

NICHOLAS F. JONES

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FOR FARMSTEAD RESIDENCE IN ATTICA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 133 (2000) 75–90

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FOR FARMSTEAD RESIDENCE IN ATTICA

The settlement patterns of ancient rural Attica have been in recent decades a frequent topic of investigation. The fundamental question is whether populations resided on the agricultural lands that they owned or worked, that is on “farms”, or whether the primary residence was in some nucleated village, town, or city. Given a result in favor of farmstead residence, it can then be asked if such residence was year-round or merely seasonal in keeping with the demands of an agricultural calendar; and, with regard to status, whether and to what extent these residents, permanent or temporary, comprised citizen landowners, tenants, seasonal workers, slaves, or some combination of these. The body of relevant evidence is large and complex, but this short study will attempt to advance our understanding by narrowing the focus to a dossier of surprisingly neglected source materials.

Naturally, classicists have looked to literary texts for any light they might shed on these matters, but their indications are far from unequivocal. Some, written from an urban point of view, speak only loosely of the country (*chora*) or fields (*agroï*), without revealing anything about settlement patterns. Those few, now well known, passages that do seem to be informative have nonetheless proved susceptible to contrasting interpretations; for one scholar, they demonstrate that Athenian farmers did not live on their ground;¹ for another, just the opposite.² Archaeological excavation of various sites continues to yield valuable results, but much of the vast territory of ancient Attica with its 139 Kleisthenic demes remains to be explored.³ Inscriptions, too, might be thought relevant, for not only are they contemporary and documentary but they also possess in many cases the inestimable advantage of having originated in the countryside itself. But even inscriptions, however close to the reality that is our subject, can, it now appears, be made to support quite different lines of interpretation.

Marking a major advance over Jan Pečirka’s 1973 survey of “homestead farms” in Classical and Hellenistic Greece,⁴ Robin Osborne in two 1985 publications argued extensively in favor of what might be called the nucleated settlement position. The book *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika* made the case ultimately on the basis of the peculiar nature of the socio-political regime and the resulting inclination of rural Athenians to reap the benefits of community life.⁵ An article “Buildings and Residence on the Land in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: the Contribution of Epigraphy” reaffirmed

¹ Robin Osborne, *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika*, Cambridge 1985, pp. 15–22, with the conclusion at p. 17: “... there is no clear evidence in the literature for anyone who lives and farms out on his own in the country”.

² Thus, in reply to Osborne, Merle Langdon, On the Farm in Classical Attica, *CJ* 86 (1990–1991) 209–213 at 209–211.

³ Among several recent treatments of individual Attic demes, modern archaeological study is well represented by H. Lohmann, Atene, eine attische Landgemeinde der klassischen Zeit, *Hellenika Jahrbuch* 1983, pp. 93–117; and Ἀττική. *Forschungen zur Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*, Köln/Weimar/Wien 1992, two vols. Earlier, physical remains associated with deme-centers had been described by C. W. J. Eliot, *Coastal Demes of Attika*, Toronto 1962. Extensive citation of archaeological sites will be found in Jan Pečirka, Homestead Farms in Classical and Hellenistic Hellas, in M. I. Finley, ed., *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, Paris–La Haye 1973, pp. 113–147 (with pp. 133–137 for Attica). Attic demes, severally and in the aggregate, are the subject of various papers in W. D. E. Coulson et al., eds., *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, Oxford 1994. Studies of wider scope based on or incorporating archaeological observation or survey include D. Rupp and D. Keller, eds., *Archaeological Survey in the Mediterranean Basin*, BAR S155, Oxford 1983; R. Osborne, *Classical Landscape with Figures: the Ancient Greek City and Its Countryside*, London 1987; T. H. van Andel and C. Runnels, *Beyond the Acropolis: a Greek Rural Past*, Stanford 1987; A. Snodgrass, Survey Archaeology and the Rural Landscape of the Greek City, in O. Murray and S. Price, eds., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, pp. 113–136; G. Shipley and J. Salmon, eds., *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity: Environment and Culture*, London and New York 1996.

⁴ Pečirka (note 3), pp. 113–147, with pp. 133–137 for Attica.

⁵ Osborne (note 1), pp. 15–46, with p. 41 for the point that “The whole working of Athenian democracy demanded that the demes continued to be communities, and without modern means of communication that was effectively a demand that people continued to dwell together in villages.”

the position by denying a residential function to buildings situated on agricultural lands, although, where Attica is concerned, “epigraphy” turned out to mean exclusively the leases.⁶ Since 1985, the opposing claims of farmstead (or “homestead”) residence have been reasserted but, despite Osborne’s lead, with a conspicuous inattention to the evidence of inscriptions. To Osborne’s book (but only incidentally the article), Merle Langdon launched a response with his succinct essay “On the Farm in Classical Attica”, yet, despite the evidentiary breadth of the inquiry, with only scant reference to the epigraphic texts.⁷ Victor Hanson’s *The Other Greeks* has emphatically upheld the notion of the owner-occupied permanent farmstead both in Attica and elsewhere in Greece, but his discussion, too, reveals little awareness of the potential relevance of inscriptions.⁸ As a result, as things stand now, Osborne’s interpretation of the Attic leases has gone unopposed, and no scholar, in support of any position, has brought into the debate what will here prove highly relevant additional bodies of epigraphic evidence – viz. the *poletai* records, the *rationes centesimarum*, and the security horoi. My purpose is to carry out such an investigation and, in the course of doing so, to strengthen the case in favor of farmstead residence in Attica.

Two preliminary matters. Since, first, we are dealing with written texts, it is obvious that terminology will play an important role. A review of words for real property was long ago carried out by W. Kendrick Pritchett in his study of the Attic Stelai.⁹ More recently, Osborne’s lexical analysis confines itself to words that might be appropriate for the description of an isolated farm, but whatever merit his comments upon individual terms for land and buildings may possess, his general conclusion must be rejected. “That, by contrast, it [the classical Attic vocabulary] has no term at all for the unit of a land with a house from which the land is worked must surely be indicative of the absence of such a unit from the countryside of Attika. Land does occur with a house associated, but this always seems to be seen as land and a house and not as a single unit, let alone as a ‘farm’.”¹⁰ Already, Langdon, who took up passage by passage Osborne’s analysis of the literary record, has challenged the textual basis for so drastic a conclusion.¹¹ More generally, it may be objected that Osborne’s position rests on a confusion between meaning and reference. Because Greek lacks a single word that *means* “farm” (that is, agricultural land with on-site residence), it is implicitly concluded that no other single Greek word or phrase could *refer* to such an entity. The speaker in Demosthenes’ third speech *Against Aphobos*, 29.3, calls an agricultural property with an *oikia* and slaves an *agros* (“field”), and in the later first speech *Against Onetor*, this same property is called a *chorion* (“plot”) at 30.29 and 31. The reference is to a farm, although neither *agros* nor *chorion* itself contains any notion of residence. The Athenian reality is composite, with each component separately termed and denoted both in literary narratives and in legal or documentary texts. Even though it is true that Greek lacks a specific term for “farm”, this is no reason for doubting the *existence* of the thing itself.

The second matter concerns our expectations. Sources of various types, including our inscriptions, frequently mention a plot (whether denoted by *chorion* or some other term) without revealing any hint of the existence of a structure, residential or otherwise, sitting on that plot. Does this mean that, in these cases at least, the owner or other persons involved with the working of the plot necessarily resided elsewhere? To respond in the affirmative would be to overlook a fundamental feature of Athenian (and presumably generally Greek) land tenure: its tendency over time towards fragmentation, especially as the result of the workings of inheritance. Scholars acknowledge the dispersed character of Attic

⁶ *ABSA* 80 (1985) 119–128. The Athenian material, including the leases, is discussed at pp. 122–123, 124–125, and 127.

⁷ Langdon (note 2), pp. 209–213. Security horoi are briefly mentioned at p. 211, note 7.

⁸ V. D. Hanson, *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization*, New York 1995, pp. 47–89, especially 51–60.

⁹ The Attic Stelai, Part II, *Hesperia* 25 (1956) 178–317, at pp. 261–276, V. Real Property.

¹⁰ Osborne (note 1), p. 21.

¹¹ Langdon (note 2), pp. 209–211.

estates,¹² but here it needs to be emphasized that such an estate might consist of a single *chorion* with a house possibly occupied by the owner and of one or more others lacking a residential structure or at least one deserving of the appellation “primary residence”. At any time, a given source may refer to one of the latter, houseless plots. Thus the question, as we shall see, is not so much whether a given plot had a “house” or not as whether, if such a “house” is attested, that “house” served a residential or some other, non-residential purpose.

Poletai Records

The surviving records of public sales conducted by the *poletai*, collected and reedited in 1991 by Merle Langdon in *Agora XIX*, contain abundant references to landed property and to various kinds of structures. Most of the items at issue are confiscated properties put up for public auction, but a few figure in mining leases as well. Land goes by the generic *chorion*, although occasional mention is also found of *charadra*, *edaphos*, *eschatia*, *kepos*, *oikopedon*, and *pagos*. Structures, besides the common *oikia*, include its diminutive *oikidion*, *kaminos*, *klision*, *pyrgos*, and *synoikia*. Pairings of terms for land and structure, provided the surrounding text has been preserved, might in sufficient quantity tell us something about the existence or non-existence of “farms”, but the fact that they – especially *chorion* and *oikia* – frequently occur in badly damaged contexts often leaves the matter open. Nonetheless, a half dozen or so inscriptions preserve some promising candidates:

P2 (402/1), sale of confiscated properties. At e 10–11 Langdon prints οἰκίαν ...7.... καὶ / κῆπον without proposing a restoration of the missing text, but the presence of the “garden” suggests a farm as one possibility. Elsewhere on the stelai an *oikia* or *oikiai* are situated with reference to neighboring properties (a, b, c 7 [plural] and 14; d [2], 9–10 [Salamis], and 16), but there is admittedly no reason to suspect that such properties, including that on which the *oikia(i)* in question stood, were farm land.

cf. P4 (370/69), sale of confiscated properties. An estate located on Lemnos comprised χωρίου ἐν Ὀμφαλαίαι [ἐν ᾧ ἀμπ|/έλοισ ὄρχοι [καὶ συστάς καὶ ἀβλή καὶ ἐσχατ[ία] (8–9). No trace of a residence here, although *oikiai* do appear elsewhere on the stele (41, 48).

P5 (367/6), sale of confiscated properties and mining leases. A farm may lie concealed in the *pyrgos* and *oikia* localizing a concession at lines 74–75, if the “tower” served some agricultural purpose¹³ and if it and the “house” were situated on arable, but mention of a *chorion* is lacking.

P9 (paullo ante med. saec. IV), mining leases. A reopened *metallon* is situated in fragmentary context with relation to a conjoined *chorion* and *oikia* in lines 18–19, 20–21.

P17 (350/49), sale of confiscated properties. Registered properties include an οἰκίαν καὶ χωρί|οισ|ν καὶ [κ]λισίον in Melite (20–21). Because the terms are accompanied by a single localization (from line 21), it is clear that a unified ensemble is in question. The fact that *two* structures are conjoined with the land opens up the possibility that one, the *oikia*, is residential in function, while the other, a “lean-to” or “shed”, satisfied any agricultural needs,¹⁴ although, in line with Osborne’s analysis, it remains arguable that neither was meant for human occupancy.

P26 (342/1–339/8), sale of confiscated properties and mining leases. On Face B, col. III, the fragmentary line 368 is restored to record the registration of a χωρίου καὶ οἰκίαν in Hagnous.

P29 (340/39), mining leases. At lines 11–12, Langdon prints τὰ χωρία τὰ [...9.... κ]/αὶ ἡ οἰκία marking the eastern boundary of a *metallon*.

¹² See, for example, Allison Burford, *Land and Labor in the Greek World*, Baltimore and London 1993, pp. 56, 68, 119.

¹³ On the towers of southern Attica, their agricultural or other functions, and possible place on an isolated farm, see Osborne (note 1), pp. 31–34. J. Young, *Studies in South Attica. Country Estates at Sounion*, *Hesperia* 25 (1956) 122–146, had associated the towers with “agricultural estates”, a conclusion opposed by Osborne.

¹⁴ For the agricultural function of the *klision*, see Osborne’s discussion (note 6, p. 122) opposing Kent’s view, worked out in his study of the temple estates of Delos, Rheneia, and Mykonos, that the term denotes a “farmhouse”.

While a “farm” might fit almost any of these contexts, it must be conceded that the residence-on-the-land model is not absolutely required by any of them, for, as a consequence of Osborne’s work, it is clear that we cannot merely assume a residential function for the *oikia* appearing in each of the Attic examples. Nonetheless, since these estates were presumably all private properties, the possibility that the *oikia* was occupied by owner or laborer obviously cannot be excluded.

Rationes Centesimarum

The accounts inscribed in the second half of the fourth century recording a one percent tax (*hekatostê*) on the proceeds of land sales in Attica, now reedited with commentary by Lambert, preserve 144 separate items distributed over 16 fragments.¹⁵ Given so large a number of properties, particular significance might be ascribed to any discernible pattern regarding the presence or absence of structures associated with the parcels. As it happens, in only eight instances is the mention of a structure preserved or restored, invariably in the form of the phrase χωρίου καὶ οἰκία(ν): nos. 12 (F4, lines 1–3), 13 (F4, lines 4–7), 14 (F4, lines 8–10), 15 (F4, lines 11–13), 16 (F4, lines 14–17), 34 (F6B, lines 27–31), 60 (F10A, lines 10–12), and 99 (F8B, lines 41–43).¹⁶ In six of the eight cases, the location of the property is preserved or conjectured: Prasiai (12?, 13, 14), Prasiai or Paiania? (15), Paiania (16), and Rhamnous (99) – all demes in which the practice of agriculture is hardly to be doubted. (The sellers and the buyer in no. 34 are Sphettians; the sellers are the Thorikioi (?), one buyer a Skambonides in no. 60, but the property itself may of course in both cases be situated in still another, unnamed deme). Since in no instance is there reason to regard land and structure as distinct properties, eight *prima facie* cases for “farms” are thus at hand.¹⁷ Additionally, the restored conjunction at Pallene of [χωρίου καὶ κ?]ῆπος in no. 124 (F13B, lines 2–4) unambiguously indicates some kind of agricultural activity, albeit in this instance in the absence of a structure.¹⁸

At the same time, while in every instance the buyers are individual Athenians, the sellers are all Athenian *corporate groups* of varying description, “territorial” (stelai 1–2) or “non-territorial” (stelai 3–4).¹⁹ Ownership by a group may make problematic the notion of “farm”, although residence on the land by any member of that group, tenant, bailiff and slaves, etc. will be sufficient to distinguish the arrangement from the nucleated settlement model. Against my thesis, it is also entirely possible, as Lambert suggests, that the *oikia*, in line with the property’s corporate ownership, was a meeting or club house of some kind,²⁰ but I find it unlikely that the group in question would be willing to divest itself of a structure so obviously vital to its functioning.

At all events, how do we explain the very large percentage of *choria* lacking an *oikia* or structure of any description? Several texts record the sale of *eschatiai*, understood by Lambert as outlying land in

¹⁵ S. D. Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum. Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens*, Amsterdam 1997. Earlier, the stelai had been studied, but without attention to our questions, by D. M. Lewis, *The Athenian Rationes Centesimarum*, in M. I. Finley, ed., *Problème de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 1973, pp. 187–212. For Lambert’s item and fragment numbers, see the Table of Sales, pp. 113–147.

¹⁶ For the sale of a *chorion* with an *oikopedon* in [Thymai]tadai, see no. 79, F9B, lines 9–14, with p. 227, where Lambert suggests that the latter term denotes “a block or set of housing, a partially constructed house or, perhaps more likely, a partially ruined or abandoned one”.

¹⁷ So Lambert (note 15), p. 226: “In most of these cases it seems likely that what was sold was a “farm”, i.e. a piece of agricultural land with associated house, or possibly other farm structure.”

¹⁸ On the “garden”, see Lambert (note 15), p. 227, and below in connection with the leases.

¹⁹ Lambert (note 15), p. 1, with chapter 6 (pp. 183–206) for the selling groups and chapter 5 (pp. 149–182) for the officials of the selling groups and the buyers.

²⁰ Lambert (note 15), pp. 226–227. At the same time, as he notes, one would not expect a group to own multiple houses of this sort in the same place, as the hypothesis would seem to require in the case of F4, wherein five *chorion*-and-*oikia* ensembles are preserved.

hilly areas, at least in some cases agriculturally marginal.²¹ Moreover, certain descriptive words or phrases occasionally attached not only to *eschatai* but to several of the *choria* as well are in agreement with this characterization.²² Residence on such lands is unlikely, and for this reason, in combination with the fact of corporate rather than individual ownership, we can, I suggest, explain the general absence of an *oikia* with many of the recorded *choria*. That is to say, we are not driven by these silences to endorse the model of absentee residence by owner or laborer in a neighboring nucleated settlement.²³

Leases

The leasing of land with or without residential or other structures by private individuals is scarcely found in the epigraphic record of classical Athens.²⁴ Rather, in nearly all the examples that have come down to us, the leasing party is a corporate body – the Athenian state; or one of its segmentary divisions, a deme or phyle; or a cultic association such as one of the several groups of *orgeones* organized around a god or hero. Examination of these texts, conveniently collected in D. Behrend's *Attische Pachturkunden*, Vestigia 12, München 1970, now joined by Michael Walbank's edition of leases of public lands from the Athenian Agora (*Agora XIX*, L1–16, LA 1–8),²⁵ reveals the not-infrequent occurrence of the leasing of a *chorion* in isolation and, to the point here, of a *chorion* with an *oikia* and/or other structure. Again, the question is whether, given the presence on the land of a structure, the lessee will occupy it during some or all of the period of the lease. Osborne maintains that the texts show that the *oikia* (the one consistently used term for a structure in the Attic leases) was merely agricultural in function or, at the minimum, at least not necessarily residential.²⁶ But the case is not, as we shall now see, a compelling one.

1) Lease of the demesmen of Rhamnous, *IG II²* 2493, 339/8. This *chorion* (6–7, [25]), the *temenos* of the goddess in *Hermeus (4–5), had previously been farmed (5–6) and, according to the terms of the present lease, will be farmed again by the lessee in conformity with elaborate guidelines (7–31). Michael Jameson reported that the full text in line 21–22, with the addition of recent finds from Rhamnous to the *IG* text from Sounion, runs: οἰκήσει [τ]ὴν οἰκίαν ὁ μισθωσάμενος τὴν ἐπὶ / τῶν τεμένει τούτῳ ...²⁷ Given the rigorous requirements regarding the use of the land imposed upon the lessee, that an *oikia* should stand upon it and that he should be obligated to reside in it should not come as a surprise. But residence must be contractually stipulated because, it may be suggested, the leasing party is not the owner and may lack the incentive to uphold the agricultural stipulations of the lease, to guard against any depredation of the *chorion* and its infrastructure, and so on. If, as Jameson suggests,²⁸ the arrangement was really a quasi-liturgy, with the lessee making a *pro bono* contribution to the deme-association, such a lack of incentive would be particularly easy to comprehend. *These* are the unusual conditions, then, that make for the exceptional insertion of the clause requiring residence. What this text

²¹ Lambert (note 15), pp. 228–229. On the meaning of *eschatia*, see Lewis (note 15) pp. 210–212.

²² Lambert (note 15), pp. 228–229.

²³ Thus I find entirely unnecessary Lambert's mention in this connection of nucleated settlements (note 15, p. 242): "It was fairly common in Attica, albeit by no means universal, for agricultural holdings to lie around and [be] accessible, but separate, from nucleated settlements; ..."

²⁴ For the few examples, see D. Behrend, *Attische Pachturkunden*, München 1970, pp. 50–55, nos. 1–4.

²⁵ *Agora XIX*, pp. 170–207 (Agora texts). In his Preface, Walbank promises a new corpus of "all Athenian documents relating to the leasing of publicly owned real property" (p. 147).

²⁶ Osborne (note 6), pp. 122–123, 124–125.

²⁷ Apud Osborne (note 6), p. 123.

²⁸ The Leasing of Land in Rhamnous, in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*, *Hesperia* Supplement 19, Princeton 1982, pp. 66–74: 71–74.

does not show is that such residence was *of itself* exceptional, as Osborne, arguing from his interpretation of the lease from Prasiai (no. 9, below), maintains.²⁹

2) Law of the citizen *orgeones* of Bendis, *IG IP* 1361, post med. s. IV. This *nomos* (13) contains regulations for the use of the *hieron* with its *oikia* and, although no mention is made of land or farming, the explicit acknowledgment of residence by the renter is of interest. “In order that the *oikia* and the *hieron* be repaired, to spend the house-rent (τὸ ἐν[οίκιον τῆς οἰκίας, 9) and the money raised from the sale of water on the repair of the *hieron* and *oikia* and for no other purpose, until the *hieron* and the *oikia* are repaired” (8–11) ... “and to leave water for the party in residence (τῶι ἐνοικοῦντι) to use” (12). Such language hardly leaves any doubt on the point of the renter’s occupancy of the *oikia*. Furthermore, if the occupant needs water on-site and if the sale of such water (to him) is of a magnitude to contribute significantly to the maintenance of the sanctuary, such occupancy will have been continuous, very possibly for the entire duration of the rental.

3) Mediation of dispute between Salaminioi from Sounion and Salaminioi of Heptaphylai, W. S. Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 9–12, 69–74, no. 2; H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 75–76; *Agora* XIX, L4b, ca. 250. The settlement concerns the disposition of the *temenos* of Herakles once “the altars and what lies beyond the railing as far as the first olive trees” have been set aside for sacred uses (8–11). Generally speaking, the plan is to divide the non-sacred properties, each *genos* receiving *choria* and an *oikia* but with certain elements to be held in common. The Sounians are to construct a new threshing floor “in the common *temenos*” of the same size as their own, which is to belong to the men of Heptaphylai; two *oikiai* are allocated, one abutting the *temenos* to the men of Heptaphylai, another one on the east to the Sounians; gardens and “half” the well are to belong to each *genos* (18–36). “The Hale and the agora in Koile are to be common to both *genê*” (36–38). Two sets of *choria*, one to the east, one to the west, will be assigned to the two associations, corresponding to the location of their respective *oikiai* (38–43), with “the sacred earth” to be in the custody of the men of Heptaphylai (43–44). These *choria* were, as Ferguson explained, in accordance with the terms of the first inscription, pledged for the maintenance of the sacrifices offered by the Salaminioi from their own funds.³⁰ Although no direct indication is forthcoming regarding occupancy, the conjunction of house, gardens, and well on the land open up the possibility of ongoing residence on the land while under lease. According to Burford, Greek *kepoi* served “to produce the vegetables, edible herbs, and other plants useful to the household”.³¹ As for the well, a law of Solon allowed a person who had not found water on his own land “to take from his neighbor, filling a six-*chous hydria* twice each day”³² – the equivalent of a single *metretes* or *amphoreus*. The very small quantity suggests that at least some wells in Attica were intended only to supply a residential household (and perhaps its “kitchen” *kepos*). Alternatively, of course, the *kepos* might have been a more substantial income-earning plot, with the well providing irrigation,³³ possibly in the absence of a household residing on the land

The remaining texts, save number 7), constitute the basis on which Osborne mounts his case that buildings that might be referred to as *oikiai* “were not primarily residences but centres of agricultural activity”, with number 9), which I reserve for last, providing what is for Osborne the clinching evidence.³⁴ Thus the several clauses in the following inscriptions calling for the maintenance, or allowing for the construction, of structures on the land are interpreted as referring to such an agricultural

²⁹ Osborne (note 6), pp. 124–125.

³⁰ See the editor’s commentary, p. 72.

³¹ Burford (note 12), pp. 135–137, with p. 135 for the quotation. Earlier, the garden had been the subject of Maureen Carroll-Spilleke’s *Kepos: der antike griechische Garten*, Wohnen in der klassischen Polis, III, München 1989.

³² Plutarch, *Solon* 23.6 (= E. Ruschenbusch, ΣΩΛΟΝΣ ΝΟΜΟΙ, *Historia Einzelschriften* Heft 9, Wiesbaden 1966, F 63 [55]).

³³ A case for more extensive “artificial watering” is made by Hanson (note 8), pp. 60–63.

³⁴ Osborne (note 6), pp. 124–125.

purpose. Here, however, it will be suggested that the structures are maintained or constructed precisely in order to enhance the property as a place of residence by the leasing party or his representative(s).

4) Lease of the *orgeones* of the Hero, H. W. Pleket, *Epigraphica* I (1964) 63, no. 43 (*SEG* 24.203), 333/2. Charops of Phaleron and the *orgeones* of the Hero lease τὸν [κῆπ]ον to Thrasyboulos of Alopeke at 20 drachmas each year for 30 years (1–11). Thrasyboulos may, if he wishes, build at his own expense “in the *chorion* outside the drain” (11–16). “When the time of the lease runs out, Thrasyboulos is to leave (ἀπιέναι, 18), taking the tiles and the woodwork and the doors”,³⁵ unless the lessors persuade him otherwise (16–23). We are not told what is to be built by Thrasyboulos (if he so wishes) nor whether the tiles, woodwork, and doors belong to such new construction and/or to some already existing structure. But the inference that he will reside on the property is suggested by the verb ἀπιέναι, a very relevant article of evidence not noted by Osborne in his discussion of this text. Sometimes the sense is taken abstractly in the sense of “quitting”, that is surrendering of the lease, but nothing in the present context rules out the literal, and therefore in the absence of contrary indications preferable, interpretation.

5) Lease of the demesmen of Peiraeus, *IG* II² 2498, 321/0. The terms set out regarding the leasing of the deme’s *temenê* (3) touch on the removal of mud and earth (9–11) and the cutting of timber (11); the land (*chorion*, 11) under lease includes pasturage ((τ)/ἄλλα ἐννόμια, 12–13); ploughing may proceed continuously for the first nine of the ten years, only half to be ploughed in the tenth; and a crop will be produced (17–22). At the close of the preserved text, the lessee of Halmyris is instructed, having received the *oikia* watertight (στέγουσαν) and with walls standing upright (ὀρθῆν), to turn it over in the same condition (22–24). It may be suggested that the object of this last clause is to ensure that the *oikia*, having already served as the residence of the current lessee, be ready for occupancy by his successor.

6) Lease of the *orgeones* of Egretes, *IG* II² 2499, 306/5. The *orgeones* call for the lessee “to use the *hieron* and the *oikiai* built upon it as (a) *hieron*” (5–7). The lessee Diognetos will whitewash any of the walls (house walls, *toichoi*) in need of it and will build, furnish, and so forth when he wishes (7–11). He is not to remove any of the trees upon pain of replacement in equal number (14–18). When he leaves (ἀπεισιν, 12), he will take the woodwork, tiles, and doors, disturbing nothing else (11–14). Failure to comply will result in his surrendering the woodwork, etc. and in the loss of the lease (30–37). But why does the text read “when he leaves” (rather than, say, παραδώσει [“turns over”] or ἀποδώσει [“returns”]), unless he is actually to occupy one or more of the *oikiai*? Similarly, the clause calling for Diognetos, when the *orgeones* sacrifice to the hero in Boedromion, “to present the house where the *hieron* is located, opened and roofed (στέγην), the kitchen, couches, and tables for two *triklinia*” (24–30) suggests two things: that the house was suitably equipped for continuous residence and that the lessee, while maintaining such continuous residence, is being required to vacate the premises on this single special occasion. Analogously, as with text 4), the “quitting” by the lessee (ἀπεισιν, 12) should refer to his literal departure from the property.

7) Lease by the *orgeones* of Hypodektes, *IG* II² 2501, fin. s. IV. The *hieron* (1, 4, et al.) or *temenos* (4, 15, 19), like the foregoing, boasts an *oikia* (11, in fragmentary context), and, also as in the foregoing, the lessee is to make the shrine available on a single, named festival day (6–9). No reference is made to land or farming.

8) Decree of phratry Dyaleis leasing land, *IG* II² 1241, 300/299. The *chorion* called Sakinê (8–9) incorporates an *oikia*, regarding which the lease contains specific instructions: the lessee is to keep it in good repair (17–18) and he is to refrain from taking it, or any part of it, down (32–33, 40–41). Did the lessee Diodoros reside in this *oikia*? Two clues suggest that he might well have. For one, he is a Myrrhinousian (as are the two named lessors, 5–7, 12–13) and the *chorion* is located at Myrrhinous (2, 4–5) (the find spot of the stone, too, being “In vico Merenda”, *IG* loc. cit.), so at least we know that he is probably not managing the property from a distance. For another, the lease requires that Diodoros cultivate the vines twice “in all seasons”; that he sow half the plot with grain, planting as much as he

³⁵ The Greek, as often, inverts the expected relationship between main verb and participles.

wishes of the fallow half with pulse; and that he tend to the fruit trees (19–25). Given such an evident ongoing need for presence on the site, residence in the *oikia* would obviously be advantageous, although he admittedly could have worked out of an existing residence in the deme, not to mention the fact that here, as elsewhere, we have no way of identifying the person or persons who will actually carry out the agricultural tasks.

9) Lease of the demesmen of Prasiai, E. Vanderpool, J. R. McCredie, and A. Steinberg, *Hesperia* 31 (1962) 54–56, no. 138 (*SEG* 21.644), ca. 350–300. A *chorion* (1–2, 7) that will produce a crop (13–16), the property comes with a number of specific items detailed from line 16 to the fragmentary end of the text. Since Osborne’s case rests in large part on these closing lines and because I believe that he has misinterpreted them, I reproduce the text of the original edition:

[σκε]ύη δὲ ὅσα ἐ-
 στὶν τοῦ δήμου ἐν τῇ οἰκίαι πα-
 ραδιδόασιν [[Π[ο]λλυσ[σθέ]νει]], φιδά-
 κνας ἀμφορέων χόνδην : ΠΔΔΔ : χάρ-
 20 ακας : XXXX : οἴκημα τὸ μ[... 7 ... ἦ]-
 ρειμμένον δοκοί : ΠΙ[... 9 ...]
 [.]τες οἰκήματος εχ[..... 10]
 [.]μμένον καὶ τὸ κ[..... 11]
 [.]νος ἔχει τουτ[..... 13]
 25 [.] : ΙΙΙΙ : καὶ ἐπ[..... 14]
 [..]στος καὶ [..... 15]
 [..]ιστ[..... 17]
 [.. 5 ..][..... 19]

Osborne asks us to believe that these lines establish the point that a structure termed *oikia* might have a non-residential function. If this were true, then the meaning of the word *oikia* in all the many inscriptions (and other texts) under review here would potentially be affected and the case for farmstead residence that I am urging would be severely compromised. However, the alleged agricultural function of the *oikia* in line 17 depends upon Osborne’s unargued assumption that to the phrase “all the pieces of equipment that belong to the deme in the *oikia*” stand in apposition the “eighty *phidaknai*” (i.e. “small pithoi”³⁶) of amphorae “in the ground”³⁷ and “4,000 stakes” in lines 18–20, implying that the implements were housed inside. Such a use of the structure for storage, he believes, is inconsistent with the notion of residence. But the practice of modern Greek farmers illustrates how agricultural and residential functions might be combined under a single roof;³⁸ and even in the absence of the modern parallels, no ancient evidence precludes, or even makes unlikely, such an arrangement. Alternatively, it may be further suggested that the amphorae “in the ground” and the stakes do *not* stand in apposition to *skeuê* and so were not inside, but outside, the building. “All the *skeuê*” (16) would then be a self-contained, all-inclusive phrase designed to capture any and all articles happening to be in the *oikia* at the time, without unnecessarily specifying particular items in detail. But the amphorae and stakes, if located outside the *oikia* (and the *oikemata*), would accordingly need to receive specific mention in the lease, as in fact they do. Finally, if the *oikia* is in whole or part residential in function, the two *oikemata* might be candidates for non-residential uses, although the first mentioned seems to be dilapidated (20–21).

³⁶ Φιδάκη is the Attic for πιθάκη (*LSJ*⁹ s.v) and the diminutive of πίθος (see the scholiast on Aristophanes, *Equites*, line 792).

³⁷ For the derivation of the *hapax legomenon* χόνδην from χόω, giving the sense “buried or sunk in the ground”, see the editors’ commentary, op. cit., p. 56. Alternatively, *LSJ*⁹ Supplement, s.v., refers the word to χανδάνω, giving the sense “in capacity”.

³⁸ See, for example, the descriptions of rural homes by E. Friedl, *Vasilika: a Village in Modern Greece*, New York 1962, pp. 39–42 and J. du Boulay, *Portrait of a Greek Mountain Village*, Oxford 1974, pp. 15–40.

Since Osborne's case comes down to his reading of this lease, which we have now called into question, there is no longer any good reason to believe that at Athens an *oikia* in agricultural contexts was ever anything other than what it is in other contexts – a residential house (albeit one that could simultaneously be used for storage of agricultural implements).³⁹ Besides, scrutiny of the very inscriptions reviewed by Osborne has revealed several additional signs of occupancy of *oikia* on leased *choria*. Two texts (nos. 4 and 6) speak of the lessee as “leaving” the property at the expiry of the lease period. Two texts (nos. 6 and 7) call for the evacuation of the premises by the lessee on a single occasion, suggesting that those premises were otherwise continuously occupied. Two texts (nos. 1 and 8) require the performance of agricultural tasks of such magnitude as to imply clear advantages to ongoing presence on the site through all or much of the year. One text (no. 3, cf. no. 2) reveals the presence alongside the house of a garden and well, thereby opening up the possibility of on-site occupancy.

The import of these findings, however, remains conditioned by the peculiar prosopographical content of the documents on which those findings are based. Some evidence is at hand from Delos that the parties entering into lease agreements with corporate bodies were relatively prosperous.⁴⁰ At Rhamnous, among the lessees are individuals who, as Jameson has attractively suggested, are probably performing a virtual liturgy on behalf of their deme-association by assuming the burden of terms of lease not necessarily attractive from a strictly business standpoint;⁴¹ and at least one other appears among Davies' register of the liturgical class.⁴² Given a wealthy lessee, it is less likely that he would personally need or choose to establish residence on leased land, even in those cases where we can be sure that it was equipped with a residential *oikia*. Such a man probably already had a permanent residence. Why should he relocate to a lease-holding for the limited period of the lease's duration? Besides, wealthy men do not do agricultural work themselves; they assign it to others and periodically pay visits to monitor their progress. Hence, again, the unusual requirement that the presumably prosperous Rhamnousian lessee reside in the *oikia* on the *temenos*-plot he will be farming. Probably more often, however, the occupants of the *oikia* on properties such as those just reviewed will have been a bailiff (*epitropos*), tenants (whether citizen or metic), hired hands, or slaves.

At the same time, it would be wrong to eliminate the possibility of a middling lessee who views the rental of land as a money-making venture and who reduces overhead expenses by residing on the land that he is renting and working himself. Such a possibility is consistent with the fact that three, possibly four, of the identifiable lessees in our documents do not appear among Davies' register of the liturgical class⁴³ and is further encouraged by the at least one case where the amount of the yearly rental payment was particularly low.⁴⁴ What remains in doubt is whether any of this holds for *owners* of farming land in Attica. For that, we now turn to our final class of documents, the security horoi.

³⁹ See Pritchett (note 9), p. 265, where it is stated that in legal contexts an *oikia* is a “private residence” and that, with citation of Finley, on the horoi it has the meaning “personal residence”.

⁴⁰ Osborne observes (note 6, p. 125) that the individuals who lease temple estates on Hellenistic Delos are “men of high status who are also active in a number of other fields at the same time”.

⁴¹ Thus one Hierokles, lessee in no. 1, is identified as “a man of substance” by Jameson (note 28, p. 71).

⁴² If the restoration of the name of the lessee of no. 7 as Diopieithes, son of Diopieithes, of Sphettos is correct, he will have been *APF* 4328, p. 160.

⁴³ The assured examples are Thrasyboulos of Alopeke in no. 4; Diognetos, son of Arkesilos, of Melite in no. 6; Diodoros, son of Kantharos, of Myrrhinous in no. 8. If the lessee in the lease from Prasiai (no. 9), Polysthenes, was himself a demesman of Prasiai, then he too is certifiably absent from the register.

⁴⁴ Such as, for instance, the payment of 20 drachmas each year for 30 years in *SEG* 24.203, lines 6–9 (no. 4, above). In no. 6, the rent, payable in two installments, totaled 200 drachmas per year (lines 18–24); in no. 7, 50 drachmas per year due in a single payment (lines 4–6); in no. 8, 600 drachmas per year (lines 13–14)

Security Horoi

A large percentage of the inscribed markers called horoi stood upon properties encumbered as security for debts. Typically, an intact text identifies itself as a horos, specifies the property or properties in question (often with the appended phrase “sold for redemption”), names the creditor(s), and closes with the amount of the debt expressed in drachmas. The horos was presumably erected on the mortgaged property itself (thereby making unnecessary the naming of the debtor, who continued to reside on the land, in the house, etc. and so was known to all) and served to inform other prospective lenders of the property’s encumbered status. By my count, 266 different security horoi have thus far been published in various collections, as follows: John Fine’s *Horoi* (*Hesperia* Supplement 9, Princeton 1951), ch. 1, New Horos Mortgage Stones from the Athenian Agora, pp. 1–27; ch. 2, Previously Published Mortgage Stones, pp. 28–40; Moses Finley’s *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C.* (New Brunswick 1951, revised 1985), Appendix I, The Texts of the Horoi, pp. 118–176, nos. 1–180; Appendix III, New Horoi from the Agora, pp. 182–193; Paul Millett’s second appendix to the 1985 revision of Finley, The Texts of the New Horoi and Accompanying Statistical Tables, pp. xxii–xxxiii; Gerald V. Lalonde’s contribution to *Agora XIX, Inscriptions: Horoi, Security Horoi*, pp. 37–51, nos. H73–H130, of which three, H112, 119, and 130, were previously unpublished; and thirteen new texts reported in the pages of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* since the closing of Millett’s appendix to Finley. Because Finley’s catalogue of texts incorporates all of Fine’s then-new texts from the Agora and Millett’s appendix adds the more recently published examples in the 1985 revision of this same work, with the consecutive numbering having been preserved by inserting the new texts at the appropriate place with the addition of an “A”, “B”, etc. (e.g. 92A, 146B), it will be convenient to refer to these texts by Finley’s numbers. The more recently published examples will be cited by reference to *Agora XIX* and to *SEG* through volume 45 for the year 1995.

The security horoi are overwhelmingly Athenian, only 25 texts thus far published from outside Attica, namely the islands Amorgos (nos. 8, 9, 102, 130, 154, 155, 172, 173), Lemnos (nos. 10, 103–110, 115, 190A), Naxos (nos. 131, 156, 165), Skyros (no. 111), Syros (nos. 179, 180). Among the Athenian examples, 41 are too fragmentary with respect to the identification of the property originally named on the stone to play a part in my analysis: nos. 3A, 31A–B, 37, 39, 93–95, 95A–B, 96–100, 101A–C, 127, 129A, 157, 160A, 164, 164A–C, 166–171, 171A–F, 178B, *Agora XIX* H119 and 130. One intact text does not identify the encumbered property (no. 129). One text included by Finley (no. 101C) has been re-identified by Charles Hedrick as marking a shrine.⁴⁵ Twelve texts name properties not visibly associated with arable lands or potential residential structures located on them: *ergasterion/a* (nos. 7, 91, *Agora XIX* H112), *ergasterion/a* with *andrapoda* (nos. 88–90; 166A; *SEG* 32.236 = 40.175 = 42.146), *kaminos* and *edaphoi* (no. 92), *ke[pos]* and *andrapod[a]* (no. 178), *mylon* (*SEG* 35.136 = 39.199), and *synoikia* (no. 171F).⁴⁶ The remaining 186 texts, the subject of our study, record, broadly speaking, the hypothecation of either land (always denoted by the Greek word *chorion*) or a building (almost always *oikia*) or a combination of the two. The three major groupings break down as follows: *chorion* without a structure (66 examples), *oikia* (or *oikema*, *oikemation*) with or without other properties but without land (62 examples), and *chorion* and *oikia* with or without additional properties (58 examples). Given the generally accepted meanings of these Greek terms, we have in this record *prima facie* indications of the interrelationships of land and domicile, with the final category at first blush comprising farms in the familiar sense of land with on-site residence. But in order to shed greater light on settlement patterns, we will need, first, to tabulate the varying incidence of land or building or

⁴⁵ The Thymaitian Phratry, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 81–85, no. 1 (reproduced by Lalonde in *Agora XIX* as an addendum, H131).

⁴⁶ Not included here is no. 90A, which names an *ergasterion* in conjunction with a *chorion* and therefore belongs in the major category of encumbered lands (below).

the two in combination with respect to topography, specifically on the point of intramural urban versus extramural rural locales.⁴⁷ In the end, it will be the results of the latter installment of our project, the clear patterning of the properties named in the horoi in relation to town and country, that will yield a conclusion firmly in favor of the model of farmstead residence. (Throughout the following tabulation, assignment of a stone with a recorded provenience to an Attic deme is based on John Traill's most recent table of assignments of demes to sites,⁴⁸ and all extramural Attic place names may be assumed to be demes unless otherwise specified).

Land (chorion) without a residential structure

This category comprises all horoi marking land but without the addition of a structure that might normally be taken to have served as a residence.

urban Athens (25): 2 *ad Ilissum*, 43 Parthenon, 48 Agora, 53 Agora, 54 Athens, 55 Peiraeus, 58 Peiraeus, 60 Acropolis, 60A Agora, 66 Kerameikos, 66B–D Agora, 82B Agora, 90A Athens, 114B Agora, 122 southeast Athens, 123 north of Parthenon, 126A–C Agora, 141A Agora, 144 Munychia, 158 Athens, 175B Agora.

extra-urban Attica (26): 3 Acharnai, 40 Eleusis, 42 Dekeleia, 49 Mt. Hymettos, 51 Hagnous, 52 Pelekes, 56 Erchia, 57 Eleusis, 61 Sounion, 65 Acharnai, 82A Marathon, 112 Teithras, 121 Mesogaia region, 125 Eleusis, 126 Eleusis, 126D Erchia, 126E Eleusis, 141 Anaphlystos,⁴⁹ 142 Kephale, 145 Phlya, 146 between Athmonon and Phlya, 146B Myrrhinous, 163 Hagnous, *SEG* 39.200 modern Ano Voula, *SEG* 39.201 Marathon, *SEG* 43.56 Rhamnous.

no recorded provenience (15): 41, 44–47, 50, 59, 62–64, 124, 160, 174, 177, *SEG* 45.164.

From the nearly even distribution between town and country one might be tempted to infer that the hypothecation of *choria* was not significantly related to gross variations in urban or rural topography. But the actual situation may be more complex than at first meets the eye, for in none of the urban examples, including all the recently edited (or re-edited) examples from the Agora, can we be sure of the original location of the monument and hence of the *chorion* (or *choria*) in question. Self-evidently, private individuals did not own real property in the Agora, on the Acropolis, or in the Kerameikos. But from what quarters did these stones wander? Probably from no great distance, to judge from a handy (and relevant) index: of the 138 or so documents of the extramural demes, not a single example is known to have been discovered in urban Athens (or, for that matter, at any great distance from the deme center in question).⁵⁰ If various types of inscription other than horoi demonstrably fail to migrate from rural locations to the urban center, why should these security horoi have been any different?

If, then, these two dozen or so *choria* did lie near or within the city's walls, what are we to make of properties that, in a rural situation, would naturally be assumed to be agricultural plots? It is probable, as commentators have noted, that the invariable use of the colorless generic term *chorion* masks a wide variety of real properties.⁵¹ Pasturage, vineyards, orchards, and wood lots, as well fields with grain crops, are all obvious possibilities. Less attractive, however, is Finley's suggestion, made on the basis of

⁴⁷ A tabulation similar to mine will be found in Osborne (note 1), p. 205, Table 5. But his brief analysis (pp. 59–60) does not broach the question of farmstead residence. Likewise, Pečirka's discussion of Finley's study of the horoi (note 4, pp. 117–118) fails to perceive their relevance to our question.

⁴⁸ See the "Conspectus of Deme Quotas and Locations" in *Demos and Trittys: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*, Toronto 1986, pp. 125–140.

⁴⁹ On the complex relation between the provenience Anavyso and the ancient deme Anaphlystos, see Eliot (note 3), pp. 81–82.

⁵⁰ For the most thorough and recent roster of the documents of the deme associations, see D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.*, Princeton 1986, Appendix 3, pp. 374–393, with the addition of a few more recent texts by N. F. Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens*, New York 1999, p. 100, n. 54 (pp. 100–101). Of the 145 documents assignable to 48 specific demes, only seven originate in the five intramural units (Jones, p. 101).

⁵¹ So Finley 1985, p. 60.

a single horos from Peiraieus (no. 55), that a *chorion* might sometimes be a building lot,⁵² although this rendering of the word would admittedly make the recorded urban proveniences more readily comprehensible and in particular would suit the conjunction of an *ergasterion* with a *chorion* on horos 90A from Athens (which was published after Finley wrote). But working against the suggestion is the occasional occurrence on horoi from urban contexts of the term *oikopedon*: once on a restored marker from the southern slope of the Acropolis (no. 143), another time on a restored marker from the Agora reused in the wall of modern house (no. 31A–B).⁵³ To judge from the word's etymology, an *oikopedon* must be the ground under an *oikos* (vel sim.), that is to say, a building lot. Another, less certain, candidate is *edaphos*.⁵⁴ Now, given the seeming consistency and conventionality of these texts, any variation in wording must be taken as significant. Accordingly, since a term (or terms) with this specific meaning were available, why would the vague *chorion*, with Finley, have been pressed into service in its place?⁵⁵

The intramural agricultural plot, then, whatever its precise character, must remain a preferable alternative. The restoration in no. 2 of a *chorion*, a garden, and a spring adjacent to the garden,⁵⁶ however, affords the only trace of agricultural activity found in this group of horoi.

Structure (oikia, oikema, oikemation) with or without other properties but without land

This category comprises markers of structures that, given normal Greek linguistic usage, might have served as a residence, not infrequently with the addition of some other, sometimes ancillary, property, e.g. *ergasterion/a* (nos. 87, 161), *kapeleion* (nos. 92A, 92B), *kepos/oi* (nos. 92A, 153), *kopron* (nos. 86, 86A), *lithorgeion* (no. 87), and water (no. 159). The usual term is *oikia*, but *oikema* is found in no. 81 and *oikemation* is restored in no. 86A. In none of the examples is *chorion* or other word for land read or restored.

urban Athens (48): 2A Agora, 4–5 between Pnyx and Areopagus, 66A Agora, 67 Peiraieus, 67A Agora, 68 Peiraieus, 69 Acropolis, 70 Munychia, 71–72 Agora, 72A Agora, 73 Peiraieus, 73A Agora, 74A Agora, 76–77 Acropolis, 78 Athens, 78A Agora, 80A Agora, 81A Agora, 81C–D Agora, 83 Athens, 84 Acropolis, 85 Athens, 85A–C Agora, 86 Athens, 86A Agora, 87 Dipylon, 92A Agora, 92B Athens, 114 Pnyx, 114A Agora, 147 area of Pnyx, 148 north of the Amyneion, 148A Agora, 150–152 Athens, 152A Agora, 153 Athens?, 159 Athens, 161 Athens, 162 Athens, 175A Agora.

extra-urban Attica (8): 6 Eleusis, 75 Eleusis, 163A Teithras, *SEG* 41.127–129 Rhamnous, *SEG* 43.55 and 57 Rhamnous.

no recorded provenience (6): 74, 79, 80–82, 149.

In contrast with the even town and country distribution of the previous group of stones, nearly all the examples with a provenience are of immediate urban origin. Moreover, the octet of extra-urban horoi is easily explained away. Two originate in the heavily built-up sanctuary deme of Eleusis.⁵⁷ The

⁵² Finley 1985, p. 60.

⁵³ The term also occurs occasionally in the *poletai* records: see *Agora* XIX, P 17, lines 16 and 22; P 26, line 406; and P 53, line 41.

⁵⁴ For the conjunction of multiple *edaphoi* with a *kaminos*, see horos no. 92; and of a single *edaphos* with an *oikia*, the inscription *Agora* XIX, L8, line 107.

⁵⁵ Rejection of Finley's suggestion requires only that we admit in the case of no. 55 the possibility of a plot of land in Peiraieus that was "sold for redemption" for 150 drachmas, a figure that Finley found exceptionally low for farming land. Of course, a property may be used as security for a sum less than its actual value; the sum secured is not equivalent to its "fair market value" or the like. For tabulations of the *sale* prices of real properties, see Pritchett (note 9), pp. 269–276.

⁵⁶ Finley's text (which substitutes a *chorion* for Ziebarth's *ergasterion* in the text of line 2 in *IG* II² 2759) reads: χωρίο καὶ κή]/πιου καὶ τῆς προσούσης [κρήνη]/ς τῶι κηπιδίῳ (lines 2–4).

⁵⁷ As an index of the deme's citizen population, one may cite its bouleutic quota of 11? (Traill [note 48], p. 138), which places it with Aixone (11?) and Lower Paiania (11) as the fourth most populous deme behind Acharnai (22, combined), Aphidna (16), and Kydathenaion (11/12). Also, with 10 known metics, Eleusis ranks eighth behind Melite, Peiraieus, Kollytos, Alopeke, Kydathenaion, Skambonidai, and Keiriadai (Whitehead, note 50, p. 83).

five examples from Rhamnous are all reported too have been found in or around the fortress. In no. 163A, from Teithras, the multiple *oikiai* are conjoined with a *perioikion*, evidently an encircling yard of some kind which potentially places this example within the larger category of “land and house” to be discussed in a moment. None of the eight, in other words, is necessarily to be associated with an agricultural setting; in none is there good reason to think that the occupant of the *oikia* in question was a farmer who commuted to and from his plot(s). But under more typical circumstances, not a single horos marking a structure in the absence of land is reported to have originated in extramural rural Attica. So pronounced a pattern cannot be lacking in significance.

The absence of any mention of land in these texts was noted by Finley, who instanced in explanation the fact that under ordinary circumstances urban real estate had “little, if any, monetary value”.⁵⁸ But the true explanation may be otherwise, that it went without saying that the ground under a structure came with it for the purposes of hypothecation. Besides, the letter cutter, compelled to fit his text on the single face of a narrow pillar, was routinely constrained by extreme limitations of space and on occasion may have elected not to express the obvious. In any case, the monetary value of urban lots in densely packed inner Athens could only have reflected demand for convenient urban location in an age of primitive modes of communication and transportation.⁵⁹ If urban real estate was in any sense lacking in value, it would more likely have been due to the absence of the nostalgic or sentimental associations that characterized rural agricultural and pastoral acreage. By contrast, the mere ground, invisible and inaccessible, lying underneath a house or other structure hardly qualified for such attention.

Something of the nature of these *oikiai* is suggested by the additional properties sometimes appearing with them, with the non-Attic island horoi shedding valuable additional light. A marker from Athens (no. 159) specifies the adjacent water supply, a valuable asset which Solon’s law on water rights leaves no doubt was not enjoyed by all landed properties.⁶⁰ Two markers add a *kopron*,⁶¹ once with an *oikemation* (no. 86A), the other time with an *oikia* (no. 86). With the *perioikion* conjoined with multiple *oikiai* in Teithras (no. 163A) may be compared the *kepoi* attending *oikiai* on markers from Aigiale (no. 9) and Arkesine (nos. 154 and 155, both restored) on Amorgos and from Athens (no. 153). These may, as noted earlier in connection with the lands of the Salaminioi, be domestic “kitchen” gardens attached to a private residential dwelling. Obviously commercial in nature, however, are the *ergasteria* associated with *oikiai* in nos. 87 and 161 and the *kapeleion* with another in no. 92B. *Oikia*, *kapeleion*, and *kepos* are combined in no. 92A from the Agora; *oikia*, *kepos*, and *keramos* are marked by no. 165 (with the first two terms being entirely restored) from Naxos. Naturally, it is not absolutely certain that such multiple properties all stood on the same ground, but if the purpose of the marker was to warn off unsuspecting prospective lenders, the fact that the several properties were named on a single stone strongly suggests that this was the case. When it was not the case, variable locations could be specified, as in no. 87, on which an *oikia* is hypothecated with *ergasteria* “inside the wall” and with a *lithorgeion* “outside the wall”. Beyond the city, another marker, no. 14 from Vari, distinguishes an *oikia*-and-*chorion* ensemble presumably before which the horos stood from a second *oikia* “in the *asty*”. The prepositional phrases, in other words, specify what could ordinarily not otherwise be inferred from the typical horos text. If, then, the multiple properties named on a single horos constituted a unified whole, it is probable, against Osborne, that at least some of these *oikiai* were residences, for water and gardens

⁵⁸ Finley 1985, p. 61.

⁵⁹ Against Finley (1985, p. 253, note 50), I do not agree that Xenophon’s statement at *Poroi* 2.6 that there were many vacant sites within the city walls necessarily implies that “they have no significant monetary value”. Besides, contra Finley, Xenophon’s remark (4.50) that an influx of population into the Laureion district would render the *choroi* no less valuable than those “around the *asty*” seems to imply quite the opposite of his position.

⁶⁰ For the law, see above with note 32.

⁶¹ For the *kopron* at classical Athens, see E. J. Owens, *The Koprologoi at Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, *CQ* 33 (1983) 44–50.

bespeak continuing presence on the site, not the occasional visit. Workplaces, predictably non-agricultural in these urban settings (workshop, retail shop, kiln, quarry), will have been, in keeping with practice well attested elsewhere, closely integrated with the owner's or worker's residence (a conclusion strongly urged by the presence of the garden alongside the retail shop in 92A and the kiln in no. 165).⁶² Although we cannot demonstrate the residential function, the combined effect of this evidence makes the inference more plausible than to suppose, following Osborne's analysis of the leases, that an *oikia* was merely a storeroom, shop, barn, or the like.

All this, again, pertains to the urbanized areas of Athens, from which alone (with the exception of the eight atypical texts from Eleusis, Rhamnous, and Teithras) we have markers for *oikiai* in the absence of any mention of land. But why, it is now time to ask, are such markers not associated with Attica outside the walls? Given the abundance of extra-mural horoi and the consequent attractiveness of the argument from silence, the obvious answer is that an *oikia* without land (save for the ground it sat upon) was generally not to be found in rural Attica. But before considering further this possibility, we must first examine the many instances of markers signifying an *oikia* and *chorion* in combination.

Land (chorion) and building (oikia) with or without additional properties

Land and building often occur as a pair, but sometimes (as we shall see) in conjunction with other properties. The one lexical variation is the restoration of *oikema* in no. 101A. Employing the same categories used in the previous tabulations, we find the following topographical distribution:

urban Athens (15): 1 Athens, 18A Agora, 21A Agora, 23 Kerameikos, 26 modern Kallirhoe, 33 Athens, 35 Acropolis, 36 Pnyx, 39A Agora, 101A Agora, 113 Peiraieus, 120 Agora, 120A Agora, 139 Areopagus, 176 northern Athens.

extra-urban Attica (35): 11 Erchia, 12 Ikarion, 12A between Laureion district and Sounion, 13 Sphettos, 14 site at Vari (including an additional *oikia* "in the *asty*"), 15 modern Patissia, 16A Trikorynthos, 17 Laureion, 18 Iphistiadai, 19–20 Kephale, 22 Athmonon, 24 Sounion, 25 Ikarion, 28 Acharnai, 30 Erchia, 31 Kettos, 32 Erchia, 116 Acharnai, 117 Marathon, 118 Kephale, 119 Hagnous, 128 Cholargos, 132 Erchia, 133 Kephale, 134 Thria, 135 Erchia, 135A Ikarion, 136 Erchia, 137 Steiria, 137A Brauron sanctuary, 138 Euonymon, 140 Ikarion, *SEG* 38.165 Aixone and 44.82 Thorai?

no recorded provenience (8): 16, 21, 27, 29, 34, 38, 39B, 175.

As with the previous tabulations, the sizable number of examples from urban areas is compromised by the absence of even a single horos found in situ and by the certainty that a privately held land or building could not have been situated on the Acropolis, Pnyx, or Areopagus, or in the Agora or Kerameikos. At the same time, again, any assumption of as many as 15 *pierres errantes* is constrained by the failure of parallel examples of stones of known rural origin to be discovered in these same urban areas. So, as with the isolated *choria*, it seems more attractive to imagine that these *chorion*-and-*oikia* combined properties were located within or just outside the walls, and that the horoi that originally marked them had been transported short distances for reuse in post-classical structures in the heart of Athens.

The fact that two-thirds of this group of horoi with recorded provenience are from extramural locations in Attica naturally suggests that the *chorion* is arable land and the *oikia* a house located on that land. My general reason for assuming that the *oikia* in fact stood on the *chorion* has already been given – that the single horos naming both properties must have visibly marked both building and land or it could not served its intended purpose. One may add the specific evidence of a marker from Brauron, no. 137A, that is restored to read "*chorion* and the *oikia* on the *chorion*". Rather than take this uniquely explicit phrase as indicating a departure from routine practice, it is easier to assume that the text makes an implicit distinction between the *oikia* situated, as was normal, on the land and some other unnamed

⁶² The "sub-agera" districts, especially to the southwest, provide some clear examples of the phenomenon: see *Agora* XIV, pp. 173–185.

oikia that happened to be excluded from this dotal hypothec. The fuller text of horos no. 14 from Vari marking an *oikia*, *chorion*, and an “*oikia* in the *asty*” illustrates such a disposition of properties. Moreover, where an additional property is combined on a single marker with *chorion* and *oikia*, the ensemble is consistent with farmstead residence: *choria*, *kepoi*, and *oikia* (no. 12, from the deme Ikarion); *chorion*, *oikia*, and *kepoi* (no. 12A, found “by the road between Laurion and Sounion”); *chorion*, *oikia*, and *kepos* (no. 13, from Sphettos, as restored); *choria*, *oikia*, and water adjacent to the *choria* (no. 116, from the deme Acharnai).⁶³ The presence of gardens and in one case of water in these examples does not absolutely prove on-site residence but it certainly suggests it strongly.⁶⁴ When the debtor undertook to mortgage property as security for his debt, he sometimes put up the natural integrated unit of land, house, garden, and, when present, water supply.

These last few examples shed light on the problem of farmstead residence in still another way. In two cases (nos. 12 and 116) multiple *choria* are conjoined with a single *oikia*. The simplest explanation is that we are dealing here with a composite estate comprising distinct plots on only one of which an *oikia* was standing. Presumably that one *chorion* with the *oikia* was the site of the horos. Such an arrangement would also make comprehensible the markers for a *chorion* without an *oikia* that we studied earlier. Rather than suppose the existence of an uninhabited farm with the owner residing in a nucleated village center or even in the city, it is more economical to imagine in these cases an estate of multiple *choria* of which one happening to lack an *oikia* had been put up as security.

Conclusion

We must, it seems, conclude that the epigraphic record favors the inference that to a significant degree the *choria* of rural Attica, and very likely others within or near the city walls, were occupied by persons, owners or otherwise, residing in *oikiai*. The case presented here, furthermore, represents something more than a mere incremental addition to the evidence on one side of the current debate. We already knew that some Athenians with rural deme affiliations resided in a nucleated center in or around the *asty* or Peiraius⁶⁵ while certain other Athenians, on a straightforward reading of the literary sources, resided on their farms.⁶⁶ To add a favorable instance or two to one side of the controversy would bring us no closer to discovering a predominating *pattern*. The present investigation, however, besides culling a few ambiguous candidates from the *poletai* records and the *rationes centesimarum* and some more or less explicit positive instances from the leases, has in the security horoi tapped a very substantial body of documents representing the entire expanse of Attica and covering a fairly wide span of time.⁶⁷ That 186 independent contemporary documents should not provide a single straightforward non-conforming example is of more than particular significance. What may be more problematic is how we are to

⁶³ No. 2, from the area of the Ilissos, marks, as restored, a “*chorion*, *kepos*, and the *krênê* adjacent to the *kepidion*”, but no reference to an *oikia* or other structure is preserved in the acephalous text. No. 8, from Arkesine on Amorgos, marks, as restored, *choria*, *oikia*, and *kepoi*.

⁶⁴ Again, as noted above with note 32, the Solonian law regarding access to wells suggests that they, at least in some cases, were used to meet small demands, such as those of a household garden, and not for the irrigation of acreage.

⁶⁵ Some examples can be found at Whitehead (note 50), p. 353, with note 14 (pp. 353–354). For the evidence from inscribed tombstones of migration from the countryside of Attica to urban areas, see A. Damsgaard-Madsen, *Attic Funeral Inscriptions: Their Use as Historical Sources and Some Preliminary Results*, in *Studies ... Rudi Thomsen*, Aarhus University Press 1988, with p. 66 for the conclusion.

⁶⁶ Incontrovertible positive instances of farmstead residence in the narrative sources include Demosthenes 53 *Against Nikostratos*, 4; 55 *Against Kallikles*, 23; and [Demosthenes] 47 *Against Euergos and Mnesiboulos*, 53. The character sketch of *agroikia* by Theophrastos likewise depicts farmstead residence and even introduces a dog which, in the language of the inscriptions, guards τὸ χωρίον καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν (4.10). See Langdon (note 2), pp. 209–211, for a fuller treatment of these and similar passages.

⁶⁷ The dated examples (that is, those bearing an archon’s name) compiled by Millett in his 1985 appendix to Finley (pp. ix–x) range between 363/2 (no. 127) and 184/3 (no. 137A).

integrate these findings within the larger body of evidence, literary and especially archaeological, but that must be the subject of some other investigation.⁶⁸

University of Pittsburgh

Nicholas F. Jones

⁶⁸ An earlier version of the paper was presented at a symposium honoring my former teacher W. K. Pritchett in celebration of his 90th birthday at the University of California in Berkeley on May 1, 1999. My thanks to Professor Pritchett and others in attendance for their comments and suggestions.