

MICHAEL B. WALBANK

SALES OF PROPERTY IN ATTICA: NEW READINGS IN IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1593

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 107 (1995) 69–72

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn





	[- . .]γε[- -ca 7- - -]v	[ἐγ]γυη[τ]ῆς Σπο[υ]δίας Ὀῆθε[ν <sup>v v v v</sup> ]
15	[- . .]μπε[- ca 5- - -]ι <sup>v</sup>	[ὠνητής Ἀ]ρ[ί]στανδρος Κολ[- -ca 6- - -]
	[- . .]ολ[- - -ca 8- - -]	ἐγγ[υητής . .]λίας Ἐρχι: ὠ[νητής <sup>v v</sup> ]
	[- . .]ε[- - -ca 8- - -]	[- -ca 6- - -]  [- . Φ]λυεὺς ἐγ[υητής <sup>v v</sup> ]
	[- . .]ασ[- - -ca 8- - -]	[- -ca 7- - -]λ[- . .]ς Παιανι: ὠ[νητής]
	[- . .]κρ[- . .]ε[- ca 4- -]	[- - -ca 10- - -]ς Μελιτε ἐγγυ[ητής]
20	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[- -ca 4- - ω]γίδης Μελιτε: ὠ[νητής <sup>v v</sup> ]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[- - -ca 8- - -] Σφήττ: ἐγγυ[ητής <sup>v v v</sup> ]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[- - -ca 8- - -] Ἄν[α]γυ: ὠ[νη]τ: Ξ[ε]γο- <sup>v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[- -ca 7- - -]: ἐγ: Λεώστρατ[ος] <sup>v v v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[- -ca 7- - -] ὠνητής Ξενοκλή[ς <sup>v v v v</sup> ]
25	[- - - - - - -]ετ[- -]	[-ca 4- -]λ[- .]ς: ἐγγ: Λυσιάδης ἐξ [Οἴου]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ὠνητ]ή[ς]: Ἄνδ[?]ροκλῆς Σφήττ[ιος <sup>v</sup> ]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ἐγγυητής]: [Χα]λρίας Ποτάμιος <sup>v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ὠνητής]: Ἄνδροκλῆς Σφήττιος <sup>v v v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ἐγγυητή]ς: Κηφισόδωρος Ποτάμ[ι]
30	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ὠνητής]: Ἄνδ[?]ροκλῆς Σφήττιος <sup>v v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ἐγγυητής]: Ξενοφών Πόριος <sup>v v v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ὠνητής: . .]μαχος Ὀῆθεν <sup>v v v v</sup>
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ἐγγυητής: . .]οκλῆς Ποτάμ[ιος <sup>v v</sup> ]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	ὠ[νητής: . .]μαχος Ὀ[ῆ]θεν <sup>v v v v</sup>
35	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[ἐγγυητή]ς[.]Πυθ[. .]ρος [.]εσ[. . . .]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[- - -ca 8- - -]αγ[- . .]σ[- - -ca 10- - -]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[.]η[- . .]υθ[. .]ο[- - - -ca 14- - - -]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[.]σ[α[. . . .]ι[α[- - - -ca 14- - - -]
	[- - - - - - - - - - -]	[.]ησ[ο[- - - -ca 21- - - -]

lacuna

lacuna

Col. I, line 4: [M]ένυλλ[ος] Ἀ[- . .]. Perhaps PA 10062, Menyllos Halaieus, son of Astyphilos. Col. II, line 7: Μέ[ναν]δ[ρο]ς Ἀλι[μούσιος]. Perhaps an ancestor of PA 9869, Menandros Halimousios. Line 9: [Ἀ]ριστό[μα]χος Ἀλαι[εύς] (also line 11). Sundwall: PA 1968; see now Agora XV, no. 62, line 210, where he is listed as the father of Astyanax, a bouleutes in 303/2 BC. Line 10: Φίλ[ιπ]π[ος] Ἀλαιεύς. Sundwall restored Φίλ[α]γ[ρος] Ἀλαιεύς, but, since there are two letter-spaces before the letter read by him as a gamma, Philagros is ruled out. Philippos Halaieus is PA 14384a; see also Agora XVII, no. 56, where he is listed as the father of Nikon in the mid-fourth century BC. Line 12: Ἀ[στυά]ν[α]ξ Ἀλαιεύς. He is, probably, the father of Aristomachos, the purchaser in lines 9 and 11. Line 14: Σπο[υ]δίας Ὀῆθε[ν]. Sundwall suggests that he is ancestor to PA 12869, Spoudias Oethen, son of Kaphisios. Line 20: [- - - ω]γίδης Μελιτε. Possibly PA 14908, Philonides Meliteus, son of Onetor, guarantor for ships sent to Chalkis in 340/39 BC (but see also PA 14907 and 14909 for other men of the same name and demotic in the fourth century; other

names with the ending -ωνίδης are not attested in the deme of Melite). Lines 22-23: Ξενοκλή[ς][ - - -ca 4- -]λι[. .]ς; see also 24-25: Ξενο[ - - - -]. The letter-traces in line 23 suggest that the restoration should be [Αίγι]λι[εύ]ς. The surviving letters of this line are rather cramped, so that it is necessary to restore a line of ca 28 letters here. Line 25: Λυσιάδης ἐξ [Οΐου]. Sundwall identifies him as the father of Astynomos, PA 9347. Line 28 (also 26 and 30?): Ἀνδροκλῆς Σφήτιος. Sundwall: PA 872. Line 29: Κηφισόδωρος Ποτάμι[ι]. Sundwall suggests that he is ancestor to PA 13145, Sonikos Potamios, son of Kephisodoros. Lines 32 and 34: [. . .]μαχος Ὀῆθεν. Sundwall restored [Λά]μαχος Ὀῆθεν (PA 8980), but the space available requires at least three, not two, letters before μαχος. Perhaps [Ἐπί]μαχος? Line 33: Perhaps [Φιλ]οκλῆς Ποτάμι[ος]. If so, he will be an ancestor to PA 14557, Philokles Potamios, son of Eniochos.

This document seems to be a record of sales, probably of real property. Each entry takes up two lines, the name of the purchaser and his demotic on the first, and that of his guarantor and his demotic on the second, each preceded by the designation "Purchaser" (ὠνητής) or "Guarantor" (ἐγγυητής). From line 22, where a name is incomplete and uncut stone is preserved at the end of the line, it seems likely that these rubrics sometimes ran over from line to line; personal names are unlikely to have been abbreviated, as demotics and the words ὠνητής and ἐγγυητής sometimes are. Punctuation is inconsistent: sometimes a punctuation-mark precedes and follows each of the words ὠνητής and ἐγγυητής, as well as each name-demotic combination; once, a space is left, as if the mason had forgotten to inscribe the punctuation-mark (II, 25); in several instances there is no trace either of a space or of a punctuation-mark. From what is preserved in the middle of the stone, in lines 14 and 15, where the end of Column I survives, and in line 16, where the beginning of Column II is preserved, it appears that the inscription comprised at least two columns, each about about 0.15 m. in width (thus about 25 letters on average), separated by a gap of 1-2 letter-spaces, their lines not quite aligned one with the other. What little survives in Column I is similar to what is found in Column II; no property-descriptions or prices seem to have been engraved in either column. Both columns seem to be the work of the same mason. The mason appears to have attempted to maintain syllabic division, and usually managed to keep proper names intact (but note Column II, line 22, where enough uncut stone survives in the margin to show that here, at least, he broke a personal name into two parts). Also, it was his practice, wherever possible, to begin each line with the rubric ὠνητής or ἐγγυητής.

There are some instances of one man acquiring several properties: Aristomachos Halaieus acquired two properties (II, 9 and 11), each with a different guarantor; likewise, Androkles Sphettios acquired one property (II, 28) and probably two more (II, 26 and 30), each with a different guarantor; and [. . .]machos Oethen acquired two properties (II, 32 and 34), again with two different guarantors. In all these instances, the names are grouped sequentially, as if the sales were registered under the names of the purchasers, rather than under the locations of the properties; therefore it can be argued that Xenokles of II, 23-24 is very likely to be the same man as Xenokles of II, 24-25, and thus another multiple purchaser. His demotic may be Aigilieus. Again, these sales are guaranteed by two different

men. No guarantor can be identified as standing surety for more than one purchaser. No purchase, in the preserved text, at least, required more than one guarantor.

Of the thirty-one purchasers and guarantors who are named, in whole or in part, fourteen purchasers can be identified geographically; and three are unable to be so identified with certainty. Of the guarantors, thirteen can be placed geographically; one cannot. Four individuals cannot be identified definitely as either purchaser or guarantor, and only one of these, perhaps two, can be placed geographically. However, so far as can be determined, all purchasers and guarantors alike, are Athenian citizens. Any attempt to discern a geographical pattern by analysis of the purchasers fails: their home-demes are scattered at random all over Attica, but with a slight preponderance within or close to the City of Athens. Guarantors may be relatives or neighbours to purchasers, though often not close neighbours; but in about one-third of cases the homes of guarantors and purchasers are widely separated. Thus, if these properties were all situated in the same place, or shared the same characteristic, there is no way of telling from this document where or what they might have been. The purchasers come from six of the ten phylai; thus, this document cannot be the result of a division of properties among pairs of phylai, as happened when Athens acquired the territory of Oropos.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, we must assume that the properties were named as a block on a part of the stone that is now lost, and, since there is no indication in the surviving texts of their value, it is likely that their dimensions and value were uniform.

I have assumed, so far, that this document is a record of the sale of real property. However, an ὠνητής is not necessarily a purchaser of land: he may be the lessee (of a mine, for instance: see IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1587, line 4). I believe that it is also possible that he may be a contractor who undertakes some sort of public work. Indeed, the absence of any designation of area or value suggests that what has been sold here is something divisible into equal parts, as does the manner in which several properties acquired by a single purchaser are grouped together; and the requirement that each ὠνητής should have a guarantor suggests that it is of considerable value: a series of mining-concessions would probably not fit both these qualifications, but a contract for public works might.

Perhaps, then, this document records some activity such as the provision of equal amounts of, for instance, quarried stone for the construction of a public monument. In the absence of any other evidence, the question must remain open.

---

<sup>3</sup> In 338 BC; see Hypereides 4, 16.