

SACRED LAND IN CLASSICAL ATHENS
AND HISTORICAL EMPIRICISM*

Nikolaos PAPAARKADAS, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011 (Oxford Classical Monographs), XII + 395 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-969400-6, £87.00.

Since the book by Nikolaos PAPAARKADAS [= P.] was published in 2011, it has already received a number of reviews, most notably those of David WHITEHEAD and Stephen LAMBERT, both esteemed experts on the subject of the book¹. The reviews by LAMBERT and William S. BUBELIS both touched upon some important methodological issues, but I believe that their remarks have not exhausted the subject and some points still need to be made before building a future discussion, as LAMBERT has wished², on the foundation laid by P.

The book is an impressive treatment of all aspects of land tenure in ancient Athens. The emphasis is put upon the Classical period, but the author has included Hellenistic, Roman and Archaic material to some extent, where he felt it necessary. The emphasis on the Classical period does not just come from its popularity among classical scholars; the most important material for P.'s work comes precisely from the time between the mid-fifth and the late fourth century BCE. Since the book is devoted to the use of sacred and public lands, the sale of lands, as this was predominantly the domain of private property and private economic activity, is only treated marginally. When the author does discuss the public sale of properties, it is only in the case of either confiscated or donated properties. He persuasively argues that the Athenian state, or any body of citizens (be it *phyle*, *phratry*, *genos* or *orgeones*) concerned with some landed properties, was not interested in selling but rather letting them to continually provide for their cultic needs. Therefore, in the author's opinion, and inspired by S. LAMBERT's comment on the *Rationes Centesimarum*³, the sale of lands attested in the *Rationes Centesimarum* was a strategy employed only when the state needed to return to financial equilibrium rather than a trace of a constant and regular procedure (pp. 132–135). P. deliberately speaks of “sacred and public land” rather than “sacred and public real property”, because he is naturally unable to include the leasing of the Attic silver mines in his investigation. Here he claims that the analysis of the mine leases would take much more space and consume much more time than “an average monograph” has (p. 13), which is a fair point. Even without such an analysis (for which there is also a great need), the work is absolutely satisfactory in terms of content and size. The monograph is impressive as it is – I can only guess that its initial version was so voluminous that the publisher chose to decrease the font size in the appendices (pp. 244–325 – which makes them a considerable part of the book). Unfortunately, the short sighted amongst us may much regret this publishing decision!

The work begins with an introductory Chapter 1 (pp. 1–15) which consists of a short review of the most important bibliography on the subject as well as with basic definitions. The author has also devoted some space to discussing the notion of the “public” and “sacred”. He rightfully asks where to draw the line between the sacred and public land and whether those two worlds

* This research was made possible thanks to a post-doc research grant funded by the Polish National Science Centre, decision no. DEC-2012/04/S/HS3/00301.

¹ D. WHITEHEAD, *CR* LXII 2012, pp. 547–549; S.D. LAMBERT, *AJPh* CXXXIV 2013, pp. 507–510; see also W.S. BUBELIS, *BMCR* 2012.07.16.

² LAMBERT, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 510.

³ S.D. LAMBERT, *Rationes Centesimarum. Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens*, Amsterdam 1997, pp. 280–291, esp. p. 288.

overlapped (p. 2). The question must remain unanswered and P. concludes, in agreement with other scholars, that “when a public executive body – the Boule, the Assembly, a committee appointed by them – or even an Athenian magistrate, appears to regulate some aspect of a given cult, we are probably on the right track to identify such a cult as public” (p. 17). Therefore, the lands of Athena or the Other Gods were *de facto* both public and sacred. The author reminds us that he must be cautious, even if somewhat eclectic, in his approach. However, the initial question becomes nothing more than a theorem with no practicality in the rest of the monograph (see his doubts on pp. 76, 96 and 140), while the monograph does little to address the distinction between the “public” and “sacred”, especially with regard to such difficult material as epigraphy. On the other hand, perhaps the lack of a conclusion is indeed the best answer, and once again the wider field needs to understand that our theoretical models remain at odds with the data we work on.

Chapter 2 (pp. 16–98) is devoted to the sacred property of the Athenian polis and the means by which it was leased. P. discusses the property of Athena Polias and the Other Gods, as well as the property of the Two Goddesses and the new polis-gods such as Asklepios and Amphiaraos. The discussion is accompanied by detailed analyses of the available sources, executed in an exemplary fashion, especially in the case of the enigmatic Pelargikon, the properties on Kythnos, the Rharian field, and the Athenian acquisition of Oropos in the 330s at the benevolence of Alexander the Great. The chapter, as the author notes (pp. 14 f.), needs to be read in conjunction with two appendices, namely Appendix I, concerned with the creation and administration of the Sacred Orgas, and Appendix II on the sacred olive trees, the *morai*. The chapter is accompanied by a careful commentary on the *Athenaion Politeia* 47, 4 f. (pp. 51–75), in which one can read that the *basileus* acted along with the board of the ten *poletai* in the matter of sacred leases. P. brilliantly demonstrates the shaky ground upon which the claim stands, and persuasively argues that there were apparently no “administrative links” between the *basileus* and *poletai* (p. 54). Instead, the author puts forward a new possibility which emphasizes the role of the *paredroi*. They are attested in the Eleusinian accounts (IG II² 1672 = *I.Eleusis* 177, ll. 372 f.) and they helped the *basileus* along with the *epimeletai* of the Mysteries and the Eleusinian *epistatai* to lease the sacred Eleusinian estates. Hence, P. proposes that they also helped the *basileus* to lease other sacred properties (pp. 54 f.). The author also presents a modified version of Vincent ROSIVACH’s hypothesis⁴ that sacred leases subsidised not only ancestral sacrifices (πάτριοι θυσίαι), but also the additional feasts (ἐπίθετοι ἑορταί) (pp. 77–79).

Chapter 3 (pp. 99–162) undertakes the problem of the sacred property of the Athenian *phylai* and demes. P. discusses the problematic case of land apportionment after Athens gained Oropos and deals excellently with the lack of the sources on the topic of the property of the *phylai*. However, if one excludes the tribal properties in the Oropia from the investigation, then there is almost no evidence to work on. Due to the fact that the *phylai* (in contrast to demes) were not able to levy taxes, the author concludes that since they did not possess significant property, some of their income must have come from loans (though only one such transaction in Athens is attested – IG II² 2670), but, admirably, he expresses a readiness to change his opinion with the emergence of new evidence (p. 109). Conversely, it is surprising that the author does not underline the very fact he has already discussed: the sole land allotment of the Oropia and handing it down to the *phylai* must have meant that the *phylai* had instruments and knowledge to deal with such property. It is, of course, an argument *ex silentio*, but it is striking that, with the acquisition of Oropos, nobody raised any doubts whether the *phylai* were entitled to acquire and administer any property (see Hyp. *Eux.* 16).

In case of demes, P. brings forward an argument that the rentals were used to provide for the sacrifices listed in the demes’ sacrificial calendars, since this was the most expensive item in their annual budget and leases were the most reliable option for securing a steady income (p. 140). The

⁴ V.J. ROSIVACH, *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*, Atlanta 1994, pp. 121–127.

earlier lack of distinction between sacred and public has made P. doubt the validity of his earlier questions: “In theory, income raised from such properties should have been used by deme authorities for their cultic needs. [...] But is this premise confirmed by the evidence? Furthermore, how meaningful is the distinction between sacred and secular landholdings in the context of demes?” (pp. 139 f.).

The author makes a persuasive and impressive case for the buyers and lessees of deme property. While relying on the data provided by WHITEHEAD and LAMBERT, who have counted that 76.5 per cent of the lessees and 68 per cent of the buyers of deme properties belonged to the same demes as the property they were interested in⁵, P. states that the lessees and buyers did not only want to make a profit, but also to render service to their demes or (in the case of sacred property) their favourite cults (pp. 153–155). The hypothesis is very attractive, but some further evidence would be needed to support it. Demokedes of Aphidna, who bought a property at Sphettos⁶ and is known to have made a dedication to Hermes at Sphettos (*IG* IP²4628), could have been religiously motivated in his decision to buy at Sphettos, as P. argues, but it could also have been the other way round. The simple fact that Demokedes bought a property at Sphettos means that he must have visited the deme at least once. Such an event as the successful acquisition of property could have been an excellent opportunity to leave a dedication at the local sanctuary.

Chapter 4 deals with the “non-constitutional associations of Athens” as administrators of realty, i.e. the phratries (pp. 163–170), *gene* (pp. 170–191) and *orgeones* (pp. 191–211). P. honestly states that “thanks to two intact inscriptions found in the excavations of the Athenian Agora we know more about the Salaminioi’s landed property than we know about the landed assets of the remaining Attic *gene* taken together” (p. 171). This is true and the reader must constantly remind himself that the reasoning in the whole sub-chapter relies fully on the analysis of two decrees of the two branches of the Salaminioi. The author has justly summarised recent research on that topic and presented a coherent and convincing analysis of the inscriptions. The case, however, becomes complicated with regard to the *gene* supervising the state cults which had their own sources of financing. P. concludes that in the case of the Eumolpidai, Kerykes, Krokonidai, Koironidai, and Eudanemoi (but one might easily adduce here other *gene* like the Philleidai or the *gene* concerned with the other state cults, first and foremost the Eteoboutadai and Praxiergidai) the *gene* “might have had a say on issues concerning administration of realty belonging to the Two Goddesses. This is not to say, however, that the *gene* owned the real property in question; gentilician and polis-owned properties clearly stood apart” (pp. 190 f.). Such a statement is not convincing, especially when one takes into account the considerable sums the *genos* priests had to devote at their own expense just to maintain the normal functioning of the gentilician cult. The appearance of the leading families in particular *gene* and their subsequent multi-affiliation with many *gene* on the one hand, and the gradual impoverishment of the other *genos* families on the other, both of which are well attested to in the Hellenistic and Roman times, all suggest that the financing of the *genos* cult and the postulated division between the city, gentilician, and private financing might have been much more complicated⁷. The problem needs a thorough examination for which there is no space here, but I believe that the city might have financially supported some traditional and well respected

⁵ D. WHITEHEAD, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.*, Princeton 1986, pp. 157 f.; LAMBERT, *Rationes...* (n. 3), pp. 248 f.

⁶ LAMBERT, *Rationes...* (n. 3), F6 B, col. 2, ll. 38–39, and p. 155.

⁷ The problem has been very fervently discussed since the article by K. KARILA-COHEN, *Les pythaïstes et leurs familles. L’apport de la prosopographie à l’histoire religieuse*, in: M.-F. BASLEZ, F. PRÉVOT (eds.), *Prosopographie et histoire religieuse. Actes du colloque tenu en l’Université Paris XII–Val de Marne les 27 & 28 octobre 2000*, Paris 2005, pp. 69–83; see also J.H. BLOK, S.D. LAMBERT, *The Appointment of Priests in Attic Gene*, ZPE CLXIX 2009, pp. 95–121.

genos cults just to allow them to survive in cases where the *genos* priests were not able to cope with all the expenses required from them and the *gene* did not have enough income on their own to support their cults.

In case of the *orgeones*, P. persuasively argues that the leases of orgeonic property can be seen as a form of liturgy and the tenants even took on themselves the burden of erecting inscriptions containing the leasing clauses (p. 197). The author is convincing in saying that the lessees of orgeonic property would get only a small profit out of such properties and that it would only make sense if the lessees themselves belonged to the leasing bodies and were interested in the well-being of their cultic groups (p. 205).

Chapter 5, which concerns “public, non-sacred realty” (pp. 212–236), has already been marked as “the most original and perhaps the most important of the book”⁸. P. duly states that it is his intention to test the hypothesis of David LEWIS that “no text encourages us to think that the Athenian state ever retained, worked, or leased anything called *ge demosia* (public land)”⁹ (p. 212). Hence, the following analysis focuses on the word *demostios* in the context of property, especially landed property. P. follows other scholars in arguing that in most cases where public lands (τὰ δημόσια) were mentioned, what was meant was “a commonly used land” (pp. 220, 223). He points out that Athens did not have the *astynomoi* (ἄστυνόμοι) who usually dealt with the leasing of public properties in other poleis, which further suggests that there were no leases of public lands in Athens (pp. 221 f.).

The main part of the book ends with a *Conspectus* (pp. 237–243) in which the author summarises the most important theses of his book.

I have already mentioned the first two appendices of the book, but it is worthwhile pausing at Appendix II concerning the *morai* (μοραία), i.e. the sacred olive trees of Athena (pp. 260–284). P. remarkably sums up modern scholarly research on the topic and undertakes a thorough analysis of the *Athenaion Politeia* 60, 1–3. He investigates the popular statement by Plutarch, who claimed that Solon had prohibited the export of all the agricultural products apart from olive oil (Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 24, 1 f.). After discussing many scholarly theories on the subject, the author comes to a brilliant conclusion: “Hard as one might search, it is impossible to find for the Classical period any archaeological evidence of Attic oil exports other than that of the Panathenaic amphorae” (p. 275). The author poses the question of what the sacred status of the *morai* was and he argues that the “*morai* along with their fences (σηκοί) were nothing but tiny *temene* like those attested as belonging to Athena in inscribed leases” (p. 283).

Appendix III is an informative analysis of *IG II² 1593* (pp. 285–290). The author argues for interpreting the inscription, a list of buyers and their guarantors from the Lykourgan period (337–324 BCE), as a list of tax-collecting contracts (pp. 288 f.), but his analysis has been already appraised as “perhaps not wholly convincing”¹⁰. Appendix IV (pp. 291–293) is a treatment of two inscriptions: *IG II² 2497*, a lease contract for a property named Theodoreion in the deme of Praseis, and *Rationes Centesimarum F7A, 3–8*, a sale contract for a property named Charinidai in the deme of Poros. P. makes valuable prosopographical remarks on the buyers and lessees and persuasively argues that the families in question were in fact the original owners of the public properties they wanted to buy or lease. In Appendix V (pp. 294 f.) P. objects to the earlier identification by LAMBERT¹¹ of the Pyrrhakidai as a phratry attested on Delos c. 400 BCE and argues for them being a *genos* which had a branch in the deme of Aigilia, just like the Salaminioi had a branch

⁸ LAMBERT, [Review] (n. 1), p. 508.

⁹ D. LEWIS, *Public Property in the City*, in: O. MURRAY, S. PRICE (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, p. 251.

¹⁰ LAMBERT, [Review] (n. 1), p. 507.

¹¹ LAMBERT, *Rationes...* (n. 3), pp. 218, 368.

in Sounion. In Appendix VI (pp. 296–298) the author hypothesises whether the division of the Salaminioi into two branches and later two separate *gene* was an effect of political disturbances in the third century, especially around the time of the Chremonidean War (267–261 BCE).

Appendix VII: “Catalogue of Lessees and Guarantors of Polis-Controlled *Temene*” (pp. 299–325), is also of great importance. The list contains 96 names and all the available prosopographical data on them. In sharp contrast to the book by Kirsty SHIPTON¹², P. is able to prove that a significant part of the lessees (16 people = 16.68%) belonged to the liturgical class. Another 9 individuals (9.37%) were engaged in public life and 23 others (23.96%) were only possibly engaged in public life, but certainly belonged to families that were thus engaged (p. 319). All this means that nearly half of those engaged in land-leasing belonged to the higher echelons of Athenian society. P., however, duly states that such quasi-statistical analysis does not take into account the “mini-patterns”, i.e. “geographical considerations, professional interests, family ties, political aspects, and religious concerns” (p. 320).

The work, which is impressive in terms of content and size as well as the sheer number of literary and epigraphic sources cited and commented upon, is methodologically inconsistent. The author claims in the introductory chapter that he took “the rather unfashionable approach of historical empiricism, but with a new historicism twist. Theoretical schemes can only be useful if applied to concrete evidence” (p. 14). Contrary to David WHITEHEAD, who states in his review that these objectives were “achieved most satisfactorily”¹³ by the author, I cannot state the same. Historical empiricism, the approach of “choose-your-method-as-you-go”, may seem very tentative and indeed such methodological rigour is sometimes the only guarantee that saves one from various preconceptions and presuppositions while investigating problems that find their echo in modern times. On the other hand, such an approach more often leads to a lack of any methodological framework into which the aforesaid preconceived notions might easily slip undetected.

It was difficult for P. to stay on his declared path. The author at the outset shares his thoughts on the land held and administered by the church in modern Greece (pp. 8 f., n. 38), leaving the reader with a notion of the great injustice done to the Greeks when the state helplessly tried to get back land for the people but was blocked by a “small minority influenced by the clergy”. Such sentiments are easily recognisable in his discussion on the remarkable perseverance of the sacred land-leasing system in Oropos.

The author, while describing the acquisition of Oropos by Athens and its geographical proximity to Attica, writes of the Athenian plans for land allotment in Oropos as “sinister” (p. 44). In short, when the land of Oropos came into the hands of the Athenians, they in turn crowned Amphiaros (*I. Oropos* 296; 332/331 BCE), delimited a part of the newly gained territory with the help of 50 *horistai* (*Hyp. Eux.* 16), that part being the hill of Amphiaros, which probably had already been divided between the *phylai*, and which was then either sold or leased (as P. believes). The revenue from either the sale or the lease was the idea of the atthidographer Phanodemos, for which he was crowned in 332/331 (*I. Oropos* 297) and was later made one of the *epimeletai* of the Amphiareia in 329/328 (*I. Oropos* 298). I, however, fail to see anything sinister in the procedures involved. After the system had been invented in the 330s BCE and Oropos had been subsequently lost to Athens in 322, the system itself was apparently still at work in 80 BCE when the Roman *publicani* tried to exact taxes from the Oropia. The Oropians appealed to the Senate and got permission to use the revenues from the sacred lands to finance the daily functioning of the sanctuary of Amphiaros. P. therefore remarks: “Here again we get the same old tricks. The protagonists might have changed

¹² K. SHIPTON, *Leasing and Lending. The Cash Economy in Fourth-Century BC Athens*, London 2000, pp. 39–49.

¹³ WHITEHEAD, [Review] (n. 1), p. 549.

but the ingredients of the recipe remained the same: sacred rentals for sacred celebrations with an eye on political manipulation” (p. 50). It seems only reasonable that any collective body or individual, when given the opportunity and fully entitled to do it, would try to make themselves exempt from taxes, no matter who is trying to levy them. I again fail to see “the same old tricks here” as well as “an eye on political manipulation”. It seems illogical that a small group of envoys from Oropos would be able to effectively manipulate the whole Roman Senate into granting vindication for themselves. That would be true, of course, only if one is willing to see the piety of the Roman senators not as weakness making them susceptible to manipulation. What is more, P. adds here a surprising remark: “This litigation bears such a strong resemblance to the events that had taken place almost three centuries before that one cannot help recalling Karl Marx’s well-known maxim about history repeating itself” (pp. 49 f.). Although the author has every right to see the similarity of these events to the earlier proceedings, a reference to Karl Marx’s theory is thoroughly ahistorical and has more to do with evolutionism than with the declared empiricism.

The aforementioned presuppositions are not only to be found in the case of Oropos. While discussing the system of administration of deme property and the practice of the *ad hoc* making of the *horoi* that delimited the sacred estates, P. concludes: “In general, the picture we get is more that of automatic response to short-lived exigencies, rather than that of an orchestrated apparatus dealing with marking off properties. This picture, it has to be said, matches the amateurism of the polis in that respect” (p. 129). I fully agree with the first sentence: it appears that the demes did not have a unified system of administration of their properties. I cannot, however, accept the conclusion of the second sentence. No matter how disorganised the Athenians were as regards property administration, they seemed to be satisfied with the state of affairs as it was, because there is absolutely no evidence in the sources (from the Classical, but also the Hellenistic and Roman periods) of them wanting to change the aforesaid system. It is rather the author who expects the Athenians to behave professionally, whatever that might mean, and fails in his expectations. What is even more misleading is that the whole Athenian polis as well as its demes are marked as “amateurs” with regard to managing their properties. A similar phenomenon can be observed in a discussion of the tripartite division of land, done under the supervision of the Milesian town-planner and philosopher Hippodamos. P. then expresses his doubts as to whether, by the mid-fifth century, such a “rudimentary, albeit naive, concept of publicly owned territory had started materializing...” (p. 218). No matter how much respect Hippodamos enjoyed among the Athenians and how many of his philosophical ideas he wanted to employ in his model, the reader is left with an image of the naivety of either Hippodamos or, again, the Athenians who decided to bring the plan to life.

Another important methodological problem arises from the very definition of the word *temenos* (τέμενος). At the outset, the author is adamant in claiming that *temenos* could “apply both to a sanctuary and an arable sacred estate” (p. 3) and is very quick to accuse such scholars as Walter BURKERT and Irad MALKIN of confusing the two meanings of the term. BURKERT defines *temenos* as “the land cut off and dedicated to the god or hero”¹⁴. It is true that he is more interested in the religious aspect of the *temenos*, but his very definition does not exclude the possibility of renting the sacred land (or at least a part of it). The reference to MALKIN and his entry on *temenos* in the *OCD*³ is even more surprising: MALKIN indeed puts stress on the fact that the *temenos* had to be demarcated and needed to have a sanctuary and an altar; but, in the same entry, he does underline that *temene* could be “revenue-bearing estates”. It seems to me that P. would like to invert the proportions between the two aspects, the primary meaning being of purely economic significance (see p. 11, but also p. 99). Such an approach may lead to some oversimplifications, to say the least.

¹⁴ W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*, transl. by J. RAFFAN, Oxford 1985, p. 86.

Though a very exhaustive study, the monograph by P. is not for everyone. It not only requires from its reader familiarity with ancient sources on the problem, but it also leaves no doubt that a good knowledge of the following: J.V.A. FINE, *Horoi. Studies in Mortgage, Real Security, and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens*, Athens 1951; T. LINDERS, *The Treasurers of the Other Gods and Their Functions*, Meisenheim am Glan 1975; volume XIX of the *Athenian Agora* (1991) with its most useful commentaries on three of its parts written by G.V. LALONDE, M.K. LANGDON, and M.B. WALBANK; R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford 1996; and S. LAMBERT, *Rationes Centesimarum. Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens*, Amsterdam 1997, is absolutely necessary for merely having some idea of the problem and understanding the construction of the book. Therefore, the study seems hermetic and cannot serve as a guidebook through the complicated question of land tenure in Athens for students who are only beginning their adventure with the economic history of Athens.

That being said, one must note some radical differences between the monograph by P. and the aforementioned studies. The one that has caused me most confusion is the usage of the word “pledge” for three different forms of security in leasing contracts. The author either uses it to describe: (i) *apotimema* (ἀποτίμημα – p. 57), (ii) *hypotheke* (various forms of the verb ὑποκείμαι – pp. 131, 132), or (iii) *enechyron* (ἐνέχυρον – p. 120). Such a merging of different phenomena would be understandable in a study on a completely different topic written by a non-specialist in the field, but it cannot be permitted in a work investigating the very nature of property leases where various forms of securities are indeed important for the author’s argument. According to a rather widely accepted definition which is excellently presented by FINE in *Horoi...*, pp. 61 f., only *enechyron* was a form of security that could be rendered by the English term “pledge”. What is more, P. generally defines *enechyrasia* (ἐνεχυρασία) as a procedure for “expropriating a part of the lessees’ property in case they failed to pay the due rent” (pp. 120 f.), but it seems that the author would see both movables and immovables in that group. FINE believes the *enechyron* was, in accordance with a passage from Pseudo-Demosthenes’ *Against Timotheos* ([Dem.] 49, 48–54), “movable property, the object offered as security passed immediately on the formation of the contract into the possession of the creditor”¹⁵. P. is fully entitled to his own view and definition of the *enechyron*, but then he should explain on what basis his understanding of the term lies, especially since the citations from the sources in the relevant entry in LSJ⁹ either support the interpretation of FINE or require further investigation¹⁶. One might accuse me of being far too rigorous in that respect. That sole detail, however, can completely change the conclusion of the sub-chapter on the public properties of the demes. In one of the last paragraphs on this problem, the author states: “demes would certainly from time to time [as an effect of the hypothecs and the *enechyrasia*, if I understand the argument correctly – PS] end up acquiring real property that previously belonged to individuals” (p. 132). The acquisition of a hypothec by a deme gave it only a *ius vendendi* of the property in question, therefore the deme would probably not be able to keep it and for that very reason the demes can be found in the *Rationes Centesimarum*. Furthermore, if the demes only acquired movables by means of the *enechyrasia*, the argument for the demes actually gaining real property with the passing of time does not find enough support.

Similar problems can be observed in P.’s discussion on the property of the phratries. Relying on the evidence provided by the inscriptions *I.Rhamnous* 187, ll. 2–4 and *SEG* 51, 164, ll. 1–3,

¹⁵ J.V.A. FINE, *Horoi. Studies in Mortgage, Real Security, and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens*, Athens 1951, p. 61, n. 4.

¹⁶ It refers to movables in the following sources: Hdt. II 136 (a corpse); Hermippus fr. 29 KOCK (a cup); Ar. *Pl.* 451 (a breastplate and a buckler); Ar. *Ec.* 755 (something carried in hands). And. 3, 39 (And. 1, 39 in LSJ⁹ is a typo) speaks of the city walls and the ships as the *enechyron*, but the sentence is undoubtedly rhetorical. The relevant passages in Xen. *An.* VII 6, 23 and Antiph. 6, 11 are enigmatic and would need further examination.

the author states that “upon the debtor’s default the ownership of the buildings would have been transferred to the phratry” (p. 165). That is true only in very broad terms. Both of the above inscriptions speak explicitly of the $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ type of transaction in which the creditor could only get unqualified ownership of the property, and that property was still an object of redemption (at the price of the original loan) if the debtor had the means and desire to do so¹⁷. Since the money was the object of the original transaction and the property was only the security, in the case of the debtor defaulting the phratry would only gain a usufruct and would not be entitled to lease the property or sell it – the original debtor would still be legally bound to it. It would be interesting to examine what such a body like the phratry could do with the objects of $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, but I understand that the available evidence does not allow us to move forward. We deal with exactly the same type of inaccuracy when P. discusses the means by which the *orgeones* could acquire new property (p. 201), as evidenced by inscriptions from Lemnos *IG XII 8, 19* and *21* – these two inscriptions attest the procedure of $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ as well.

The author discusses the fifth-century records of loans from both the Treasuries of Athena and the Other Gods and hypothesises whether the leases of the sacred lands did not already begin in the fifth century, though there is no solid evidence for such a procedure that early (p. 23). P. argues that, in comparison to the well attested leasing procedures from the fourth century, the leasing itself must have begun at least a century earlier. The evidence, however, might point in a different direction. If I am not mistaken, the first account of the lease of land and the buildings on it that is attested in Athens comes from 434–432 (*IG I³ 402*), but, quite importantly, it was a document of the Delian Amphictyony and the leased land was itself located on Delos. The first extant leasing of sacred land in Athens comes from 418/417 BCE and concerned the *temenos* of Neleus and Basile (*IG I³ 84*). All that evidence might therefore suggest that the leasing procedures were not that old in Athens and that some change occurred around the time of the acceptance of Asklepios into the public cults in 420 BCE. Such a change would coincide with the establishment of the leasing procedures of the property of Asklepios in Piraeus attested at the beginning of the fourth century (*IG II² 47* and *SEG 26, 121*), a coincidence that P. must have been well aware of (see pp. 42 f.).

All the above remarks do not change the fundamental notion about the book by P. as being so far the most important work on the subject of land leases in Classical Athens and it will hold that position for many years to come. The amount of evidence he discusses (some of which he is the first to bring to scholarly attention) must astound even the most stringent of readers. The monograph can both serve as a sourcebook and a key commentary on the problem of landholding in Athens, though one needs to be aware that it is sometimes too speculative, lacking in theoretical framework, and that the arguments are presented in a somewhat chaotic manner (see the author’s remark on p. 51). However, the overall narration and high requirements the monograph imposes on readers should already make them both cautious and attentive, and allow them to fully appreciate the effort that Nikolaos PAPA-ZARKADAS put into his book.

Przemysław Łukasz Siekierka
Institute of History, University of Warsaw
psiekierka@yahoo.com

¹⁷ For a detailed and exhaustive discussion of the $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, see FINE, *op. cit.* (n. 15), pp. 142–166.