

Citizenship, Land Tenure, and Community: A View from Oropos

Michele Faraguna

Università degli Studi di Milano

ORCID: 0000-0002-6202-6543

DOI: 10.54103/milanoup.292.c753

ABSTRACT:

“The land” (*chōra*) and the “people” (*anthrōpoi*) are, according to Aristotle’s *Politics*, the primary elements a *polis* consists of. The aim of this paper is to focus on the interplay between land and citizenship by analysing the case of the Athenian administration of Oropos in the 330s–320s BCE, a period of time, following the return of Oropos under Athenian control, for which the literary and especially epigraphic evidence is remarkably abundant. Three documents regulating land-use in distinct areas of the *chōra* of Oropos (the territory sacred to Amphiaraios, the hill district and the *Nea*) are analysed in detail. As a result, the community aspect in the management of the new territory, in which the ten Athenian tribes appear to act as the framework of collective participation, is underlined. In this context, a decree in honour of Amphiaraios uniquely granting the god a crown of 1000 drachmas “for the health and safety of the Athenian *demōs*” and all that pertained to the citizens as individuals, including their families and possibly their possessions, is brought into connection with Aristotle’s definition of the *polis* and its “parts” in Book 1 of *Politics*.

KEYWORDS: *polis*; citizenship; land; Athens; Oropos.

1. “The land” and “the people” in Aristotle’s *Politics*

In Book 2 of *Politics*, in his critical review of Plato’s *Laws*, Aristotle notes that “it is said (*legetai*) that the legislator ought to lay down his laws with an eye on two things, the territory and the population” (πρός τε τὴν χώραν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, 1265a 18-20). “The land” (*chōra*) and the “people” (*anthrōpoi*) are therefore the primary elements a *polis* consists of. The same idea returns in Book 7, where Aristotle deals with the “presuppositions” (ὑποθέσεις) regarding political equipment of the “best constitution” (*politeia aristē*) and begins from the problem of the size and quality of the inhabitants (πλήθος ἀνθρώπων) and of the territory of the ideal city (1326a 5-8; cf. also 1265b 39-40: λέγω δὲ οἶον περί τε πλήθους πολιτῶν καὶ χώρας).¹ He then provides a detailed description

1 See the commentary in Bertelli *et al.* 2022, 338-43.

of the organization of the *chora* into four parts (sacred, public, private near the border, private near the city) and the pattern of landholding in the *polis* “of our wishes” (*kat’enchēn*) (1330a 9-18). In this framework, it is underlined, the ownership of properties is to be in the hands of “those who possess arms and those who share in the political system” (ὅτι δεῖ τὴν χώραν εἶναι τῶν ὅπλα κεκτημένων καὶ τῶν τῆς πολιτείας μετεχόντων, 1329b 36-37), for “the citizens (*politai*) must possess plentiful means, and they are the citizens” (1329a 17-20). Not surprisingly, land tenure consequently features as a key theme also in Aristotle’s analysis of the best constitutions, both imagined and historical, in Book 2² as well as in the so-called “empirical books” (Books 4-6), where the focus of the inquiry shifts from the *politeia aristē* to the existing or attainable *politeiai* and to the problem of how constitutions can be preserved and remain stable.³ The Stagirite thus clearly articulates one of the fundamental political and legal tenets governing civic life across the spectrum of the Greek world, namely that only citizens could be the owners of real estate, and that the *chora* as a whole was conceived as the collective property of the *politai*. The citizens, among other things, were also a group of interest.⁴

In light of this, it is therefore striking that, in the recent intense debate regarding what frameworks shaped Greek citizenship and, ultimately, what “sharing in the *polis*” (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως) was all about, land ownership has mostly been conspicuous by its absence, despite being itself a potent factor of inclusion or exclusion within the community. This is surely partly due to the fact that in the first chapters of Book 3 of *Politics*, where Aristotle enquires about “who should be called a citizen and who the citizen is” (τίνα χρὴ καλεῖν πολίτην καὶ τίς ὁ πολίτης ἐστὶ σκεπτέον), land ownership does not contribute to defining the ontological essence of the *politēs*, since, as we learn from Book 7, property (*ktēsis*), which is recognized as a *necessary* condition for the *polis* to exist, is at the same time not properly speaking “part” (*meros*) of the *polis* (1328a 33-35: διὸ κτήσεως μὲν δεῖ ταῖς πόλεσι, οὐδὲν δ’ ἐστὶν ἡ κτήσις μέρος τῆς πόλεως), and the citizens are not meant to engage in manual occupations that are considered incompatible with the exercise of virtue (1328b 37-1329a 2, 1329a 19-21; cf. 1278a 3-4). Or possibly, being ubiquitous in a predominantly agricultural

2 Faraguna 2024, 129-30; Beck 2025, 21-26.

3 See esp. 1318b 9-1319a 19 on the *demos geōrgikos*, “the agricultural people”, described as “the best” (βέλτιστος) variety of *dēmos*, since in the resulting type of democracy—the first in Aristotle’s taxonomy—“the masses live by farming or stock rearing” (ἀπὸ γεωργίας ἢ νομῆς) and, owing to the lack of leisure, “do not frequently attend the assembly”, as well as on various examples of archaic and classical Greek laws aimed at limiting the accumulation of property within the community (cf. also 1266b 14-28); see Lupi 2003, 159-62; Malkin, Blok 2024, 219-22. On the key role of land tenure in Aristotle’s *Politics* cf. Faraguna forthcoming.

4 Ampolo 1996, 320-24; Filonik 2023, esp. 272-75.

society,⁵ in their inquiry about the primary nature of citizenship (institutional, religious, performative, or else?) scholars have simply taken land ownership for granted and not regarded it as worthy of special attention.

2. Land and citizenship in the *polis*: the case of Athens

The intent of this essay is to focus on the interplay between land and citizenship in classical Athens. Surprisingly, although the evidence is relatively abundant, such relationship comes into prominence only occasionally and, one might say, mainly through its *negative* implications. The capacity to own real estate was for instance so tightly entwined with full membership in the civic community that *atimia* in the legal sense, when involving the deprivation of one's citizen rights, was often also associated with confiscation of property.⁶ The "Attic *stelai*" going back to the events of 415 BCE (*IG* I³ 421-430) and the similar *pōletai* inscriptions recording the sales of the properties of the Thirty Tyrants and other officials in 402/1 (*Agora* XIX, P2) are well-known and there is no need to focus on them.⁷ A suggestive and less often cited passage is, on the other hand, provided by Isocrates' speech *Against Euthynos*, where it is recounted how at the time of the Thirty a certain Nikias, fearing that his name would be erased from the list of citizens, "mortgaged his property (τὴν μὲν οὐσίαν ὑπήθηκε), sent his slaves out of the country, brought his household contents to me, and entrusted three talents of silver to Euthynos for safekeeping; he himself went to live in the countryside (αὐτὸς δ' εἰς ἀγρὸν ἐλθὼν διητᾶτο)" (21.2).⁸ Here, being removed "from those who shared in the constitution" (ἐκ τῶν μετεχόντων τῆς πολιτείας), *i.e.* from the enjoyment of political rights, would have automatically brought about the loss of honour (*timē*) and privileges also concerning his

5 Finley 1973a, 10: "la *terre*, the space of the *polis*, is dialectically bound up with every aspect of Greek society, its institutional behaviour and its values and beliefs".

6 The key passage is provided by the discussion in Andoc. 1.73-74; cf. also *IG* I³ 21, ll. 27-28; 46, ll. 24-29 (= OR 142); 71 (= OR 153), ll. 31-33; RO 22, ll. 54-57; *IG* II³ 1, 320 (= RO 79), ll. 16-22; 399, ll. 12-14 (where ἀτιμία is restored). See the lucid and illuminating analysis by Rocchi forthcoming. On the association between *atimia* and confiscation of property cf. moreover Harrison 1971, 178-79; Youni 2019, 368-74; Canevaro 2026, 72-74, 78-79. In Lys. 18.1 (cf. also 14) the speaker emphasizes that οὐ γὰρ μόνον περὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἀγωνιζόμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας, εἰ χρὴ δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως ἡμῖν μετεῖναι, "we are on trial not simply for our property but also for our civic status, (to discover) if we will have a place in the city under the democracy". The law in [Dem.] 59.52, providing that "if anyone shall give an alien woman in marriage to an Athenian man, claiming that she is his own relative, he is to lose his citizen rights, and his property is to be confiscated" (ἐὰν δέ τις ἐκδῶ ξένην γυναῖκα ἀνδρὶ Ἀθηναίῳ ὥς ἐαυτῷ προσήκουσαν, ἄτιμος ἔστω, καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ δημοσία ἔστω), as shown by Canevaro 2013, 187-90, is a later insertion and, almost certainly, a forgery.

7 See however, for a much earlier example, Hdt. 6.121.2. Cf. also Faraguna 2024, 148-51.

8 See the commentary on this passage in Whitehead 2022, 112-23.

properties, something that Nikias tried to circumvent by fictitiously alienating his assets.

Likewise, in Lysias' speech *Concerning the sēkos* (7.4) we hear about the vicissitudes of a piece of land (χωρίον), which used to belong to Peisandros (ἦν μὲν γὰρ τοῦτο Πεισάνδρου τὸ χωρίον), during the troublesome years between the oligarchic coup of 411 and the rule of the Thirty Tyrants: when Peisandros' property was confiscated (δημευθέντων δ' ἐκείνου τῶν ὄντων) after he fled to join the Spartan camp at Dekeleia (Thuc. 8.98.1) and was presumably tried on such account, the *chōrion* was first given by the *dēmos* as a *δωρεά* to Apollodoros of Megara who owned and farmed it until Antikles purchased it from him and made a profit by renting it out. It was then sold once more, this time to the speaker of Lys. 7, as he is very keen to stress, before the Thirty came to power. Again, this rather extraordinary story, which attests to the circulation of a landed asset between different hands within a limited number of years, has its origins in its confiscation when Peisandros was convicted for treason (Lycurg. 1.121).⁹

The same applies to *enktesis*, the right granted to foreigners to acquire and own land and a house (or simply a house), sometimes even conferred temporarily (as for instance in *IG II³ 1, 316 = RO 77, ll. 24-26*).¹⁰ As regards Athens, we have a body of more than 60 decrees awarding *enktesis* from the end of the fifth century to the mid-second century, from which it strikingly appears that such legal restriction was in fact never relaxed.¹¹ Moreover, as shown by Julien Faguer, the right of *enktesis* never equalled the right of ownership associated to citizen status and was always subject to limitations of various sorts.¹² In his *Poroi* Xenophon for instance suggests that metics might be offered the possibility to acquire (ἐγκεκτῆσθαι) vacant lots in some areas of Athens within the city walls for building a house, but that this should happen only on condition that they applied and were deemed worthy of such privilege (οἱ ἂν αἰτούμενοι ἄξιοι δοκῶσιν εἶναι) (2.6).¹³ Still in

9 Nails 2002, 241-42. For Peisandros (*PA* 771270) as a man of substance cf. Ostwald 1986, 350-53. On Lysias' passage see the commentary by Todd 2007, 514-17.

10 For an analysis of *enktesis* in a legal perspective cf. Stelzer 1971; Henry 1983, 204-40; Hennig 1994. For the ἕως ἂν κατέλθωσι clause in Athenian decrees in the second half of the fourth century see Loddò 2020, 218-24. See also Appendix, *s.v. enktesis*.

11 Faguer 2021 (with an updated table listing the 62 inscriptions at 86-91). For a Siphnian family that enjoyed *enktesis* of land during the fourth century for more than a generation cf. Flament 2023, 8-9, with a list of the attestations in the *pōletai* records (cf. Davies 1971, 590-92 [C 12]). See also in this respect *JEG* 50.45 = OR 161, a decree dated to 422/1, surprisingly not quoted by Flament. The nature of the privileges granted to Kallaischros and his son Stesileides however remains unclear (compare Flament 2023, 8-15 with OR, 376-77).

12 Faguer 2021, 67-69.

13 For a discussion of this passage cf. Gauthier 1976, 66-68; Whitehead 2019, 25-26, 59-60, 117-25; see also Feyel 2009, 236, stressing on his part that, despite Xenophon's proposal, "les Athéniens n'ont pas jugé bon d'adopter cette idée, si limitée que fût sa portée: l'*enktesis* est toujours restée un privilège accordé en majorité, non à des métèques, mais à des étrangers qui ont bien mérité de la communauté civique".

the Lykourgan period, as noted by Stephen Lambert, for all uncertainties deriving from the heavy restorations of the text, a new law was introduced prior to 325/4 to prevent foreign recipients of the right of *enktēsis* from acquiring public or sacred lands (cf. *IG* II³ 1, 324, ll. 44-46: εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνοις γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησιν ἀπέχοντι τῶν [κ]οι[νῶν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶ]ν, “and he and his descendants shall have right of ownership of land and a house, except for common and sacred property”).¹⁴ It may well be that the enactment was in some way connected to the contemporary programme of massive sales of lands belonging to demes and other corporate groups recorded in the *Rationes Centesimarum*, where the buyers are all invariably Athenians.¹⁵

3. Oropos and Athens in the Classical period

In what follows, I would however like to focus on a case where the relationship between land and citizenship works in a *positive* direction, namely the case of Oropos. The history of Oropos, despite its territory being located at the northern frontier of Attica and being indeed under Athenian control for long spans of time, remains to a remarkable extent obscure. In particular, the Oropians as citizens (δημόται in *IG* VII² 2, 1, 294 = RO 27, ll. 9-10: ἂν δέ τις ἀδικεῖ ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ ἢ ξένος ἢ δημότης) of their own *polis* are almost invisible in the sources. Oropos was in all probability an Eretrian foundation and, significantly enough, it preserved its distinct cultural identity (for instance reflected in the Ionic dialect of the inscriptions) until the Hellenistic period, even though from the end of the fifth century it became a subject of competing claims between the Boiotians, Eretrians and Athenians (Nikokrates, *FGrHist* 376 F 1). Athens’ interest in Oropos is to be seen as a part of a broader canvas, whereby Athens was pushing to consolidate and enlarge its borders with Megara and Boiotia¹⁶.

In the fifth century Oropos was under Athenian control at least from 446/5 (*IG* I³ 41, A, ll. 57-63, setting the fares for ferry transport across the Euripos between Oropos, Hestiaia and Chalkis), and possibly from much earlier on,¹⁷

14 Lambert 2018, 164-65: “The restriction is referred to explicitly in the grant to the doctor, Euenor, in 322/1 [*IG* II³ 1, 367, l. 20], but this may also be the significance of the phrase, ‘according to the law’, with which *enktēsis* grants are qualified from 325/4 onwards”. On the κατὰ τὸν νόμον formula in Athenian decrees conferring *enktēsis* see, more generally, Stelzer 1971, 213-25; Henry 1983, 214-15; Faguer 2021, 72-74. The law in question could hardly have set maximum values for the price of the properties (houses and land) to be purchased. Given the normative priority of laws over decrees, an honorific ψήφισμα, awarding the privilege of *enktēsis ad personam*, could under no circumstances modify (e.g. increase) the limits set by a νόμος.

15 The most reliable and complete edition of the difficult fragments of the *Rationes Centesimarum* still remains that of Lambert 1997. On these documents see also Faraguna 2014a.

16 Fachard 2017; Lucas 2019.

17 Wilding 2022, 19-29, tracing back Athenian (and Boiotian) interest in Oropos “to the close of the sixth century”. For the process of *polis* formation in Oropos see now Charalambidou 2025.

but, in our perspective, the most valuable piece of information is provided by Thuc. 2.23.3, where the Oropians are said “to cultivate the land called Πειραιϊκή and to be subjects of the Athenians” (τὴν γῆν τὴν Πειραιϊκὴν καλουμένην ἣν νέμονται Ὀρώπιοι Ἀθηναίων ὑπήκοοι; cf. 4.99.1: νομίζοντες τὴν μὲν Ὀρωπίαν... Ἀθηναίων κατὰ τὸ ὑπήκοον εἶναι).¹⁸ The inference is that at that time there was a local population (“the Oropians”) settled on the territory¹⁹ and that the latter was notable for its produce and economic value—the Peloponnesians plundered it on their way back from Attica.²⁰ From Lysias (20.5–6) we also learn that, prior to the oligarchic coup of 411 BCE, following which Oropos first briefly regained its independence (cf. Lys. 31.9; *IG* I³ 1032, l. 170: Φιλ[ών]ιχος Ὀρώπι(ος), “Philonikos from Oropos”), there was an Athenian official in Oropos (ἄρχας ἐν Ὀρωπῷ), either the commander of a garrison or a magistrate, possibly like the *archōn* for Salamis (Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 54.8).²¹

When we next extensively hear about the Oropian land eighty years later, the political scenario, after some periods of intermittent Boiotian and Athenian control, interspersed with three phases of Oropian independence, had radically changed. Athens reacquired once more possession of this territory in 335, after the destruction of Thebes, and securely held on to it until the end of the year 322/1 (*I.Oropos* 300 = *IG* II³ 1, 385).²² To this period of renewed Athenian control belongs a substantial *corpus* of epigraphic documents reflecting Athens’ strong interest, during the age of Lykourgos, in “politically” and economically investing into Oropos and its sanctuary of Amphiaraios.²³ Despite the lack of explicit evidence, it may be inferred that the local Oropian inhabitants were expelled from their own *polis* (or at least they seem to have left no trace of their presence) and possibly moved across the Euripos to Eretria.²⁴

18 For the textual problems connected to this passage see Hornblower 1991, 278–79; Fantasia 2003, 332; Knoepfler 2010, 439–40. For the meaning of νέμομαι, “exploit”, “reap the fruits of”, cf. Chaniotis 2004a, 187–90.

19 For the status of Oropos until 411, when it became independent from Athens (Thuc. 8.60.1–2), see Gschnitzer 1958, 82–83 (“Die Stelle besagt offenbar, daß die Oropier nicht zu den Athenern gehören, vielmehr ihnen untertanen sind; weiter dürfte sie zeigen, daß das Gebiet um Oropos Eigentum der Oropier ist, den Athenern also nun insofern gehört, als die Oropier ihnen unterworfen sind”); Bearzot 1987, 80–88; Sineux 2007, 75: “Le statut d’Oropos et des Oropiens au V^e siècle est difficile à établir; le territoire n’est pas devenu un dème attique et ses habitants ne sont pas des Athéniens, mais des Oropiens, ὑπήκοοι (‘sujets’) des Athéniens”; Manieri 2009, 211–12.

20 For the results of a survey of (part of) the territory of Oropos see Cosmopoulos 2001.

21 Gschnitzer 1958, 83; Rhodes 2023b, 55. For the Athenian *archōn* εἰς Σαλαμίνα cf. Taylor 1997, 158–78.

22 Knoepfler 2001a, 367–89.

23 For a list of the documents see Davies 2018, 67–68 (nos. 6–13); Wilding 2022, 82–84. The inscriptions from Oropos are now re-edited by B.Ch. Petrakos in *IG* VII² 2, 1 (2023).

24 Knoepfler 2010, 443–44; Papazarkadas 2017, 126–28, observing that “[r]emarkably, out of 213 Oropian funerary inscriptions recorded in Petrakos’ corpus, only 6 can be dated to the fourth century B.C.” and suggesting that graves and funerary monuments were removed

After re-appropriating Oropos the Athenians were therefore apparently free to use the *chora* as they saw fit and, rather than redistributing it to private individuals, their strategy was to keep it under communal and cultic control, making it partly public and partly sacred.²⁵ It should be stressed, however, that, like in all Greek cities, there must have been private land in Oropos *before* the Athenian takeover. This can be inferred from *IG VII*² 2, 1, 25 and 26, two proxeny decrees dated between 338 and 335, where γῆς καὶ οἰκίης ἔγκτησις is included among the privileges bestowed on the honorands.²⁶ It can be surmised that the Athenians, in order to speedily take over and exploit the new territory, had to make use of the pre-existing land division rather than redivide and redistribute it.

4. The Oropian territory and Athenian land management at the end of fourth century

As regards the overall framework of the organization of the new territory, we first have to distinguish the land that was reserved for Amphiaraos, ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀμφιαράου: *I.Eleusis* 177 reveals that, alongside the First Fruits offered to the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore in Eleusis (via the tribes) by the Attic demes, also some localities in the borderlands outside the area allocated to the ten *phylai* contributed, including the sanctuary and the territory sacred to Amphiaraos, for which the *aparchē* was bafflingly handed over by the *demarchos* Prokles of Sounion (ll. 401-403).²⁷ It is unclear when Athens earmarked such area for Amphiaraos, whether upon receiving it from Alexander in 335 or, as argued by Denis Knoepfler, much earlier on, at the time when it exerted full control of Oropos between 371 and 366.²⁸ Hyp. 3 (*Enx.*).16 mentions the board of 50 *horistai* that had “previously” (πρότερον) marked off the land for the god (ὡς πρότερον τοὺς πεντήκοντα ἐξελόντας αὐτὸ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀφορίσαντας)

during this period of Athenian domination before the celebration of the new penteteric festival of the Amphiareia in 329/8; Wilding 2022, 49-50.

25 Davies 2018, 69: “The strategy was evidently to retain the land wholly or mainly in corporate or cultic hands, and to lease it on stated conditions, rather than to sell it into private ownership or retain the Oropians as tenants”.

26 *Enktēsis* for some reason does not appear among the honours conferred in *IG VII*² 2, 1, 27, which is contemporary to the two other decrees. After 322 *enktēsis* again regularly features in proxeny decrees voted by the Oropian *boulē* and *ekklesia*. The attestations down to the second century BCE are in the tens.

27 Clinton 2010, 11 with n. 23, holding the view that, like before 411, the Athenians appointed a magistrate for Oropos with the title of *demarchos*. Cf. also Papazarkadas 2011, 48-49: “we should not discount entirely the possibility that the office refers to the archon in charge of Oropos, although this by no means forces us to recognize Oropos as a constitutional Cleisthenic deme”; Wilding 2022, 49-50 with n. 11.

28 Knoepfler 1986, 92-95.

but how long before can only be a matter of guesswork.²⁹ I agree nonetheless that setting the allocation of land to Amphiaraios after 335 would make the time sequence extremely compressed. It has in particular been suggested that Amphiaraios' sacred land is to be identified with the coastal plain of Oropos and that, if this identification is correct, the territory assigned to the god turns out to be about 17 per cent of the total area of Oropos.³⁰ Significantly, in the *aparhē* records from Eleusis the barley to wheat production ratio for ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀμφιαράου is one of the lowest in the whole list of the First Fruits, with barley approx. only 1,5 times more than wheat, which once again clearly reveals that at least this fairly extensive area of the territory of Oropos was important for its agricultural potential.

A second much larger portion of the Oropian *chōra*, “the hill district of Oropos” (τὰ ὄρη τὰ ἐν Ὀρωπῷ), was to the contrary allocated to the Athenian tribes, grouped in pairs (αἱ φυλαὶ σύνδυο γινόμεναι), so that each of the five “mountains” was assigned to two tribes randomly selected and paired for this purpose.³¹ We are informed about the essential facts concerning this system of land management by Hyperides' speech *In Defence of Euxenippos*, apparently a religious expert who was publicly given the task of consulting Amphiaraios about the boundaries of the god's sacred land by incubating in the sanctuary (16-18).³² Something had clearly gone wrong with the division of the territory, because it was soon discovered that two of the tribes, *Akamantis* and *Hippothonis*, had received land that had been previously set aside for the god.³³ This however was not all, for a frustratingly worn stele found in the Athenian *agora*, and by general consensus belonging to this period of intense Athenian activity in Oropos (l. 10: [οἱ]δε ὀρί(σ)αντο τὰ ἐδά[φη] τὰ ἐ[ν] Ὀ[ρ]ωπ[ῶ]ι τ[ῶν]

29 Papazarkadas 2011, 102-3, rightly underlines the fact that the allocation of the hills of Oropos to the five pairs of tribes (Hyp. 3 (*Eux.*).16) and the allocation of sacred land to Amphiaraios cannot have been contemporary but “took place on different occasions” and that in the succession of the events the latter must have been performed before the former. For the verb ἀφορίζω as a technical term see Faraguna 2023b, 239-40.

30 Cosmopoulos 2001, 75; Papazarkadas 2011, 48; Wilding 2022, 95 n. 141.

31 Knoepfler 2016a, who regards the attested pairings of tribes as further proof for his argument that the organization of the Oropian *chōra* implemented by Athens in the 330s in fact went back to more than thirty years earlier, when there was a brief spell of Athenian domination, and needed only to be revived during the period of renewed control following the sack of Thebes. Doubts on the plausibility of such reconstruction have been put forward by Wilding 2022, 94 n. 133.

32 For the prosopography of Euxenippos son of Ethelokrates of Lamprai see Bowden 2019; van Hove 2019; Matthaïou 2020.

33 For a full commentary on the relevant paragraphs of the speech (16-18) see Whitehead 2000, 206-15. For a different approach, which reverses the situation, see Humphreys 2018, 750 n. 30: “Perhaps, either the preparation for the Amphiaraiia of 329/8, or the celebration of the festival, emboldened sanctuary officials to claim that part of the land assigned to the tribes belonged to Amphiaraios”.

Αἰγεῖδων καὶ Αἰαντιδῶν [...]),³⁴ records the results of a survey, conducted on the ground by a commission of ὀρισταί, of the district allocated to *Aigeis* and *Aiantis*, where among the recurring terms of the very fragmentary text are the verb ἀμφισβητέω (ll. 91, 99-100, 103, 132-133, 140) and the adjective ἀνανφισβήτητος (ll. 134-136, 145, 147) (*SEG* 37.100; *Agora* XVI, 84).³⁵ They clearly point to a situation in which disputes had arisen following widespread encroachment on (some of) the parcels of land into which the district had been apportioned—as indicated by the inscription, with a view to renting them out to members of the two tribes.

Concerning this document, some observations on points of detail can be made:

1. that the land had been leased out is shown by the verb μισθῶ featuring in two separate sections (ll. 108: τα[ῦ]τα ἔφη μεμισθῶσθ[α]ι; 138: [φ]άσκων μ[εμ]ισθῶσθαι) and by the monetary amounts in acrophonic numerals recorded within different “entries” of the inscribed text (ll. 19, 109, 138, 174);

2. a large majority of the individuals whose names (demotic included) can be identified belong to the two tribes *Aigeis* and *Aiantis*.³⁶ Use of the portion of new land allocated to them was therefore overwhelmingly (if not exclusively) reserved for the benefit of their tribesmen;

3. the claims that had given rise to the disputes settled by the *horistai* necessarily entail that some time had elapsed between the apportioning of the lands and the agency of the ten commissioners. Knoepfler’s suggestion that the original land division must have gone back to the previous spell of Athenian domination (c. 370 BCE) may on the face of it appear convincing, but it also poses almost intractable problems. How could the dispossessed Athenians lay their claims to lands they (or, more likely, their fathers) had lost more than thirty years before to Boiotian domination? The only reasonable answer seems to be that, when taking over the Oropian territory, the Athenians made use of the pre-existing (i.e. “Oropian”) land division and simply proceeded to distribute the different districts of the hill territory to the tribes. Trespassing and illegal occupation, as proposed by Nikolaos Papazarkadas, must have occurred in the years following the allocation of the land to the ten *phylai*, in all probability because its manifold resources proved remarkably attractive at the time;³⁷

4. as underlined in a seminal article by Louis Robert long ago, the “hills” (ὄρη) of Oropos were mostly economically exploited for their pastures, wood

34 For the dating of the inscription to the 330s-320s see Culasso Gastaldi 2020, 275-76 n. 40 with a review of the previous literature.

35 For a new edition and an enlightening commentary on the document see Papazarkadas 2009 (*SEG* 59.141). Cf. also Culasso Gastaldi 2020, 274-79.

36 All the members of the commission of *horistai* mentioned at lines 10-16 are invariably either from *Aigeis* or from *Aiantis*. As for the other individuals named in the inscription, but for some unclear exceptions where the text is largely missing (ll. 75, 81 and 97) they all seem again to belong to the two tribes in question.

37 Papazarkadas 2009, 164; 2011, 103.

and charcoal.³⁸ Such insight has been confirmed by the new inscription, where the almost unparalleled expression τόπος ἔφυλος, “wooded area”, indeed recurs several times (ll. 76, 96, 102, 113, 115, 128), but where, less predictably, we also frequently encounter the parallel expression τόπος ἐργάσιμος, which to the contrary points to “cultivable” land, sometimes also planted with trees (ll. 106-107: ἔτ[ε]ρα ἐργάσιμα πολλὰ... υ[.]ητα καὶ [πεφυ]τευμένα, “other cultivable plots... planted with trees”; cf. ll. 114-115: μέχρι τῶν ἀμ[π]έλ[ων], “up to the vines”), as well as mentions of a meadow (l. 148: ὁ λειμῶ[ν]), of pastoralism (l. 176: τὸ ἐ[ν] βου[κ]όλο[ις]) and of φρύγανα, shrubs or twigs for gathering (l. 178). There are also some references to ὑλῶναι (ll. 103 and 141), a term that Langdon in his *editio princeps* interpreted as “timber merchants”,³⁹ and Knoepfler as “tax farmers” specialised in the collection of a tax on timber,⁴⁰ but which more probably alludes to contractors who purchased the right to exploit the timber of some well-identified public areas (ll. 102-103);⁴¹

5. the document appears to be organized into two sections: the second and much longer section (ll. 10-187), which has so far been the focus of my commentary, provides an account of the results of a locally conducted on-site survey, as suggested not only by a number of references to the cardinal points (ll. 88, 110-111, 116) but also to physical features of the morphology of the landscape, such as a valley (ll. 79 and 82: διαβὰς τὸν αὐλῶνα), a ravine (l. 112: χαράδρα ξύλα ἔχουσα), one or more hills (ll. 102: μέ[χ]ρι τοῦ λόφ[ο]υ; 103: π[ρ]ὸς τῷ λόφ[ω]; 105: παρελθόντι τὸν λόφον; 105: ἀπὸ τοῦ λόφ[ο]υ). The general impression is that this part of the inscription is very similar in structure to the records of the *pōletai* lists, the *diagraphai* concerning the leases of the Laurion silver mines.⁴² Terms such as ἐργάσιμος, “workable”, “cultivable”, and ἔδαφος, “land”, “property” (ll. 10: οἷδε ὠρί(σ)αντο τὰ ἔδάφη, and 107),⁴³

38 Robert 1960, 196: “les montagnes”, τὰ ὄρη τὰ ἐν Ὀρωπῶι, pour une grande partie domaines collectifs pour le pâturage, pour le bois et le charbon”. Knoepfler 2010, 452-53, adds also resin and pitch (“et aussi pour la résine et donc pour la poix”). See also Humphreys 2004, 112-13: “it seems possible that the land distributed to the Athenian tribes was hill country, exploited by herdsmen, beekeepers, charcoal-burners and hunters, rather than coastal farmland”.

39 Langdon 1987, 54.

40 Knoepfler 2010, 448: “des *télônai* spécialisés, ayant pour mission de lever les taxes sur la production et/ou la vente du bois”.

41 Marchiandi 2018, 112 n. 30: “Gli *hylonai*, probabilmente da intendere come aggiudicatari del diritto di sfruttamento di specifiche aree boschive date dalla *polis* in concessione a privati secondo pratiche abituali, sono attestati per via epigrafica in un documento ateniese della seconda metà del IV secolo a.C.”.

42 Faraguna 2006, 156-59.

43 For the meaning of ἔδαφος see Crosby 1950, 194: “One might suggest that χωρίον has a somewhat rural agricultural connotation and for this reason the more general word ἔδαφη came to be used in the mining district where much of the property must have been non-agricultural”; Hopper 1953, 218. Cf. also Isae. 11.42 (where ἔδάφη collectively refers to an *agros* and two *oikiai*); Dem. 26.11; *IG* II² 2750 (= Finley 1985², no. 92): ὄρος κ[α]μίνου καὶ ἔδαφον.

indeed almost exclusively occur in such contexts. The first section (1-9), on the other hand, records a tribal decree (ll. 2-3: δεδ]όχθαι ταῖς [φ]υλαῖς),⁴⁴ whose financial content is reflected by the word [τ]ὸ κεφάλαιον, “the total amount”,⁴⁵ possibly referring to the total revenues accruing from the leases of the second section that, in a typically Lykourgan spirit, were to be allocated to the outlays for the performance of sacrifices (ll. 2-3: δεδ]όχθαι ταῖς [φ]υλαῖς θῦσαι). We see here in operation the principle of assigning specific sources of funding to specific expenses, which is one of the fundamental principles of Athenian financial administration during this period.⁴⁶ What we thus have on the stone is apparently a “report” on the work conducted by the *horistai* combined with a decree that earmarked some well-defined income for expenses connected with sacrifices and cultic activities.

The “stone guest” within this argument is represented by another “composite” epigraphic document, the third in our list, consisting of two non-joining fragments, which in turn almost uniquely combines on a large stele a law and a decree concerning the Little Panathenaia,⁴⁷ allocating the revenues from *the Nea*, ἡ Νέα—telling from the amount of the expected rent a substantial piece of land⁴⁸—to the sacrifices performed during the festival (*IG II³ 1, 447 = RO 81, 335/4 BCE*).⁴⁹ Much remains contentious about the *Nea*, beginning from

The term ἔδαφος significantly does not feature in the *Rationes Centesimarum* (cf. Lambert 1997, 225-29).

44 Cf. in such regard Knoepfler 2010, 448, who argues that the decree must have been voted by the ten Athenian tribes altogether: “Comme les premiers éditeurs, Papazarkadas estime que le décret émane des deux tribus directement concernées par une partie au moins de l’inscription, l’*Aigèis* et l’*Aiantis*. Mais le fait que le mot apparaisse toujours au pluriel (ainsi dans la formule de résolution, δεδ]όχθαι ταῖς φυλαῖς θῦσαι κτλ., et plusieurs fois dans la suite du texte), jamais au duel—encore en usage, pourtant, à cette date—m’incite à penser qu’il s’agit en réalité d’un décret pris en commun par les dix tribus, puisque c’est à l’ensemble des *phylai* qu’avait été confiée la gestion des collines boisées de l’Oropie, d’où aussi l’exposition probable du document sur l’Agora”. The argument is no doubt based on sound linguistic elements. Knoepfler does not however take into consideration the prosopography of the inscription which consistently sets it in the framework of the two *phylai*.

45 Migeotte 2014, 495-501.

46 Faraguna 1992, 179-93; Rhodes 2013, esp. 216-18; Rohde 2023, 57-58 with n. 196. Cf. also Humphreys 2018, 750: “We do not know whether the tribes kept all the revenue for themselves or were expected to use it for contributions to the Panathenaia, to which other Oropian revenue may have been devoted”.

47 For the Little Panathenaia see now Shear 2021, 83-115; cf. also Knoepfler 2016b.

48 Lambert 2012, 81 n. 69, rightly rejects the possibility that the two talents envisaged as income from the *Nea* in the law at lines 16-17 were designed as a capital sum which, as suggested by Sosin 2002, 124, would then “be lent on an annual cycle, in addition to the other sources of revenue”. The envisaged income of two talents was meant to accrue as rent from the lease of the landed assets (*ketemata*) in the *Nea*; cf. RO, 400; Papazarkadas 2011, 21-22, 46-47, 85, 140.

49 For the date of the law see Knoepfler 2016b, 191-92 (“l’année même 335/4 paraît désormais s’imposer”). Cf. also RO, 400.

its location which is taken for granted in the document. Since there is no other “new land” but for Oropos in this period of Athenian history, the most plausible suggestion is however that the *Nea* should after all be identified with it.⁵⁰ Several issues admittedly still remain open: in the first place, whether the *Nea*, “a specific and well-known area of state-owned land”,⁵¹ encompassed the whole territory of Oropos, as argued by Denis Knoepfler,⁵² or, with more probability, was only a part of it; and then whether it was public or sacred.⁵³ My personal view is that we should distinguish between three different public areas in the *chōra* of Oropos: *a*) the land sacred to Amphiaraos (ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀμφιαράου); *b*) the hill district (τὰ ὄρη τὰ ἐν Ὠρωπῷ); *c*) the *Nea*, to all appearances an area of considerable size, possibly dedicated to Athena, although difficulties remain in placing such “new land” on the map.⁵⁴ According to Hansen and Nielsen’s *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oropos is nonetheless a “size 3” territory (100–200 km²),⁵⁵ which does not rule out the possibility of fitting the *Nea* into its *chōra*. Based on fifth-century practice, it may in fact have had an extension of one-tenth of the whole territory (Thuc. 3.50.2). How large was the domain sacred to Amphiaraos is also mainly a matter of speculation. John Davies at any rate posits that the sacred land in Oropos may have amounted to about one-fourth of the entire *chōra*.⁵⁶

Concerning the law, I have very little original to add but for the fact, which has mostly gone unnoticed, that it consisted of *ketemata*, “properties” (ll. 16–17: ἡ πρό]σοδος γένηται δυοῖν ταλάντ[οι]ν... ἀπὸ τῶν κτημάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ Νέα[ι]). We do not know whether the *Nea* had been divided up and then distributed to the tribes in pairs, κατὰ δικληρίαν (9), with the same sort of arrangement as with the hill district⁵⁷ or whether it had been apportioned into (two-

50 Robert 1960; Humphreys 2004, 112 with n. 6: “Association of this text... with Oropos has been contested but on flimsy grounds”; Papazarkadas 2009, 164; Knoepfler 2010, 449–53; 2016b, 190–95; Davies 2018, 69. Doubts have once more been expressed by Langdon 2016. A skeptical approach also in RO, 400–1: “the identity of the *Nea* with Oropos cannot be taken as proven”; Sineux 2007, 103–4 n. 48.

51 Lewis 1959, 242 (= 1997, 257).

52 Knoepfler 2010, 449–54.

53 Contrast Papazarkadas 2011, 22 (“The legislation stipulated that the subsidy of the festival was to be carried out with funds from the Νέα (*Nea*). The source of funding should leave no doubt about the ownership of this area; it belonged to Athena”), with Rousset 2013, 2.

54 Faraguna 2023b, 220–21 n. 24.

55 Hansen, Nielsen 2004, 448.

56 Davies 2018, 74. For the (quite different) structure of the Oropian territory (χώρα Ὠρωπία) at the end of the Hellenistic period see Müller 2019, esp. 404–6, with reference to IG VII² 2, 1, 308, ll. 31–32 and 45–48.

57 Knoepfler 2010, 451–52; Humphreys 2004, 112: “Meanwhile, arrangements were made to use revenue from the new territory (*Nea*) to fund additional sacrifices at the Lesser Panathenaia. IG II² 334 + was probably passed in 335/4, allowing time for surveying, division of the land among the ten tribes, and tax collection before celebration of the festival”.

keleroi) plots and leased out to multiple lessees at affordable rents,⁵⁸ but there is again the concrete possibility that, in order to get things into operation speedily, Athens was taking advantage of the already existing land division.

5. Oropos under Athenian administration: the role of the ten tribes

Having looked into the organization of the territory and the pattern of land-use in Oropos between 335 and 322, we can go back to the core theme of this paper, in other words the relationship between land and citizenship. In this perspective, the most original feature of the administrative system implemented by Athens during this period is the role of the ten tribes in managing at a minimum the hill district of the Oropian *chōra* (and possibly the *Nea* too). The only parallel for such a scheme is remarkably offered at the end of the fourth century, after the restoration of Athenian control in 304⁵⁹, by Oropos itself, for which an honorific decree dated to 303/2 provides evidence for the activity of a certain Euthydemos, probably in his capacity as *epimeletēs* of the *phylē Antiochis*, in taking care of the tribe's landholdings in the "wooded" (ἔφυλον) land of the *chōra* (*ISE* 8, ll. 13-21: καὶ πάλιν αἰρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τ[ῶν] φυλετῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐν Ὀρωπῶι ἐπ[ὶ γῆν] ἔφυλον νεμηθεῖσαν ταῖς [φυλαῖς] ἐπεμελήθη ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀν[τιοχίδος] φυλῆς, ὅπως ἂν μηθὲν [βλαβερόν γένη]ται τοῖς φυ[λ]έ[ταις]).⁶⁰

The question therefore arises why the administration of this non-sacred territory was left to the tribes. In her monumental study of kinship in Athenian society Sally Humphreys maintains that this was so especially for economic reasons: the terrain was wild and unsafe and "[i]f Athenian woodcutters, resin-collectors, and charcoal-burners were to move into the area, and revenue was to be derived from their activities, enterprise on a larger scale than that of the individual donkey-owner was needed. To give the land to tribes was a way of motivating wealthy men to take on management roles".⁶¹

I do agree that economic enhancement of the new territory was a powerful factor in the Athenian occupation of Oropos but I would argue, on a more general level, that in the absence of the deme-system for this extra-Attic territory, which always remained outside the scope of Kleisthenes' political and territorial organization, the tribes became the most obvious framework of collective participation. Denis Knoepfler underlined in the past the similarities (and differences) between the history of Samos and Oropos in the fourth century and

58 Williams 2008.

59 For the historical context see Habicht 1997, 77.

60 Papazarkadas 2011, 103-4; Culasso Gastaldi 2020, 279-83. For other tribal landholdings, both in Attica and outside, cf. Jones 1995, 516-17; Culasso Gastaldi 2020, 207-10.

61 Humphreys 2018, 750.

suggested in this respect that Oropos was in fact “une clérouquie dissimulée”, a “hidden cleruchy”, but such analogy can also be applied to local administration. The Athenian community in Samos was like a “second” Athens where the democratic institutions could function, to some limited extent, independently of the mother city, without a system of demes specific to the island, and where public life was articulated precisely through the ten Athenian tribes.⁶² We may assume that, despite some major differences (in Oropos we do not find for example a local community organized with an assembly and a *boulē*, as it was in Samos), the same went on in Oropos, where the tribes appear to have been functional also to objectives other than land-use.

One area that deserves to be singled out is clearly represented by military organization. Based on the work of Reinmuth and Knoepfler, there is now a consensus that the reform of the *ephebēia* introduced by the law of Epikrates in 335/4 after the recovery of Oropos (Harp. *s.v.* Ἐπικράτης) and the re-fashioning of the second year of training as patrol and garrison duty on the Attic-Boiotian frontier (Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 42.3-5: περιπολοῦσι τὴν χώραν καὶ διατρίβουσιν ἐν τοῖς φυλακτηρίοις) was part of a strategy of territorial control of the northern borderlands.⁶³

Oropos and the sanctuary of Amphiaraos were prominent within the ephebes’ training programme, as appears from several inscriptions found in the sanctuary.⁶⁴ *I.Oropos* 353, a complete document, records a list of the *epheboi* of the tribe *Leontis*, 64 in number, arranged in three columns by demes, and, on the left and right sides of the dedicatory base, the list of the various officials to whom they had awarded honours at the end of their period of service.⁶⁵ *I.Oropos* 348 is a dedication commemorating a victory in javelin throwing (l. 3: [νικήσας] ἐφήβους ἀκοντίζων). It is uncertain whether the contest in question was part of the agonistic programme of the Amphiaraia (cf. *I.Oropos* 520, a list of victors in musical, athletic and hippic competitions at the Great Amphiaraia) and whether the victory was gained in Oropos. *I.Oropos* 352 (= *IG* II³ 4, 344) and 354 (= *IG* II³ 4, 345) are (badly fragmentary) dedications by the ephebes of unrecoverable tribes, again possibly for their victories in agonistic events.⁶⁶ In his commentary on *I.Oropos* 352 Stephen Lambert observes that the finding of “several ephebic inscriptions from the Amphiaraion” suggests that “ephebes could also be stationed at Oropos (in addition to Rhamnous or Eleusis

62 L. Rubinstein, *Ionian*, in Hansen, Nielsen 2004, 1098; Gallo 2010, 366-67.

63 Reinmuth 1971, 70; Knoepfler 2001a, 381-82; Sineux 2007, 106-109; Wilding 2022, 97-98.

64 Humphreys 2004, 114-17 with n. 18; Sineux 2007, 106-7, and especially Russo 2022, 307-8.

65 Reinmuth 1971, 58-82 (no. 15) (324/3); Friend 2019, 225-31 (T15), where the inscription is dated to 330/29-324/3 BCE. For a discussion of the date see also Humphreys 2004, 116 n. 18; 2004-2009, 84-85.

66 Humphreys 2004-2009, 84.

or Phyle) in their second year of service”.⁶⁷ If we broaden the scope of the chronological window under consideration to include the period of renewed Athenian control following 304 BCE, we moreover happen to have two tribal decrees (ἔδοξε τοῖς φυλῆταις) conferring honours to *didaskaloi* involved in the military training of the ephebes (*I.Oropos* 369-370).

Less clear, on the other hand, is to what extent tribal subdivisions functioned as a civic framework also in the sphere of cult and festivals, for instance as groups structuring the organization of, and participation in, the Amphiaraia. If the ephebes of specific tribes made dedications in the Amphiaraion to commemorate their victories in agonistic contests, this must mean that the *phylai* arguably played a role at least on *some* occasions (cf. also *I.Rhamnous* 98).⁶⁸ As far as the *epimeletai* entrusted with supervision over the first celebration of the penteteric Amphiaraia and the reshaping of their programme are concerned (*I.Oropos* 298 = *IG* II³ 1, 355), however, the ten members of the board, including Phanodemos, Lykourgos, Demades and other prominent figures, were surely selected for their prestige and interest to promote the cult of Amphiaraos and the god’s sanctuary in Oropos rather than as representatives of the tribes they belonged to (Lykourgos of Boutadai, Sophilos Phylasios and Thrasyleon Acharneus are all from *Oineis*, while Thymochares Sphettios and Kephisophon Cholargeus are both from *Akamantis*).⁶⁹ At the same time, it should be noted that participation in the Great Amphiaraia extended well beyond the Athenian borders, as is shown by the list of victors in *I.Oropos* 520, where, alongside a majority of Athenians, we find competitors from Thebes, Sikyon, Macedon, Cyrene, Argos, Larisa, Pharsalos, Kolophon, Elis and Phleious.⁷⁰ The festival patently reached a broad audience and enjoyed an international status, attracting visitors from the whole of mainland Greece and, in one case, from Asia Minor.

67 *AIO*_1679. Cf. also Russo 2022, 308: “The presence of such documents could indicate that Oropos was included among the places where the ephebes were garrisoned, that the ephebes only visited the sanctuary during the Amphiaraia and held an end-of-service ceremony there, or that they even took part in competitions and set up their dedications there”.

68 Humphreys 2004, 88-91 and 114-16; see esp. 90: “Another ephebic dedication, from the Amphiaraion, probably commemorates participation in the Amphiaraia of 325/4 (Reinmuth 1971, no. 15...). *IG* ii² 3105, from Rhamnous (Pouilloux 1954, 2 *bis*) is now confirmed as a dedication celebrating victory by the ephebes of Erechtheis in a torch-race in 333/2 (Petrakos 1981, 68-9, no. 21); this may even indicate that ephebic participation in the Amphiaraia preceded Phanodemos’ reorganization of the festival”, and 116 n. 18. Cf. also Habicht 1997, 16-17 with n. 19; Sineux 2007, 106-7. According to Petrakos 1999, 85 (*ad* no. 98), the torch-race commemorated in Rhamnous is to be associated to the Great Nemesis.

69 Text and commentary also in Manieri 2009, 222-24 (no. Oro. 4). For the prosopography of the list see Faraguna 1992, 215-24; cf. also Sineux 2007, 100-2; Wilding 2022, 85-88.

70 For the date (329/8) see the commentary in Manieri 2009, 225-28 (no. Oro. 5).

6. IG II³ 1, 349: a prayer for the citizens and their possessions?

As a result, before pulling the threads of this analysis, it may be useful to consider a decree which is quite extraordinary in many respects (*I.Oropos* 296 = IG II³ 1, 349). It was proposed in the ninth prytany of 332/1 by Phanodemos son of Diylos of Thymaitadai, a prominent Athenian, and a well-known attidographer, with a prolonged and well-documented interest in the sanctuary of Amphiaraos,⁷¹ whom we have already encountered as distinguished *epimeletēs* in 329/8. The decree most unusually provided for the award of a crown worth 1000 drachmas to Amphiaraos himself, “since the god takes good care of those Athenians and others who come to the sanctuary, for the health and safety of all in the country (ll. 11-15: ἐπειδὴ ὁ θεὸς καλῶς ἐπιμελεῖται τῶν ἀφικνουμένων Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἐφ’ ὑγιείαι καὶ σωτηρίαι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ).

An honorific decree for a god is totally unexpected and, as a matter of fact, is unparalleled in Attic epigraphy. Incidentally, on the same day, at the very same assembly, Phanodemos was in his own right granted a crown of the value of 1000 drachmas for having drafted a law about the sanctuary of Amphiaraos “well and with love of honour” (καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως νενομοθέτηκεν περὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου) and, on top of this, for having supplied financial means for the penteteric festival of the god with a view to both the sacrifices and the repair of the sanctuary (*I.Oropos* 297 = IG II³ 1, 348, ll. 10-17: ἐπειδὴ Φανόδημος Θυμαϊτάδης καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως νενομοθέτηκεν περὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου, ὅπως ἂν ἥ τε πεντετηρίς ὥς καλλίστη γίγνηται καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι θυσίαι τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου, καὶ πόρους πεπόρικεν εἰς ταῦτα καὶ εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ).⁷²

The honorific decree for Amphiaraos, following the enactment formula, instructed the treasurer of the military fund (*tamias tōn stratiotikōn*) to pay out the money for the crown and, once the latter had been made, to hand it over to the *epimeletai* who were to proclaim in the sanctuary “what had been decreed by the *dēmos*”⁷³ and then dedicate the crown to the god “for the health and safety of the Athenian *dēmos* and the children and women and everyone in the country” (ἐφ’

71 Faraguna 1992, 217-19; Manieri 2009, 222; Brun 2013; N.F. Jones, *BNJ* 325, *Biographical Essay* (2013).

72 Manieri 2009, 220-22 (no. Oro. 3).

73 This appears to be the most natural translation of ἀνείποντας τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τῷ δήμῳ at ll. 25-27: cf. Davies 2018, 70: the *epimeletai* “are to proclaim in the sanctuary what has been voted by the *dēmos* and are to dedicate the crown to the god”. Note however that Stephen Lambert, *AIO*_62, renders the passage differently: “and the managers, having announced what has been decreed to the People in the sanctuary, shall dedicate the crown to the god”. Such a translation would have in particular the consequence of emphasising the community aspect in the sanctuary of Oropos.

ὑγίαι καὶ σωτηρία τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ πάντων) (*I.Oropos* 296 = *IG* II³ 1, 349, ll. 25-31). The translation of the “dedicatory prayer” (to quote an expression used by Adele Scafuro in her seminal study of this inscription⁷⁴) I have provisionally offered is the one that has been proposed by most commentators, since it appears to be in line with the gist of the motivation (ἐπειδή) clause where, as we saw, Amphiaraios is said to “take care of the Athenians and the others who come to the sanctuary for the health and safety of all in the land (πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ)”.

I wonder however whether καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ πάντων could not instead possibly refer, as a neuter plural, with a variation of the above formula, to “all the things”, “all the properties” in the land, a reference to the territory and its resources that would perfectly fit into the Oropian context we have been investigating. True, in most cases ἐφ’ ὑγίαι καὶ σωτηρία is followed by the indication of the beneficiaries, *i.e.* the *persons* for whose “health and safety” the sacrifice was performed: these could sometimes be just the *dēmos*, or the *boulē* and the Athenian *dēmos* (*IG* II³ 1, 306, B, ll. 21-22; *IG* II² 456, fr. b, ll. 2-3), but more often, even taking into account that the text is sometimes heavily restored, the formula appears to have been expanded to include, besides the “council” (*boulē*) and the “people” (*dēmos*), “the children and the wives” (*IG* II³ 1, 995, ll. 9-11; 1168, ll. 12-14; 1263, ll. 18-20)⁷⁵ and/or “the others who are well-disposed (εὖνους) and friends of the *dēmos*” (*IG* II³ 900, ll. 8-10: καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων, ὅσοι [εἰσὶν εὖν]ους τῷ δήμῳ; 915, ll. 15-19: καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσοι [εἰσὶν εὖν]ους καὶ φίλοι τοῦ δήμου; 920, ll. 4-10; 953, ll. 3-4) and “the allies” (*IG* II³ 1, 1168, ll. 9-11; 1296, ll. 9-11).⁷⁶

There are however variants of this formula, in which, as a rule in turbulent historical circumstances, “health and safety” are prayed for also for “the possessions”, “the properties” of the *politai*. In *IG* II³ 1, 416, a priest and *hieropoioi* are praised and crowned for announcing the good things that occurred when they sacrificed to Dionysos and the other gods ἐφ’ ὑγίαι καὶ σωτηρία τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῷ Ἀθηναίων καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κτημάτων τῶν Ἀθηναίων, in other words “for the health and safety of the *boulē* and *dēmos* of the Athenians and of their children, women and other possessions (*ktēmata*)” (ll. 14-16). Stephen Lambert made an important contribution by suggesting that the decree should be set in the context of the

74 Scafuro 2009, arguing that the model for the unique crowning of Amphiaraios was provided by decrees “conferring honors upon foreigners, especially in proxeny decrees” (73-75). Building on this, Wilding 2022, 92, suggests that “Phanodemos possibly gifted the right of land (*enktesis*) to the god; again a fitting honour for a foreign benefactor”.

75 It is worth noting that in such formulas women, as wives, are invariably styled as γυναικες.

76 Cf. Scafuro 2009, 73-74, observing that “the ‘prayer formula’ for the ‘health and protection’ of x, y and z group becomes inventively programmatic in the course of the fourth century and thereafter”.

emergency situation following the battle of Chaironeia, when it was decided to “bring the women and children in from the countryside behind the walls” (Lycurg. 1.16: ἐψηφίσατο ὁ δῆμος παῖδας μὲν καὶ γυναῖκας ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰς τὰ τεῖχη κατακομίζειν) and shelter them in Piraeus ([Plut.] *Mor.* 849a: ἱερὰ δὲ καὶ παῖδας ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰς Πειραιᾶ ἀποθέσθαι).⁷⁷ The “dedicatory prayers” in this and in the Oropian inscription are nevertheless almost identical and moreover resonate with a similar, even more concrete formula found in a later, third-century decree (266/5?), where the sacrifices are made “for the health and safety of the *boulē* and the Athenian *dēmos* and the crops in the countryside” (IG II³ 1, 920, ll. 8-10: ἐφ’ ὑγιείας καὶ σωτη[ρίας τῆς βο]υλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν κ[αρπῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ]).⁷⁸ A similar expression, to quote an example from outside Athens, is found in a honorific decree from Priene dating from after the invasion of the Galatians in 278/7 BCE where the honorand, Sotas, is praised for “having assembled a force made up by the strongest of the citizens and those people from the countryside who were eager to join them in the dangers against the barbarians”, being determined to “save the *politai* in the countryside, themselves, their children, their wives and properties, in order to bring them safely into the city” (σώ[ζ]ειν προελόμενος τοὺς[ς] π[ολίτ]ας τοὺς ἐν τῇ χώρῃ αὐτοῦ[ς] καὶ τ[έ]κνα καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ὅπως ἀνασ[ώ]ισι αὐτ[ο]ὺς εἰς τὴν πόλιν) (*I.Priene B-M* 28, ll. 19-23).

7. Conclusions

Based on these parallels, it can therefore be plausibly suggested that Phanodemos’ decree in honour of Amphiaraios also included, within the dedicatory prayer for “health and safety”, the citizens, their families and properties. For all the Athenians’ efforts to consolidate their control of the Oropian *chora* the historical circumstances in Lykourgan times were still unsettled enough. Whatever the merits of this interpretation, such all-embracing expressions are of outstanding significance in the perspective of this paper, since they appear to encompass the manifold aspects subsumed under the notion of citizenship as “sharing in the *polis*”, namely, in the first place, the citizen *qua* member of the *dēmos* and of both the political (the *boulē* and the assembly) and the cultic community (Phanodemos’ decree was after all discovered with other documents in the very

77 Mikalson 1998, 42-44, stresses the new defensive “religious outlook” reflected by the “for the health and safety” formula: “[i]n the turbulent times of the last half of the fourth century and in the following centuries, the obtaining of health and safety plays an increasingly large role in state cult. ‘For health and safety’ soon becomes formulaic in state decrees treating sacrifices and other religious matters, and various types of gods promising these come to the fore”.

78 As suggested by Stephen Lambert, “[t]he anxiety about the crops is doubtless linked with the Chremonidean War” (*AIO*_398, n. 2).

heart of the sanctuary of Amphiaraos), but also his family—the children and wives (καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναίκων), always in that order—and property.

Through these almost contemporary epigraphic documents, we are somehow unexpectedly brought back to the description of the “parts (μέρη)” of the *polis*, in particular the elements the *oikia* consisted of, in Book 1 of Aristotle’s *Politics* (1253b5-7: πρῶτα καὶ ἐλάχιστα μέρη οἰκίας δεσπότης καὶ δοῦλος, καὶ πόσις καὶ ἄλοχος, καὶ πατήρ καὶ τέκνα)⁷⁹ and to its “sociological” take, as opposed to the “institutional” approach, not necessarily incompatible with the former,⁸⁰ that permeates the definition of the *polites* in Book 3, where, after a laborious argument, it is concluded that “the one who has the right to participate in deliberative or judicial office is a citizen of the *polis* in which he has that right” (1275b1820: ὃ γὰρ ἐξουσία κοινωνεῖν ἀρχῆς βουλευτικῆς ἢ κριτικῆς, πολίτην ἥδη λέγομεν εἶναι ταύτης τῆς πόλεως). As I noted at the beginning of this paper, the *polis* consisted of the land and the people, but it also encompassed the diverse complex networks of social relations, public and private, revolving around such primary elements.

79 “And the first and smallest parts of a household are: master and slave, husband and wife, father and children”. For a detailed commentary see Schütrumpf 1991a, 228-31; Ferrucci 2006, 186-92. Cf. also Hinsch 2021, 255-56. In Arist. [*Oec.*] 1343a10 the *polis* is defined as οἰκῶν πλήθός... καὶ χώρας καὶ κτημάτων. Zoepffel 2006, 422, styles it as “eine völlig unaristotelische Definition” in so far as the author “nicht von den Menschen ausgeht wie Aristoteles..., sondern von Dingen”, but if *oikia* is interpreted here as consisting of the elements listed at *Pol.* 1253b6-7, there is in fact no contradiction.

80 For Aristotle’s treatment of citizenship see Faraguna 2025a. See also Ferrucci 2006, 203: “Se in apertura della *Politica* si riconosce la *polis* composta nella sua unità ultima di case, nel senso che abbiamo cercato fin qui di delineare, nel libro III si presenterà come suo elemento essenziale e componente nucleare il cittadino. Non c’è una vera contraddizione in questo: su un piano strettamente politico è anzi evidente che alla base della *polis* ci sia il *polites*, mentre, in una prospettiva sociale, assume rilevanza come soggetto pienamente definito la struttura articolata dell’*oikos*: la società greca comprende e riconosce al suo interno molte figure escluse dal godimento del pieno *status* civico ma tuttavia parte integrante della collettività”.