

Public Registers of Land Sales in Ancient Greece*

RACHEL ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ

This paper examines inscriptions that record land sales, aiming to find out whether and how they can teach us the extent to which the polis intervened in private transactions or even instigated them, and under what circumstances. Studying inscribed records of transactions in real estate contributes to our knowledge of the development of practices of recording and publishing contracts. But examining the evidence of state intervention as it emerges from such records may also contribute to our understanding of the ancient Greeks' definition of 'public' and 'private' and of the process leading to the crystallization of these concepts. Of course, definitions of public and private spaces and spheres of activity were not monolithic. They changed over time and may have differed from one polis to another. However, I hope to show that in respect of land sales, public intervention in the private sphere increased over time in several places, so that sharper lines were drawn between these spaces in the process.

* This is an expanded and revised version of a paper read at the 5th LDAS meeting on 'Sale and Community' in Budapest in October 2012. I am grateful to the participants of the conference for their useful comments. Research for this paper was carried out during my stay as a visiting fellow at the Institute of Classical Studies at the University of London, School of Advanced Study (March to August 2011). All translations from the Greek are mine.

The terms *idios* and *koinos* are generally considered to correspond to ‘private’ and ‘public’ respectively, but modern concepts of public and private are not equivalent to these terms, both of which may contain elements alluding to individuals and to community.¹ Still, the opposition between private and public can be detected already in Homer.² Another word that served to describe what belongs to the community, as against the private, was *dēmosios*. The latter usually described specific items, such as property, finances or buildings (whereas *koinon* seems to have been a more general term for the community itself), and according to Alain Fouchard it best translates the notion ‘public’.³ More important to the subject of this paper is Fouchard’s observation that the adjective *dēmosios* was also applied to public territory on which it was not permitted to encroach.⁴ He suggests that *dēmosios* was first applied to whoever administered the *dēmos* as an entity, in the first place to the management of the ‘common’ lands – lands not yet distributed.⁵ Similarly, David Lewis observes that in Athens there were areas which had been in the public domain for so long that no question of private property could arise: the Agora, the Kerameikos, and the Pnyx (all delimited by boundary-markers, *horoi*).⁶

According to Aristotle (*Pol.* 1267b 33ff.), Hippodamos of Miletos suggested that the territory of the polis be divided into three categories: sacred (*hiera*), public (*dēmosia*) and private (*idia*). The question of the relation between public and sacred land and of their possible opposition has been much discussed by scholars. Recently Nikolaos Papazarkadas has argued that the polis of Athens held no property that could be termed ‘public’ other than sacred property, but that the demes (in contrast to the polis itself and the tribes) held lands as their common public properties (in addition to managing sacred lands).⁷ Papazarkadas claims that ‘public realty did exist in Classical Athens, but it did not fall under the category of arable revenue-generating estates.

¹ See DESCAT 1998.

² CASEVITZ 1998, 41-5, assembles and analyzes the occurrences of *idios* and its derivatives down to the fifth century B.C. He argues that in Homer *idion* means the individual as belonging to a group, and that originally the ‘private’ was the ‘particular’, the smallest communal unit of the public.

³ FOUCHARD 1998, 59-60. Fouchard bases his conclusions on the examination of some 600 occurrences of *dēmosios* in the literature, down to Aristotle, and in epigraphic collections.

⁴ See Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 3.4; *Ath. Pol.* 52.1; Arist. *Rhet.* 1374a5; *Syll.*³ 279; 936; 938; 1009.

⁵ FOUCHARD 1998, 60.

⁶ Other possible sites were the various gymnasia; LEWIS 1990, 245-63, esp. 249.

⁷ PAPAZARKADAS 2011.

Rather it consisted of landed zones in mainly marginal areas, used, if at all, for the common benefit of members of the political community.’⁸

Whether these arguments are sound or whether the polis had its own ‘public’ lands from which it derived its public (*dēmosion*) income, private assets were undoubtedly distinguished from other categories – legally, if not always in practice.⁹ But already in the early sixth century B.C. the state intervened in the private sphere by enacting laws pertaining to private lands.

According to Plutarch (*Sol.* 21.2-3), until Solon an Athenian could not bequeath his land even if he was childless; by permitting the citizens to make wills, Solon καὶ τὰ χρήματα κτήματα τῶν ἐχόντων ἐποίησεν (‘made a man’s possessions his own property’). On the other hand, Solon restricted this right to those who were not under the influence of sickness or drugs or imprisonment, or under compulsion or yielded to the persuasions of their wives.

Likewise, Lykourgos the Spartan lawgiver prohibited the sale of a family’s estate, but allowed those who wished to give away their estate by gift or bequest (Aristotle, *Pol.* 2, 1270a 19-21); and at Locri a man could sell his land only if he could prove that a misfortune had befallen him (Aristotle, *Pol.* 2, 1266b 20). Other legislators limited the amount of land sold or leased (Arist. *Pol.* 2, 1266b 5-7; 6, 1319a 7-13).

Evidence also seems to imply that in several poleis sales and leases of land were registered in the local public archives, at least from the fourth century B.C. Usually this move was initiated by the parties to the transaction, seeking to protect their rights; but sometimes registration was also a legal requirement. Fragment 21 of Theophrastos’ *Nomoi* (written towards the middle of the fourth century B.C.) is often cited as proof. Concerning Athens, however, Theophrastos mentions only the *prographē*, the registration of the transaction *before* its implementation: the sales were registered with the magistrate no fewer than sixty days in advance and the purchaser had to deposit one percent of the property’s price (ἐκατοστή).¹⁰ Outside Athens, he says, a law requiring

⁸ Ibid. 235-6. Papazarkadas also argues that the supervision of these outlying areas was left to the demes, but the latter functioned merely as agents and had no rights of possession over these lands; their own landed properties constituted a different sub-category. The *Rationes Centesimarum*, he argues, were ‘the only recorded effort by Athens to make some profit out of her non-sacred landed resources. Paradoxically, the principle of privatization meant that the project could never again be repeated.’ On the *Rationes Centesimarum* see below.

⁹ See the three categories ‘sacred’, ‘public’ and ‘private’ (εἴτε ἱερὸν εἴτε δαμόσιον εἴτε ἴδιον) in *IG* V.2 6, line 39, in Tegea (fourth century B.C.), and the contracts made by the polis of Arkesine with individuals who lent it money, mortgaging the common as well as the private property (τὰ κοινὰ καὶ τὰ ἴδια): *IG* XII.7 66, 67 A and B, 68, 69, 70 (cf. MIGEOTTE 1984, nos. 49-54; GABRIELSEN 2008, 128-30).

¹⁰ Theophrastos, *Nomoi*, Fr. 21.1 (Szegedy-Maszak): ἔνιοι δὲ προγράφειν παρὰ τῆ ἀρχῆ πρὸ

the parties to realty transactions to swear upon a sacrifice as a precondition to registration (ἐγγράφειν) existed among the Aineans (21.3).¹¹ Philosophers too may reflect existing practices. Thus Plato (*Laws* 5, 745a) prescribes that every man's property that is over and above his allotment should be openly written down (ἐν τῷ φανεροῦ γεγράφθω) and be kept by the magistrates appointed by law;¹² Aristotle (*Pol.* 6, 1321b 34-35) recommends the appointment of magistrates to write down private contracts and verdicts of law (ἐτέρα δ' ἀρχὴ πρὸς ἣν ἀναγράφεσθαι δεῖ τὰ τε ἴδια συμβόλαια καὶ τὰς κρίσεις τὰς ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων).¹³

Registration of land sales in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, the *katagraphē*, was required by law in order to render the transfer of title valid (see *P.Hal.* 1, ll. 242-59; *P.Adler* 13).¹⁴ In his Rhodian oration, Dio Chrysostomos mentions as a matter of fact the registration in the city's records of purchases of land, boats or slaves, alongside loans, manumissions of slaves and gifts (31.51). Yet as Moses Finley noted, although the state had an interest in public records and public knowledge of the legal and economic position of the land, public record-keeping was 'generally spasmodic, impermanent, and unreliable'.¹⁵

Sometimes, the parties to transactions in real estate decided to inscribe the deeds on stone or metal. Examples of such private advertisements come from different parts of the Greek world. The fourth-century B.C. *horoi* in Athens and places under her influence certified that a certain piece of property had been mortgaged, for example, *IG II² 2658* (ca. 350-300 B.C.): ὄρος χω/ρίο πεπο/αμένο ἐπ/ὶ λύσει πα/ιδὶ Καλλιστ/τράτο :H – ('boundary marker of land sold upon redemption to Kallistratos' son for the price of ---'). Unlike the Egyptian *katagraphē*, which could be carried about, the *horoi* were fixed in the ground and were meant to make public the transactions indicated by them.¹⁶

Other examples are the lead tablets from Sicily, which record individual transactions and date to between the fourth and the first century B.C. For ex-

ήμερων μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ ἐξήκοντα, καθάπερ Ἀθήνησι.

¹¹ Theophrastos also mentions other poleis' legislation that does not involve actual registration but makes sure that the sale is publicized and the ownership guaranteed. Thus at Cyzicus the sale had to be announced many times for five days (21.1); see also on Thurii (21.2). For a discussion of Theophrastos' *Nomoi* see also FARAGUNA 2000, 71-4.

¹² Cf. 754d, 850a, 855b, 914c.

¹³ For a thorough discussion of Plato and Aristotle on land sales registration see FARAGUNA 2000, 65-71. See also FARAGUNA 2005.

¹⁴ See WOLFF 1948; FARAGUNA 2000, 75-82. See also YIFTACH-FIRANKO 2014.

¹⁵ FINLEY 1985, 13-14. For other testimonies to registration of lands and sales see FARAGUNA 2000, 82-7.

¹⁶ On the Attic *horoi* see FINE 1951; FINLEY 1985.

ample, *SEG* 34,940 from Kamarina (= ed. pr. F. Cordano, *BA* 26, 1984, 34-41; Dubois 1989, 131-5, no. 124), dated to the third or second century B.C., reads:¹⁷

[ἐπὶ — —], Ἡραίου ἐκ[ται ἰστα]μένου, συ[ν]αλλακτῆρων π[ρ]οστάτας / Δίνα[ρχος] Κλεάνδρου. Σω[σί]στρατ[ο]ς Θεών[ος] νή(τα) πρ(ῶτα) ἐπρίατο οἰκῆσιν καὶ / τὰ<ν> κατήλειαν τὰν Δίων[ος] πάσαν καὶ τὰ θυρώματα, τοίχους κοινούς / ποτὶ Φιλόξενον καὶ Θράσυλλον, λαύρα [ύ]πὲρ Γάου κα Φ[ε]ρσο[σ] οφάσας, / παρ Δίωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλείδα τέ(τρατα) πρ(ῶτα) τετράκοντα ταλάντων- ἄμποχου / Ἀρίστων Ἐμμενίδα νή(τα) πρ(ῶτα), Φίλιππος Πανσανία νή(τα) πρ(ῶτα), / Ἀρταμίδωρος Ἡρακλεί[δ]α τέ(τρατα) πρ(ῶτα), Πανσανίας Σωσιγράτεος νή(τα) πρ(ῶτα), / Ἡράγλειος Νίκωνος τρ(ίτα) πρ(ῶτα), Σάννω[ν] Ζωπύρου τέτρα(τα) πρ(ῶτα), / Σίμος Γελωίου νή(τα) πρ(ῶτα), Νίκων Εὐθυμένεος ἔκ(τα) πρ(ῶτα), / δφ'. / Θεῦδω[ρ]ος Δάμωνος ἔκ(τα) πρ(ῶτα), Γέλων Καλλιστράτου ἔκ(τα) πρ(ῶτα).

[In the year of...], on the sixth day of the month of Heraion, when Dinarchos son of Kleandros was the president of those responsible for drawing the contracts: Sosistratos son of Theon, of the last phratry, first tribe, bought the house and the shop of Dion, in entirety with the planks, its walls adjacent to those of Philoxenos and Thrasyllon, the street above (the sanctuary) of Gaos and of Pherssophasa, from Dion son of Herakleidas, of the fourth phratry, first tribe, for the price of forty talents. Guarantors: [here follows a list of names].

Cordano understood the *συναλλακτῆρων προστάτας* mentioned in line 1 as a magistrate in charge of drawing up contracts. It has been suggested that this person was rather an official who acted as the president of a *collegium* responsible for drafting contracts.¹⁸ If this interpretation is correct, it might indicate the existence in Kamarina of an institution similar to the Egyptian *katagraphē*. In any case, only one other document from Kamarina, dated to the second/first century B.C., seems to refer to the same official.¹⁹ The letters δφ' in line 10 have also been subject to several interpretations.²⁰ But whatever the correct interpretation, Faraguna rightly stresses that these elements in the inscription indicate the active intervention of magistrates in the drafting and keeping of contracts, akin to the *astynomoi* in Tenos (on which see below).²¹

¹⁷ For the whole corpus of lead tablets from Kamarina see CORDANO 1992 (*SEG* 41,778-795), who argues that these tablets served as allotment plates during elections of magistrates. See also DUBOIS 1989, 131-5, no. 124, and cf. GAME 2008, 151-3, no. 79.

¹⁸ DUBOIS 1989, 131-5, no. 124: 'il est vraisemblable que le nom d'argent en -τήρ désigne un collège, présidé par un *προστάτας* chargé de veiller à la légalité des actes entre particuliers et, sans doute, de rédiger ces contrats' (p. 133). FARAGUNA 2000, 92-99 (apparently unaware of Dubois' suggestion), postulates a similar view and compares this office to the *astynomoi* of Tenos (see below). For a summary of the interpretations offered see GAME 2008, 152.

¹⁹ *SEG* 39,1001 (ed. pr. G. MANGANARO, *PP* 44, 1989, 196-9 = GAME 2008, 153-4, no. 80), line 1-2: *προστάτας Πανσανίας / [Φιλιστίω(?)]*νος.

²⁰ See FARAGUNA 2000, 96; GAME 2008, 152.

²¹ FARAGUNA 2000, 96.

The inscribed records from Olynthos are private documents as well. One example is *TAPA* 69 (1938), 47-50, no. 3 (ca. 375-350 BC):

θεός. οὐνή εὐθεΐα· ἐπὶ / [Ἀριστοβούλου] Καλλι/κράτερος [ιερέω]ς· μείς / Ταργηλιών.
Ζωΐλ[ο]ς / Φιλοκράτεος πα[ρ]ὰ / Διοπείθεος τοῦ Ἄ[ν]/τιπάτρου τὴν [οἰ]κίην / τὴν
ἐχομένην [τ]ῆς / [Δ]ιοκλέος τοῦ [Χάρω]/[ν]ος οἰκίης καὶ τῆ[ς] / τῶν Ἀπολλοδώ[ρ]ου
/ πα<ι>δων {⁸1200 dr.}⁸. βεβαι[ω]/τῆς Πολεμάρχη[ς] Σ[τ]/[τ]ράτωνος· μάρτυ[ρ]ες
Διοκλῆς Χάρω/νος, Εὐξίθεος Ξαν/θίππου, Φύλων Θεο/δότου.

God. A straight purchase.²² When Aristoboulos son of Kallikrates was the priest. In the month of Targelion. Zoilos son of Philokrates (bought) from Diopieithes son of Antipatros the house adjoining the house of Diokles son of Charon and that of the children of Apollodoros, for 1,200 drachmas. Guarantor: Polemarches son of Straton; witnesses: Diokles son of Charon, Euxitheos son of Xantippos, Philon son of Theodotos.²³

Although Zoilos, the purchaser, and Diopieithes, the vendor, made sure that their transaction be valid by dating it, specifying the location of the property sold, using a guarantor and witnesses, and giving it publication, this is still a private document. And we do not even see evidence for the intervention of magistrates (as was the case in the inscription from Kamarina cited above). The inscriptions from Amphipolis, on the other hand, show state intervention, although the documents are still private initiatives. Thus *SEG* 41,556 = Hatzopoulos, *Meletemata* 14, 1991, 19, no. 2 (ca. 357/6 B.C.):

ἐπρίατο Λυκόφρων νν / παρὰ Μενάν{ν}δρ{ρ}ου οἰκία/ν δραχμῶν διακοσίων
νν / ὀγδοήκοντα, ἦι γείτων / Κάσων καὶ Δρουβις καὶ Νί/κανδρος, ἐπὶ ἐπιστάτου
/ Σπ<α>ργεως· βεβαιωτῆς / Ἀγλαΐ{αι}νος· μά<ρ>τυρες Πολύ/βουλος, Ποιάνθος,
ννν / Ἀρχιππος· ν τὰ δὲ τέ/λη οἶσει ὁ πριάμεν/ος ἅπαντα καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο ὑπὲρ τῆς
οἰ- ννν/κίας. *rasura*.

Lykophron bought from Menandros, for 280 drachmas, a house whose neighbours are Kason, Droubis and Nikandros, when Sparges was the *epistatēs*. Guarantor: Aglaïnos. Witnesses: Polyboulos, Poianthos, Archippos. The purchaser will pay all the taxes and anything else concerning the house.

It is remarkable that the document from Amphipolis mentions taxes (*telē*, lines 10-11) paid by the purchaser. This means that at least in the year of the epon-

²² HATZOPOULOS 1988, 24, argues that this expression meant that the purchase immediately resulted in acquisition of ownership ('achat direct'), whereas the phrase οὐνή κάτοχος (as in e.g. *SEG* 38,671 from Stolos) which was a definitive purchase without the possibility of repurchase ('achat ferme'). See, however, THÜR 2008, 180-4, who contends that οὐνή εὐθεία means a sale which 'does not face objection from any third party', whereas οὐνή κάτοχος is a purchase that is bound or blocked by protest.

²³ On the inscriptions from Olynthos see also FARAGUNA 2000, 99-108.

ymous *epistatēs* Sparges, the polis of Amphipolis intervened in the private sphere of economic activity by taxing transactions of immovable properties, as was the case in Egypt and in Attica.²⁴ Hatzopoulos believes that a similar tax system existed in Kellion in Chalcidike, where other inscribed deeds of land sale were found.²⁵ Faraguna too argues that despite its being attested in only two inscriptions from Amphipolis (a fact he ascribes to the documents being extracts from the original documents), such a tax was the general rule there, and that it was exacted for the public registration of the acts.²⁶

The above examples show that some people in the fourth and third (or second) centuries B.C. decided to publicize their transactions in real estate on stone, probably in addition to their registration in local archives.²⁷ The dating of the inscriptions by eponymous magistrates, the involvement of special magistrates, such as the *συναλλακτῆρων προστάτας* in Kamarina, and the mention of taxes in Amphipolis and Chalkidike attest – where such constituents are found – to the intervention of the state in private economic activity and its control of real estate transactions.²⁸ In this respect, these inscriptions support what we know from the literary texts discussed above. Still, the publication of these transactions was not a state enterprise and nothing implies that it was dictated by the state.

Although the time of the first inscribed transactions roughly corresponds to that of Aristotle's and Theophratos' prescriptive and descriptive evidence, there is a difference between registering an act on papyrus or a wooden tablet and depositing it in a local archive and inscribing it on imperishable material which is set up in a public place. As far as I know, there is no evidence of any legislation in the various poleis that required the inscription of land transactions on stone, in addition to or instead of registration before a magistrate and deposition of the documents in the local archives. A logical explanation for the decision of parties to transactions in real estate to use inscriptions is the wish for wider and permanent publication as a guarantee of their preservation

²⁴ Another document from Amphipolis, dated to the same year (*SEG* 41,557 = no. 3 in Hatzopoulos 1991), specifically mentions this tax (line 14); Hatzopoulos suggests that in nos. 6 and 9 (*SEG* 41,560 and 41,563 respectively) the quoted prices of the sold properties may have included taxes. He also argues that the rates of the tax were 20 dr. for prices lower than 500 dr., and 30 dr. for prices higher than this.

²⁵ See HATZOPOULOS 1988, 31-3, no. 4 from Kellion (identified by the author with Stolos), where a house is sold for 238 dr.; Hatzopoulos suggests that the real price of the house was 200 dr., to which were added a sale price (*ἐπώνιον*) of thirty dr. and a surtax (*ζηρούχειον*) of two dr.

²⁶ FARAGUNA 2000, 105-6.

²⁷ FARAGUNA 2000, 106-7, concludes that these inscriptions do not reproduce the content of contracts, which could be deposited with a third person, but that of the record made before the magistrate. See also THÜR 2008, 176-7; GAME 2008, 172.

²⁸ Cf. FARAGUNA 2000, 115.

or, if the property was given as security for a loan (as attested in the Attic *horoi* or in some of the inscriptions from Olynthos – see below), to warn potential purchasers or lenders that the property was encumbered.²⁹ Concerning the inscriptions from Olynthos, Lisa Nevett has also suggested that advertising these transactions increased the purchasers' personal prestige.³⁰ Others propose that the uncertainties connected with the expansion of Macedon could have motivated the citizens of neighbouring cities or confederacies to inscribe the acts, so that proofs of the private contracts would remain intact after an eventual conflict.³¹ But as Game comments, one may ask why they kept on inscribing acts when the situation became more stable, as is the case in Amphipolis.³² Still, political events may have induced people to give a more public and enduring form to the document recording their contract.

Another question, related to that of motivation, is whether these inscriptions, most of them found in situ, in the houses or fields to which they referred, record real sales or lands put as securities for loans (πράσις ἐπὶ λύσει).³³ However, since my concern is with the publication of the documents, not the nature of the transaction, I do not intend to discuss this issue here.

But how should we interpret long inscriptions listing numerous transactions, sometimes mentioning taxes, and undoubtedly done within the framework of legal restrictions and registration practices pertaining to the relevant poleis? Should we see them as identical in purpose and motivation to the documents discussed above?

In a short while I shall discuss several documents of such character from different parts of the Greek world. My working assumption is that unlike the individual documents discussed above, inscriptions recording *numerous* real estate transactions were inscribed by a state decision because of special circumstances. To make my case clearer, let us examine first an inscription that belongs to the group of individual, private acts from Olynthos, an example of which was discussed above; but this one mentions the polis of Olynthos as a vendor in a real estate transaction. *TAPA* 69 (1938) 52, 6 (400-348 B.C.) reads:

²⁹ See GAME 2008, 171-2; NEVETT 2000, 334.

³⁰ NEVETT 2000, 334, 341. But see THÜR 2008, 177.

³¹ HATZOPOULOS 1988, 72-7, and DOUKELLIS 1988, 156, argue that this situation is reflected in the low prices of the properties. See also FARAGUNA 2000, 107-8.

³² GAME 2008, 172.

³³ See FARAGUNA 2000, 103, who argues that unless the inscription explicitly mentions security it records real sale. For a detailed discussion of the documents recording securities see THÜR 2008, 176-84.

θεός· τύχη ἀγαθή· ὦνή / εὐθεΐα· μηνὸς Πανθεῶ / νος ἐπὶ Κλεάνδρο Σώσω / νος ἱερέως,
 Στρῆν[ιος] Ἀσπία / παρὰ Φειδίππο τὸ Φεΐδ/ωνος τὴν οἰκίαν ἣν ἐπρ/ίαιο Φεΐδιππος
 παρὰ τῆς / πόλεως τῆς Ὀλυνθίων / τὴν ἐχομένην τῆς Τηλ/εκλέως τετρακίς χιλίων
 / πεντακοσίων· βεβαιωτα[ι] / Ἡρόδωρος Ἡροδώρο, Ἀθην/όδωρος Ἀριστοδήμο,
 Στρῆνιος [(patronymic)]· μάρτυρες...

God. Good Fortune. A straight purchase. In the month of Pantheon, when Kleandros son of Soson was the priest, Strenios son of Aspias (bought) from Pheidippos son of Pheidon the house which Pheidippos had bought from the polis of the Olynthians, adjoining that of Telekles, for the price of 4,500 (drachmas). Guarantors: [names]. Witnesses: [names].

It has been suggested that the earlier sale by the polis of the house to Pheidippos, the vendor in this document, may have been the auction of a confiscated property.³⁴ If this property was one item in a list of confiscated properties auctioned by the polis, which is a reasonable guess, the polis might also have decided to engrave on a stele an inventory of the confiscated properties, with the names of the former owners and the names of purchasers, as well as the proceeds from this auction – the sort of publication we see, for example, in the Attic Stelai (*IG I³ 421-430*).³⁵ But no such inscribed inventory for Olynthos has been found, and what we have here is only an allusion to a state transaction within a private document.

Another case which seems to teeter between the categories of private and state publication is a somewhat unique inscription found in Mieza in Macedonia: *SEG 53,613* (ed. pr. E. Stefane, *AE*, 2003 [2005], 155-196; ca. 250-225 B.C.).³⁶ Here I quote from col. I (fragments A and B), lines 1-18:

- A [Ζώπυρος Γοργία ἐπρίαιο παρὰ-----πλέ]-
 [θρ]α[.] ΡΟΘ : ἀκαΐνας : ΟΕ : τὸ[ν περὶ Δροϊέστα]ς, τὸ πλῆθρον δραχμῶ(ν)
 : Ο : τὴν τιμὴν ἔχει πάσαν; [βεβαιωτ]αί Ἐ[Σ]κτωρ Μαννία Σκυδραί-
 ος, Ἀττίνας Ἀνδρόνικου Νε[απολίτ]ης · ἡ ὦνή ἐγένετο μηνὸς
 4 Περιτίου, ἐπὶ ἐπιστάτου Ὀγ[ομάρχ]ου, ἱερέως Νικάνωρος, ταγω-
 νατῶν Εὐπολέμου, Νικάνο[ρος· μ]άρτυρες Ἀσκληπιόδωρος
 Σωπάτρου, Ἀντίφιλος Βα[. . . .], Διογένης Πυθογένους,
 Φίλος Δροπίδα, Φίλιππος Ἀμ[. . .]κτου Σκυδραΐος, Μένων
 8 Μόλωνος Σκυδραΐος, Τόλων Ἀδ[ύμο]υ

³⁴ *Bull. Ép.* 1939, no. 168. On the expression ὦνή εὐθεΐα ('straight purchase') see above.

³⁵ See also BLÜMEL 1993 (= *Syll.*³ 46; cf. *SEG* 43,713), an inscribed record from Halikarnassos (425-350 B.C.) of properties confiscated and re-sold, listing the names of the purchasers.

³⁶ The inscription consists of five fragments; Stefane re-published fragment A and published the other four fragments (B-E). For a summary, see Hatzopoulos in *BE* (2006), no. 252; *GAME* 2008, 93-101, no. 39.

- B Ζώπυρος Γοργία ἐπρίατο παρὰ Ἀδ[ρ]ά<σ>του γῆν τὴν περὶ Νέαν πόλιν καὶ Δροϊέσσας, πλέθρα : ΡΟΘ : [ἀ]καίνας : ΟΗ : τὰ ἐχόμενα ὧν παρὰ Κρατεροῦ ἠγόρασεν καὶ [τ]ῶν Αττίνα · τὸ πλέθρον
- 12 δραχμῶν : Ο : · βεβαιοτῆς Ὀρέσσης Ζ[ωί]λου Μαρινιαῖος · τὴν τιμὴν ἔχει πᾶσαν · ἡ ὠνὴ ἐγένετο μηνὸς Περιτίου ἐπὶ ἐπ<ι>-στάτου Ὀνομάρχου, ἱερέως τοῦ [Α]σσκ[λ]ηπιοῦ Νικάνορος, ταγωνατῶν Εὐπολέμου, Νικάνορος · μάρ[τ]υρες δικ<α>στῶν Λυσανί-
- 16 ας Σικίπτου, Εὐπόλεμος Τάρτιος · {Μ} [ἀν]τία δικαστῶν Νίκανδρος Σιβυρτίου, Ὀλύμπιχος Σακόλα, Τ[ό]λων Ἀδύμου, Ἀσκλη-πόδωρος Σωπάτρου.

(A) Zopyros son of Gorgias bought from [---] 179 plethra, 75 akainai of land in the vicinity of Droiestai, at the rate of 70 drachmas a plethron. He paid the entire sum. Guarantors: Hektor son of Mannias, a Skydraian, and Attinas son of Andronikos, a Neopolitan. The sale took place in the month of Peritios, when Onomarchos was the *epistatēs*, Nikanor was the priest, and Eupolemos and Nikanor were the *tagōnatai*.³⁷ Witnesses: [names].

(B) Zopyros son of Gorgias bought from Adrastos a plot in the vicinity of Neapolis and Droiestai, 179 plethra, 78 akainai, adjoining the properties he had bought from Krateros and from Attinas, at the rate of 70 drachmas a plethron. Guarantor: Orestes son of Zoilos, a Marinian. He paid the entire sum. The sale took place in the month of Peritios, when Onomarchos was the *epistatēs*, Nikanor was the priest of Asklepios, and Eupolemos and Nikanor were the *tagōnatai*. Witnesses of the judges: [names]. Against(?) the judges: [names].

The inscription as a whole mentions ten deeds of land sale (four of them almost complete, the other six fragmentary). Each deed records the name of the vendor, the nature and/or the location of the land sold, its size and price, the witnesses and the guarantors. Each deed is also dated by the month, the *epistatēs*, the priest of Asklepios and the *tagōnatai*. The purchaser in *all* the recorded transactions is one and the same person, Zopyros son of Gorgias, and he seems to have bought these properties in the course of three consecutive years.³⁸

It is not clear why Zopyros' land acquisitions (more than 32 hectares for more than 26,500 drachmas³⁹) were inscribed on stone and set up in a public place. On the one hand, this inscription seems to belong to the category of privately inscribed land sales discussed above (such as those from Kamarina or Amphipolis), except it clusters together several acts instead of inscribing them

³⁷ Stefane explains that these ταγωνᾶται were annual officials. Hatzopoulos (*BE*, 2006, no. 252, pp. 676-7) reads ταγῶν ἀτῶν. See also *GAME* 2008, 97-8.

³⁸ Hatzopoulos, *BE* (2006), no. 252, p. 677. Cf. *GAME* 2008, 98.

³⁹ Hatzopoulos, *BE* (2006), no. 252, p. 676. Hatzopoulos corrects the ed. pr. in the calculation of the total size of the lands bought and the price paid. On the amounts paid by Zopyros see also *GAME* 2008, 100, who infers that Zopyros belonged to the elite of Mieza.

on separate steles. It may be that because the landed properties that Zopyros bought were situated in a relatively small area (hence also the repetition of names in different capacities: officials, vendors, and witnesses),⁴⁰ he wished to give publicity to the fact that he was the new owner in that vicinity.

However, there are some elements that render this classification difficult. First, these acts, all of which start with the name of Zopyros as the purchaser, were probably arranged month by month, year by year, as a kind of inventory. This led Game to propose that the register was intended as an evaluation of Zopyros' property, perhaps for tax purposes.⁴¹ Game also suggests that the use of formulaic forms in these records may be a sign of the rationalization of the administrative system under the Antigonids. But why was it considered necessary to inscribe this assessment on stone? Another confusing constituent of the inscription is the mention in act B of *μάρτυρες δικαστῶν*, 'witnesses of the judges', and *ἀντία δικαστῶν*, those 'against the judges' (lines 15-16). Act C has a slightly different formulation: *μάρτυρες δι[καστῶ]ν Λυσανίας / Σικίττου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων* (lines 25-26), followed by four names, and in act D the text after *μάρτυρες δικαστῶν* (lines 34-35, followed by four names) has not survived, but might have been formulated as in act C. Stefane proposes that these *μάρτυρες δικαστῶν* might have been the same as the *βασιλικὸι δικασταί*, the 'royal judges' mentioned in another Macedonian inscription, *SEG 47,999* from Tyrissa (ed. pr. P. Chrysostomou, *Tekmeria* 3, 1997, 23-43), dated to the early second century B.C. and recording two transactions concerning the same vineyard.⁴² Lines 5-7 of the inscription read *δίκης γενομένης / [πρὸς] τοῖς βασιλικοῖς δικα[σ]/[τ]αίς* ('the trial being conducted in front of the royal judges'). Chrysostomou notes that this is the first time that this magistracy is attested in Macedon, and suggests that the trial may have been connected with the fact that the vineyard was sold by Philagros' son and widow. He raises the possibility that the 'royal judges' of Tyrissa were identical to the 'witnesses of the judges' in Mieza (where they acted as witnesses) and to the judges mentioned in other Macedon inscriptions.⁴³ Chrysostomou proposes to see in these 'royal judges' a secondary legal body, called to approve cases on appeal.

⁴⁰ In the course of the month of Peritios Zopyros bought three plots in the same neighbourhood (*περὶ Δροιέσστας*; acts A – C) and another which bordered on his estate (act D).

⁴¹ GAME 2008, 99.

⁴² In the first transaction Philagros had bought the vineyard from Philippos; he then gave part of it to Boukartas, probably his son. In the second transaction, after Philagros' death, the vineyard was sold by Boukartas and Philagros' widow to Polyainos. See also GAME 2008, 101-3, no. 40.

⁴³ E.g., *Meletemata* 22, *Epiq. App.* 50 (= *IG X(2)* 1, 1028; Thessalonike, 240-230 B.C.); *IG X,2* 1, 3 (Thessalonike, 187 B.C.).

Since nothing is known about this magistracy, it is not possible to draw any definite conclusion. However, if the inscription from Mieza indeed refers to judges, this might indicate, as Game suggests,⁴⁴ that the sales were executed according to a court ruling. Although, as the ed. pr. notes, the ‘witnesses of the judges’ appear only in three of the ten transactions on the stone, it is still possible that all the acts were of the same category. It may be that the register of Zopyros’ acquisitions was displayed publicly because these lands were now put up for auction following a court decision – perhaps in a way similar to the Attic Stelai (*IG I³ 421-430*) and to *SGDI 5653* from Chios (475-450 B.C.). The latter seems to have contained two inscriptions: the first [A] records the delimitation of a plot of public land, probably because of acts of usurpation by private citizens; the second [B-D] records the auction of lands confiscated from citizens.⁴⁵ The list of Zopyros’ acquisitions in Mieza might have been similarly compiled and inscribed because it was deemed essential to publicize the exact location and the identity of the former owners of each plot, now being put up for a re-sale. However, the mention of the μάρτυρες δικαστῶν as witnesses to the various purchases made by Zopyros may speak against this interpretation, which assumes that they were involved at a later stage when Zopyros’ purchased landed properties were perhaps confiscated. Yet even if this interpretation is wrong, the μάρτυρες δικαστῶν apparently were state officials; the use of their services – whether as judges or witnesses – shows the involvement of the state in realty transactions. I therefore suggest as an alternative interpretation that the μάρτυρες δικαστῶν or the βασιλικοί δικασταί were in charge of registering landed (and perhaps other) transactions in third-century B.C. Macedon; in the process of registering land sales (which was perhaps conducted as a trial), challenges to the transactions may have been raised by rival claimants, hence the mention of ἀντία δικαστῶν.⁴⁶ The absence of this term in act A of the Mieza inscription may be accidental and the result of the negligence on the part of whoever drafted the text (or copied it from the original, hand written contract). The other acts are too fragmentary to decide whether they alluded to these ‘judges’.

⁴⁴ GAME 2008, 100.

⁴⁵ FARAGUNA 2006. Cf. the list of confiscated properties and their purchasers in an inscription from Halikarnassos, mentioned in n. 35 above.

⁴⁶ Or perhaps we may see Zopyros’ case as similar to the process attested in *Syll.³ 279* from Zeleia (shortly after 334 B.C.), where an elected committee of nine citizens (called ἀνευρεταί) is to check public lands (χωρία δημόσια), supposedly usurped by private citizens. For the process of legal decisions to be taken in case of disputes, eleven elected citizens are to serve as δικασταί, judges, aided by three συνήγοροι (lines 27-30). Could it be that the μάρτυρες δικαστῶν and ἀντία δικαστῶν of Mieza were involved in a legal dispute between Zopyros and the polis over the ownership of lands, a dispute that Zopyros eventually won?

The first document I discuss in the category of “state publications” is the so-called *Rationes Centesimarum*, from which I cite two passages:⁴⁷

(a) Stele 2, Face A, col. 1 (*IG II² 1594*), lines 15-22: Attica; mid fourth century B.C.:

- 15 ἐτέρα ἐσχατιὰ ἐν Βῆ[σαι]
 ὦνη Κλεομέδων Λέοντος Α/[— —]·
 ἐτέρα ἐσχατιὰ ἐν Πόρω[ι τὸ δη]-
 μόσαι ἄλοι καλούμε[νον],
 ἐτέρα ἐσχατιὰ ἐμ Πόρω[ι τῆς]
 20 αὐτῆς ταύτης *vac.*
 ὦνη ἀμφοτέρων Εὐκλῆς Α[ακλέους]
 Ἀλαιεὺς ΗΔΔΓ·

Another outlying estate in Besa; buyer: Kleomedon son of Leon of[--]. Another outlying estate in Poros, called ‘the public threshing floors’; another outlying estate in Poros, of the same name; buyer of both: Eukles son of Lakles of Halai: 125 dr.

(b) Stele 3, Face A, col. 1 (*IG II² 1596*), lines 5-11: Attica; mid 4th century B.C.:

- 5 [Ἴ]Ηρακλέους ἱερομνήμο[νες]
 Χαρίσανδρος Δημοκρίτου Ἄλωπ(εκήθεν)?·
 Δημοκλῆς Γναθ[ίου] Ἄλωπ(εκήθεν)
 ἀπέδοντο χωρίον Ἄλωπε[κῆσι]
 ὦνη Λυσικράτης Λυσιμάχου Ἀφι[(δναίος) – ἑκατ(οστή) –]
 10 κεφάλαιον : ἤΤΤΤΧΧΧΗΗΗ :
 τοῦτο ἑκατοστή : Ἰ^Ϟ ΗΗΗΔ | | |·

Of Herakles, *hieromnemes*: Charisnadros son of Demokritos of Alopeke and Demokles son of Gnathios of Alopeke sold a site in Alopeke. Buyer: Lysikrates son of Lysimachos of Aphidnai. Total: 13 talents 3,300 dr. *hekatostē*: 807 dr.

The *Rationes Centesimarum* (or the *hekatostē*-inscriptions) comprise four steles that record sales of land by Attic corporate groups (demes, phratries, etc.) to individual citizens in the second half of the fourth century B.C. The entries are very concisely formulated, describing the sold property in outline, naming the selling group and the purchaser, and noting the price and the one percent tax paid (in passage b cited above a grand total is given).⁴⁸ Lambert has convincingly argued that these inscriptions should be understood in the context of the processes of accountability, characteristic of democratic Athens. Hence, the *Rationes* are no mere copies of the transactions but accounts of the proceeds from the *hekatostai* collected in these transactions; the *hekatostai*, he

⁴⁷ I follow the edition of LAMBERT 1997.

⁴⁸ LAMBERT 1997, 270-1, suggests comparing the *hekatostē* in these inscriptions with the payment of one percent put down sixty days in advance by purchasers of landed property, as reported by Theophrastos (see above). Contra, FARAGUNA 1998, 179.

suggests, went to Athena, and the accounts were probably issued by the joint board of the treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods.⁴⁹ In this respect the *Rationes* are analogous to the fifth-century Athenian Tribute Lists (*IG* I³ 259-90), as the latter record not the sums paid as tribute but the taxes due to the goddess.⁵⁰ That the record of the transactions themselves ‘was incidental, as it were, to the formal purpose of the texts – to record the payment of Athena’s due portion’ can be inferred from the absence of an accurate description of the properties sold: the terms χωρίον and ἐσχατιά, the demes’ names, and the occasional designation of the asset were apparently considered sufficient.⁵¹ This is not the case in the private documents discussed above, nor in other formal Attic accounts stemming from sales or leases of landed and other properties. For instance, *IG* I³ 424, one of the Attic *Stelai* recording the sale of the confiscated property of the Hermakopidai in 414/3 B.C., describes in detail the boundaries and location of the houses sold. This feature of the *Rationes Centesimarum* also relates to the circumstances of their publication.

Lambert argues that the *Rationes* reflect Lykourgos’ policy to increase Athens’ revenues and to improve the exploitation of land resources.⁵² Lykourgos first appears in 343/2 B.C., hence Lambert assigns *stelai* 1 and 2 of the *Rationes* to ca. 343-340 B.C., dating the other two *stelai* (3-4) to 330-325 B.C. It is roughly at this time that other inscribed accounts of sacred leases appear, probably also connected with Lykourgos’ policy.⁵³ Lambert also suggests that the *Rationes* may represent a shift from the public sphere to the private, consonant with a contemporaneous trend of shifting the burden of communal euergetism from the obligatory liturgical system to reliance on the goodwill of wealthy individuals.⁵⁴ Faraguna, in his review of Lambert, suggests two other motives: the need to intensify agricultural production at a time when Philip II was ominously approaching the straits, and to increase the efficiency of the fleet by raising the number of those potentially liable to the trierarchy (formerly exempted from this liturgy).⁵⁵ Faraguna rightly points to reasons which are beyond, or – more accurately – additional to the financial purposes,

⁴⁹ LAMBERT 1997, 272-3.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 273-4.

⁵¹ LEWIS 1973, 199; LAMBERT 1997, 228. See also FARAGUNA 1998, 175. For a typical description of the asset’s location, see e.g. passage “a” above, lines 17-18: ἐτέρω ἐσχατιᾷ ἐν Πόρω [ι τὸ δη]/ μόσια ἄλοι καλούμε[νον] (‘Another outlying estate in Poros, called “the public threshing floors”’).

⁵² LAMBERT 1997, 280-91. See also PAPA ZARKADAS 2011, esp. 235-6.

⁵³ LAMBERT 1997, 289-90.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 291.

⁵⁵ FARAGUNA 1998, 179.

but these reasons do not fully explain why it was decided to inscribe on stone not only the amounts of money paid as taxes but the details – sketchy and general as they are – of the transactions. As noted above, the *Rationes Centesimarum* record the identity of the selling groups, the officials conducting the sales, the properties sold and the names of the buyers, as well as the prices paid. Lambert suggests that these records were also relevant to the accounting processes of the other officials involved and could be consulted in case of dispute.⁵⁶ I would like to suggest that the *Rationes Centesimarum* served also as permanent proofs for the landed transactions they recorded: disputes could also have arisen between the selling groups and the buyers, not only between the officials involved. The ascendancy of Macedon and the involvement of Athens in military operations might have induced the Athenians to safeguard the transfers of ownership on landed property by inscribing them on stone. If Lambert is right that the inscriptions are the result of Lykourgos' policy, these records are a unique combination of state initiative, privatization of public (or demotic) lands, and official publication of the sales and of the state's revenues derived from the taxes paid on these sales.

Several inscriptions listing land sales in the late fifth or early fourth century B.C. have been found in Erythrai. Each inscription consists of numerous deeds, again concisely and identically formulated. Here is an example:

SEG 37,917A, lines 1-14 (ed. pr. Engelmann, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9, 1987, 134-138, no. 3):⁵⁷

- A. [- - - - 19 - - - -]λιος, ἐπωλ[ήθη - - 6 - -]
 [- - - - 14 - - ἐπ]ώνιον δέκα, ἐπρία[το - 4 - -]
 [- - - - 14 - -] ν Ἀπολλωνίδευ τοῦ Ἀντι[. . .]
- 4 [. γῆ ἥτις ἦν Ἀπ]έλλιος, ἐπωλήθη μυριέων ἐπ[ακ]-
 [οσιέων ε] ἴκοσιν, ἐπώνιον τεσσαράκοντα, ἐπ[ρί]-
 [ατο Μιν]νίων Ἡροφάνευς ν Ἐκατομβίου τοῦ Ζ[ωπ]-
 [ύρο]υ ἄμπελοι ἐν Ἀργαδεύσιν, αἵτινες ἦσαν [Ἀπ]-
- 8 [έλλ]ιος, ἐπωλήθησαν ἑξακοσιέων, ἐπώνιον δ[έκ]-
 [α], ἐπρίατο Ἀριστήμων Δόρκωνος ν ἄλλη γῆ ἐν [Ἀύ]-
 λικοῖς, ἐπωλήθη χιλιέων ἑξακοσιέων δέκα, [ἐπ]-
 ώνιον εἴκοσιν, ἐπρίατο Ζηνόδοτος Πυθέρομ[ο]

⁵⁶ LAMBERT 1997, 275.

⁵⁷ Other Erythraian inscriptions recording land sales are *I. Erythrai* 153 (SEG 37,918), and possibly 154, 156; S. ŞAHİN, *EA* 9 (1987), 52, no. 1 (SEG 37,921), 52-53 no. 2 (SEG 37,919), recording the payment of *epōnion*.

12 Νικάνδρου τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου γῆ ἐν Αὐλικοῖ[ς, ἦτ]-
 ις ἦν Μύσκωνος, ἐπωλήθη ἑπτακισχιλιέων [τρι]-
 ακοσιέων δέκα, ἐπώνιον τεσσαράκοντα...

[---]lios, sold [for ---], *epōnion*: 10. [---] bought from [---] a plot, the one which belonged to Apellis, sold for the price of 10,720 drachmas, *epōnion*: 40. Minion son of Herophanes bought from Hekatombios son of Zopyros vineyards in Argadeusis, those which belonged to Apellis, sold for 600 drachmas, *epōnion*: 10. Aristemon son of Dorkon bought another plot in Aulikoi, sold for the price of 1,610 drachmas, *epōnion*: 20. Zenodotos son of Pythermos bought from Nikandros son of Herakleitos a plot in Aulikoi, that which belonged to Myskon, sold for the price of 7,310 drachmas, *epōnion*: 40. Etc.

For each deed of sale the *epōnion*, a sales tax, was paid.⁵⁸ Like the *Rationes Centesimarum*, this document is very different from the individual acts cited above. The Erythraian inscription was formulated in such a way as to accommodate on the stone as many transactions as possible. Again we may ask, what was the motivation behind this publication? If the parties sought legal protection, was not registration in the public archives enough? If it was publicity that they wanted, why not make an individual, private inscription as in Sicily, Amphipolis or Olynthos? The record of the sums paid as *epōnion* may suggest that, as in the case of the Attic *Rationes Centesimarum*, the state wished to have an official and public account of the taxes paid on sales of land. But, again, this cannot be the sole motivation.

We do not know the *exact* date of the inscriptions. An Athenian decree, found at Erythrai and dated to shortly before 386 B.C. (that is, before the Peace of Antalkidas), might be of help. It promises support for the democrats in Erythrai, who seem to have just managed to re-establish democracy after some civil strife; it also mentions exiles driven out of the city by the democrats (ed. pr. S. Şahin, *Bulleten* 40, 1976, 566-571).⁵⁹ Rhodes and Osborne date the inscription ‘to the end of the period between c.390, when Thrasybulus re-established an Athenian presence in the Aegean, and 386’.⁶⁰ Another inscription, a decree of Erythrai dated to ca. 400 B.C. (*SEG* 36,1039),⁶¹ records the oracle brought back by citizens who had been sent to Delphi (οἱ θεοπρόποι) and the subsequent decision of the polis to build a temple and set up a statue to Aphrodite Pandemos, ἐ[πὶ σ]/[ωτηρ]ίηι τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἐρυθραίων (‘for

⁵⁸ For another example see n. 25 above. ENGELMANN (1987) suggests that the *epōnion* was assessed thus: on prices up to 100 dr., 2 dr.; between 100 and 200 dr., 5 dr.; between 200 and 1000 dr., 10 dr.; between 1000 and 2000 dr., 20 dr.; and over 2000 dr., 40 dr.

⁵⁹ Cf. *SEG* 26,1282; RHODES – OSBORNE 2003, 74-77, no. 17.

⁶⁰ RHODES – OSBORNE 2003, 74.

⁶¹ Ed. pr. R. Merkelbach, *EA* 8 (1986), 15-18.

the safety of the Erythraian People’, lines 4-5). The ed. pr. suggests that the Erythraians sent to Delphi to consult about the best way to attain ὁμόνοια, concord, among the citizens. Although this word does not appear in the extant text of the inscription, the decision taken for the sake of *sōtēria* implies that Erythrai has recently recovered from internal, and possibly external, strife.

These two inscriptions, then, refer to troubles in Erythrai, and although the second (the decision to erect a temple and statue to Aphrodite Pandemos) was perhaps inscribed at least ten years earlier than the Athenian decree for Erythrai,⁶² it seems plausible that both should be placed in the same context. In war, whether external or internal – and the Erythraians experienced both – uncertainties could arise concerning ownership, threatening the stability of the regime. Hence SEG 37,917A may well reflect the need to set up a solid and lasting proof of real estate transactions made during these difficult times. The state would also be in need of resources, here supplied by the collection of the *epōnion*.

I now turn to the famous and much discussed long inscription from Tenos, recording transactions in real estate, registered with the *astynomoi* over a period of less than two years. I quote here the opening lines of the inscription (*IG* XII,5 872, lines 1-15: Tenos; ca 300 B.C.):⁶³

[κατὰ τάδε πράξεις ἐγένοντο χωρίων [καὶ οἰκιῶν καὶ προικῶν] δόσεις [ἐ]π’
ἄρχοντος Ἀμ[ε]ινύ[λ]α πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυ[νόμους] Σωσιμ— — — — —
— — — c.21— — — σονα Ἀρισ[τό]νακτος Θεσ[τι]άδ[η]μ· [μην]ὸς Ἀρ[τ]ε[μ]ισίωνος·
{2I}² Κρινύλ[ι]ον . . . [ίδου Θεσ[τι]άδ[η]ο[υ] μ[ε]τὰ κ[υ]ρίου [Σωμ]βρότου Στρομμονίδου
[Δονα]κέως]
[παρὰ — — — — —]λόχου ἐκ [πό]λεως ἐπρίατο
τὴν οἰκ[ία]ν καὶ τὰ χωρία τὰ ἐν Δ[ονα]κεία[ι], οἳς γείτονες(?) — — — — —]
[— — — c.15— — — καὶ [τὰ] οἰκία, οἳς γείτονες Εὐσ— — — c.14— — — δραχμῶν
ἀργυρίου δισχιλίων πεντακοσίων· πρατ[ή]ρες . . . ιστος — — — — — — —
5.σισίας. ἔνει καὶ νέαι μ[η]ν[ὸς] Ταυρε(?)ῶν]ος· {2II}² Καλλι[ιστ]
αρέτη Καλλιφόρου [. ἧς] κύριος Ἀνδρογέν[η]ς Μυρτώσιος Ἐσχατιώτης
παρὰ Τεισιμάχου]
[.]ου Ἐσχατιώτου(?), οὗ κύριος Ἀνδρογέν[η]ς Μ[υρτώσιος] Ἐσχατιώτης,
ἐπρίατο τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐν ἄστ[ει] ἢ ἐστὶν ἐν [τ]όλ[ω]ι ἐβδόμωι, ἧ[ι] γείτονες — —
— c.18— — — , ἣν]
.τει. . . λατο(?) [καὶ] ὑπέθετο Τεισιμάχος, παρὰ [τῆς μητρὸς] Εὐτελείας
[ἀ]ργυρίου δραχμῶν δισχιλία[ς] τριακοσίας εἴκοσι [λαβών, Καλλισταρέτη καὶ]
[Ἀνδρογέν]ει Μυρτώσιος Ἐσχατιώτει, Καλλισταρέτη[ι] τεί γυναικί] τεί αὐτοῦ. {2III}²

⁶² The ed. pr. suggests that the inscription is ‘aus dem 5. oder dem Beginn des 4. Jahrhunderts’. On the basis of paleographical considerations C. Brixhe, *BSL* 84, 1 (1989) 33-4, argues that it should be dated later than ca. 400 B.C. (*SEG* 39,1238).

⁶³ The bibliography on the Tenos inscription is vast. See FARAGUNA 2000, 87-92.

Εὐτέλει[α] Γυραῖς μετὰ [κυρίου Μν]ησικ[— — — — — παρὰ]
 [. Γρ]υπίωνος Ἑρακλείδου ἐπρίατο [ο τ]ὰ οἰ[κ]οδομημένα
 πάντα [— — ὄσα ἐστὶν ἐν — — — τ]ωι, οἷς [γείτονες — — — — — — — — — —]
 10 [δραχμῶν ἀ]ργυρίου [ἑκα]τόν. {²IV}² Πραξίαςδ.....ω.....σανδρος Ἀρισ[τω]ν—
 —
 ὅι γείτ[ων] Θεόφαντος ἀριστερὰς εἰσιόντιλη ἐ.....ομ μέρος καὶ τον[— — —
 —
 [. Δον]ακεὺς, Α.....ος Φίλ[ο]φά[ν]του Ἐσατιώτης [καὶ μ]έσω[ι] κ[αὶ] χωρὶς
 ἑκάτερος πα[ντ]ῶς τ[οῦ] ἀργυρίου. {²V}² Φερεκράτης Φερεκράτους παρὰ]
 [Νικοδρόμου] Θρυησίου ἐπρίατο τὰ χωρία τὰ ἐν Σίχνει πάντα ὄσα ἐπρίατο
 Νικόδρομος παρὰ Φερεκράτους, οἷς γείτονες Α— — — — — , — — — — — , δραχμῶν
 [ἀργυρίου — — — — — — — — — —]
 {²VII}²ρατος Ἑρακλείδ<ο>υ Κλυμενεὺς παρὰ Στρατίου Παντ[α]λέοντος
 Θρυησίου ἐπρίατο οἰκόπεδον ἐμ Πανόρωμι, ὃ καλ[ε]ίτ[αι] ὅι γείτων
 Πεισικ[ράτης]
 15 πρᾶτηρ Πανταλέων Στρατίου. Ἀπελλαιῶνος πέμπει ἐπὶ δέκα·

According to the following (details) transactions of lands and houses and grants of dowries took place in the archonship of Ameinolias, in front of the *astynomoi* [----]. In the month of Artemision: Krinylion son of [---], a Thestiad, with his *kyrios* Sombrotos son of Strymonides, a Donakean, bought from [---] the house and lands in Donaka, whose neighbours are [---], and the buildings whose neighbours are [---], for the price of 2,500 drachmas. Guarantors: [names]. Etc.

This inscription reveals the control exercised by the state on sales:⁶⁴ the *astynomoi* here are in charge of registering the transactions. The question is again why these records were inscribed on stone. As Faraguna notes, this inscription is one in a series of approximately contemporaneous inscriptions of similar content.⁶⁵ We do not know the exact dates, either of the inscription from which I quote here or of the other inscriptions (they are all dated to ca. 300 B.C.); but a series of inscriptions published by a state decision, like the series from Erythrai, may imply that this was not an exceptional or single publication. It has also been argued that the sums involved indicate that the polis needed cash.⁶⁶ Furthermore, the heading of the inscription states that it records donation of dowries as well (though none appear in the preserved text);⁶⁷ such an

⁶⁴ See FARAGUNA 2000, 90-2, who draws a parallel between the Tenos inscription and the Alexandrian *dikaionmata*; GAME 2008, 171.

⁶⁵ FARAGUNA 2000, 88. The other inscriptions are *IG XII,5 874-877*; new inscriptions were published by ÉTIENNE 1990, Appendix III, 268-269, no. 27 (*SEG 40,698*), and 269, no. 28 (*SEG 40, 699*).

⁶⁶ OSBORNE 2010, 124.

⁶⁷ FARAGUNA 2000, 88 n. 81, suggests that the dowries were inscribed on a twin stele, of the same type as *IG XII, 5 873* from Tenos (late fourth/early third century B.C.), which does record dowries. On the legal and economic status of women in Tenos in the Hellenistic period see ÉTIENNE 1985; STAVRIANOPOULOU 2006, 62-4, 97-8, 137-40.

inscribed register (except for *IG XII,5 873* of Tenos) of dowries is known only from one other place, the neighbouring island of Mykonos in the third century B.C. (*Syll.*³ 1215). VÉRILHAC and VIAL argue that the publication on stone of dowries in the two islands was intended to allow husbands to demand what remained unpaid.⁶⁸ But neither the need for cash nor the need to publicize debts explains fully the official inscribed register. Here, too, the reason should be sought in political and economic circumstances which could have caused social unrest.

Again, our information is meagre, but such circumstances may have been the frequent changes of hegemony and wars following the death of Alexander the Great.⁶⁹ The Cyclades frequently changed hands between Ptolemy I and the Antigonids in the period 314 to 286 B.C. In 308/7 Ptolemy I, commanding a naval force, sailed through the islands and seems to have weakened Antigonos Monophthalmos' control of the Cyclades, since he liberated Andros from a garrison, presumably Antigonid; Ptolemy then took possession of cities in mainland Greece: Megara, Corinth and Sicyon.⁷⁰ A year later Antigonos sent his son Demetrios to Greece restore his control. In an article discussing the relations between Athens and Tenos, Reger suggests that in 307/6 B.C. the Athenians granted the Tenians access to their law courts (*IG II² 466*) because Demetrios used Tenos as a base and the Tenians helped him liberate Athens.⁷¹ Whatever the relations between Tenos and Athens and whether or not Tenos was involved in Demetrios' actions in Athens, it is reasonable to assume that the island, as well as the other Cyclades, was prey to the conflicting ambitions of the Hellenistic kings. The military conflicts between Alexander's successors may have induced the islands to give a more substantial form to official records in fear that existing claims to real estate and dowries would not be honored or remembered.

In Chersonesos too, political circumstances may explain an inscription recording land transactions (of which again, I quote only a part). *SEG* 40,615, Fragment B, lines 7-20 (edd. pr. E.I. Solomonik and G.M. Nikolaenko, *VDI* 1990, 2, 79-99), with new readings by J.G. Vinogradov⁷² (270-250 B.C.), reads:

⁶⁸ VÉRILHAC – VIAL 1998, 149.







⁶⁹ See BURASELIS 1982, 39-60.

⁷⁰ Diod. Sic. 20.37.1; BURASELIS 1982, 49; cf. REGER 1992, 367. On the Nesiotic League and its relations with the Hellenistic kings see BURASELIS 1982, 60-87.

⁷¹ REGER 1992, 367-8. See also BURASELIS 1982, 52 and n. 58.

⁷² In *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur historischen Geographie des Altertums* 4 (1990) [1994] 366-9. Here I adopt Vinogradov's restorations of lines 7-9 and 13-15.

[- - -Τοῖδε ἐπ]-

- 8 ρίαντο [τ]οὺς ἑκατόρυγ[ας] τοὺς [ἀ]πὸ τὰς χεῖρονος γᾶς ?
πο]λεύειν Γ καθ' ἓνα· Προμ[α]θ(ί)ων [Διο]νυσ[ίου, ὁ δεινα]
[Ν]άγωνος  Ο ἱ Νικάνω[ρ - -] ζ ἱ Προμαθίων Διονυσίου ?
 Χ  CC Προμαθίων Διο[νυσί ?]ου Δ  [- - - - - Καλλι?]-
- 12 ἄδα Ο)Ψ Πασιχάρης ΔΔΟΟ[ΟΟ]C'·ΗΗ<ρακ[λείδας - - -]
ν Κεφαλὰ ΕΑΟΟΟηCCC Ἀπότο[μα τ]ὰ πε[πραμένα - -]
ΠΟΟΟ· ἄτ' ὄροι. τῶι Φοινικίδο[ς παρακείμενα καὶ τῶι]
ωντος οὐκ ἔχομες ΓΟΟ [- - - - -]
- 16 Δ  Ο  Μ[Υ]ΣΠΧΕΙΟ Λεύκω[ν - - - - -]
[Κ]εφαλὰ ἑκατορύγων τῶ[μ πεπραμένων κατ']
αὐτὰν τὰν πράσιν τὰ[ν ἐποίησαν κατὰ τὸ ψάφισμα ?]
[ἐ]πιμεληταὶ α[ί]ρ]εθέντ[ες ὁ δεινα τοῦ δεινός],
- 20 Νευμήγιος Φιλιστίο[υ, ὁ δεινα τοῦ δεινός]

The following persons bought the *hekatōrygai*⁷³ of the inferior land(?) for turning over the soil(?), [---] per one (parcel): Promathion son of Dionysius, [---] son of Nanon 48.78 hectares [etc.] Total of the parcels bought in this sale, (performed) according to the decree, supervised by the elected *epimeletai*: [---], Neumenios son of Philistios, [---]

The quoted text is part of Fragment B of an opisthographic marble plaque which, together with Fragment A, was published by Solomonik and Nikolaenko in 1990. Two other fragments, published as fragment b, face A and B in *IosPE* I² 403, belong to the same plaque. To these also belongs *SEG* 40,616 (edd. pr. E.I. Solomonik and G.M. Nikolaenko, *VDI*, 1990, 2, 97-98), which comes from a different plaque. Hence, as in Erythrai, we should think of a series of (or at least two) inscriptions recording sales of land by the polis, that is, public land.⁷⁴

A recurring formula in all fragments of *SEG* 40,616 and *IosPE* I² 403 is τοῖδε ἐπρίαντο ('the following persons bought'), followed by the specification

⁷³ SOLOMONIK – NIKOLAENKO 1995, 193-5, read ἑκατορύγ[ους] and interpreted this *hapax* word as a unit of measurement of an area (36 Chersonitan plethra = 4.4 hectares). VINOGRADOV 1990 understands this word as referring to a certain kind of land from which shattered rocks were to be dug out and then used to build walls around it.

⁷⁴ VINOGRADOV 1990 argues that the inscription does not record sales of land, but is an inventory of lands leased by the polis. The possibility that the inscription records leases was already raised by LATYCHEV in *IOSPE*, because of the double meanings of the word πρᾶσις as both 'sale' and 'lease', but he left the question open. SOLOMONIK – NIKOLAENKO 1995, 202, argue persuasively that the more common term for lease and leasing was μίσθωσις and μισθῶ, and tend to assume that this is a record of lands sold.

or location of the land, names of purchasers, and numbers – which the edd. pr. argue refer to the size rather than to the price of plots. Twice in the section quoted above (lines 13 and 17) the inscription gives a total – which, by Solomonik and Nikolaenko’s interpretation, is the total measure of the land bought. In the section quoted here we also learn that the transactions were carried out according to a *psēphisma*, a decree, and under the supervision of *epimelētai* (lines 18-19). These indeed are unquestionable indications that the polis initiated both the transactions and the publication of the record. What induced the action and its subsequent publication on stone?

As Solomonik and Nikolaenko suggest, two other inscriptions imply that in that period an attempt had been made to overthrow the democracy at Chersonesos: the famous inscription recording the oath of allegiance to the democratic regime, taken by the citizens of Chersonesos (*IosPE* I² 401 = *Syll.*³ 360; ca. 300-280 B.C.); and a fragmentary law of ca. 300-275 B.C., probably concerning the return of exiles and judiciary problems it entailed (*SEG* 34,750 = 40,614). At the same time, the pressure from the neighbouring Skythian tribes increased and some of the territory was lost. A severe political (and perhaps also economic) crisis, following civil strife, gave rise to the demand for the redistribution of lands. The democrats decided to lease or sell land to landless citizens and thus also raise the polis’ revenues.⁷⁵ If indeed the land in question was public, leased out to citizens in private tenure, it is all the more understandable why it was decided to inscribe the re-distribution on stone.

Saprykin offers a slightly different scenario. He argues that the land division and the farm building activity, apparent from the inscriptions and land surveys, were ‘the result of a concerted, centralized, policy of the state’ (a policy he attributes to Agasikles, honored in *IosPE* I² 418). He suggests that *IosPE* I² 403 refers to plots of land which had been taken from the public land and leased out to private citizens; later, as a result of internal political crisis and the attacks of the Skythians, part of these plots were abandoned or were concentrated in the hands of rich citizens – which caused an attempt to establish an oligarchy or tyranny. Saprykin argues that when the democrats came back to power they re-distributed the land and leased these abandoned or usurped plots to their supporters.⁷⁶ If these interpretations are right, the Chersonesos witnessed a process of privatization of public land, similar to the one

⁷⁵ SOLOMONIK – NIKOLAENKO 1995, 203, 207. See also SAPRYKIN 1997, 179-208; NIKOLAENKO 2006, 170.

⁷⁶ SAPRYKIN 1994, 73-9, 87-94; SAPRYKIN 1994, 191-2, 206-8.

suggested by the *Rationes Centesimarum*.⁷⁷ But whatever the exact arrangement, it is clear that the inscription recording the land transactions attests to state involvement in land tenure.

The inscriptions from Athens, Erythrai, Tenos, and Chersonesos, discussed above, have features that clearly distinguish them from inscriptions such as those from Kamarina, Olynthos, and Amphipolis. As noted above, although evidence for obligatory registration of transactions exists in some places already in the fourth century B.C., and systems for the keeping of documents concerning transactions are attested from the early third century, there is no evidence of their obligatory publication on stone. The inscriptions that record land sales, as in Kamarina, Olynthos, and Amphipolis (and other places), were private documents, giving the essentials of transactions whose full records must have been kept in local archives. The dating by eponyms and the occasional mention of taxes paid were designed to guarantee the validity of the transactions. But each such inscription recorded a single act (except Zopyros' purchases in Mieza, an inscription which is unique in nature). Reversely, the *Rationes Centesimarum* and the inscriptions from Erythrai, Tenos, and Chersonesos consist of lists, each recording numerous acts of land sales or leases, unmistakably initiated and publicized by the state.

The public inscriptions do not reflect a change of policy in the poleis where such inscriptions were found, by which land transactions were required to be inscribed on imperishable material. Despite the obvious advantages of such a measure for the economic and political stability of the polis, and its potential use as a means of control, I believe that these inscriptions were ad hoc responses to immediate political and economic conditions that forced the poleis to act as they did. On the other hand, we should not see these inscriptions as peculiar, one-time actions. If Lambert is right in his explanation and dating of the *Rationes Centesimarum* in Athens, there was a gap of some fifteen years between the publication of the two first *stelai* and that of the other two; so the circumstances that motivated the program of selling groups' lands, and the publication on stone of these sales persisted for some time. Similarly, the inscription from Erythrai discussed above is one of three that have survived (and perhaps there were more).⁷⁸ In Tenos, seven inscriptions listing land transactions, dated to the same period, have been found, and in Chersonesos at least two.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ SAPRYKIN 1994, 78, compares the events in the Chersonesos with Agis IV's and Kleomenes III' reforms in third-century B.C. Sparta.

⁷⁸ See n. 57 above.

⁷⁹ For Tenos see n. 65 above; for Chersonesos see *SEG* 40,616.

These “state publications”, then, were the manifestation of the poleis’ control over their citizens in the economic sphere in response to certain circumstances, and as such there may have been others yet to be discovered.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Cf. the fragmentary list of sales from Philippoi in Macedon (ca. 350-300 B.C.): ed. pr. P. DUCREY 1988, 207-13 (= *SEG* 38,658), where ἐπώνιον is exacted for each item sold. But this is a list of sales of sacred lands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BLÜMEL 1993
W. BLÜMEL, 'SGDI 5727 (Halikarnassos): eine Revision', *Kadmos* 32, 1-18.
- BURASELIS 1982
K. BURASELIS, *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Agais: Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden (Antigonos Monophthalmos, Demetrios Poliorketes und Antigonos Gonatas) im ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, Heft 073), München.
- CASEVITZ 1998
M. CASEVITZ, 'Not e sur le vocabulaire du privé et du public', *Ktéma* 23, 39-45.
- CORDANO 1984
F. CORDANO, 'Camarina VII: alcuni documenti iscritti importanti per la storia della città', *BA* 26, 31-56.
- CORDANO 192
F. CORDANO, *Le tessere pubbliche dal tempio di Atena a Camarina*, Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto Italiano per la storia antica, fasc. 50, Rome.
- DESCAT 1998
R. DESCAT, 'Public et privé dans l'économie de la cité grecque', *Ktéma* 23, 229-41.
- DOUKELLIS 1988
P.N. DOUKELLIS, 'Biens fonciers et territoire en Chalcidique', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 14, 155-58.
- DUBOIS 1989
L. DUBOIS, *Inscriptions dialectales grecques de Sicile*, Genève.
- ENGELMANN 1987
H. ENGELMANN, 'Inscripfen von Erythrai', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9, 133-52.
- ÉTIENNE 1985
R. ÉTIENNE, 'Les femmes, la terre et l'argent à Ténos à l'époque hellénistique', in: *La femme dans le monde méditerranéen* I, G.S. Maison de l'Orient, 61-70.
- ÉTIENNE 1990
R. ÉTIENNE, *Ténos II. Ténos et les Cyclades du milieu du IV^e siècle av. J.-C. au milieu du III^e siècle ap. J.-C.* (BEFAR vol. 263 bis), Paris.
- FARAGUNA 1998
M. FARAGUNA, 'Un nuovo studio sulle "Rationes Centesimarum"' (review of Lambert 1997), *Dike* 1, 171-80.
- FARAGUNA 2000
M. FARAGUNA, 'A proposito degli archivi nel mondo greco', *Chiron* 30, 65-115.
- FARAGUNA 2005
M. FARAGUNA, 'Scrittura e amministrazione nelle città greche: Gli archivi pubblici', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, Vol. 80.2, 61-86.
- FARAGUNA 2006
M. FARAGUNA, 'Terra pubblica e vendite di immobili confiscati a Chio nel V secolo a.C.', *Dike* 8, 89-99.
- FINE 1951
J.V.A. FINE, *Horoi: Studies in Mortgage, Real Security and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens*, Hesperia Suppl. 9.
- FINLEY 1985
M.I. FINLEY, *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.: The Horos Inscriptions*, Oxford.
- FOUCHARD 1998
A. FOUCHARD, 'Dèmosios et dèmos: sur l'État grec', *Ktéma* 23, 59-69.
- GABRIELSEN 2008
V. GABRIELSEN, 'The Public Banks of Hellenistic Cities', in:

- K. VERBOVEN – K. VANDORPE – V. CHANKOWSKI (ed.), *Pistoi Dia Tèn Technèn: Bankers, Loans and Archives. Studies in Honour of Raymond Bogaert*, Leuven, 115-30.
- GAME 2008
J. GAME, *Actes de vente dans le monde grec. Témoignages épigraphiques des ventes immobilières*, Travaux de la maison de l'orient et de la méditerranée 50, Lyon.
- HATZOPOULOS 1988
M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *Actes de vente de la Chalcidique centrale*, Meletemata 6, Athens.
- HATZOPOULOS 1991
M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis*, Meletemata 14, Athens.
- HATZOPOULOS 1996
M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, Epigraphic Appendix, Meletemata 22, Athens.
- HATZOPOULOS 2006
M.B. HATZOPOULOS, 'Macédoine', *Bulletin Épigraphique*, REG 119, 675-677, no. 252.
- LAMBERT 1997
S.D. LAMBERT, *Rationes Centesimarum. Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens*, Amsterdam.
- LEWIS 1973
D. LEWIS, 'The Athenian Rationes Centesimarum', in: M.I. FINLEY (ed.), *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 187-212.
- LEWIS 1990
D. LEWIS, 'Public Property in the City', in: O. MURRAY – S. PRICE, *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford, 245-63.
- MIGEOTTE 1984
L. MIGEOTTE, *L'Emprunt public dans les cités grecques: Recueil des documents et analyse critique*, Paris.
- NEVETT 2000
L. NEVETT, 'Real Estate "Market" in Classical Greece? The Example of Town Housing', *ABSA* 95, 329-43.
- NIKOLAENKO 2006
G.M. NIKOLAENKO, 'The Chora of Tauric Chersonesos and the Cadastre of the 4th-2nd Century BC', in: P. GULDAGER BILDE – V.F. STOLBA (ed.), *Surveying the Greek Chora. Black Sea Region in a Comparative Perspective. Black Sea Studies 4* (The Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Black Sea Studies), Aarhus, 151-71.
- OSBORNE 2010
R. OSBORNE, *Athens and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge.
- PAPAZARKADAS 2011
N. PAPAZARKADAS, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford classical monographs, Oxford-New York.
- REGER 1992
G. REGER, 'Athens and Tenos in the Early Hellenistic Age', *CQ* 42.2, 365-83.
- RHODES – OSBORNE 2003
P.J. RHODES – R. OSBORNE, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 B.C.*, Oxford.
- SAPRYKIN 1994
S.J. SAPRYKIN, *Ancient Farms and Land-Plots on the Khora of Khersonesos Taurike (Research in the Herakleian Peninsula – 1974-1990)*, Amsterdam.
- SOLOMONIK – NIKOLAENKO 1995
E.I. SOLOMONIK – G.M. NIKOLAENKO, 'Parcelles de terre chersonésiennes au début du III^e s. av.n.è. (*IosPE*, I², 403)', in: M.-M. MACTOUX – E. GENY (ed.), *Esclavage et dépendance dans l'historiographie soviétique récente*, Paris, 185-210 (= *VDI* 1990, 1, 79-98).
- STAVRIANOPOULOU 2006
E. STAVRIANOPOULOU, 'Gruppenbild mit Dame': *Untersuchungen zur rechtlichen und sozialen Stellung der Frau auf den Kykladen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Stuttgart.
- STEPHANE 2003 [2005]
L. STEPHANE, 'Onai ek tes Emathias, II', *AE* 142, 155-96.
- THÜR, 2008
G. THÜR, 'Ownership and Security in Macedonian Sale Documents', in: E. CANTARELLA – M. GAGARIN – J. MÉLÈZ MODRZEJEWSKI – G. THÜR (ed.), *Symposion 2007: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Wien, 173-87.
- VÉRILHAC – VIAL 1998
A.-M. VÉRILHAC – C. VIAL, *Le mariage grec du VI^e av. J.-C. à l'époque d'Auguste*, BCH Supplément 32, Athènes.
- WOLFF 1948
H.I. WOLFF, 'Registration of Conveyances in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Aegyptus* 28, 17-96.
- YIFTACH-FIRANKO 2011
U. YIFTACH-FIRANKO, 'Katagraphe', in: J.G. KEENAN – J.G. MANNING – U. YIFTACH-FIRANKO (ed.), *Law and society in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest (330 BC-640 AD)*, Cambridge, 314-35.