετταράκοντα καὶ πεντακισχιλίων τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντός ἐστιν οὐδὲ ζῦμπαντος τοῦ γένους οὕτως ὡς τῆς πόλεως δημόσιός τε καὶ ἴδιος, "no house of the 5040 belongs to the occupier or to the whole family as much as it is the public and private property of the city".

²⁷ For the meaning and political (and ideological) implications of the term γεωμόρος (already attested in Aesch. *Suppl.* 613-614), "chi possiede una porzione della terra della *polis* in base ad un diritto non separabile dal suo status di membro della comunità politica, ad esempio perché l'ha ricevuta in una spartizione primaria", see Luraghi 1994, 282-6; Mignosa 2021, 19-20 with note 24. For the *gamoroi* ("le groupe des propriétaires de terre, qui comprenait la totalité des *politai*") in Syracuse cf. Bravo 1992, esp. 85.

tos and other unnamed legislators, which were chiefly designed to enforce equality and/or stability in property holding (1266a36-b33, 1268a32-b3).

When we move from the city of utopia to the institutions of historical *poleis*, it is nonetheless surprisingly difficult to find in the sources such a clear statement about the principle that the ownership of real property was a privilege reserved for the *politai*²⁸. As regards Athens, this rule can be safely inferred from the over 60 grants of *ἐγκτησις γῆς καὶ οἰκίας* (or simply *ἐγκτησις οἰκίας*), in other terms the right to purchase (and own) land and a house, awarded, sometimes even only temporarily (*JG II*³ 1, 316 = RO 77, ll. 24-26), to foreigners (and, interestingly enough, rather sparingly to metics), attested by Attic inscriptions²⁹, and from a famous passage of Demosthenes' speech *For Phormion*, where Phormion's choice to have Pasion, who was a naturalised Athenian, as "debtor" (*χρήστην*) for the eleven talents the latter had lent out on security of land and lodging houses (*ἐπὶ γῆ καὶ συνοικίας*) is explained with the fact that Phormion "did not yet have Athenian citizenship" (*μήπω τῆς πολιτείας αὐτῶ παρ' ὑμῖν οὐσης*) and would not have been able to execute on these very substantial sums (*οὐχ οἷός τ' ἔσοιτ' εἰσπράττειν*) (36.6)³⁰. A similar picture can moreover be drawn from Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 56.2, where the (eponymous) archon's yearly proclamation that "whatever each man possessed before his entry into office he shall possess and control until the end of it" (*ὅσα τις εἶχεν πρὶν αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν*

²⁸ A quite explicit epigraphical example is provided by *I.Magnesia 7b* (= *Syll.*³ 941), a treaty between Magnesia on the Maeander and Phokaia (first half of the third century BCE), ll. 13-19: *ἐὰν δέ τις Φωκα[ίτων ἐ]νοικῆι ἐμ Μαγνησί[αι, εἶναι αὐ]τῷ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἐ[γκτησιν κ]αὶ τῶν ἄλλων αὐ[τῷ μετεῖναι π]άντων ὧν καὶ τ[οῖς Μάγ]νησιν, τέλη τελοῦντι ὅσα ὁ Μ[άγνης] τελεῖ, "if a Phokaian resides in Magnesia, he shall have the right to own land and a house and share in all the *other* privileges the Magnesians are entitled to, paying the same taxes as the Magnesian". Cf. Bresson 2007, 68 (annexe no. 8). Adak 2023, 136, dates the document "back to the 4th century B.C."*

²⁹ For an analysis of *enktesis* in a legal and social perspective see Stelzer 1971, esp. 1-9 (8: "Enktesis die Fähigkeit zum Erwerb einer bloßen 'Fremdbesitz' hinausgehenden Sachherrschaft über Immobilien verleiht"); Hennig 1994; Faguer 2021b. On metics and *enktesis* cf. Niku 2007, 115 ("[*e*]nktēsis was never a specific metic privilege"), 125-6. For the *ἕως ἂν κατέλθωσιν* clause in Athenian decrees after the middle of the fourth century BCE see Loddo 2020, 218-24.

³⁰ Cohen 1992, 129-35, esp. 133-4; Trevett 1992, 27-31; Hennig 1994, 305-6; Faguer 2021, 77-9. A parallel example is offered by Arist. [*Oec.*] 1347a1-3, a financial stratagem whose mechanisms are predicated on the assumption that metics were legally excluded from *enktesis* and the right to own real property.

ἀρχὴν, ταῦτ' ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν μέχρι ἀρχῆς τέλους)³¹ must have primarily concerned landed properties and be addressed to members of the citizens' community. There is a consensus that this proclamation guaranteeing the citizens in their secure possession of property was a survival from the archaic period and possibly – although not necessarily – went back to Solon³².

³¹ The precise meaning of ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν in this context, whether the expression conveys the idea of ownership in the full sense or not, is debated. Contrast Kränzlein 1963, 15, 18-19: “Auch κρατεῖν ist sonach kein Eigentumsterminus, sondern bezeichnet eine Machtlage”, with Harris 1988, 378 (= 200-1) note 83, where it is maintained that “the phrase obviously means ‘to own’”. Differently, Scheibelreiter 2015, 77-84, drawing a parallel with the *uti possidetis* clause in international agreements, argues that the distinction between possession and ownership implicitly underlies the archon's proclamation of Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 56.2, “wo zusätzlich zu dem ἔχειν auch das κρατεῖν des ὅσα τις εἶχεν, also das Verfügungsrecht über die Sache, die man besitzt, verankert wird”. As a result, “umfasst die Verheißung auch den Schutz des Detentors, der eine fremde Sache erlaubterweise innehat und auch darüber verfügen darf (ὅσα τις εἶχεν – ταῦτ' ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν) wie etwa der Bestandnehmer, Leihnehmer oder Verwahrer” (83-4). ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν thus primarily concerns the “Verfügungsrecht über die Sache”, the “legal right to dispose of the property”. A similar meaning is implied by Dem. 37.10, where, on his return to Peiraeus after a trading voyage to the Black Sea, Nikoboulos found that “Pantainetos had given up the property and Euergos was *in possession and control* of what we had purchased” (τοῦτον μὲν ἀφεστηκότα, τὸν δ' Εὐεργον ἔχοντα καὶ κρατοῦνθ' ὧν ἐωνήμεθα). To a significant extent, the same principle was affirmed in the reconciliation covenants between the democrats and the oligarchs after civil strife in 403 BCE, where, concerning the oligarchic enclave in Eleusis, one of the clauses stated that τοὺς βουλομένους Ἀθηναίων τῶν ἐν ἄστει μεινάντων ἐξοικεῖν ἔχειν Ἐλευσίνα ἐπιτίμους ὄντας καὶ κυρίουσ καὶ αὐτοκράτορας ἑαυτῶν καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν καρπουμένους, “Of the Athenians who had remained in the city, those who wished to emigrate shall hold Eleusis, being fully enfranchised, with full power and authority over themselves, and drawing the revenues from their own property” (Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 39.1). This meant that the émigrés to Eleusis both fully retained Athenian citizenship and had their rights over their properties and landholdings in Athens and throughout Attica confirmed and secured (Joyce 2023, 77-8; cf. also Loening 1987, 67).

³² Rhodes 1981, 622; Hansen 1998, 93 (“probably a survival from the sixth century”); Scheibelreiter 2015. For Solon's legislation on the enforcement of property rights cf. *schol.* Hom. *Il.* 21.282 = Leão, Rhodes 2015, 55-6 (fr. 36a-b); Thür 2003, 58-60; Carey 2019, 87-8; Schmitz 2023, II, 682-3, 688-90. It is generally agreed on the basis of Harp. s.v. ἐξούλης, that the “action for ejectment” (δίκη ἐξούλης) was open to four privileged categories of people who were unlawfully barred from entering their property, including a) the litigant whose claim on a piece of property had been adjudicated by a previous court verdict; b) the legitimate heir of a deceased person by right of succession; c) the person who had successfully bid for some public lease; d) the mortgagee foreclosing on the property offered as security after the debtor's default. Harpokration's entry (*fin.*) however shows that already in antiquity there was some discussion whether the

Here the concept clearly emerges that political stability could be ensured only in so far as property was secure and landholding was well regulated.

3. Public control and land resources: from “Homeric society” to the classical *polis*

If we take this as our base and then broaden the scope of the analysis, one of the striking features of the functioning of the Greek *polis* is that it exerted tight administrative control over all matters concerning land, not only as an economic but also as a “political” asset. In the classical period some of the functions performed by *polis* officials included the protection of boundaries, management (at central or local level) of public and sacred land³³, supervision over, and registration of, real estate transactions and the keeping of property records³⁴, legislation on inheritance and adoption, regulation of access to non-agricultural communal resources (*in primis* silver mines³⁵; perhaps stone quarries, although it is controversial whether an all-embracing model such as the one for the mines can be applied in this case³⁶, and, salt-works – a monopoly is here certainly to be ruled out³⁷), regulation of access to water rights (including the use of wells), norms enforcing restrictions of property rights³⁸, and, more occasionally, in extraordinary circumstances, as a result of *stasis* and political strife, the confiscation of private properties and the allotment of land.

Given this overall picture, in what follows I propose to explore some of its aspects from two vantage points. The first focus point, which is certainly the one that poses the most complex problems, concerns the *origins*, how such a framework of public control developed and came to be. In fact, although we tend to take it for granted, it is not after all so obvious. While,

suit could have broader application. For Solon’s legislation as a probable framework also for the *nomos argias* (Leão, Rhodes 2015, fr. 61a-g) designed to punish idleness and inactivity (and thus protect property) see Cecchet 2015, 185-8; 2016, esp. 122-6, placing the statute “in the context of the agrarian crisis of the early sixth century”; see also Canevaro 2022, 399-400. For a different view of the law cf. now Schmitz 2023, I, 395-413, with the review by Chr. J. Joyce, in *BMCR* 2024.05.12.

³³ Papazarkadas 2011; Faraguna 2023, 216-37, with bibliography.

³⁴ Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 293-367.

³⁵ Faraguna 2006; Thür, Faraguna 2018.

³⁶ For the legal status of quarries in Attica compare Carusi 2019 with Marchiandi 2020.

³⁷ Carusi 2008; Migeotte 2014, 244.

³⁸ Faraguna 2023, 244-9.

as we have seen, in the classical *polis* the legal rules governing ownership of real estate became to a significant extent an instrument of *exclusion*, in the more open and more fluid society described by Homer and Hesiod the gift (or the mere occupation) of land is to the contrary a means of *integration* into the community. Hesiod's father, "fleeing evil poverty" (φεύγων... κακὴν πενίαν), moving from Kyme in Asia Minor was allowed to settle in the village of Askra and was allotted the *klēros* his sons later inherited and divided between themselves (*WD* 37, 631-640). Similarly, in a neglected fragment of the *Catalogue of Women* studied by Donatella Erdas, Melampous and Bias, coming as *xenoi* to Argos, received from Proitos in exchange for their benefits a *klēros* and, possibly, if Bartoletti's suggestion is correct, also two of his daughters as wives (Hes. *Cat.*, fr. 37 M.-W., ll. 10-14)³⁹. The *xenos* who comes to the community is granted the right to settle and become part of it through the allotment of land and the gift of a wife.

Interestingly, the same pattern features several times also in the Homeric poems, although the terminology is different and, in lieu of *klēros*, which occurs in the epics with the meaning of "land allotment" only four times (*Il.* 15.497-499; *Od.* 11.489-490 [ἄκληρος]; 14.63-65, 211 [πολύκληρος])⁴⁰, we find τέμενος, ἄρουρα, "arable land", "field" or κτήματα, "possessions" (*Il.* 6.191-195: τέμενος τάμιον ἔξοχον ἄλλων, καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης; *Il.* 14.119-124: Ἀδρήστοιο δ' ἔγημε θυγατρῶν, ναῖε δὲ δῶμα ἀφνειὸν βιότιο, ἄλις δὲ οἱ ἦσαν ἄρουραι πυροφόροι πολλοὶ δὲ φυτῶν ἔσαν ὄρχατοι ἀμφίς, πολλὰ δὲ οἱ πρόβατ' ἔσκε; *Od.* 7.311-315: οἶκον δὲ κ' ἐγὼ καὶ κτήματα δοίην; 21.214-216: κτήματα and οἰκία). The last term, κτήματα, is sufficiently vague to indicate both movable and immovable property⁴¹ but, in light of the fact that in all these passages the recipient is offered a house, land and a wife, in other terms the possibility of starting a new *oikos* and being admitted into the community, *ktēmata* must refer to (or at least include) agricultural land. In *Il.* 6.191-195 it is Bellerophon who is offered half of the kingly honour (τιμῆς βασιληΐδος ἥμισυ πάσης), the king's daughter and, on the part of the Lykians, a τέμενος ἔξοχον ἄλλων consisting of an orchard

³⁹ Erdas 1997; cf. also Piñol Villanueva 2013, 119-20.

⁴⁰ Hennig 1989, 38-9; Zurbach 2017, I, 224-7.

⁴¹ Hennig 1980, 45 n. 31: "so ist dazu zu sagen, daß κτήμα bzw. κτήματα zumindest in Odyssee mehrfach ganz eindeutig den Gesamtbesitz and damit natürlich auch die Ländereien eines Mannes bezeichnen (bes. deutlich *Od.* 1,402. 404; 22, 220; für die *Ilias* vgl. 5, 480 f. 9, 400)".

and arable land⁴²; in *Od.* 7.311-315 Odysseus, as a *xenos*, is invited to remain in Scheria and receive, together with Alkinous' daughter, a house and *ktēmata* (313: οἶκον δέ κ' ἐγὼ καὶ κτήματα δοίην).

It is, however, the case of Eumaios and Philoitios in *Od.* 21.214-216⁴³ which is more controversial since at least the former was certainly a slave (and the same probably applies also to Philoitios). It is therefore unclear whether the gift of a wife, κτήματα and a house built *near* Odysseus' own house (οἰκία τ' ἐγγυς ἐμεῖο τετυγμένα)⁴⁴ went hand in hand with their being manumitted and made free. I am inclined to believe that it did since the two men were to become “companions” (ἑταῖροι), a term implying equality and reciprocity, and “brothers” (κασίγνητοι) of Telemachos⁴⁵, and thus new members of the community, but, leaving this question aside, what needs to be stressed in our perspective is that in “Homeric society” there is plenty of unoccupied land, especially in the *eschatia*⁴⁶. In *Od.* 24.205-212, for instance, we find a description of the “beautiful estate” (ἀγρὸν... καλόν) of Laertes “which he had won for himself after he had much toiled for it” (ὄν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς Λαέρτης κτεάτισσεν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλ' ἐμόγησεν) and was located “far from the city”, from where his slaves had gone off to gather stones for building a wall for the vineyard. The same process of extending the cultivable land by building walls can be gleaned from *Od.* 18.357-359, where Eurymachos challenges Odysseus to “serve for hire (θητεύμεν)...on an outlying farm...gathering stones for walls and planting tall trees” (αἶμασιάζ τε λέγων καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ φυτεύων)⁴⁷. Likewise, as a part of Odysseus' estate⁴⁸, the swineherd Eumaios lived in a farmstead somewhere over the woodland (*Od.* 14.1-2), near the border of the land (ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιᾶς), where he had himself built a house, a large court with sties for the pigs and the livestock, thus exploiting new

⁴² Ulf 1990, 182; Faraguna 2023, 216.

⁴³ Cf. also 14.62-65, where Eumaios states that “a kind-hearted master (ἄναξ) gives to his *oikeus* a house, a *klēros* and a much-wooded wife (οἶκόν τε κληρὸν τε πολυμήστην τε γυνᾶκα), when he has worked hard for him (ὅς οἱ πολλὰ κάμησι)”.

⁴⁴ Donlan 1997, 659-61; Zurbach 2017, I, 225-6. For the ideological underpinnings of Eumaios' portrait as the loyal, “good slave” in the *Odyssey* see Fisher 1997, 49-50; Lewis 2018, 111-5. Cf. also Harris 2012, 357.

⁴⁵ Zanovello 2021, 26-33.

⁴⁶ On the notion of *eschatia* see Giangiulio 2001; Faraguna 2012, 188-9.

⁴⁷ On the legal and social status of *thētes* cf. Faraguna 2012, 182-3; Cecchet 2024.

⁴⁸ On Odysseus' estate, where “cereal farming and arboriculture...form a symbiotic relationship with animal husbandry”, see Lewis 2018, 114-7.

tracts of land for pastoralism and productive purposes⁴⁹.

4. Land ownership as a heuristic tool for the institutionalisation of the *polis*

In contrast with this picture where land, albeit surely not the best land, was apparently available in abundance and could be freely claimed and improved, so as to make it suitable for cultivation or animal husbandry, or even be granted to a *xenos* and his household as a sign of his admission into the community, the classical *polis* displays a less generous, more “defensive” and inward-looking attitude. *Enktēsis*, as we saw, could occasionally be granted but land tenure in all its manifold aspects came to be under much closer public scrutiny. Even citizens’ registers could from time to time undergo review to check that only those meeting the requirements of *politeia* were enrolled⁵⁰. To explain how this change came about, considering the paucity of the *contemporary* sources, is obviously an ambitious, if not overambitious task; nonetheless I would argue that land ownership, and the political, legal and socio-economic relations and concepts that revolve around it, represent from a heuristic point of view a powerful lens through which the processes of institutionalisation of the *polis* can be profitably investigated⁵¹. As an agenda for future, more systematic research, I would like to draw attention to some areas where the evidence is more plentiful and consistent and can be expected to provide insights into the process of state formation.

⁴⁹ Lepore 1973, esp. 27.

⁵⁰ Fantasia, Carusi 2004; Kierstead 2019, esp. 30-8; Poddighe, Loddo 2022; Fisher 2023.

⁵¹ For the notion of institutionalisation cf. Peters 2019, 40, where, after defining an institution as “a collection of norms, rules, understandings, and perhaps most importantly routines” (35), the author notes that “[r]outines appear to arise rather naturally once people begin to interact in a proto-institutional setting...As routines become more established and have some meaning attached to them, the degree of institutionalization within the structure is increased”. See also Faraguna forthcoming (a). Ma 2024, 12, while reintroducing the notion of “state” with regard to the archaic *polis*, mentions “land-tenure and agriculture” as concerns of the early Greek city but does not pursue this topic in the rest of the article.

5. Arbitration about *polis* boundaries

In the “ancestral” (πάτριος) oath of the ephebes, which is generally acknowledged as a genuine archaic document, the Athenians undertook “not to leave the fatherland diminished, but greater and better” (ll. 9-10: καὶ ὄκ ἐλάττω παραδώσω τὴν πατρίδα, πλείω δὲ καὶ ἀρείω) and swore to this effect, among other deities, on the “boundaries of the fatherland” (l. 19: ὄροι τῆς πατρίδος) (RO 88, § i, ll. 5-20)⁵². The establishment and consolidation of well-defined territorial boundaries (or, as in the case of the frontier between Athens and Megara, of a tract of land as a sort of buffer zone⁵³) was surely an important element in the process of institutionalisation of a *polis*. In the “agrarian law” of Naupaktos (see below § 6.1), the text, after laying down regulations concerning a distribution of new lands in the (mountain) districts of Hyle and Liskara, provides – as an exception to the general rule that made it thereafter illegal to bring a motion about redistributing land – for the possibility, in case of a war, of the settlement of a group of supplementary colonists (ἐπίφοιτοι) (IG IX 1².3, 609 = *Nomima* I.44, ll. 7-14)⁵⁴. It can be surmised that the law was functional to the city’s efforts to enlarge its territory and consolidate its control over the borderland⁵⁵.

In this context, if we leave aside the case of territorial disputes between *poleis* in the archaic age which, like the ongoing conflict involving Samos and Priene for the control of the Batinetis (IG XII 6.1, 155; *IK.Priene* 132, ll. 135-143 [ll. 141: ὀρίξασθαι γὰρ ποτ’ αὐτοῦς ὡς ὑδάτων ῥοαί; 142-143; *Plut. Mor.* 295f-296b)⁵⁶, are related by Hellenistic or even later sources, the

⁵² Siewert 1977; RO, 445-6; Friend 2019, 19-21 with note 49.

⁵³ Daverio Rocchi 1988, 179-94; Papazarkadas 2011, 244-6; Culasso Gastaldi 2020, 266-74.

⁵⁴ It is generally assumed that the new colonists were to be at least 200 in number (cf. for example *Nomima* I.44, 186 [“A moins que, sous la contrainte de la guerre, cent un citoyens de l’aristocratie, soit la majorité, ne décident de faire venir comme nouveaux colons au moins deux cents hommes aptes au service militaire”] and 190); for a different interpretation see however Maffi 1987, 414-22: “A meno che, costretti dalla guerra, non sembri opportuno a centouno distinti cittadini, quanto al *plethos* essendo di almeno duecento cittadini, far venire dei coloni atti alle armi”. For some linguistic problems in ll. 7-9 of the inscription cf. Favi 2016.

⁵⁵ *Nomima* I.44, 188: “Les problèmes sont ceux d’une petite communauté qui étend par étapes la mise en valeur du territoire qu’elle prétend contrôler et qu’elle doit défendre contre des voisins ou d’anciens occupants, en faisant éventuellement appel à des renforts venant de la cité-mère”; cf. also Lepore 1973, 28-30.

⁵⁶ Magnetto 1997, esp. 132-3 (no. 20); 2008, 89-101.

earliest preserved document is a bronze tablet from Thebes, still awaiting full publication, which records an arbitration over one or more pieces of land between Megara on one side and Thebes and Eleutherai on the other side (*SEG* 60.506)⁵⁷. One of the most striking aspects of this tablet is represented by the mention of the Eleutheraians as claiming the land alongside the Thebans, which dates the arbitration before the last decade of the sixth century, when Eleutherai came under Athenian control⁵⁸. The document clearly belongs in a historical context when Athens, Megara and Thebes were in the process of defining the geographical limits of their respective territories⁵⁹. As is well known, in the case of Athens such process was already largely completed by the time of Kleisthenes' reforms⁶⁰.

6. Distributions

6.1. Distributions of land to groups

1. Besides the new law from Himera mentioned at the beginning of this

⁵⁷ Matthaiou 2014, 213-5; 2018, 35-6: “κρίσις περὶ ἀμφοιβητουμένης γῆς”; Papazarkadas 2021, 272. A slightly later epigraphic example (475-450 BCE) is provided by the definition of the “boundaries of the land” (ὄροι τᾶς γᾶς) in Argos' arbitration between Knossos and Tylissos (*IC* I, viii, 4 and xxx, 1 = *Nomima* I.44, II = OR 126, B, ll. 26-29); on this document see Minon 2007b; Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 201-3.

⁵⁸ Connor 1989, 8-16 (placing the incorporation of Eleutherai after Kleisthenes' tribal reform, between 506 and 501 BCE); Hansen, Nielsen 2004, 431, 434, 625; Lucas 2019, 235-6 (“avec quelque certitude une date dans le dernier quart de VI^e siècle”).

⁵⁹ Lucas 2019, esp. 237; Chatzivasilioi, Robu (2024). For a possible reflection of this historical situation on the mythical plane see Ferraioli 2020, 191-2.

⁶⁰ For the controversial case of Eleusis see in particular Clinton 1993, 110-2; Parker 1996, 12-4, 25-6; Valdés Guía 2022; for Salamis Piccirilli 1973, 46-56 (no. 10); Taylor 1997, 62-82; Lambert 1997, 94-103. I find myself unable to agree with the argument advanced by Greg Anderson that the process whereby Athens extended its physical limits to the boundaries of Attica “was still relatively unadvanced at the time when the Peisistratids were expelled from Athens” (Anderson 2000 [the quotation from p. 411]; cf. also Anderson 2003, 14-34 [34: “we have no evidence that any conscious attempt was made before the Peisistratid period to create institutions linking the center and the periphery of Attica, and we do have various items of testimony that suggest that substantial parts of the Attic periphery lay beyond the *de iure* reach of the Athenian state down to the last quarter of the sixth century”]); see Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 157-60. Anderson believes that the territories of Attica that were not under direct Athenian control were a sort of no man's land. He is followed by Canevaro 2017 and Meister 2020, 311-8.

paper, the problem of the assignments of land in the face of the influx of an increasing number of new settlers drawn by the enticing prospect of a γῆς ἀναδασμός is at the core of the tradition on the history of Kyrene in the first half of the sixth century (Her. 4.159-161)⁶¹. Inevitably, such tradition is made uncertain by the question of the “authenticity” of the “oath (ὄρκιον) of the *oikistēres*” in a well-known epigraphic document from the fourth century (ML 5 = Boffa 2021)⁶². In the text of the oath (but not in Herodotus’ narrative) it is stated that “if the colonists establish the settlement, any of their fellow-citizens (or kinsmen) who later sails to Libya shall have a share in the citizenship and honours and receive a portion of the unoccupied land” (τῶν οἰκειῶν τὸν καταπλέον[τα] ὕστερον εἰς Λιβύαν καὶ π[ο]λιτείας] καὶ τιμᾶμ πεδέχειν καὶ γὰρ τᾶς ἀδεσπότης ἀπολαγγάνεν) (ll. 30-33). This clause is to some extent suspect because, apart from the early, unparalleled occurrence of the term *politeia*, which is otherwise not attested before the fifth century (Her. 9.34.1)⁶³, in the overall economy of the document, where the decree voted by the Theraeans and the text of the *horkion* must be read as a coherent whole, it is functional to the establishment of *isopoliteia* for the Theraeans in Kyrene, which is the main content of the fourth-century decree inscribed above the oath (ll. 2-22). Lines 30-33, far from being historically reliable, could therefore easily appear to be an example of *intentional history* aimed at providing legitimation for present concerns⁶⁴. At the same time, the clause is part of a section of the document which provides for the “right to return” of the colonists after five years which, in Irad Malkin’s view, is not without parallels in the sources about colonisation, and is likely to be genuine⁶⁵. Another important factor to be reckoned with is that the term οἰκιστήρ, a Doric form, is a recurring element, even as an official term, of the tradition on the origins of Kyrene and appears to

⁶¹ On the unique wealth and complexity of traditions relating to the foundation and early history of Kyrene cf. Giangiulio 2001; Malkin 2003, 2016; Zurbach 2008, 95-8; Rosamilia 2023, 18-21.

⁶² Rosamilia 2023, 229-32 (no. 1).

⁶³ Graham 1960, 106. A new early attestation of the term πολίτης (c. 470 BCE), from which πολιτεία is derived, occurs in the *Tabula Cauloniensis* published by Ampolo, Rosamilia 2021 (l. 8: θαύματα μὲν ξένοισι, μ<έ>γαν κόσμον δὲ πολίταις).

⁶⁴ See, most recently, Rosamilia 2023, 19: “Si tratta evidentemente del prodotto di un processo di *intentional history*, dai tratti marcatamente anacronistici, probabilmente tratto da un’opera storiografica preesistente e forse rimaneggiato per meglio rispondere alle esigenze dei Terei che richiedevano e ottennero l’*isopoliteia*”.

⁶⁵ Malkin 2016, 39-42.

be an integral part of it rather than a later accretion⁶⁶. As emphasized by Malkin, the “agreement of the founders” was part of a *living* memory and “‘tradition’..., shaped as it might be by present concern, is also limited by...frameworks of collective memory... These are determined not just by unstable politics but also by religious and social *aide-mémoires*”⁶⁷.

2. Another document concerning land division and distribution is the agrarian law (τεθμὸς ὄδε περὶ τᾶς γᾶς) of the “Pappadakis bronze” from Western Lokris (probably from Naupaktos) (*IG IX 1².3, 609 = ML 13 = Nomima I.44*), dated to *c.* 500 BCE, defining the legal position of those who were allotted marginal land, both the ἀπότομα and δαμῶσια, respectively “(public) land (already) divided into allotments” and “public (undivided) land”⁶⁸, in the districts of Hyle and Liskara; it provides moreover for the distribution of the κοῖλοι μῶροι detailing that exchange of the plots between individuals was possible, provided it was performed before a magistrate (ll. 20-21: τὸς δὲ κοῖλος μῶρος διαδόντο· ἀλλαγὰ δὲ βέβαιος ἔστο, ἀλαζέσθο δὲ ἀντὶ τῷ ἀρχῷ). In order to be legally valid, the exchange in other words had to take place under public control⁶⁹.

3. From Naupaktos we happen to have another slightly later legal text (first decades of the fifth century) (*IG IX 1². 3, 718 = ML 20 = Nomima I.44*)⁷⁰, which is striking for the insights it provides into the degree of institutional complexity reached by the Lokrian *ethnos*. The statute (l. 46: τὸ

⁶⁶ Pasquali 1913, esp. 201: “Die Übereinstimmung des Pindar, des Orakels und des Kallimachos spricht unter diesen Umständen dafür, dass οἰκιστήρ der staats- und religionsrechtliche Ausdruck der Stadt Kyrene gewesen ist”; Lehnus 1994, 191-3; Giangiulio 2001, 130-1; cf. Casevitz 1985, 103-4.

⁶⁷ Malkin 2003, 166-70. Colonial narratives moreover were not necessarily merely oral. Giangiulio 2001, 132-3, aptly defines such kind of memories as belonging to “a semi-oral tradition” where written texts and oral traditions were tightly intertwined and the former “were echoed, complemented, or even manipulated by oral forms of communication and transmission”.

⁶⁸ Faraguna 2023, 217-8; see also Link 1991b, 69-70.

⁶⁹ For an early parallel case see Theophr. fr. 21 Szegedy-Maszk = 650 Fortenbaugh (Περὶ συμβολαίων), § 1: οἱ μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ κήρυκος πωλεῖν καὶ προκηρύττειν ἐκ πλειόνων ἡμέρων· οἱ δὲ παρ’ ἀρχῆς τινί, καθάπερ καὶ Πιττακὸς παρὰ βασιλεῦσι καὶ πρυτάνει, “Some enjoin that the sale be made through a herald and announced several days in advance; others (that it be made) in the presence of a magistrate, as Pittacus too (enjoined that it be done) in the presence of *basileis* and a *prytanis*”.

⁷⁰ For the date of the law (*c.* 500-475?) see Jeffery 1990, 105-6, 108 (no. 3). The date must be at any rate earlier than the Athenian seizure of Naupaktos before 455 BCE (Thuc. 1.103.1-3): cf. Matthaiou 2011b, 48.

θέθμιον), engraved on the two sides of a bronze tablet, consists of 47 lines and appears for some reason to be divided into two broad sections. The second section (ll. 11-47), as far as I know, is unique in Greek epigraphy in that the nine discrete provisions it contains are numbered, like paragraphs, with letters from A to Θ⁷¹. The law lays down a set of regulations defining the legal status of a group of colonists (ἐπίφοιροι) who were sent by the Hypoknemidian Lokrians to settle in Naupaktos (l. 1: ἐν Ναύπακτον κατ τῶνδε ἡα ἵπιφοικία) – and thus fully received the status of Naupaktians (ll. 1-2: ἐπεὶ κα Ναυπάκτιος γένεται, Ναυπάκτιον ἔοντα; cf. also 14-16, 19: αἱ δὲ μέ, τοῖς Ναυπακτίοις νομίους χρῆσται, 20) – in order to strengthen (or replenish) the existing local, Naupaktian community. At the same time, the *epoikoi* were meant not to sever their ties with the motherland and to retain some of their privileges and duties as East Lokrians, to the point that they were bound to swear “not to break away from the Opountians of their own will on any pretext or by any device whatsoever” (ll. 11-12: ἔνορρον τοῖς ἐπιφοίοις ἐν Ναύπακτον μὲ ἵποστᾶμεν ἄ<π Ὅ>ποντίον τέκναι καὶ μηχανᾶι μεδὲ μιᾶι φερόντας).

The law regulates, at different levels, a complex network of relations, both those between the *epoikoi*, the Naupaktians and, in one case, the Western (Ozolian) Lokrians (ll. 10-11: τέλος μὲ φάρειν μεδὲν ἡότι μὲ μετὰ Λορρῶν τῶν Φεσπαρίον), whose regulations appear to be taken for granted and may have been spelled out in a separate agreement⁷², and, in a far more extensive and detailed manner, those involving the colonists, their families and *poleis* of origin (ll. 21, 26 and 28) as well as the Eastern (Hypoknemidian/Opuntian) Lokrians as a political organisation⁷³. It is for instance stated that a colonist had a “right to return” to Eastern Lokris provided some stringent conditions were met (i.e. an adult son or a brother was left in Naupaktos in his place; a public announcement was made in the agora of Naupaktos and, among the Hypoknemidian Lokrians, in the agora of

⁷¹ For a summary of the contents of the law, both substantial and procedural, see Barta 2010, 400-1; Harris, Lewis 2022, 238-9.

⁷² Asheri 1967, 347-8: “*l'intero statuto...si fonda su un previo accordo tra Opus e Naupatto*”.

⁷³ Asheri 1967, 348-54; Beck 1999, 57-9 (esp. 57: “Der komplizierte Status der Siedler als ursprünglich hypoknemidische Lokrer, künftige Naupaktier und – obschon Naupaktier – Rechtspersonen in Ostlokris wird hier in seiner ganzen juristischen Tragweite erfaßt”); Nielsen 2000, 109-115; Giangiulio 2018, 285-7.

the *polis* the colonist came from) (ll. 6-8, 19-22)⁷⁴; the mutual oath of allegiance between the *epoikoi* and the Opountians could be renewed after 30 years (ll. 12-14)⁷⁵; the regulations could only be changed by mutual agreement between the two parties and had to be voted by both the assembly of the Opountian Thousand and the assembly of the Naupaktian *epoikoi* (ll. 39-40: *ὅτι κα μὲ ἀμφοτέρους δοκέει Ἡοποντίον τε χιλίον πλέθαι καὶ Ναυπακτίον τῶν ἐπιφοίρον πλέθαι*); moreover, for lawsuits between *epoikoi* and Hypoknemidians, the Naupaktians could still have access to a judicial court (*δικαστῆρες*) in Orous, with the right to a speedy procedure (ll. 32-33: *τὰν δίκαν πρόδιον ἡαρέσαι πὸ(τ) τοὺς δικαστῆρας*), and, significantly, a *prostatēs* was to be appointed to this effect (ll. 31-35)⁷⁶.

Within this general framework, the main objective of the law is to define the property and inheritance rights of the colonists, both in Naupaktos and in Eastern Lokris, in the latter case also based on the laws of the individual cities they originated from (ll. 26: *ὁπόσ ἂ πόλις φεκάστον νομίζει*; 29-30: *ὁπόσ καὶ Λοκρῶν τῶν Ἡυποκναμιδίων νόμος ἐστὶ*)⁷⁷. Here the close relationship between ownership rights and citizenship emerges quite clearly. In the first place (ll. 6-8, 44-45), we learn that, as in the case of Himera, each *epoikos* on moving to Naupaktos was granted (from the Naupaktians?) a house and a tract of land *μετὰ φοικιατᾶν*, whatever this term referred to – possibly, as is generally assumed, some sort of slave labour of the helotic type⁷⁸. In this case, as in some of the laws mentioned by Aristotle in book 2

⁷⁴ Malkin 2016, 39-40.

⁷⁵ As noted by Asheri 1967, 350-1, at ll. 12-14 the “one hundred men of the Naupaktians” can only be identified with the Naupaktian *epoikoi* as opposed to the Opountians.

⁷⁶ The meaning (and function) of *prostatēs* in this context (representative or surety?) is obscure: cf. Gauthier 1972, 354; Koerner 1993, 197-8.

⁷⁷ Maffi 1986, 70: “il problema che gli estensori della legge si sono posto... non è quello di giustificare la deroga al diritto di Naupatto [i.e. the infringement of the so-called *Personalitätsprinzip*]; cf. also Barta 2010, 398-426, esp. 415-26] ma di manovrare la disciplina dei rapporti privati (successioni e proprietà) per raggiungere uno scopo eminentemente politico – cioè assicurare la continuità della presenza ipocnamidia a Naupatto”. For the term νόμος, already occurring in the document with the meaning of “law”, cf. Hölkeskamp 2000, 80: “So bezeichnet schon das Gesetz der opuntischen Lokrer bezüglich ihrer Kolonisten im westlokrischen Naupaktos aus dem frühen 5. Jahrhundert sich selbst wiederum eindeutig als *thethmion*; an anderer Stelle des Textes wird dann aber auf bestimmte Klauseln des Gesetzes selbst mit dem Begriff τὰ νόμα verwiesen, und mit solchen Begriffen (νόμματα, νόμος) werden im gleichen Text auch noch andere Gesetze von Naupaktos beziehungsweise der Lokrer bezeichnet”.

⁷⁸ Zurbach 2017, II, 542: “Le term de *woikiatai* n’indique pas un statut particulier, mais

of *Politics*, the aim is to ensure that the number of colonists in Naupaktos remained stable and that the *epoikia* would not run the risk of being depleted over time. To this effect the statute provided for a set of rules for the order of succession: first direct heirs (γένος) and, as a second option, relatives qualifying as lawful heirs (ἐχεπάμουν) in Naupaktos (τῶν ἐπιροιῶν)⁷⁹, then the next-of-kin (ἐπάγχιστος) in Eastern Lokris, whether an adult or a boy, who, however, acquired title to inherit and take possession (κρατεῖν)⁸⁰ of the estate on condition of relocating to Naupaktos within three months. Only at this point, if there happened to be no legitimate heir, the οἶκος was to be considered ἔρημος and the laws of Naupaktos applied. Nonetheless, even in this case, it is probable that the estate was to be granted to some member of the community of the colonists⁸¹.

Conversely, although they became Naupaktians and were in fact to be regarded as ξένοι for religious (and judicial) purposes in Eastern Lokris (ll. 1-3: Λορρὸν τὸν Ἡποκναμίδιον ἐπεὶ καὶ Ναυπάκτιος γένηται, Ναυπάκτιον ἔοντα, ἥπος ξένον ὅσια λάγγάνει καὶ θύειν ἐξεῖμεν ἐπιτυχόντα, αἱ κα δεῖλεται)⁸², the colonists did not give up all their property rights in Hypoknemidian Lokris. We may as a result reasonably wonder what happened to

ce lien avec la terre fait penser à un groupe servile de type hilotique, d'autant plus que Timée dit que les Locriens, comme les Phocidiens, n'ont pas d'esclaves achetés (*argyrônētoi*: *FGrHist* 566 fr. 11)"; cf. also Koerner 1993, 200. See however Lewis 2023, 226-7 with note 8: "Here we have land and workers mentioned together – is this a case of serfdom, or just slaves and land being confiscated concurrently as happened to the Attic hermakopidai?"

⁷⁹ For a discussion of the problems related to the identification of the ἐχεπάμουν see Maffi 1986, 71.

⁸⁰ Kränzlein 1963, 17-9: "κρατεῖν bringt die Macht einer Person über eine Sache oder andere Personen zum Ausdruck". In his survey of the occurrences of the verb κρατεῖν Kränzlein does not, however, take into account this passage of the Lokrian "colonial law".

⁸¹ Maffi 1986, 70-2.

⁸² The provision refers to Naupaktians in Eastern Lokris and not in Naupaktos, as for instance incorrectly assumed by Asheri 1967, 353; Harris, Lewis 2023, 238. Cf. Koerner 1993, 178-9, and, among recent works, Peels 2017; Blok 2018, 90-1: "By this decree, by contrast, every colonist and his descendants, who now had their own covenant with the gods and fitting sacrificial regime in their new *polis* Naupaktos, could *always* participate in Lokris 'as strangers' because they were former Locrians". Whatever the interpretation of ὅσια in these lines, it is clear that the clause regulated participation of Naupaktian colonists in their former home *polis*. *Pace* Blok, such provision however shows that participation in cultic activities was *not* the decisive element in defining the very essence of citizenship.

the properties they owned in their motherland before migrating to Western Lokris. The answer to this issue is provided by two paragraphs of the law where it is laid down that, should one of the brothers, or the father to whom he had entrusted his *chrēmata* (a term surely including landed properties), die, the *epoikos* was entitled to take possession of his share according to the laws of his former home *polis* (ll. 29-31: τὸν χρεμάτων κρατεῖν τὸν ἐπίφορον, τὸ κατιρόμενον κρατεῖν; ll. 35-37: ἡόσστις κ' ἀπολίπει πατέρα καὶ τὸ μέρος τῶν χρεμάτων τῷ πατρὶ, ἐπεὶ κ' ἀπογένεται, ἐξεῖμεν ἀπολαχεῖν). In the case of the enigmatic Perkotharai and Mysacheis this was taken to extremes, in so far as “he and his property in Naupaktos will be subject to the laws of Naupaktos, those in Hypoknemidian Lokris shall be subject to the laws of the Hypoknemidians, as the law may be in each of the cities of Hypoknemidian Lokris”⁸³. The two groups of Perkotharai and Mysacheis as a consequence not only kept *potential* property rights in Eastern Lokris but actually owned property *at the same time* in Naupaktos and in the *poleis* they formerly belonged to⁸⁴.

How this can be explained in legal terms is a moot point. One could resort to the legal category of *isopoliteia*, as recently construed as a form of dual citizenship by Christel Müller⁸⁵, but in the colonial law it is plainly stated that the Naupaktian *epoikos* was to be considered a *xenos* at home and that he needed a *prostatēs* for judicial purposes, which evidently put him *outside* the political community⁸⁶. Or it could be surmised that the *epoikoi* simply retained their right of *enktēsis* at home even after moving to Western Lokris. There is admittedly hardly any secure attestation of the legal concept of *enktēsis* before the second half of the fifth century⁸⁷, al-

⁸³ ll. 22-27: ἐπεὶ καὶ Ναυπάκτιος τις γένεται, αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ χρέματα τὴν Ναυπάκτῳ τοῖς ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ χρεῖσται, τὰ δ' ἐν Λοκροῖς Ἰπποκναμιδίοις χρέματα τοῖς Ἰπποκναμιδίοις νομίῳις χρεῖσται, ἡόπος ἂ πόλις φεκάστον νομίζει.

⁸⁴ Zurbach 2017, II, 540-2. For a different, though not totally convincing, interpretation of these clauses see Maffi 1986, 73-81.

⁸⁵ Müller 2015, 358-66; 2022, 335-9.

⁸⁶ Cf. Gauthier 1972, 352, stressing that the “right to return” was “une assurance provisoire, valable tout au plus pour la première génération, si l'on en juge par les dispositions du texte relatives au droit de succession. Aussi doit-on se garder de parler d'isopolitie”.

⁸⁷ *IG I³* 227, ll. 19-21; 81, ll. 22-23; 102, ll. 30-31. L. Dubois, following J.G. Vinogradov (*SEG* 31.701), suggests that the expression γῆ[ς ἐγκ]τ[ησιν] should be restored in *I.dial. Olbia Pont* 5, a decree (δόγμα) from Olbia granting citizenship to two or three people from Sinope (c. 440 BCE) but considering the loss of most of the text doubts are as a

though – it bears stressing – its occurrence in the fragment from Argos of the inscribed document(s) regulating the relations between Knossos and Tylissos has gone almost unnoticed in scholarship. In the treaty, dated to the second quarter of the fifth century, it is laid down that “a Knossian shall not possess property in Tylissos but a Tylissian who wishes shall possess property in Knossos” (*IC I*, viii, 4 and xxx, 1 = *Nomima I.44* = OR 126, B, ll. 23-25: *χρέματα δὲ μὲ ἄνπιπασκέσθο ἡο Κνόσιος ἐν Τυλισοῖ, ἡο δὲ Τυλίσιος ἐν Κνοσοῖ ἡο χρέιζον*). As remarked by Henri van Effenterre and Françoise Ruzé in their commentary, “le verbe ἐνπιπάσκομαι est un *hapax*, sans doute dérivé d’ἐμπάομαι, équivalent d’ἐγκτάομαι”⁸⁸.

Another possible line of approach, and surely the most plausible one, as suggested by Hans Beck, is to look at the problem in practical terms: the expedition of the colonists to Naupaktos, as indicated by ll. 8-10 (*ἀ κα ἡυπ’ ἀνάγκας ἀπελάονται ἐ(γ) Ναυπάκτο Λογροὶ τοὶ Ἠυποκναμίδιοι, ἐξεῖμεν ἀνχορεῖν ἡόπο φέκαστος ἐν, ἄνευ ἐνετερίον*), was not devoid of risks and there was no warranty of success. Recruitment of the colonists needed to be encouraged. The aim of the law was therefore to find the right balance between stability and continuity for the new settlement and the guarantee offered to the *epoikoi* that they were not being ousted from their old communities and their economic interests were, at least in the medium term, protected and safeguarded⁸⁹.

minimum justified (*status quaestionis* in *SEG* 47.1180).

⁸⁸ *Nomima I*, 231, where the authors add: “Les *χρέματα* seraient donc ici les biens immobiliers, mais à la l. 32 il s’agit de prises de guerre: un seul mot pour les possessions mobilières et immobilières? Ce droit d’*enktesis* sans réciprocité est très surprenant: témoignerait-il de la tentation impérialiste des Cnossiens?”. Cf. also Minon 2007b, 197 with note 163, connecting the verb ἐνπιπάσκομαι to πᾶμ[ατα] in *IG* IV 506, l. 3. On Argos’ arbitration between Knossos and Tylissos see above § 5, note 57. Another even more tantalising case is provided by what remains of a late archaic bronze plaque from Kasmennai where (Syrakousan?, Kasmenian?) γαμόροι are apparently awarded ἀ[τέλειαν και ἐν[κτασιν] (or ἐν[πασιν]) (*SEG* 4.27 = *Nomima I.18* = *I.dial. Sicile* 219, ll. 2-3). The restoration of the term *enktesis* has been proposed virtually by all editors. If correct, it would represent far the earliest (and most unexpected) occurrence of the term; cf. Erdas 2006, 45-47, 50-1 note 12 (“[t]ra il 491 e il 484 a.C.”; cf. Her. 7.155.2); Mignosa 2021 (dating the text to the end of the sixth century).

⁸⁹ Beck 1999, 55: “Der Beschluß verfolgte somit einen ‘widerspruchsvollen Mittelweg’ zwischen der Aussendung und Anbindung von Bürgern, der sich allem Anschein nach dadurch erklärt, daß das Motiv für die Epoikie in der Stärkung der Wehrtüchtigkeit der naupaktischen Bürgerschaft gegenüber den benachbarten Aitolern lag. Wollte man in Ostlokris Bürger finden, die sich freiwillig auf ein solches riskantes Unternehmen

As already noted, a striking feature of this Lokrian document is the surprising level of institutionalisation it reflects. On the one hand, taxation appears to be one of the primary concerns: in several paragraphs of the law mention is made of diverse local and federal taxes, both in Ozolian and Hypoknemidian Lokris⁹⁰. On the other hand, the document refers to a vote of an assembly, both of the Opountian Thousand in Opeus and of the *epoikoi* in Naupaktos, as mandatory for a revision of the status of the colonists as well as to a well-designed judicial procedure with judges (δικαστῆρες), a prosecutor submitting an indictment (ll. 41 and 43: τοῖ ἐγκαλεμένοι, a technical term here probably attested for the first time), an entrenchment clause (ll. 38-44) setting severe penalties such as *atimia* and confiscation of property (ll. 41 and 44: χρέματα παματοφαγεῖσθαι) for those who attempted to change the statutes (ἡόσστις κα τὰ φεραδερότα διαφθείρει, literally “destroys the decisions”) without following the appropriate procedure. In sum, the importance of property rights in contributing to the development of statehood, even for individuals who happened to be in between (or at the intersection of) two discrete communities, is here at the forefront.

6.2. Distributions of land to individuals

Further early inscriptions attesting the grant of landed assets this time to *individuals* are⁹¹:

1. The decree from Gortyn where “the polis as a whole” (Γόρτυνς ἐπίπανσα) granted, “gave as a gift” (δορίαν ἔδοκαν), a bundle of honours to a Dionysios, certainly a *xenos*, all together totaling to something equal to citizenship and including, alongside access to “a citizen’s justice” (φαστίαν δίκαν), a house and an *oikopedon* (καὶ φοικίαν ἐν Ἄφλῳνι ἔνδος Πύργου καὶ φοικόπεδον) (*I.Cret.* IV, 64 = *LAC* G64), c. 525-500 BCE.

einließen, so mußten die materiellen Risiken der Kolonisten durch gesetzliche Erleichterung des Wiedereintritts in ihr ursprüngliches Bürgerrecht abgedeckt werden”; cf. also Zurbach 2017, II, 540-3, stressing that the property claims of the *epoikoi*, now resident in Naupaktos, notwithstanding the detailed provisions of the law, were nonetheless in the long run bound to be put at risk, hence the need to insert a clause on judicial procedure (Z, ll. 31-35) between paragraphs F (ll. 29-31) and Ξ (ll. 35-37).

⁹⁰ ll. 4-6 (τέλος...μὲ φάρειν ἐν Λορροῖς τοῖς Ἑποικναμιδοῖς), 7-8 and 9-10 (ἄνευ ἐνετερίων), 10-11 (τέλος μὲ φάρειν μεδὲν ἡότι μὲ <μ>ετὰ Λορρόν τῶν φεσπάρων), 15-16 (ἔντε κ’ ἀποτεῖσει τὰ νόμια Ναυπακτίως).

⁹¹ For the documents examined in this section the comparative analysis in van Effenterre 1979 remains essential.

2. The rather laconic grant of citizenship (ll. 2-3: Χαλάδριον ἕμεν αὐτὸν καὶ γόνον) and land (γῆ) in Pisa, coupled with some additional privileges, i.e. the status of *ῥισοπρόξενος* and *ῥισοδαμιοργός*, to a certain Deukalion by the Chaladrioi in an inscription from Olympia, c. 500-475 BCE (ll. 4-5: τὰν δὲ γᾶ[v] ἔχεν τὰν ἐν Πίσαι) (*IvO* 11 = Minon 2007a, no. 12)⁹².

Other similar documents, respectively from Cyprus and Crete, that could belong in this *dossier* are less clear because the status of the honorand before and, above all, *after* the grant of the honours remains uncertain⁹³.

3. The “tablet (*daltos*) of Idalion” from Cyprus concerning the award, as “remuneration (*misthos*) and additional gratuity”, of two fields (ll. 8 and 18: χῶρος) and an orchard (l. 20: κᾶπος) from the royal land (l. 8 and 17: ἀπὸ τᾶ γᾶ(?) τᾶ βασιλῆφος), together with the full right to sell (*πανώνιον/πανώνιο(v)ς*) and *ateleia*⁹⁴, to the doctor Onasilos son of Onasikypros and to his brothers, c. 499-478 BCE (*ICS* 217 = *Nomima* I.31), is paradigmatic in this respect⁹⁵. Onasilos – a personal name that is frequently attested in Cyprus since the archaic age⁹⁶ – in all likelihood came from another city on the island of Cyprus⁹⁷. Whether with this grant he became a citizen of the *polis* of Idalion (cf. l. 2: βασιλεὺς Στασίκυπρος κὰς ἄ πτόλις Ἐδαλιῆφες) is difficult to say. What is certain is, at any rate, that he and his descendants were meant (and encouraged) to stay in Idalion “forever” (ll. 10, 28, 31), in other words for the generations to come (ll. 29-31: τά(v)ς γε γᾶ(?) (v)ς τά(v)σδε κὰς τὸ(v)ς κάπο(v)ς τό(v)σδε οἱ Ὀνασικύπρων παῖδες κὰς τῶ(v) παίδων οἱ παῖδες ἔξο(v)σι αἰφεῖ, οἰ(ῖ) ἰ(v) τ’ οἰρῶνι τῶι Ἐδαλιῆφι ἴω(v)σι). Significantly, considering the relatively early date of the inscription, the document startlingly provides detailed information about the location and boundaries of the properties granted to the physician and his brothers in

⁹² What the status of *ῥισοπρόξενος* and *ῥισοδαμιοργός*, “avec les mêmes privileges (ou droits?) qu’un proxène et qu’un demiurge”, concretely entailed in the inscription is debated: cf. Gauthier 1972, 44-6; *Nomima* I, 100; Minon 2007a, 89; Piñol Villanueva 2013, 124-5; Zurbach 2017, II, 488-9.

⁹³ van Effenterre 1979, 282-7.

⁹⁴ Georgiadou 2010, 154-5. The document thus strikingly anticipates, albeit with different terminology, the conditions stated in some land donations of early Hellenistic Macedonia, including *Syll.*³ 332 = Hatzopoulos 1996, II, no. 20 (ll. 10-15: καθάπερ καὶ Φίλιππος ἔδ[ω]κεν ἐμ πατρικοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγγόνις κυρίοις οὔσι κεκτῆσθαι καὶ ἀλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι), and 18-23; cf. Faraguna 2018.

⁹⁵ On this document see Georgiadou 2010; Perdicoyianni-Paleologou 2021.

⁹⁶ Fraser, Matthews 1987, 350.

⁹⁷ Perdicoyianni-Paleologou 2021, 41-2.

perpetuity, identifying them with detailed reference to their whereabouts and to the names of the neighbouring owners (ll. 8-9, 17-22), a method that is otherwise well attested in epigraphic documents only from the second half of the *fourth* century⁹⁸.

4. In the Spensithios inscription from Datala in Crete (*Nomima* I.22 = *LAC* Da1) the *ποινικιστάς* is promised rations of food (*θροπά*) and, as an annual salary (*misthos*), 50 measures (*prokooi*) of grape must⁹⁹. Intriguingly, it is specified that the *polis* was to provide the must “from whatever portion of land (*μόρος*) he may wish” (ll. 14-15: ἐξ τῷ μόρῳ ὅπῳ καὶ λεῖ ἐλέσθαι)¹⁰⁰. We do not know whether Spensithios, before being appointed to the office of *poinikistas*, was a foreigner. What is clear, however, is that, according to the decree, he was remarkably to perform sacrifices on behalf of the *polis* whenever there was no special priest (B, ll. 4-6) and that he was in the future to belong to an ἀνδρήϊον and pay the dues members had to contribute (B, ll. 11-14). His primary task, “to write and remember for the *polis* public matters, both sacred and secular” (A, ll. 4-5: πόλι τὰ δαμόσια τὰ τε θήϊα καὶ τὰνθρώπινα ποινικάζεν τε καὶ μναμονεῦρην), was moreover life-long, hereditary and exclusive for his offspring (A, ll. 7-10: αὐτόν τε καὶ γενιᾶν τῶν). Like in the case of Onasilos at Idalion, it was assumed that Spensithios and his family would be part of the community for generations. As a result, whatever his origins, it appears probable that he was (or was to become) a citizen and a full, indeed quite privileged member of the community¹⁰¹. No landed property that was granted to him is mentioned in the text, although he was expected to be able to “give ten axes of meat...and the annual obligation” (B, ll. 11-13: τὸ ἐπεινάτιον). We can surmise that Spensithios must have been in possession of some tract of land. Leaving this aside, even in a minimalist approach, we can nonetheless at least con-

⁹⁸ Faraguna 2019, 108-11; Faguer 2020; Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 325-47.

⁹⁹ On this document and the numerous questions it poses see Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 138-43, with bibliography.

¹⁰⁰ van Effenterre 1979, 281: “pour Spensithios, on autorise un prélèvement direct de certains produits, comme le moult, γλεῦκος, ainsi que la perception privilégiée de droits domaniaux, τεμένια”. For the term *μόρος* in a sixth-century inscription from Chios regulating land cultivation see *SEG* 56.995. Cf. also the κοῦλοι μόροι in *IG* IX 1².3, 609 = *Nomima* I.44, l. 20.

¹⁰¹ *LAC*, 189; Pałuchowski 2019, 21-23 with note 23. Zurbach 2017, II, 461-2, rather thinks of “un statut intermédiaire permettant à cet étranger de vivre dans la cité, avec protection de ses biens contre la prise de gage et la saisie (B 6-11) et privilèges en justice”. See also van Effenterre 1979, 286-7.

clude that, whether the *moros* was public land or the must was paid to the *polis* as a share of produce for taxation purposes, some form of direct public involvement in (and control over) the property regime was clearly in place.

7. Confiscation of properties

Ownership rights were so entwined with the privilege (*timē*) of belonging to the community that *atimia* in the legal sense, when involving the loss of one's citizen status, and thus leading to the deprivation of all the rights pertaining to a citizen¹⁰², also brought about the loss of that privilege and, together with it, confiscation of property¹⁰³. We are of course familiar with the records of the Athenian *poletai* about the sales of property confiscated from those convicted of mutilating the Herms and profaning the Eleusinian Mysteries in 415 BCE (*Agora XIX*, P1) and from the Thirty Tyrants and other officials involved in the events of 404/3 BCE (*Agora XIX*, P2), but it should be noted that such procedures are epigraphically attested for Athens and for other *poleis* at a much earlier date and, as in the case of distributions of land, go back to the sixth century.

1. A newly published inscription on a bronze πίναξ (l. 18) from Olympia (c. 475-450 BCE)¹⁰⁴, possibly stemming from a reconciliation agreement for the Elean *polis* of Ledrinoi, contains the ruling (δοκιμία) of three foreign judges from Pellene in Achaia detailing the prohibitions those who had been condemned were subject to. These, as far as can be gleaned from this rather difficult text, were banned from public banquets, from communal activities on a threshing floor (assemblies?), from military service as hoplites, from hoeing (and thus cultivating) some kind of "hetairic" land (μεδὲ σκαλείεν σκάλαν μεδεμίαν ἑταιρικών)¹⁰⁵ and from performing sac-

¹⁰² Youni 2019, 368. On *atimia* as both a socio-ethical and a legal form of dishonour see also, most recently, Rocchi 2023.

¹⁰³ Filonik 2023, 273. See also Karabélias 2005b, 271-2.

¹⁰⁴ Hallof 2021, 99-121; for the linguistic aspects of the document cf. also Minon 2021.

¹⁰⁵ The expression "hetairic land" (σκάλαν...ἑταιρικών) remains obscure, although it could perhaps make sense if the *hetaireia* was, like in Kyrene (ML 5 = Boffa 2021, ll. 15-16; cf. Crisculo 2001) and Gortyn (*IC IV* 42, B, ll. 11-14; 72, X, ll. 37-39), a subdivision of the civic body. In this case, we would have to assume that the prohibition applied to some category of public land. For the verb σκαλείω/σκαλεύω, "hoe" (German "hacken") cf. also the late archaic (and possibly contemporary) law about "agricultural activities" from Olympia, published in the same year as our document by Siewert 2021, l. 3: ἔλεος σκαλέροντα τὰμέραι τᾶι κυρία<ι>, with the commentary at pp. 152-3, 160-

rifices before a seer (ἐπὶ μάντι)¹⁰⁶, under penalty of confiscation of their real properties (including τὰ[ς μ]εγίστας χώρας), which were to be “made public” and dedicated to Zeus Olympios (τὰ δ’ αὐτῷ δαμευτῆμεν ποτῷ Διὸ τὸλυμπίῳ) (Il. 2-8)¹⁰⁷.

2. Confiscation of properties (χρέματα παματοφαγεῖσθαι is the expression twice used in the text), as we saw before, is one of the penalties for those attempting to change the “colonial law” of Naupaktos without following the established procedure (*IG IX 1². 3, 718 = ML 20 = Nomima I.44, ll. 41 and 44*).

3. OR 133, a marble stele from Chios c. 475-450 BCE, records on sides B, C and D the proceedings of the public sale of houses and landed properties confiscated from a number of individuals presumably after a *stasis*¹⁰⁸. The properties are in some (but not all) cases identified with their geographical location.

4. A still unpublished inscription on a bronze tablet from Thebes, dated by A.P. Matthaiou to the end of the sixth century, contains entries related to the public sale of properties belonging to seven persons with the name of the owner, the place where they were located and the size of the property (*SEG 60.507*). The term *πρατίδιοι* in all probability refers to the board of magistrates in charge of the public sales¹⁰⁹.

5. A sale of confiscated properties carried out by a πρόγροφος is also witnessed by a sixth-century bronze tablet from Argos (*IG IV 506 = Nomima I.100*).

6. Kimon Koalemos, Miltiades’ father¹¹⁰, was able to “come back from exile to his own property under treaty” (κατήλθε ἐπὶ τὰ ἐωντοῦ ὑπόσπονδος), which was apparently exceptional enough to be mentioned (Her. 6.103.3). Confiscation and public auction of the properties must have been the rule in such cases.

2, suggesting that the document, where a substantial part of the text on the right side of the column is missing, might have regulated an operation of land division (l. 5), in particular “die Gewinnung von Neuland” – sacred or public – “zur Verpachtung” (160).

¹⁰⁶ Hallof 2021, 109. Minon 2021, 128, translates “de sacrifier sous la responsabilité d’un devin”.

¹⁰⁷ See the commentary in Hallof 2021, 107-12.

¹⁰⁸ Faraguna 2005; Matthaiou 2011a; cf. also Mackil 2021, 193-7.

¹⁰⁹ Matthaiou 2014, 215-20 (no. 3); Papazarkadas 2021, 272.

¹¹⁰ Davies 1971, 300 (no. 8429, VII).

7. According to Herodotus, when Peisistratos' properties were put up to auction after his banishment from Athens, Kallias was the only Athenian who dared to purchase them (Her. 6.121.2: μούνος Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων ἐτόλμα, ὅκως Πεισίστρατος ἐκπέσοι ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνέων, τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ κηρυσσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ δημοσίου ὠνέεσθαι).

Akin to confiscation is expropriation of private property in the public interest. It obviously involved some form of restitution¹¹¹. Publicly sanctioned expropriation is securely witnessed for classical Athens by Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 39.3 with regard to the reconciliation agreement (διαλύσεις) between the democrats and the oligarchs in 403 BCE. In the treaty it was provided that for the oligarchs who decided to relocate to Eleusis no expropriation of properties belonging to the inhabitants of Eleusis could be legally enforced, unless the owner agreed to it or it had been decided by a board of six assessors (τιμηταί), three for each party, who had to provide an independent estimate of the amount to be paid (ἐὰν δέ τινες τῶν ἀπίοντων οἰκίαν λαμβάνωσιν Ἐλευσῖνι, συμπεῖθειν τὸν κεκτημένον· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ συμβαίνωσιν ἀλλήλοις, τιμητὰς ἐλέσθαι τρεῖς ἑκάτερον, καὶ ἦντιν' ἂν οὗτοι τάξωσι τιμὴν λαμβάνειν)¹¹². The earliest example, which the historian sets some time during the sixth century, is provided by Herodotus' tale about the μάντις Euenios (9.92.2-95), a rich and noble citizen of Apollonia on the Adriatic¹¹³ who was chosen to keep watch over the sacred sheep of Helios and caused many to be killed by wolves when he fell asleep¹¹⁴. He was first condemned by a court (δικαστήριον) to be blinded but, when in-

¹¹¹ Karabélias 2005a, 214-26. Conversely, Jones 1956, 198, interestingly notes that “[e]xpropriation without compensation, although an ever-present danger in the troubled conditions of Greek politics, was regarded as essentially inconsistent with the nature of the institution of property”.

¹¹² Karabélias 2005a, 216-7: “en cas de désaccord, l'expropriation fut confiée à la décision d'un collège de six arbitres, désignés pour la moitié par chaque partie en cause. Cette expropriation avait eu lieu en vertu de l'accord passé entre les deux factions opposés, mais ses modalités de dédommagement et les détails de son application relevaient d'une décision arbitrale de six τιμηταί. Seuls les six τιμηταί étaient habilités à décider sur l'opportunité de l'expropriation et sur le prix de la maison, proposé au propriétaire éleusinien”.

¹¹³ According to Arist. *Pol.* 1290b8-14, offices in Apollonia were open only to those who were descendants of the first settlers ([at Apollonia and at Thera] ἐν ταῖς τιμαῖς ἦσαν οἱ διαφέροντες κατ' εὐγένειαν καὶ πρῶτοι κατασχόντες τὰς ἀποικίας); cf. Hansen, Nielsen 2004, 328-9.

¹¹⁴ On the story of Euenios see Flower, Marincola 2002, 39-44; Grottanelli 1994; Reggiani 2011, 113-8.

fertility hit the land, he was compensated with two among the best estates (ἀγροί, κληροί) in the country and a beautiful house in the city, which he had himself chosen (9.94.2: εἶπας εἶ τις οἱ δοίη ἀγρούς, τῶν ἀστῶν ὀνομάσας τοῖσι ἠπίστατο εἶναι καλλίστους δύο κλήρους τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀπολλωνίῃ, καὶ οἴκησιν πρὸς τούτοισι τὴν ἥδεε καλλίστην ἐοῦσαν τῶν ἐν πόλει). What is interesting in our perspective is that Herodotus, who places his tale, centred on the notion of δίκη, in the framework of the functioning of the institutions in Apollonia¹¹⁵, somewhat unnecessarily stresses that the properties granted to Euenios had been legally purchased, in fact expropriated, by the Apollonians from their previous owners (9.94.3: οἱ δὲ πριάμενοι παρὰ τῶν ἐκτημένων διδοῦσί οἱ τὰ εἴλετο)¹¹⁶.

8. Protection of boundaries

Disputes over boundaries can be expected to be a frequent event in a community where farming is the primary source of subsistence. A similar situation is already described by a locus in Homer's *Iliad* where, in a simile, we find two individuals "when they argue over the boundary stones in the strip of land they share, having measuring sticks in their hands, and in a narrow piece of ground disagree about the fair division" (12.421-423: ἀλλ' ὥς τ' ἄμφ' οὔροισι δὺ' ἀνέρε δηριάσθον, μέτρ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες, ἐπιξύνω ἐν ἀρούρη, ὃ τ' ὀλίγω ἐνὶ χώρῳ ἐρίζητον περὶ ἴσης)¹¹⁷. In Plato's *Laws*, as part of his "agricultural laws" (νόμοι γεωργικοί), boundaries were for this reason to be under the protection of Zeus *Horios* and "no man shall move boundary-markers of land (μὴ κινέτω γῆς ὄρια μηδεὶς), whether belonging to a neighbour and fellow-citizen or to the one who shares the border (in case he holds adjoining land on a frontier)" since this equals to "moving what cannot be moved" (τάκινετα κινεῖν) and is sacrosanct (842e-843a). In Aristotle's

¹¹⁵ Grottanelli 1994, 80: "le récit... place ce pasteur, ce devin, dans le contexte d'une cité grecque, dont les institutions et les lois règlent le fonctionnement de ce qu'Hérodote nous raconte".

¹¹⁶ Karabélias 2005a, 215-6.

¹¹⁷ For the meanings of ὄρος in the early sources see in general Casevitz 1993, 17-21; Gschnitzer 1994, 21-24: "Die geläufige Bezeichnung der Grenze und zugleich des Grenzzeichens (normalweise eines Grenzsteines) ist im Griechischen ὄρος"; for a commentary on this Homeric locus cf. also Zurbach 2017, I, 230: "Différentes circonstances peuvent expliquer ce passage: examen commun des limites de champs après empiètement, partage d'un héritage, fondation de cité (comme à Schérie) ou installation de nouvelles familles dans une communauté existante".

Politics, supervision over boundaries, both of private and public properties, in the city and in the countryside is as a result the task of officials, respectively the *astynomoi* and the *agronomoi*, that are deemed as “necessary” for a *polis* (1321b21-24, 27-30). *Horoï* are moreover a ubiquitous feature of the epigraphic landscape of Greek cities. It is therefore not surprising that public intervention with a view to ensuring protection of boundaries is again attested already in the archaic period, from Solon’s legislation onwards.

1. OR 133, a document I already mentioned before, side A, concerns the setting up of 75 *horoï* in total (ll. 6-7) to mark the boundaries of a tract of public land named Dophitis. The location of the boundary-markers is indicated with reference to toponyms, to a crossroad and to a sanctuary of Apollo Delios. The task is significantly to be carried out by a board of ὄροφύλακες, “boundary-guards” (or “guardians of boundary-stones”)¹¹⁸. It is striking to note that the same method of describing the boundaries of a portion of territory, in this case with regard to land sacred to Apollo, also recurs in a recently published περιορισμός of the late second century BCE from the island of Lepsia, where it is stated that the *periorismos* already existed and was available on a *pinax* (ἀναγεγραμμέν[ος] ἐ[μ]πίνακτι) and was now to be inscribed εἰς στήλην λιθίνην (*IG XII 4*, 3897, ll. 4-11)¹¹⁹.

2. Procedural rules with regard to boundary disputes (ll. 2-3: αἱ ἀκριαῖ ἀτέρα γὰ πορτὶ τὰ μολιόμενα, “where the other’s land ends with reference to the pleadings”) are detailed in *I.Cret.* IV 42, B = *LAC G42*, B, from Gortyn dated to the first half of the fifth century.

3. According to *Plut. Sol.* 23.7-8 and *Dig.* 10.1.13 (= Leão, Rhodes 2015, frs. 60-62), a law of Solon regulated some basic matters such as the distance that had to be left from a neighbour’s land when building walls or planting trees¹²⁰.

¹¹⁸ Faraguna 2005; Matthaiou 2011a, translating ὄροφύλακες with “curators of boundary-stones” (at p. 22 and 31). Cf. also Rousset 1994, 98-9 note 4.

¹¹⁹ Dreliossi-Herakleidou, Hallof 2018.

¹²⁰ Paoli 1949; Méléze Modrzejewski 2013, 336-8, underlining “le caractère panhellénique de la législation en question”; Leão, Rhodes 2015, 103-5; Schmitz 2023, II, 734-42.

9. Legal restrictions of ownership rights

An interesting facet of the process of institutionalisation we are trying to trace is represented by public intervention in regulating the right to use or enter another individual's real property, thus restricting to some extent the latter's right of ownership, under certain well-defined circumstances¹²¹.

1. In classical Athens (and probably earlier on) there must surely have been, as part of the νόμος μεταλλικός (Dem. 37.35)¹²², some provisions regulating the complex relationships between contractors who obtained a mine lease from the *polis* and owners of the plots where the mines happened to be physically located¹²³, but, unfortunately, we never hear about them in the sources.

2. There is more evidence concerning water rights and access to wells. In the register of the *astynomoi* of Tenos (*IG XII 5*, 872), at the end of the fourth century BCE (or, as recently argued by J. Faguer on paleographical and prosopographical grounds, at the end of the third century BCE¹²⁴), in nine of the transactions recorded on the stele the country estates sold also included access to water resources, either because there was a spring on the premises or because the possessor had the right to draw water from sources outside the boundaries of the property and there were water conduits to this end¹²⁵.

¹²¹ I prefer to leave aside concepts such as those of “servitude” or “easement” which were developed in other legal cultures – respectively in Roman (Burdese 1970, 119: “Le servitù prediali...si configurano, a partire dall’ultima età repubblicana, quali diritti reali limitati, che importano una utilizzazione parziale di un fondo, cosiddetto servente, a vantaggio di un altro fondo, cosiddetto dominante”); Capogrossi Colognesi 1976, esp. 271-86 and 553-67, whose main interest lies in the approach aiming to trace a direct connection between the emergence of the category of *iura in re aliena* and the development of the concept of ownership) and in Common law (Law 2022, *s.v.* Easement, 244: “A right enjoyed by the owner of land (the dominant tenement) to a benefit from other land (the servient tenement). An easement benefits and binds the land itself and therefore continues despite any change of ownership of either dominant or servient tenements”; cf. Harrison 1968, 249-52) – and can only be improperly applied to Greek law. I draw the expression “restrictions of ownership rights” from Kränzlein 1963, 58-70 (“Die Beschränkungen des Eigentums”); Biscardi 1982, 187 (“limitazioni nell’interesse pubblico e privato”); Martini 125-6. Cf. also Todd 1993, 247: “the right... to restrict the freedom of use”.

¹²² MacDowell 2006.

¹²³ On the mine lease system in classical Athens see Thür, Faraguna 2018.

¹²⁴ Faguer 2020, 159 with note 4.

¹²⁵ Faraguna 2015b, 393-4.

3. If we move back in time, an early fifth-century law from Gortyn (*I. Cret.* IV 43, Bb = *LAC* G43, Bb), inscribed as part of a set of four legal documents, three of which deal with land management¹²⁶, established the right to derive water from the middle of the river into one's property but also set limits to the amount of water that could be extracted. We do not know whether the law applied only to those whose property bordered the river or, less likely, to all those who were in need of water. Two other Gortynian laws (*I. Cret.* IV 52 = *LAC* G52; *I. Cret.* 73A = *LAC* G73A) appear to have regulated the channeling and flowing of water through a neighbour's property¹²⁷. The details of the provisions are difficult to pinpoint and remain to some extent unclear¹²⁸.

4. As is well-known, Solon's legislation already concerned the use of public wells and the right of access to a neighbour's well and, in the latter case, it specified how deep it was necessary to dig in order to ascertain that there was no water in one's property so as to be legally entitled to share the neighbour's water (*Plut. Sol.* 23.6 = Leão, Rhodes 2015, fr. 63)¹²⁹.

5. Similar rules also applied to access to family graves. As noted by A.R.W. Harrison, this seems to be implied by *Dem.* 55.14¹³⁰ and is confirmed, in the case of the transport of a corpse, by an early fifth-century law from Gortyn. Since for once it is well preserved, I quote it in full: "if there should not be a public road, there is to be immunity for those who carry a corpse through another person's land (δι' ἀλλότριον κορίον νέκυν πέρονσι ἄπατον ἤμην); and if anyone should prevent it, he shall pay ten staters. But if there is a road and the relatives should carry (a corpse) through..." (*I. Cret.* IV 46 = *LAC* G46, B, ll. 6-14).

10. Landholding and the "epigraphic habit"

Even leaving aside the almost ubiquitous laws about inheritance and adoption (beginning with the early laws of Pheidon of Corinth [*Arist. Pol.* 1265b12-16] and Philolaos of Corinth [*Arist. Pol.* 1274b2-5], respectively

¹²⁶ *I. Cret.* IV 43, Ba, in particular, records the grant of the use of public land which is made available by the *polis* for cultivation (ll. 1-3: τὰν ἐ[ν] Κησκόραι καὶ ἐμ Πάλαι πτωταλιὰν ἔ [ἐ] δοκαν ἀ πόλις πυτεῦσαι). See the commentary in *LAC*, 309.

¹²⁷ Faraguna 2015b, 394-6.

¹²⁸ See the discussion in Faraguna 2015b, 395-6 with note 24.

¹²⁹ Faraguna 2015b, 391-2; Schmitz 2023, II, 742-4.

¹³⁰ Harrison 1968, 250.

on the number of *klēroi* to be kept unchanged and on adoption, παιδοποιία, in Thebes), the documents I have collected, though scattered and often fragmentary, draw a fairly coherent picture. Individually, each testimony sheds light on a specific aspect and is worth studying by itself, but, taken as a whole, the evidence appears to come together and point to the *polis*' increasing role in regulating several aspects of the property regime *already from the sixth century*. We must also take into account the “epigraphic habit”: the documents we have, for several reasons not only connected to the unpredictable paths of their preservation from antiquity onwards, are only a minimal fraction of a much larger body of texts that were mostly written on perishable materials. I believe this is especially true in respect to archaic legislations (especially from Athens and Gortyn)¹³¹, but the same no doubt also applies to property records. In the “tablet of Idalion” we find a description of the nature, location and boundaries of the properties given to Onasilos which we only regularly find in documents from the fourth century and later and this shows that such records *did* exist in that form, although for a long time they never (or only occasionally) feature in inscriptions. If, to quote an example, we consider the case of Athens, the oldest preserved decree we have, *c.* 508-500 BCE, concerns the cleruchy on Salamis and forbids the lease of the allotments on the island (*IG I³ 1 + Add. p. 935*). This notwithstanding, we need to wait until well into the second half of the fifth century before we encounter more epigraphic evidence on distributions (or leases) of land and property records in Euboea (*IG I³ 418*; cf. *IG I³ 420*; *Ael. V.H. 6.1*)¹³² and Brea (*IG I³ 46*). Surely there must have been other laws, introduced during the first half of the fifth century, regulating landholding, but we do not hear of them.

Many of the functions performed by the *polis* in the classical period I listed before (§ 3) are already attested, albeit spasmodically, by archaic documents. Norms regulating in detail the relations between owners of contiguous properties (§ 9) are in particular instructive in this respect, for they make sense only on a territory which is fairly intensively occupied and where anyone is likely to have a neighbour. I would also place Solon's legislation on land and the *hektēmoroi* in this context (see above § 2, note 32). As already stressed in previous scholarship, public intervention was not as a rule intended to protect individual rights but to ensure the overall

¹³¹ Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 101-32.

¹³² Morison 2003.

good functioning and well-being of the community as a whole¹³³. This is for instance apparent from the West-Lokrian law on the distribution of land where exchange of the allotments is possible but only under public control. The aim is clearly to ensure political stability within the citizens' community and to avoid conflict and, ultimately, the risk of a *stasis*.

11. Land records

This leads me to the second focus point I referred to at the beginning of this paper. It brings us back to *land records* and will allow me to touch also on the other chronological end, the Hellenistic period. Although, to be fair, the legal definition and regulation of property rights and the use of property records and/or land registers are in principle not necessarily interrelated phenomena and the need for written land records could also originate from separate and independent processes, it can still be reasonably assumed that the latter may be in some way a reflection of the former¹³⁴. From the extant body of texts, literary and epigraphical, it appears that as a rule a Greek city needed to exert control over “who owned what land”¹³⁵ in its territory for several administrative purposes – political, legal and fiscal¹³⁶. For instance, if the argument I proposed some years ago is valid, the ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον, the register kept by the demarch in each Attic deme, recorded both the roster of citizens affiliated to the deme and information concerning land ownership within its boundaries, including properties owned by the ἐγκεκτημένοι, i.e. citizens registered in other demes. Even before the administrative reorganization of Attica under Kleisthenes such records were most likely kept within the naucraries, so that we can posit that there must have been some connection between naucrary records and the Solonian property classes (τέλη)¹³⁷.

¹³³ I cannot share M. Canevaro's view that “Solon's order is meant to protect individuals' rights, prerogatives, their differential *time*” with little sense of “a community of Athenians that share rights, prerogatives and concerns” (Canevaro 2022, 401-3).

¹³⁴ Harris 2016.

¹³⁵ The quotation is from Thomas 1989, 82, who however uses it to the opposite end, while arguing that “[o]ther types of record were never made in the first place – for instance, there was no land register and no list of those eligible for agonistic liturgies... There was no central register of citizens. Some of this kind of information did not need written documents but was transmitted by oral means. Everyone in each deme knew who owned what land”.

¹³⁶ Boffo, Faraguna 2021, esp. 363-7; cf. also Harris 2016.

¹³⁷ Faraguna 1997; 2003, 104-7; Pébarthe 2013, 116-21; Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 160-3,

This is not to claim that Greek *poleis* had any such thing as a “cadaster”, if by this term we intend a systematic set of entries organized by location, in other terms in a *topographical order*. As shown by Isabelle Pernin, this is a modern concept which can hardly, or only seldom, be applied to the Greek city¹³⁸. Yet, in the diverse epigraphical documentation that has been preserved there are many public inscriptions recording single properties or lists of properties associated to the name(s) of the owner(s) and, interestingly enough, sometimes also of the *previous* owner. The typologies of such texts are manifold and include deeds of sale, registers of sales, sales of confiscated properties, lists of lands assigned to cleruchs or colonists, lists of real properties pledged as security for loans¹³⁹. In most cases they are organised chronologically or on a personal basis. More rarely, the ordering criterion is geo-topographical and the entries are listed one after the other according to spatial units arranged in strips or bands of territory, each comprising a certain number of plots (*SEG* 64.501), although the impression is that such records did not as a rule describe the entire *chōra* of a *polis* but only some sectors or some specific categories of land¹⁴⁰. We also have to consider that the information available tends to be rather patchy since most of these texts inscribed on stone are connected to some particular event and are thus the result of out-of-ordinary conditions (see above § 10). What we lack are documents primarily mirroring everyday administrative practice.

The most frequently recurring types of documents are the deeds of sales, such as those from northern Greece (the largest part being from Olynthos and Amphipolis)¹⁴¹, or the registers of sales, like the “register of the *astynomoi*” of Tenos¹⁴², in whose structure, with some variation, we find the date, the names of the buyer and the vendor, a sometimes quite detailed description of the property and its appurtenances, its location and boundaries, the price

with bibliography; Faraguna forthcoming (a).

¹³⁸ Pernin 2023, with the *Discussion* at pp. 423-31.

¹³⁹ For a comprehensive survey and discussion of the evidence cf. Faraguna 2000; 2019, esp. 108-15; Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 293-367.

¹⁴⁰ Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 351-8; for a Hellenistic inscription from Argos (*SEG* 41.282), where similarly the honorand is praised for taking care that “the parcels [of the “sacred and public land] are registered *one after the other*” (ὅπως ἀναγράφονται οἱ γῶαι ἐφεξῆς), as opposed to the situation before when they were registered ἐν διεσπασμένοις τόποις, “in scattered places”, see Pernin 2023, 397-8.

¹⁴¹ Game 2008; Faguer 2021; Harris 2023.

¹⁴² Faguer 2020; Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 325-31; Pernin 2023, 410-6.

paid and the names of the witnesses and guarantors. The legal framework is provided by a fragment of Theophrastus' *Laws* where the theory of sale is expounded, based on the principle that two were the legal requirements for a sale to be valid: payment of the price and, what matters in our perspective, some form of publicity, generally involving some sort of written notice or record (fr. 21 Szegedy-Maszak = 650 Fortenbaugh)¹⁴³. We do not know how often and who in actual fact consulted such records but, where there is information available, they were clearly meant to be kept over time for future reference. A law from Ephesos, dated *c.* 299 BCE, concerns disputes arisen between borrowers and creditors about loans and plots of land pledged as security. The decisions made by the foreign judges, including a written record of the “men’s names, the districts and the boundaries of the divisions” (ll. 19-20: ἀναγράψαντες τά τε ὀνόματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τοὺς τόπους καὶ τοὺς ὄρους τῶν μερισμῶν), were to be reported to the board of officials in charge. In turn, these officials were to make copies (ἀντίγραφα) on whitened wooden tablets (λευκώματα) and hand them over to the *neopoiai* for safe-keeping in the temple and to the ἀντιγραφεύς, who was then to ensure that “it may be possible to any citizen who so wishes to examine the divisions of the landed properties and this division may be public knowledge” (ll. 20-24: ἵνα ἐξῆι τῷ βουλομένῳ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐφορᾶν τοὺς γεγενημένους μερισμοὺς τῶν ἐγγαίων καὶ κοινήμ μὲν διαίρεσιν ταύτην εἶναι) (*I.Ephesos* 4, ll. 14-24)¹⁴⁴. Likewise, in *I.Milet* I.3, 33, in a decree granting Milesian citizenship to a group of Cretan mercenaries (234/3 BCE), it is stated that the distribution of land (διαίρεσις) carried out on this occasion was to be recorded together with the names (of the grantees) so as to be stored by the secretary of the *boulē* in the public archives (ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις). Moreover, a copy was to be made and handed over (παραδοῦναι) to the ὄνοφύλακες, the “guardians of sales”, who had to record such information “on the whitened tablets where the sales are also registered” (εἰς τὰ λευκώματα ἐν οἷς καὶ αἱ ὄναϊ ὑπάρχουσι) (*e*, ll. 2-6). The *politographia* by itself was certainly not an act belonging to everyday administration but we can infer from the last clause that the “archive” of the *ōnophylakes* was conceived of as the official register of landed properties in the *polis* of Miletos, where information was kept and made available for consultation.

¹⁴³ Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 302-8.

¹⁴⁴ Walser 2008, 244-9, with my observations in Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 319-21, esp. note 96. See also, most recently, Pernin 2023, 399-400, 429-30.

the memory of the old allotment required literacy and some form of written record¹⁴⁸. In *IG II²* 1952 we find a list of Athenian cleruchs, identified with their name and patronymic and divided by tribes and demes, who were registered as recipients of a κληρος, probably in Hephaistia (l. 2: [τοισδε ἐ]-δόθη κληρος ἐ[πὶ - - - ἄρχοντος]). In all likelihood, the list belonged with a set of measures connected to an overhaul of landholdings and to the settlement of a new contingent of colonists on the island of Lemnos after the King's Peace also reflected by *Agora XVI 41* (= *Agora XIX, L3*)¹⁴⁹. By the time the Lumbarda decree about the foundation of a new settlement on the Croatian island of Korčula and the allotment to each colonist of building plots in the walled city and parcels of land (for which the term κλᾶρος is used) in the *chōra* was passed by the Issaians in the fourth-third century BCE, a list, divided by tribe, of those who “occupied the land and fortified the city” (l. 13: οἶδε κατέλαβον τὰν χώ[ραν καὶ ἐπιτείχιξ]αν πόλιν) was appended to the document on the stele. What is more important from our point of view is, however, that, as we learn from a recently published new fragment of the inscription, the decree also enjoined that there were to be records on a πίναξ, probably a wooden tablet, “(indicating) where each settler received his first lot” (ll. 7-8: ἀναγραφῆμεν δὲ [τὸν πρῶ]τον [κ]λᾶρον ἐς πίνα[κα] εἴ ἕκαστος ἔλαχε)¹⁵⁰. The list of the plots of land therefore does not appear on the stele because it was to be written on a different medium¹⁵¹. From a documentary point of view, it is nonetheless clear that, when the new settlement was established, membership in the community, in other terms citizenship, and land naturally went hand in hand. We can surmise that such practices went back to a long time before.

¹⁴⁸ Malkin, Blok 2024, esp. 219-22, 247-56.

¹⁴⁹ Culasso Gastaldi 2008, 278-80. For a new edition and commentary on *Agora XVI 41* see Matthaïou 2020.

¹⁵⁰ The text of the decree, originally published as *Syll.*³ 141, has been further restored after the discovery of some new fragments: cf. Lombardo 2005; Marohnić, Potrebica, Vuković 2021. For the nature of the settlement see Lombardo 1993.

¹⁵¹ This weakens the point made by Pernin 2023, 403, that “pour les distributions de terre opérée dans le cadre des politographies de l'époque hellénistique, les listes gravées, lorsqu'elles ont été conservées, se réduisent à la liste des noms des nouveaux citoyens et ne mentionnent pas les lots de terrain qu'ils ont reçus à cette occasion”. The list of the plots could have well been recorded on perishable material.

Bibliography

- Adak 2023 = M. Adak, *Cités, rois et Romains: nouveaux textes épigraphiques d'Asie Mineure*, in *AEHE IV (Sciences historiques et philologiques)* 154 (2023) 136-45.
- Ampolo 1985 = C. Ampolo, *Platone e la popolazione. Del buon uso della matematica*, in *PP* 40 (1985) 200-7.
- Ampolo, Rosamilia 2021 = C. Ampolo, E. Rosamilia, *Novità sulla cultura achea e sui culti a Kaulonia: la Tabula Cauloniensis, editio minor*, in *Gli altri Achei: Kaulonia e Terina, contesti e nuovi apporti, ACSMGr* 57 (2021) 55-125.
- Anderson 2000 = G. Anderson, *Alkmeonid "Homelands", Political Exile, and the Unification of Attica*, in *Historia* 49 (2000) 387-412.
- Anderson 2003 = G. Anderson, *The Athenian Experiment. Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C.*, Ann Arbor 2003.
- Ando 2010 = C. Ando, *Introduction: States and State Power in Antiquity*, in *Ancient States and Infrastructural Power. Europe, Asia, and America*, cur. C. Ando, S. Richardson, Philadelphia 2017, 1-16.
- Asheri 1966 = D. Asheri, *Distribuzioni di terre nell'antica Grecia*, Torino 1966.
- Asheri 1967 = D. Asheri, *Il 'rincalzo misto' a Naupatto (ante 456 a.C.)*, in *PP* 22 (1967) 343-58.
- Barta 2010 = H. Barta, *"Graeca non leguntur"? Zu den Ursprüngen des europäischen Rechts im antiken Griechenland*, I, Wiesbaden 2010.
- Beck 1999 = H. Beck, *Ostlokris und die "Tausend Opuntier". Neue Überlegungen zum Siedlergesetz für Naupaktos*, in *ZPE* 124 (1999) 53-62.
- Bertelli, Canevaro, Curnis 2022 = L. Bertelli, M. Canevaro, M. Curnis, *Aristotele, La Politica*, direzione di L. Bertelli e M. Moggi, *Libri VII-VIII*, Roma 2022.
- Biscardi 1982 = A. Biscardi, *Diritto greco antico*, Milano 1982.
- Blok 2018 = J. Blok, *Retracing Steps. Finding Ways into Archaic Greek Citizenship*, in *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*, cur. A. Duploux, R. Brock, Oxford 2018, 79-101.
- Boffa 2021 = G. Boffa, *Il giuramento dei fondatori di Cirene (SEG IX, 3). Riflessioni e spunti per un inquadramento storico e culturale*, Tivoli 2021.
- Boffo, Faraguna 2021 = L. Boffo, M. Faraguna, *Le poleis e i loro archivi. Studi su pratiche documentarie, istituzioni e società nell'antichità greca*, Trieste 2021.
- Bravo 1992 = B. Bravo, *Citoyens et libres non-citoyens dans les cités coloniales à l'époque archaïque. Le cas de Syracuse*, in *L'Etranger dans le monde grec*, II, cur. R. Lonis, Nancy 1992, 43-85.
- Bresson 2007 = A. Bresson, *L'entrée dans les ports en Grèce ancienne: le cadre juridique*, in *Gens de passage en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et d'identification*, cur. C. Moatti, W. Kaiser,

- Paris 2007, 37-78.
- Burdese 1970 = A. Burdese, “Servitù prediali. Diritto romano”, in *Novissimo Digesto Italiano*, XVII, Torino 1970, 118-24.
- Canevaro 2017 = M. Canevaro, *How to Cast a Criminal out of Athens. Law and Territory in Archaic Attica*, in *Violence and Community. Law, Space and Identity in the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean*, cur. I.K. Xydopoulos, K. Vlassopoulos, E. Tounta, New York 2017, 50-71.
- Canevaro 2022 = *Societal Mobility vs. Societal Stability: Once Again on the Aims and Meaning of Solon’s Reforms*, in *From Homer to Solon. Continuity and Change in Archaic Greece*, cur. J.C. Bernhardt, M. Canevaro, Leiden, Boston 2022, 363-413.
- Capogrossi Colognesi 1976 = L. Capogrossi Colognesi, *La struttura della proprietà e la formazione dei iura praediorum nell’età repubblicana*, II, Milano 1976.
- Carey 2019 = Chr. Carey, *Bridging the Divide between Public and Private: dikē exoulēs and Other Hybrids*, in *Use and Abuse of Law in the Athenian Courts*, cur. Chr. Carey, I. Giannadaki, B. Griffith-Williams, Leiden, Boston 2019, 75-92.
- Carusi 2008 = C. Carusi, *Il sale nel mondo greco (VI a.C. – III d.C.). Luoghi di produzione, circolazione commerciale, regimi di sfruttamento nel contesto del Mediterraneo antico*, Bari 2008.
- Carusi 2019 = C. Carusi, *The Quarries of Attica Revisited*, in *From Document to History: Epigraphic Insights into the Greco-Roman World*, Leiden, Boston 2019, 56-69.
- Casevitz 1985 = M. Casevitz, *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien. Étude lexicologique: les familles de κτίζω et de οἰκέω-οἰκίζω*, Paris 1985.
- Casevitz 1993 = M. Casevitz, *Les mots de la frontière en grec*, in *La frontière. Seminaire de recherche*, cur. Y. Roman, Lyon, Paris 1993, 17-24.
- Càssola 1965 = F. Càssola, *Sull’inalienabilità del suolo nel mondo greco*, in *Labeo* 11 (1965) 337-57 (reprinted in *Scritti di storia antica. Istituzioni e politica*, I: *Grecia*, Napoli 1993, 183-99).
- Cecchet 2015 = L. Cecchet, *Poverty in Athenian Public Discourse. From the Eve of the Peloponnesian War to the Rise of Macedon*, Stuttgart 2015.
- Cecchet 2016 = L. Cecchet, *The Athenian nomos argias. Notes for a Possible Interpretation*, in *IncAnt* 14.2 (2016) 117-42.
- Cecchet 2017 = L. Cecchet, *Re-shaping and Re-founding Citizen Bodies: The Case of Athens, Cyrene and Camarina*, in *Citizens in the Graeco-Roman World. Aspects of Citizenship from the Archaic Period to AD 212*, cur. L. Cecchet, A. Busetto, Leiden, Boston 2017, 50-77.
- Cecchet 2024 = L. Cecchet, *Do not Tell Anybody you are a Thete! Athenian Thetes: Identity and Visibility*, in *Voiceless, Invisible, Countless in Ancient Greece*.

- The Experience of Subordinates, 700-300 BCE*, cur. S.D. Gartland, D. Tandy, Oxford 2024, 99-126.
- Chatzivasiliou, Robu (2024) = D. Chatzivasiliou, A. Robu, *D'Athènes à Mégare: récits mythologiques et pratiques cultuelles en miroir sur les rives du golfe Saronique*, in *La frontière absente. Études réunies en l'honneur de François de Polignac*, cur. D. Chatzivasiliou, Turnhout 2024, 89-115.
- Clinton 1993 = K. Clinton, *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis*, in *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches*, cur. N. Marinatos, R. Hägg, London, New York 1993, 110-24.
- Cohen 1992 = E.E. Cohen, *Athenian Economy and Society*, Princeton 1992.
- Connor 1989 = W.R. Connor, *City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy*, in *C&M* 40 (1989) 7-32.
- Cordano 1992 = F. Cordano, *Le tessere pubbliche del tempio di Atena a Camarina*, Roma 1992.
- Cordano 1999 = F. Cordano, *Le istituzioni delle città greche di Sicilia nelle fonti epigrafiche*, in *Sicilia epigraphica. Atti del convegno internazionale (Erice, 15-18 ottobre 1998)*, cur. M.I. Gulletta, I, Pisa 1999, 149-58.
- Criscuolo 2001 = L. Criscuolo, *Erodoto, Aristotele e la 'Stele dei fondatori'*, in *Simblos. Scritti di storia antica* 3 (2001) 31-44 (reprinted in *Egitto ellenistico e altri scritti di storia, economia, istituzioni*, cur. A. Bencivenni, M.E. De Luna, M. Mari, F. Reiter, Boston, Berlin 2023, 369-81).
- Culasso Gastaldi 2008 = E. Culasso Gastaldi, *Tra Atene e Lemnos: questioni di terra*, in *Hephaestia 2000-2006. Ricerche e scavi della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene in collaborazione con il Dipartimento di Archeologia e Storia delle Arti dell'Università di Siena*, cur. E. Greco, E. Papi, Paestum, Atene 2008, 271-94.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2020 = E. Culasso Gastaldi, *Lottare per la terra: abusi e regolamentazioni in territorio attico*, in *Studi su Lemnos*, Alessandria 2020, 259-94.
- Daniel 2007 = R. Daniel, οἰκόπεδα in *Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus and Elsewhere*, in *ZPE* 159 (2007) 61-9.
- Daverio Rocchi 1988 = G. Daverio Rocchi, *Frontiera e confini nella Grecia antica*, Roma 1988.
- Davies 1971 = J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.
- De Vido 2018 = S. De Vido, *Terra e società nel mondo coloniale: il privilegio dei primi*, in *Koinonia. Studi di storia antica offerti a Giovanna De Sensi Sestito*, cur. M. Intrieri, G. Squillace, A. Zumbo, Roma 2018, 13-34.
- De Vido 2023 = S. De Vido, *Spazio civico e spazio urbano. Ancora sulla lamina di Imera*, in *Kokalos* 60 (2023) 33-51.

- Donlan 1997 = W. Donlan, *The Homeric Economy*, in *A New Companion to Homer*, cur. I. Morris, B. Powell, Leiden, New York, Boston 1997, 649-67.
- Dreliossi-Herakleidou, Hallof 2018 = A. Dreliossi-Herakleidou, K. Hallof, *Eine neue Grenzziehungsurkunde aus Lepsia*, in *Chiron* 48 (2018) 159-70.
- Duploux 2019 = A. Duploux, *Construire la cité. Essai de sociologie historique sur les communautés de l'archaïsme grec*, Paris 2019.
- Duploux 2023 = A. Duploux, *Lifestyle and Behaviour in Archaic and Classical Greece. The Other Language of Citizenship*, in *Citizenship in Antiquity. Civic Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean*, cur. J. Filonik, Chr. Plastow, R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, London 2023, 48-63.
- Erdas 1997 = D. Erdas, *P.S.I. 1301 e la terminologia tecnica delle assegnazioni di terre in ambito epico*, in *SCO* 46.2 (1997) 741-57.
- Erdas 2006 = D. Erdas, *Forme di stanziamento militare e organizzazione del territorio nel mondo greco: i casi di Casmene e Brea*, in *Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VII-III sec. a.C.). Arte, prassi e teoria della pace e della guerra*, I, Pisa 2006, 45-55.
- Faguer 2020 = J. Faguer, *Ventes immobilières et sûretés réelles à Ténos et Paros*, in *BCH* 144 (2020) 155-207.
- Faguer 2021a = J. Faguer, *Le marché du crédit à Olynthe et le calendrier des Chalcidiens de Thrace*, in *REG* 134 (2021) 1-32.
- Faguer 2021b = J. Faguer, *Statuts et propriété foncière dans l'Athènes des III^e et II^e siècles av. J.-C.: la question de l'enktésis*, in *Statuts personnels et main-d'œuvre en Méditerranée hellénistique*, cur. S. Maillot, J. Zurbach, Clermont-Ferrand 2021, 61-91.
- Fantasia, Carusi 2004 = U. Fantasia, C. Carusi, *Revisioni e controlli delle liste dei cittadini: la diapsephisis ateniese del 346/5 a.C.*, in *Poleis e politeiai. Esperienze politiche, tradizioni letterarie, progetti costituzionali*, cur. S. Cataldi, Alessandria 2004, 187-216.
- Faraguna 1997 = M. Faraguna, *Registrazioni catastali nel mondo greco: il caso di Atene*, in *Athenaeum* 85 (1997) 7-33.
- Faraguna 2000 = M. Faraguna, *A proposito degli archivi nel mondo greco: terra e registrazioni fondiari*, in *Chiron* 30 (2000) 65-115.
- Faraguna 2003 = M. Faraguna, *Vendite di immobili e registrazione pubblica nelle città greche*, in *Symposion 1999*, cur. G. Thür, F.J. Fernández Nieto, Köln, Weimar, Wien 2003, 97-122.
- Faraguna 2005 = M. Faraguna, *Terra pubblica e vendite di immobili confiscati a Chio nel V sec. a.C.*, in *Dike* 8 (2005) 89-99.
- Faraguna 2006 = M. Faraguna, *La città di Atene e l'amministrazione delle miniere del Laurion*, in *Symposion 2003*, cur. H.-A. Rupprecht, Wien 2006, 141-60.
- Faraguna 2012 = M. Faraguna, *Hektemoroi, isomoiria, seisachtheia. Ricerche*

- recenti sulle riforme economiche di Solone*, in *Dike* 15 (2012) 171-93.
- Faraguna 2015a = M. Faraguna, *I nomophylakes tra utopia e realtà istituzionale delle città greche*, in *Politica antica* 5 (2015) 141-59.
- Faraguna 2015b = M. Faraguna, *Water Rights in Archaic and Classical Greek Cities: Old and New Problems Revisited*, in *Symposion 2015*, cur. D. Leão, G. Thür, Wien 2016, 387-408.
- Faraguna 2018 = M. Faraguna, *Documenti sul regime fondiario nella Macedonia ellenistica: aspetti politici, giuridici e amministrativi*, in *BOREIOELLADIKA. Tales from the Lands of the Ethne. Essays in Honour of Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos*, cur. M. Kalaitzi, P. Paschidis, C. Antonetti, A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets, Athens 2018, 199-214.
- Faraguna 2019 = M. Faraguna, *Aspetti dell'amministrazione pubblica della terra a Chio in età classica ed ellenistica*, in *Dike. Essays on Greek Law in Honor of Alberto Maffi*, cur. L. Gagliardi, L. Pepe, Milano 2019, 105-29.
- Faraguna 2023 = M. Faraguna, *Territorio della polis e statuti giuridici e amministrativi della terra: terminologia, concetti, problemi*, in *Les concepts de la géographie grecque*, Vandœuvres, 22-26 août 2022, cur. D. Rousset, P. Derron, Vandœuvres 2023, 213-65.
- Faraguna forthcoming (a) = M. Faraguna, *Citizenship in the Greek Polis: an Institutional Approach*, in *Rediscovering Greek Institutions: New Institutional Approaches to Greek History*, cur. M. Canevaro, M. Barbato, A. Esu, Edinburgh, forthcoming.
- Faraguna forthcoming (b) = M. Faraguna, *Aristotele, la polis, il cittadino: prospettive storiche e filosofiche*, in *Guida alla Politica di Aristotele*, cur. L. Bertelli, M. Moggi, Roma, forthcoming.
- Favi 2016 = F. Favi, ΕΦΑΓΕΣΘΑΙ nel "bronzo Pappadakis", in *ZPE* 199 (2016) 52-4.
- Ferraioli 2020 = F. Ferraioli, *I Lelegi nelle Politeiai aristoteliche*, in *Greci che pensavo, creano, scrivono la loro storia*, cur. M. Polito, Roma 2020, 180-202.
- Filonik 2023 = J. Filonik, *Sharing in the Polis. Conceptualizing Classical Greek Citizenship*, in *Citizenship in Antiquity. Civic Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean*, cur. J. Filonik, Chr. Plastow, R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, London 2023, 264-80.
- Finley 1968 = M.I. Finley, *The Alienability of Land in Ancient Greece*, in *Eirene* 7 (1968) 25-32 (reprinted in *The Use and Abuse of History*, London 1971, 153-60).
- Finley 1973 = M.I. Finley, *Introduction*, in *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, cur. M.I. Finley, Paris, La Haye 1973, 9-12.
- Fisher 1997 = N. Fisher, *Hybris, Status and Slavery*, in *The Greek World*, cur. A. Powell, London 1997, 44-84.

- Fisher 2023 = N. Fisher, *Citizenship Anxieties. The Athenian diapsēphisis of 346/345 BCE*, in *Citizenship in Antiquity. Civic Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean*, cur. J. Filonik, Chr. Plastow, R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, London 2023, 369-86.
- Flower, Marincola 2002 = M.A. Flower, J. Marincola, *Herodotus. Histories, Book IX*, Cambridge 2002.
- Foxhall 1989 = L. Foxhall, *Household, Gender and Property in Classical Athens*, in *CQ* 39 (1989) 22-44.
- Fraser, Matthews 1987 = *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, I: The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*, cur. P.M. Fraser, E. Matthews, Oxford 1987.
- Friend 2019 = J.L. Friend, *The Athenian Ephebeia in the Fourth Century BCE*, Leiden, Boston 2019.
- Game 2008 = J. Game, *Actes de vente dans le monde grec. Témoignages épigraphiques des ventes immobilières*, Lyon 2008.
- Gauthier 1972 = Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*, Nancy 1972.
- Georgiadou 2010 = A. Georgiadou, *La tablette d'Idalion réexaminée*, in *CCEC* 40 (2010) 141-203.
- Giangiulio 2000 = M.angiulio, *L'eschatia. Prospettive critiche su rappresentazioni antiche e modelli moderni*, in *Problemi della chora coloniale dall'Occidente al Mar Nero*, in *ACSMGr* 40 (2000) 333-61.
- Giangiulio 2001 = M.angiulio, *Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene*, in *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, cur. N. Luraghi, Oxford 2001, 116-37.
- Giangiulio 2018 = M.angiulio, *Oligarchies of 'Fixed Number' or Citizen Bodies in the Making*, in *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*, cur. A. Duploux, R. Brock, Oxford 2018, 275-93.
- Graham 1960 = A.J. Graham, *The Authenticity of the ὄρκιον τῶν οἰκιστῆρων of Cyrene*, in *JHS* 80 (1960) 94-111.
- Grimaldi 1980 = W.M.A. Grimaldi, *Aristotle, Rhetoric I. A Commentary*, New York 1980.
- Grottanelli 1994 = C. Grottanelli, *L'Événios d'Hérodote, IX 92-95. Mauvais pasteur, fameux devin*, in *Métis* 9-10 (1994) 79-98.
- Gschnitzer 1994 = F. Gschnitzer, *Zur terminologie der Grenze und des Gebietes im Griechischen*, in *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums, 4*, cur. E. Olshausen, H. Sonnabend, Amsterdam 1994, 21-33 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zum griechischen und römischen Altertum, I: Frühes Griechentum: Historische und Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge*, cur. C. Trümpy, T. Schmitt, Stuttgart 2001, 335-347).
- Guicharrousse 2022 = R. Guicharrousse, *Athènes en partage. Les étrangers au sein*

de la cité (V^e-III^e siècles avant notre ère), Paris 2022.

- Hallof 2021 = K. Hallof, *Alte und neue Inschriften aus Olympia III*, in *Chiron* 51 (2021) 99-122.
- Hansen 1998 = M.H. Hansen, *Polis and City-State. An Ancient Concept and its Modern Equivalent*, Copenhagen 1998.
- Hansen, Nielsen 2004 = *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, cur. M.H. Hansen, T.H. Nielsen, Oxford 2004.
- Harris 1988 = E.M. Harris, *When is a Sale not a Sale? The Riddle of Athenian Terminology for Real Security Revisited*, in *CQ* 38 (1988) 351-81 (reprinted in *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 2006, 163-206).
- Harris 2012 = E.M. Harris, *Homer, Hesiod and the "Origins" of Greek Slavery*, in *REA* 114 (2012) 345-66.
- Harris 2016 = E.M. Harris, *The Legal Foundations of Economic Growth in Ancient Greece. The Role of Property Records*, in *The Ancient Greek Economy. Markets, Households and City-States*, cur. E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis, M. Woolmer, Cambridge 2016, 116-46.
- Harris 2021 = E.M. Harris, *Ownership and Property, Greek*, in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*⁵, Oxford 2021, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.8594>.
- Harris 2023 = E.M. Harris, *The Language of Sale in Documents about Property from Northern Greece*, in *ZPE* 225 (2023) 93-102.
- Harris, Lewis 2022 = E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis, *What Are Early Greek Laws About? Substance and Procedure in Archaic Statutes, c. 650-450 BC*, in *From Homer to Solon. Continuity and Change in Archaic Greece*, cur. J.C. Bernhardt, M. Canevaro, Leiden, Boston 2022, 227-62.
- Harrison 1968 = A.R.W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens, I: The Family and Property*, Oxford 1968.
- Hatzopoulos 1996 = M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings, I-II*, Athens 1996.
- Hennig 1994 = D. Hennig, *Immobilienwerb durch Nichtbürger in der klassischen und hellenistischen Polis*, in *Chiron* 24 (1994) 305-44.
- Hölkeskamp 2000 = K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *(In-)Schrift und Monument. Zum Begriff des Gesetzes im archaischen und klassischen Griechenland*, in *ZPE* 132 (2000) 73-96.
- Hoffmann 1996 = M. Hoffmann, *Die Entstehung der Ordnung. Zur Bestimmung von Sein, Erkennen und Handeln in der späteren Philosophie Platons*, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1996.
- Honoré 1961 = A.M. Honoré, *Ownership*, in *Oxford Essays in Jurisprudence*, cur. A.G. Guest, Oxford 1961, 107-47.

- Jones 1956 = J.W. Jones, *The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks. An Introduction*, Oxford 1956.
- Joyce 2023 = C.J. Joyce, *Amnesty and Reconciliation in Late Fifth-Century Athens. The Rule of Law under Restored Democracy*, Edinburgh 2023.
- Karabélias 2005a = É. Karabélias, *L'expropriation en droit grec ancien*, in *Études d'histoire juridique et sociale de la Grèce ancienne*, Athènes 2005, 191-227.
- Karabélias 2005b = É. Karabélias, *La peine dans l'Athènes classique*, in *Études d'histoire juridique et sociale de la Grèce ancienne*, Athènes 2005, 231-97.
- Kaser 1944 = M. Kaser, *Der altgriechische Eigentumsschutz*, in *ZSS-RA* 64 (1944) 134-205.
- Kierstead 2019 = J.C. Kierstead, *Incentives and Information in Athenian Citizenship Procedures*, in *Historia* 68.1 (2019) 26-49.
- Koerner 1993 = R. Koerner, *Inschrifliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis*, cur. K. Hallof, Köln, Weimar, Wien 1993.
- Korff 1986 = F.W. Korff, *Der Grundriß von Platons utopischer Stadt "Magnesia" auf Kreta. Über die Zahl 5040 im Raster der Grundstücke*, in *Zur Kritik der wissenschaftlichen Rationalität. Zum 65. Geburtstag von Kurt Hübner*, cur. H. Lenk, Freiburg, München 1986, 225-38.
- Kränzlein 1963 = A. Kränzlein, *Eigentum und Besitz im griechischen Recht des fünften und vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Berlin 1963.
- Jeffery 1990 = L.H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. Revised edition with a Supplement by A.W. Johnston, Oxford 1990.
- LAC = M. Gagarin, P. Perlman, *The Laws of Ancient Crete, c. 650-400 BCE*, Oxford 2016.
- Lambert 1997 = S.D. Lambert, *The Genos Salaminioi and the Island of Salamis*, in *ZPE* 119 (1997) 85-106.
- Law 2022 = *A Dictionary of Law*, cur. J. Law, Oxford 2022¹⁰.
- Leão, Rhodes 2015 = D. Leão, P.J. Rhodes, *The Laws of Solon. A New Edition with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, London, New York 2015.
- Lehnus 1994 = L. Lehnus, *Antichità cirenaiche in Callimaco*, in *Eikasmos* 5 (1994) 189-207.
- Lepore 1973 = E. Lepore, *Problemi dell'organizzazione della chora coloniale*, in *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, cur. M.I. Finley, Paris, La Haye 1973, 15-47.
- Lewis 2018 = D.M. Lewis, *Greek Slave Systems in their Eastern Mediterranean Context, c. 800-146 BC*, Oxford 2018.
- Lewis 2023 = D.M. Lewis, *Did Serfdom Exist in Classical and Hellenistic Crete?*, in *Symposion 2022*, cur. Ph. Scheibelreiter, Wien 2023, 225-51.
- Link 1991a = S. Link, *Landverteilung und sozialer Frieden im archaischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 1991.

- Link 1991b = S. Link, *Das Siedlungsgesetz aus Westlokris (Bronze Pappadakis; I.G. IX 1, fasc. 3, nr. 609 = Meiggs-Lewis 13)*, in *ZPE* 87 (1991) 65-77.
- Loddo 2020 = L. Loddo, Ἐως ἄν κατέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν: *Did the Athenians Reduce their Reception of Refugees in the Fourth Century BC?*, in *Pallas* 112 (2020) 199-230.
- Loening 1987 = T.C. Loening, *The Reconciliation Agreement of 403/402 B.C. in Athens. Its Content and Application*, Stuttgart 1987.
- Lombardo 1993 = M. Lombardo, *Lo psephisma di Lumbarda: note critiche e questioni esegetiche*, in *Hesperia* 3 (1993) 161-88.
- Lombardo 2005 = M. Lombardo, *The Psephisma of Lumbarda: a New Fragment, in Illyrica antiqua. Ob honorem Duje Rendić-Miočević*, Zagreb 2005, 354-60.
- Lucas 2019 = Th. Lucas, *Entre Attique et Béotie: identités politiques et culturelles à la frontière*, in *La Béotie de l'archaïsme à l'époque romaine. Frontières, territoires, paysages*, cur. Th. Lucas, Chr. Müller, A.-Ch. Oddon-Panissié, Paris 2019, 233-50.
- Luraghi 1994 = N. Luraghi, *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*, Firenze 1994.
- Ma 2024 = J. Ma, Polis, *State and Society in the Shadow of Nomima*, in *Gaia* 27 (2024), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/11xz8>.
- MacDowell 1978 = D.M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*, London 1978.
- MacDowell 2006 = D.M. MacDowell, *Mining Cases in Athenian Law*, in *Symposion 2003*, cur. H.-A. Rupprecht, Wien 2006, 121-31.
- Mackil 2017 = E. Mackil, *Property Claims and State Formation in the Archaic Greek World*, in *Ancient States and Infrastructural Power. Europe, Asia, and America*, cur. C. Ando, S. Richardson, Philadelphia 2017, 63-90.
- Mackil 2021 = E. Mackil, *Confiscation, Exile, and Return: The Property Problem and its Legal Solutions*, in *Symposion 2019*, cur. K. Harter-Uibopuu, W. Riess, Wien 2021, 185-211.
- Maffi 1986 = A. Maffi, *Sulla legge coloniarica per Naupatto (ML 20)*, in *Festschrift für Arnold Kränzlein. Beiträge zur antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, Graz 1986, 69-82.
- Maffi 1987 = A. Maffi, *La legge agraria locrese ("Bronzo Pappadakis"): diritti di pascolo o redistribuzione di terre?*, in *Studi in onore di Arnaldo Biscardi*, VI, Milano 1987, 365-425.
- Magnetto 1997 = A. Magnetto, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci, II: Dal 337 al 196 a.C.*, Pisa 1997.
- Magnetto 2008 = A. Magnetto, *L'arbitrato di Rodi fra Samo e Priene*, Pisa 2008.
- Malkin 2003 = I. Malkin, *'Tradition' in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene*, in *Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, cur. P. Derow, R. Parker, Oxford 2003, 153-70.
- Malkin 2016 = I. Malkin, *Greek Colonisation: The Right of Return*, in

- Conceptualising Early Colonisation*, cur. L. Donnellan, V. Nizzo, G.-J. Burgers, Bruxelles/Brussel, Roma 2016, 27-50.
- Malkin, Blok 2024 = I. Malkin, J. Blok, *Drawing Lots. From Egalitarianism to Democracy in Ancient Greece*, Oxford 2024.
- Mann 1984 = M. Mann, *The Autonomous Power of the State: its Origins, Mechanisms and Results*, in *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 25 (1984) 185-213.
- Marchiandi 2020 = D. Marchiandi, “*La terra che, se non seminata, non dà frutti, se scavata nutre molta più gente che se producesse grano*”: ulteriori riflessioni sulle cave di pietra in Attica, in *Forme e modalità di gestione amministrativa nel mondo greco e romano: terra, cave, miniere*, cur. M. Faraguna, S. Segenni, Milano 2020, 23-84.
- Marohnić, Potrebica, Vuković 2021 = J. Marohnić, H. Potrebica, M. Vuković, *A New Fragment of the Greek Land Division Decree from Lumbarda on the Island of Korčula*, in *ZPE* 220 (2021) 137-43.
- Martini 2005 = R. Martini, *Diritti greci*, Bologna 2005.
- Matthaiou 2011a = A. P. Matthaiou, *The Dophitis Inscription from Chios*, in *Τὰ ἐν τῆι στήλῃι γεγραμμένα. Six Greek Historical Inscriptions of the Fifth Century BC*, Athenai 2011, 13-34.
- Matthaiou 2011b = A.P. Matthaiou, *The Treaty between the Messenians and the Naupaktians*, in *Τὰ ἐν τῆι στήλῃι γεγραμμένα. Six Greek Historical Inscriptions of the Fifth Century BC*, Athenai 2011, 45-55.
- Matthaiou 2014 = A.P. Matthaiou, *Four Inscribed Bronze Tablets from Thebes: Preliminary Notes*, in *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia. New Finds, New Prospects*, cur. N. Papazarkadas, Leiden, Boston 2014, 211-22.
- Matthaiou 2018 = A.P. Matthaiou, *Τέσσερις ἐνεπίγραφες ἀρχαϊκὲς πινακίδες Θηβῶν. Σημείωμα*, in *Grammateion* 7 (2018) 35-8.
- Matthaiou 2020 = A.P. Matthaiou, *Τὸ Ἀττικὸ ψήφισμα περὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων οἰκόντων ἐν Λήμνῳ*, Athenai 2020.
- Meister 2020 = J.B. Meister, *‘Adel’ und gesellschaftliche Differenzierung im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 2020.
- Mele 1979 = A. Mele, *Il commercio greco arcaico. Prexis ed emporie*, Naples 1979.
- Migeotte 2014 = L. Migeotte, *Les finances des cités grecques*, Paris 2014.
- Mignosa 2021 = V. Mignosa, *Decreto per i discendenti dei gamoroi dall’area di Palazzolo Acreide*, in *Axon* 5 (2021) 7-29.
- Minon 2007a = S. Minon, *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VI^e-II^e siècle avant J.-C.)*, I-II, Genève 2007.
- Minon 2007b = S. Minon, *La communication interdialectale au milieu du V^e s. av. J.-C. Argien et crétois dans les deux règlements argiens des relations entre Cnossos et Tylissos*, in *ΦΩΝΗΣ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ ΕΘΝΙΚΟΣ. Actes du V^e Congrès*

- International de Dialectologie grecque*, cur. M.B. Hatzopoulos, Athènes 2007, 169-210.
- Minon 2021 = S. Minon, *La langue de la sentence des trois juges de Pellana: une koina diplomatique achéenne faiblement éleusée*, in *Chiron* 51 (2021) 123-66.
- Mélèze Modrzejewski 2013 = J. Mélèze Modrzejewski, *Modèles classiques des lois ptolémaïques*, in *JJP* 43 (2013) 333-49.
- Müller 2015 = Chr. Müller, *De l'époque classique à l'époque hellénistique: la citoyenneté des Grecs, une citoyenneté en mutation? Réflexions sur la question de l'appartenance multiple*, in *Studi Ellenistici* 29 (2015) 355-69.
- Müller 2022 = Chr. Müller, *Migration et mémoire: Milet et ses apoikiai à l'époque hellénistique*, in *Ionians in the West and East*, cur. G.R. Tsetschladze, Leuven, Paris, Bristol (CT) 2022, 333-60.
- Müller 2023 = Chr. Müller, Περὶ τῶν συμβολῶν. La question de l'*isopoliteia* chez Philippe Gauthier, in *Dike* 26 (2023) 165-93.
- Nenci 1993 = G. Nenci, ΟΙΚΟΠΙΕΔΟΝ e ΓΗΠΙΕΔΟΝ. *Contributo al lessico urbanistico greco*, in *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, VII, Besançon 1993, 273-86.
- Nielsen 2000 = T.H. Nielsen, *Epiknemidian, Hypoknemidian, and Opountian Lokrians. Reflections on the Political Organisation of East Lokris in the Classical Period*, in *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, cur. P. Flensted-Jensen, Stuttgart 2000, 91-120.
- Niku 2007 = M. Niku, *The Official Status of the Foreign Residents in Athens, 322-120 B.C.*, Helsinki 2007.
- Nomima I* = H. van Effenterre, F. Ruzé, *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*, I, Rome 1994.
- OR = R. Osborne, P.J. Rhodes, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 478-404 BC*, Oxford 2017.
- Pałuchowski 2019 = A. Pałuchowski, *Spensithios – dépositaire de la mémoire collective et expression de l'immédiateté dans les relations intracommunautaires. Ou l'éloge de la simplicité*, in *Meministine? Memory and Oblivion in the Ancient World – The Ancient World in the Memory and Oblivion*, cur. K. Balbuza, M. Musielak, K. Królczyk, Poznań 2019, 13-51.
- Paoli 1949 = U.E. Paoli, *La loi de Solon sur les distances*, in *RHD* 26 (1949) 505-17.
- Papazarkadas 2011 = N. Papazarkadas, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford 2011.
- Papazarkadas 2021 = N. Papazarkadas, *Boiotian Inscriptions in Epichoric Script: A Conspectus of Recent Discoveries*, in *The Early Greek Alphabets. Origin, Diffusion, Uses*, cur. R. Parker, P.M. Steele, Oxford 2021, 267-92.
- Parker 1996 = R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford 1996.
- Pasquali 1913 = G. Pasquali, Οικιστήρ, in *Glotta* 5.3 (1913) 197-202.

- Pébarthe 2013 = Chr. Pébarthe, *Les archives de la cité de raison. Démocratie athénienne et pratiques documentaires à l'époque classique*, in *Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies*, cur. M. Faraguna, Trieste 2013, 107-23.
- Peels 2017 = S. Peels, *Notes on IG IX 1 (2) 3: 718 (Foundation Decree of Locrian Colony at Naupactus)*, in *ZPE* 201 (2017) 110-6.
- Perdicoyianni-Paleologou 2021 = H. Perdicoyianni-Paleologou, *La tablette de bronze d'Idalion*, in *Axon* 5.1 (2021) 31-72.
- Pernin 2023 = I. Pernin, *La notion de "cadastre" dans la Grèce des cités*, in *Les concepts de la géographie grecque*, Vandœuvres, 22-26 août 2022, cur. D. Rousset, P. Derron, Vandœuvres 2023, 389-431.
- Peters 2019 = B.G. Peters, *Institutional Theory in Political Science. The New Institutionalism*, Cheltenham, Northampton (MA) 2019⁴.
- Pezzoli, Curnis 2012 = F. Pezzoli, M. Curnis, *Aristotele. La Politica*, direzione di L. Bertelli, M. Moggi, *Libro II*, Roma 2012.
- Piccirilli 1973 = L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci, I: Dalle origini al 338 a.C.*, Pisa 1973.
- Piérart 2008 = M. Piérart, *Platon et la cité grecque. Théorie et réalité dans la constitution des Lois*, Paris 2008².
- Piñol Villanueva 2013 = A. Piñol Villanueva, *Acceso de extranjeros a bienes inmuebles: primeros testimonios (siglos VIII-V a.C.)*, in *Contacto de poblaciones y extranjería en el mundo griego antiguo. Estudio de fuentes*, cur. R.A. Santiago-Álvarez, M. Oller Guzmán, Bellaterra 2013 (Faventia Suppl. 2), 113-45.
- Poddighe, Loddo 2022 = E. Poddighe, L. Loddo, *Ephesis against Eubulides (Dem. 57): Legal Arguments against the Sykophant's Game*, in *Dike* 25 (2022) 95-150.
- Pradeau 2000 = J.-F. Pradeau, *L'économie politique des Lois: remarques sur l'institution des κλῆποι*, in *CGG* 11 (2000) 25-36.
- Reggiani 2011 = N. Reggiani, *I manteis nella Grecia nord-occidentale*, in *Ethne, identità e tradizioni: la "terza" Grecia e l'Occidente*, cur. L. Breglia, A. Moleti, M.L. Napolitano, Pisa 2011, 113-37.
- Rhodes 1981 = P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981.
- RO = P.J. Rhodes, R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*, Oxford 2003.
- Rocchi 2023 = L. Rocchi, *From (Apt) Contempt to (Legal) Dishonor: Two Kinds of Contempt and the Penalty of Atimia*, in *Emotion Review* 15 (2023) 200-6.
- Rosamilia 2023 = E. Rosamilia, *La città del silfio. Istituzioni, culti ed economia di Cirene classica ed ellenistica attraverso le fonti epigrafiche*, Pisa 2023.
- Rousset 1994 = D. Rousset, *Les frontières des cités grecques. Premières réflexions à partir du recueil des documents épigraphiques*, in *CGG* 5 (1994) 97-126.

- Scheibelreiter 2015 = Ph. Scheibelreiter, ὅσα τις εἶχεν – ταῦτα ἔχειν: *Eine rechtsvergleichende Studie zur Proklamation des Athener archon (eponymos)*, in *ZSS-RA* (2015) 68-95.
- Schmitz 2023 = W. Schmitz, *Leges Draconis et Solonis (LegDrSol). Eine neue Edition der Gesetze Dracons und Solons mit Übersetzung und historischer Einordnung*, I-II, Stuttgart 2023.
- Schriebl 2013 = A. Schriebl, *Die Wirtschaftsordnung und die richtige Einstellung zu Besitz und Reichtum*, in *Platon. Gesetze – Nomoi*, cur. Chr. Horn, Berlin 2013, 105-22.
- Siewert 1977 = P. Siewert, *The Ephebic Oath in Fifth-Century Athens*, in *JHS* 97 (1977) 102-11.
- Siewert 2021 = P. Siewert, *Spätarchaisches Gesetz über Landwirtschaft aus Olympia*, in *Tyche* 36 (2021) 149-63.
- Stelzer 1971 = E. Stelzer, *Untersuchungen zur Enktesis im attischen Recht*, diss. München 1971.
- Stolfi 2020 = E. Stolfi, *La cultura giuridica dell'antica Grecia. Legge, politica, giustizia*, Roma 2020.
- Taylor 1997 = M.C. Taylor, *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos*, Amsterdam 1997.
- Thür 2003 = G. Thür, *Sachverfolgung und Diebstahl in den griechischen Poleis*, in *Symposion 1999*, cur. G. Thür, F.J. Fernández Nieto, Köln, Weimar, Wien 2003, 57-96.
- Thür, Faraguna 2018 = G. Thür, M. Faraguna, *Silver from Laureion: Mining, Smelting and Minting*, in *Infrastructure and Distribution in Ancient Economies*, cur. B. Woytech, Wien 2018, 45-57.
- Todd 1993 = S.C. Todd, *The Shape of Athenian Law*, Cambridge 1993.
- Trevett 1992 = J. Trevett, *Apollodoros the Son of Pasion*, Oxford 1992.
- Tribulato 2019 = O. Tribulato, *La legge tardo-arcaica di Himera (SEG 47, n° 1427; IGDS II n° 15). Un riesame linguistico ed epigrafico*, in *Pallas* 109 (2019) 167-93.
- Ulf 1990 = Chr. Ulf, *Die homerische Gesellschaft. Materialien zur analytischen Beschreibung und historischen Lokalisierung*, München 1990.
- Valdés Guía 2022 = M.A. Valdés Guía, *Civilising the Eleusinian Sacred Way*, in *Gerión* 40.2 (2022) 529-52.
- van Effenterre 1979 = H. van Effenterre, *Le statut comparé des travailleurs étrangers en Chypre, Crète et autres lieux à la fin de l'archaïsme*, in *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium «The Relations between Cyprus and Crete, ca. 2000-500 B.C.»*, Nicosia 1979, 279-93.
- Walser 2008 = A.V. Walser, *Bauern und Zinsnehmer. Politik, Recht und Wirtschaft im frühhellenistischen Ephesos*, München 2008.

Whitehead 2019 = D. Whitehead, *Xenophon: Poroi (Revenue-Sources)*, Oxford 2019.

Youni 2019 = M.S. Youni, *Atimia in Classical Athens: What the Sources Say*, in Dike. *Essays on Greek Law in Honor of Alberto Maffi*, cur. L. Gagliardi, L. Pepe, Milano 2019, 361-78.

Zanovello 2021 = S. Zanovello, *From Slave to Free. A Legal Perspective on Greek Manumission*, Alessandria 2021.

Zurbach 2008 = J. Zurbach, *Question foncière et départs coloniaux. À propos des apoikiai archaïques*, in *ASAA* s. III, 8 (2008) 87-103.

Zurbach 2017 = J. Zurbach, *Les hommes, la terre et la dette en Grèce, c. 1400 – c. 500 a. C.*, I-II, Bordeaux 2017.