



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Peter Thonemann

Estates and the Land in Early Hellenistic Asia Minor: The Estate of Krateuas

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **39 • 2009**

Seite / Page **363–394**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/408/5016> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2009-39-p363-394-v5016.9

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

PETER THONEMANN

Estates and the Land in Early Hellenistic Asia Minor: The Estate of Krateuas

The Macedonian conquest of Asia in the late 330s BC brought some disruption to the lives of the inhabitants of the far north-western Achaemenid provinces. The new Macedonian king had an alarming habit of granting attractive fiscal exemptions to communities who could show themselves to be ethnically Greek.¹ One of the consequences of Alexander's philhellenic fiscal policies in Asia was the emergence of two different «zones» in Asia Minor, sharply distinguished from one another in the sphere of financial administration: the πόλεις, the Greek cities of the west coast with their associated territories, and the χώρα, the vast stretches of land in the interior inhabited by the native peoples of Asia Minor (Lycians, Lydians, Carians and others).² When the indigenous peoples of Asia Minor found themselves put at an unexpected disadvantage by this new policy of ethnic favoritism, cultural changes ensued.³

In this article I wish to address one specific aspect of the changes brought about by the Macedonian conquest: its impact on patterns of land tenure in the parts of western Asia Minor outside the territory of the πόλεις. I shall focus on one particular structural element of the west-Asiatic χώρα, namely lands granted by the King to his subordinates and benefactors. In the fifth and fourth centuries BC, both the Macedonian kings in Europe and the Achaemenid monarchs in Asia had regularly bestowed the revenues of large domains – agricultural land, villages, even entire cities – on their benefactors and officials. Given the paucity of evidence for the precise tenure-conditions of either Macedonian or Achaemenid land-grants in earlier periods, it is exceptionally difficult to judge whether the land-grants of Alexander and his Successors in western Asia accorded more closely to traditional Macedonian or Achaemenid practice. In granting the usufruct of large parcels of land and villages in western Asia to his Macedonian subordinates, Alexander was certainly acting in a manner which would have been instantly familiar *both* to his Macedonian beneficiaries *and* to the west-Asi-

¹ Arrian 1. 18. 1–2; see further P. THONEMANN, Alexander, Priene and Naulochon, in: N. PAPA-ZARKADAS – P. MARTZAVOU, *The Epigraphy of the Hellenistic Polis*, forthcoming.

² CHR. MILETA, *Der König und sein Land*, 2008, 20–35.

³ Arrian 1. 26. 4 (Side); 2. 5. 9 (Mallos).

atic rural population who worked the land itself.⁴ I hope that the following study will be of interest, not only as a chapter in the history of land-tenure in western Asia Minor, but also as a contribution to the wider debate on administrative continuity or change in the early Hellenistic East.⁵

The donation of land by the Macedonian king to his subjects and other benefactors was a traditional Macedonian royal practice.⁶ The fifth- and fourth-century evidence is almost entirely literary, but not to be neglected for that reason alone; there is no reason, for instance, to doubt the clear statement of Hegesippos that Philip II «granted the usufruct of all the land (on the Thracian Chersonese) north of Agora to Apollonides of Kardia».⁷ In his *Life of Alexander*, Plutarch relates how, shortly before crossing to Asia in 334 BC, Alexander III took care to settle the affairs of his *ἐταῖροι* by assigning them parts of the royal property (τὰ βασιλικὰ) in Macedonia: to one, he granted an estate; to another, a village; to another, the revenue of a hamlet or harbour.⁸ The vocabulary of the land-grant was used both for individual and for collective grants. At an uncertain date – probably, but not certainly, early in his reign, before the crossing to Asia – Alexander «gave to the Macedonians» (ἔδωκε Μακεδόσι) the city of Kalindoia and the dependent communities of Thamiskos, Kamakai and Tripoi. Here the «grant» of Kalindoia simply means that Alexander assigned the former independent πόλις of Kalindoia, conquered by Philip II by 349 BC at the latest, to a group of Macedonian colonists for refounding as a Macedonian city.⁹

Our best evidence for the tenure conditions of the land donated by Macedonian kings to individuals before 334 BC comes from an inscription from Kassandrea, dating to the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century BC.¹⁰

⁴ The problem is lucidly stated by P. BRIANT, *L'Asie Mineure en transition*, in: P. BRIANT – F. JOANNÈS, *La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques*, 2006, 330–342.

⁵ This article is the second in a series of studies on land-tenure in western Asia Minor: see also P. THONEMANN, *Estates and the Land in Late Roman Asia Minor*, *Chiron* 37, 2007, 435–478.

⁶ B. FUNCK, *Zu den Landschenkungen hellenistischer Könige*, *Klio* 60, 1978, 45–55; M. FARAGUNA, *Aspetti amministrativi e finanziari della monarchia macedone tra IV e III secolo a.C.*, *Athenaeum* 86, 1998, 367–378.

⁷ [Dem.] 7. 39: τὸν μὲν γὰρ τόπον ἅπαντα τὸν ἔξω Ἀγορᾶς ὡς ἑαυτοῦ ὄντα ... δέδωκε καρποῦσθαι Ἀπολλωνίδῃ τῷ Καρδιανῶ.

⁸ Plut. *Alex.* 15.

⁹ SEG 36, 626, with M. HATZOPOULOS, *BE* 1988, 847; R. M. ERRINGTON, *Neue epigraphische Belege für Makedonien zur Zeit Alexanders des Großen*, in: W. WILL, *Alexander der Große: Eine Welteroberung und ihr Hintergrund*, 1998, 79–82.

	ἐφ' ἱερέως Κυδία, βασιλε-	τολεμαίου ἔλαβεν
	ὺς Μακεδόνων Κάσσαν-	ἐν ἀργυρίῳ, δίδωσι κα[ι]
	δρος δίδωσι Περδίκαι	τοῦτον ἐμ πατριοῖς
	Κοίνου τὸν ἀγρὸν τὸν	20 καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκγόνοις
5	ἐν τῇ Σιναίᾳ καὶ τὸν ἐ-	κυρίοις οὔσι καὶ κεκτήσ-
	πι Τραπεζοῦντι, οὓς ἐ-	θαι καὶ ἀλλάσσεσθα-
	κληρούχησεν Πολεμο-	ι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι, καθά-
	κράτης ὁ πάππος αὐτοῦ	περ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος
	καὶ ὄν ὁ πατὴρ ἐπὶ Φιλίππου, κα-	25 ἔδωκεν Πτολεμαί-
10	θάπερ καὶ Φίλιππος ἔδ[ω]-	ωι τῷ πατρὶ τῷ Πτολε-
	κεν ἐμ πατριοῖς καὶ αὐτ-	μαίου δίδωσι δὲ καὶ ἀ-
	οῖς καὶ ἐκγόνοις κυριοί-	τέλειαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐ-
	ς οὔσι κεκτήσθαι καὶ	κγόνοις καὶ εἰσάγον-
	ἀλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀ-	30 τι καὶ ἐξάγοντι τῶν
15	ποδόσθαι, καὶ τὸν ἐΣ-	ἐπὶ κτήσει.
	παρτῶλωι, ὄμ παρὰ Π-	

«When Kydias was priest. Kassandros, King of the Macedonians, gives to Perdikkas son of Koinos the estate in the (former) territory of Sinos and the estate at Trapezous, both of which his grandfather Polemokrates received as κληροί, and also the estate which his father (received as a κληρος) in the time of Philip, on the same terms as those on which Philip gave them, as a patrimonial possession, both they and their descendants having the full right to possess and exchange and alienate them; and also the estate at Spartolos, which (Perdikkas) purchased for silver from Ptolemaios, (Kassandros) gives this too as a patrimonial possession, both he and his descendants having the full right to possess and exchange and alienate it, on the same terms as those on which Alexander gave it to Ptolemaios the father of Ptolemaios. (Kassandros) also gives fiscal immunity to (Perdikkas) and his descendants to import and export any of the things on his property.»

The date of the text cannot be precisely determined. The eponymous priest Kydias is certainly the eponymous official of the city of Kassandreia, founded by Kassandros in 316 BC. Kassandros' title «King of the Macedonians» narrows the date down to the period between 306 and 297 BC (from Kassandros' adoption of the royal title to his death). Although the text takes the form of a royal land-grant – «Kassandros gives to Perdikkas» – the King is in fact merely confirming Perdikkas' possession of four separate parcels of land in different parts of the Chalkidike peninsula, on exactly the same terms as those on which the estates were originally granted by Philip II and Alexander III. This confirmation was rendered necessary by the foundation of Kassandreia

¹⁰ Syll.³ 332; M. HATZOPOULOS, Une donation du roi Lysimaque, 1988, 22–26 (SEG 38, 620).

in 316 BC.¹¹ At the time when the original grants were made, all of the individual estates lay outside civic territory. Once the land on which Perdikkas' estates lay had been assigned to the new πόλις of Kassandreia, Kassandros was obliged to confirm that Perdikkas' tenure-conditions would not be affected by the recategorisation of his lands as part of the civic territory of Kassandreia. Most probably, the final clause of the inscription is an addition to the original grants: Perdikkas is further granted fiscal immunity from civic import- and export-dues, in order that the revenues from his property should not be damaged by the attribution of his estates to the territory of Kassandreia.¹²

The text thus provides us with evidence for the precise tenure conditions of Macedonian royal land-grants before Alexander's crossing to Asia in 334 BC. Perdikkas' grandfather Polemokrates and his father Koinos had received their three κλήροι from King Philip II as a hereditary possession (ἐμ πατρικοῖς), with the right of possession, exchange, and sale.¹³ The fourth estate, located at Spartolos, was originally granted by King Alexander III to a certain Ptolemaios the elder, on the same terms; the younger Ptolemaios has exercised his right to sell his father's land outright, and the estate has thus passed into Perdikkas' ownership, once again as a hereditary possession. The text also demonstrates complete continuity in the tenure conditions of land in Chalkidike from the early 330s to the end of the fourth century: Kassandros explicitly states that the terms on which Perdikkas is to hold his lands are to be identical to those laid down by Philip and Alexander at the time of the original grants.¹⁴

That these conditions of land-tenure in the Chalkidike peninsula persisted into the third century BC emerges from an inscription of ca. 285 BC, in which King Lysimachos grants a plot of land near Kassandreia to a certain Limnaios son of Harpalos.¹⁵

¹¹ R. M. ERRINGTON, Macedonian «royal style» and its historical significance, *JHS* 94, 1974, 23–24, and above all ΗΑΤΖΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ (above, n. 10) 34, 45–49. In earlier scholarship, large and inappropriate conclusions had been drawn from Kassandros' «renewal» of the land-grants of Philip and Alexander.

¹² ERRINGTON (above, n. 9) 78–79. Compare SEG 47, 940 (Kassandros grants fiscal immunity to Chairephanes, perhaps another Macedonian land-owner on the territory of Kassandreia), and SEG 47, 893 (hereditary fiscal immunity granted to Hippokles by Philip II and confirmed by Antigonos Gonatas).

¹³ The phrase ἐμ πατρικοῖς signifies that the land concerned becomes the beneficiary's private property, «as if he had inherited it from his father». This point was definitively established (against M. ROSTOWZEW, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, 1910, 252) by ΗΑΤΖΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ (above, n. 10) 31–35. However, as we shall see, his argument (on p. 35) that the same tenure-conditions are to be inferred in Syll.³ 302 is questionable.

¹⁴ Similarly, Cassander's general Eupolemos, operating in Caria in ca. 316–314, judged that Diokles of Kos should possess fiscal immunity at Pladasa on the same terms as granted to his father Dion at an uncertain date before the Macedonian conquest: κρινομεν και ημεεις ειναι αυτωι την ατελειαν κατα την αναγρα[φ]ην την εν τη στήλη γεγραμμενην τήνδε (P. DEBORD – E. VARINLIOĞLU, *Les hautes terres de Carie*, 2001, no. 48: hereafter HTC); on this text, see further below, n. 48.

¹⁵ ΗΑΤΖΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ (above, n. 10) (SEG 38, 619).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>ἐφ' ἱερέως τοῦ Λυσιμάχου
Τιμησίου, βασιλεύς
Λυσίμαχος δέδωκεν
Λιμναίῳ Ἄρπάλου ἐμ
5 πατρικοῖς τοὺς ἀγρούς,
τόν τε ἐν τῇ Σερμυλιαί-
αι, γῆς ἐνδένδρου πλέθρα
χίλια διακόσια, ὧι γείτο-
νες Ἀγαθοκλῆς Λυσι-
10 μάχου, Βίθυς Κλέωνος,
καὶ τὸν ἐν τῇ Ὀλυνθίαι
ἐπὶ Τραπεζοῦντι, γῆς
ἐνδένδρου πλέθρα τρι-
ακόσια ἐξήκοντα, ὧι γεί-</p> | <p>15 τόνες Μένων Σωσικλέους,
Πύλων Ἐπιτέλους, καὶ
τὸν ἐν τῇ Στρεψαίαι,
γῆς ἐνδένδρου πλέθρα
ἐνακόσια καὶ ἀμπέλων
20 εἴκοσι, ὧι γείτονες Γού-
ρας Ἀννύθεος, Χιωνίδης,
Εὐάλκης Δημητρίου, καὶ
αὐτῶι καὶ ἐγγόνοις κε-
κτῆσθαι κυρίοις οὐσί κα[ι]
25 πωλεῖν καὶ ἀλλάσσεσθα[ι]
καὶ διδόναι οἷς ἂν βού-
λωνται.</p> |
|---|--|

«When Timesios was priest of Lysimachos. King Lysimachos has given these estates to Limnaios son of Harpalos as a patrimonial possession: the estate in the (former) territory of Sermylia, 1200 πλέθρα of land planted with trees, contiguous with the properties of Agathokles son of Lysimachos and Bithys son of Kleon; the estate in the (former) territory of Olynthos at Trapezous, 360 πλέθρα of land planted with trees, contiguous with the properties of Menon son of Sosikles and Pylon son of Epiteles; and the estate in the (former) territory of Strepsa, 900 πλέθρα of land planted with trees and 20 πλέθρα of vineyards, contiguous with the properties of Gouras son of Annythes, Chionides, and Eualkes son of Demetrios. (He has granted these estates) to him and his descendants with the full right to possess and sell and exchange and give them to whomsoever they wish.»

Lysimachos' land-grant to Limnaios takes a slightly different form to Kassandros' land-grant to Perdikkas, since here the estates in question are being granted to the beneficiary for the first time, rather than merely confirmed in his possession. Hence Lysimachos details both the physical size and the precise location of each individual plot.¹⁶ The inscription thus serves as a kind of permanent title-deed for Limnaios. That aside, the terms on which Limnaios is to hold his estates are all but identical to those laid down by Philip and Alexander for Polemokrates and Koinos half a century

¹⁶ Here indicated with the phrase ὧι γείτονες, as elsewhere in the Chalkidike, in Macedonia, and at Amphipolis (J. GAME, *Actes de vente dans le monde grec*, 2008, nos. 2, 4, 6–10, 37–40), and in the fifth-century Athenian πωληταί-lists (e.g. IG I³ 426.6, 67). In a land-lease from Thespiiai of the late third century, neighbouring properties are indicated with the word πλατικός (M. HOLLEAUX, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques I*, 1938, 99–120, lines 12, 20). At Stratonikeia in Caria, the term used was ὁμορεῖν (I.Stratonikeia 502; 1002.14), and at Cypriot Idalion (fifth century BC), χραύεσθαι/χραύζεσθαι (touch on) and ποέχεσθαι (lie near) (ICS 217: on this text, see further below, n. 25).

earlier. In each case, the beneficiary receives his land «as a hereditary possession» – that is to say, as private property – with the right to sell, exchange, or donate the land to whomsoever he wishes.¹⁷ It is noteworthy, however, that Limnaios is not granted fiscal immunity from civic import- and export-dues: as I have suggested above, the immunity granted to Perdikkas by Kassandros is best understood as an exceptional act of royal munificence, provoked by the recent foundation of Kassandreia.

After Alexander's crossing to Asia in 334 BC, vast tracts of land in the newly conquered territories became available for distribution to favoured subjects. Shortly before the decisive battle of Gaugamela in 331 BC, two of Alexander's camp-followers engaged in mock single-combat in the roles of «Alexander» and «Darius»; the victorious «Alexander» was rewarded with twelve villages and the right to wear Persian dress.¹⁸ In Macedonia, back in early 334 BC, many Companions had received only one village each; expectations were clearly on the rise. Late in his reign, Alexander is said to have offered the pro-Macedonian Athenian politician Phokion the revenues of four entire cities in Asia Minor.¹⁹

At first sight, then, we see a Macedonian practice of royal favour being perpetuated in Asia. But things are by no means so straightforward. The Achaemenid kings, too, had regularly granted the revenues of large estates, villages and cities in the western satrapies to benefactors, family-members and high royal officials.²⁰ Our most detailed evidence for the tenure-conditions of Achaemenid-era land-grants in the far west of the Persian empire derives from a group of documents from late fifth-century Egypt. A letter from Arsames, satrap of Egypt, to his subordinate Artavant, concerns the question of a grant (*dāšna*) given by the King and Arsames to a certain Aḥḥapi, «who was an official in my domains which are in Upper and Lower Egypt».²¹ Aḥḥapi has now died, and his son Psamshek has taken up his office in his father's stead. Psamshek therefore sends a petition to Arsames asking to «carry on that *dāšna*» which was previously given to his father, a request which the satrap now grants. Evidently the *dāšna* is not a perpetual grant, but is subject to revocation or reassignment by the crown; the usufruct of the *dāšna* is bestowed on Psamshek only by dint of taking up his father's office, not as a simple matter of inheritance. A slightly different set of tenure conditions emerge from a second letter of Arsames, concerning an estate granted to a certain Pamun.²² Pamun, the hereditary lease-holder (*mḥḥsn*) of a domain with a seed-

¹⁷ See above, n. 13.

¹⁸ Plut. Alex. 31.

¹⁹ Plut. Phocion 18; Aelian VH 1. 25, ἵνα ἔχοι καρποῦσθαι τὰς ἐκείθεν προσόδους; for the phraseology, compare [Dem.] 7. 39 (above, n. 7); P. BRIANT, Rois, tributs et paysans, 1982, 58 n. 8.

²⁰ P. BRIANT, Dons de terres et de villes: l'Asie Mineure dans le contexte achéménide, REA 87/1, 1985, 53–72.

²¹ G. B. DRIVER, Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century BC, 1956, no. 2, with H. Z. SZUBIN – B. PORTEN, Royal grants in Egypt: a new interpretation of Driver 2, JNES 46/1, 1987, 39–48.

²² DRIVER (above, n. 21) no. 8, with B. PORTEN – H. Z. SZUBIN, Hereditary Leases in Achaemenid Letters, BO 42, 1985, 283–288.

capacity of 30 *artabas*, has been killed along with his household during a period of unrest. Pamun's son, Petosiri, now writes to Arsames to reclaim the lease; Arsames replies that so long as the domain has not already been reassigned, Petosiri may take up the lease as a *mhhšn* and continue to pay fiscal dues (*ilku*) on the property just as his father had done. Although a *mhhšn* differs from the beneficiary of a *dāšna* in that his lease is hereditary, rather than restricted to his tenure of a particular office, in both cases the lease-holder receives the usufruct of the property alone, not full possession.

Nonetheless, such domains could apparently be sublet by the beneficiary to a third party. Yet another letter from Arsames shows that the satrap had granted a domain in Egypt to «the prince Varuvahya», who has in turn sublet it to a certain Hatubasti. Hatubasti proves to be a poor tenant, failing to pay the fiscal dues associated with his lease, and Arsames' own steward Nakhthor (responsible for the administration of all the satrap's Egyptian estates) has to step in to enforce payment.²³ A much earlier document, dating to Year 7 of Darius I (515 BC), records a slightly different situation again: Padi, the lease-holder of a domain granted him by the king, has entered into a joint venture with a native Egyptian, Aha; Aha is to act as cultivator of Padi's domain, on the agreement that the two men will share all profits, liabilities, and fiscal obligations equally between the two of them.²⁴ It is, unfortunately, very difficult to say whether the same tenure-conditions held good in the other western satrapies of the Persian empire.²⁵

From the reign of Alexander itself, only a single such case of an Asiatic land-grant to an individual Macedonian is known to us in any detail. As our sole piece of evidence for the royal granting of land during the transitional phase between the Achaemenid and early Hellenistic kingdoms, this modest document takes on a quite extraordinary

²³ DRIVER (above, n. 21) no. 10.

²⁴ H. Z. SZUBIN – B. PORTEN, An Aramaic joint-venture agreement: a new interpretation of the Bauer-Meissner papyrus, *BASOR* 288, 1992, 67–84.

²⁵ A bronze inscription of the fifth century BC (precise date uncertain) lists the privileges awarded to the doctor Onasilos by King Stasikypros and the polis of Idalion in return for his assistance during a Persian siege: ICS 217, with R. KOERNER, Vier frühe Verträge zwischen Gemeinwesen und Privatleuten auf griechischen Inschriften, *Klio* 63, 1981, 195–201, and M. EGETMEYER, Zur kyprischen Bronze von Idalion, *Glotta* 71, 1993, 39–59. Onasilos is granted two plots of land (χωρος) and a garden (κᾶπος) located on the «royal land» (ἀπὸ τῶν ζᾶν τῶν βασιλῆος), exempt from fiscal dues (ἀτελήν/ἀτελίγια ἰό(ν)τα) and to be held in perpetuity by Onasilos and his descendants, so long as they continue to reside at Idalion (ἔξο(ν)σι αἰφεῖ, ο(ῖ) ἰ(ν) τ(ῶ) οἰρῶνι τῶι Ἐδαλιῆφι ἴω(ν)σι). Each plot of land is granted to Onasilos «to be held πανώνιος» (ἔχεν πανώνιον/ἔχεν πανώνιος). Unfortunately, the sense of the adjective πανώνιος (attested only here) is not certain. Morphologically, the word could mean either «in full enjoyment», «with full usufruct» (<ὀνίνημι) or «with full right of sale» (<ὠνόμοι): M. EGETMEYER, Apports philologiques sur l'administration du royaume d'Idalion, *CCEC* 34, 2004, 106–109. Hence it remains an open question whether Onasilos receives full possession of the land, including the right of alienation; furthermore, since the Idalion bronze dates to a period in which Idalion was not under Persian control, we should be wary of using the text as evidence for ordinary Achaemenid practice.

level of interest and importance. The inscription concerned was discovered by CHARLES FELLOWS in February 1838, built into a fountain around eight miles from Pergamon, near the modern town of Poyrazcık (ancient Gambreion) on the south flank of the Kaikos plain.²⁶ It was rediscovered and copied by MATTHAIOS GEORGIU in 1876, «by the fountain outside the village of Poyrazcık, on the road leading from Pergamon to Soma».²⁷ The text records the conveyance of a small estate in the Kaikos valley from a Macedonian by the name of Krateuas to a certain Aristomenes.²⁸ The conveyance is expressly dated to Alexander's eleventh regnal year (326/5 or 325/4 BC), while Menandros was satrap of Lydia.²⁹ The eponymous prytane of a Greek city, probably the small town of Gambreion, is also named at the head of the document.³⁰ The meaning of the Greek is not always obvious; the translation appended below will be justified in the commentary which follows.³¹

C. FELLOWS, *A Journal written during an excursion in Asia Minor*, 1839, 30 (CIG II 3561 [A. BOECKH]); A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *BCH* 1, 1877, 53–55, and *Mouseion* 2, 1876–78, 1–2, after copy of M. GEORGIU; (I)urGr I 257–258 [DARESTE – HAUSSOULIER – REINACH]; *Syll.*² 155 [DITTENBERGER]; *Syll.*³ 302 [HILLER v. GAERTRINGEN]; M. GUARDUCCI, *Epigrafia Greca* III, 1974, 310–312); H. MÜLLER, *Pergamenische Parerga*, *Chiron* 33, 2003, 419–423 (SEG 53, 1380).

White marble stele, complete. Ht. 1.04; width 0.32–0.33; thickness 0.13; letters ca. 0.017.

²⁶ C. FELLOWS, *A Journal written during an excursion in Asia Minor*, 1839, 30. The identification of Poyrazcık with Gambreion is due to J. FRANZ, *Fünf Inschriften und fünf Städte in Kleinasien*, 1840, 14–18; see further *Altertümer von Pergamon* I 1, p. 130.

²⁷ *Mouseion* 2, 1876–78, 1–2; also in *BCH* 1, 1877, 53–55, without details of the findspot.

²⁸ Peithon son of Krateuas, a native of Alkomenai, was one of Alexander the Great's bodyguards, and played a significant role in the early years after Alexander's death, acting as satrap of Upper Media, and later as general of the Upper Satrapies: H. BERVE, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* II, 1926, no. 311; W. HECKEL, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, 1992, 276–279. Another Krateuas, conceivably a son of Peithon, is attested as a general of Kassandros in 315 BC (Diod. 19. 50. 7; 19. 51. 1). The Krateuas of the Gambreion inscription could well be a member of this family: thus BERVE, *Alexanderreich* II no. 447. The suggestion of K. J. RIGSBY, *Two inscriptions from Mysia*, *Hermes* 117, 1989, 248 n. 13, that Krateuas might be a native of the region, carries little conviction.

²⁹ Whether we assign the text to 326/5 or 325/4 depends on the date of the Lydian new year: T. BOIY, *Alexander dates in Lydian inscriptions*, *Kadmos* 44, 2005, 165–174. Menandros was satrap of Lydia from 331–321: HECKEL (above, n. 28) 339–340. The geographical extent of the satrapy of Lydia varied over time: see P. DEBORD, *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle*, 1999, 116–130, 149–155, 158–160.

³⁰ See further below, p. 374.

³¹ The recent re-edition of the text by H. MÜLLER, *Pergamenische Parerga*, *Chiron* 33, 2003, 419–423 (with excellent photographs), supersedes all earlier editions, which were dependent on the defective copies of FELLOWS and GEORGIU. Note that MÜLLER accidentally omits the word σπόρου in line 14 of his text.

θεός. τύχη ἀγαθή.
 βασιλεύοντος Ἀλ-
 εξάνδρου, ἔτει ἐν-
 δεκάτῳ, Μενάνδ-
 5 ρου σατραπεύοντο-
 ς, ἐπὶ πρυτάνιος Ἴσα-
 γόρου, Κρατεύας ἔ-
 δωκεν Ἀριστομέν-
 ει γῆν ψιλὴν ἀγρὸν
 10 ἐποικίσαι πρὸς τῷ

φυτῶι τῷ ἐπὶ Κρατεύ-
 α φυτευθέντι. ὁ δὲ πε-
 ρίβολός ἐστιν τῆς γ-
 ῆς σπόρου κύπρων ἐκ-
 15 ατὸν ἑβδομήκοντα
 καὶ οἰκόπεδα καὶ κήπ-
 ος. φόρος δὲ τοῦ κήπ-
 ος χρουσοῦς ἐκάστο-
 υ ἑνιαυτοῦ.

«God. Good fortune. When Alexander was King, in the eleventh year, when Menandros was satrap, Isagoras was prytane.

Krateuas gave to Aristomenes a plot (ἀγρός) of arable land (γῆ ψιλὴ) on which to settle (ἐποικίσαι), in addition to the nursery (φυτόν) planted under Krateuas.

The perimeter of the land (γῆ) is 170 κύπροι of seed, and building-plots (οἰκόπεδα) and a garden (κήπος). The tribute (φόρος) payable on the garden is one gold stater (χρουσοῦς) per year.»

It may be helpful to take the text in three parts: the prescript and dating formula (lines 1–7), Krateuas’ land-conveyance to Aristomenes (lines 7–12), and what I understand to be a statement of Aristomenes’ resulting fiscal liabilities (lines 12–19).

Lines 1–7: Prescript

The form of the prescript has no earlier Macedonian parallels. There is no clear evidence that the Macedonian kings before Alexander distinguished the years of their reign by means of regnal dating. In a boundary-settlement of Philip II from Mygdonia, the date is indicated simply by the clause «during the reign of Philip son of Amyntas», [ἐπὶ τῆς Φιλίππου] βασιλῆας τοῦ Ἀμ[ύντου].³² A document from Olevni mentioning a «King Philip» is dated «Year 16, 19 Panemos».³³ However, it is by no means certain that the king concerned is Philip II; nor does the dating formula in the Olevni inscription (the date alone, no associated mention of King’s name, ἔτους in the genitive + Greek numeral) bear any resemblance to that in the Gambreion text.³⁴

³² SEG 40, 542; M. ΗΑΤΖΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings II*, 1996, doc. 4. For the word order (patronym after royal title), compare I.Mylasa 5 (353/2 BC), Ἀ[ρταξέρξευς βασιλεύ]οντος τοῦ Ἀρ[ταξέρξευς].

³³ ΗΑΤΖΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ (above, n. 32) doc. 5 (SEG 45, 764), dated ἔτους ςι, Πανῆμ[ου] ΘΙ.

³⁴ The date is interpreted as a regnal year of Philip II by M. ΗΑΤΖΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *La lettre royale d’Oléveni*, *Chiron* 25, 1995, 163–185; this is challenged by F. ΠΑΡΑΖΟΓΛΟΥ, *L’inscription d’Oléveni*, *Tekmeria* 4, 1998/9, 89–99 (SEG 49, 711), who dates the inscription to the reign of Philip V, arguing (among other things) that the regnal date would be unparalleled in Macedonia in the reign of Philip II, Alexander III or any of their predecessors (cf. E. GRZYBEK, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque*, 1990, 24–25). ΗΑΤΖΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ’ response to this point (BE 2000, 452) is unconvincing; he cites as a parallel the regnal date in the Gambreion inscrip-

Whatever we make of the Olevni inscription, the «dual dating» of the Gambreion document by the regnal year (in the dative) of the reigning King (in the genitive) and the name of the current satrap – βασιλεύοντος τοῦ δεῖνα, ἔτει χ' σατραπεύοντος τοῦ δεῖνα – is unambiguously Achaemenid in form. The largest concentration of examples of this kind of «dual dating» comes from fourth-century Achaemenid Caria: so for instance an inscription from Mylasa carries the dating formula ἔτει πέμπτῳ Ἀρταξέρξῃ βασιλεύοντος, Μαυσώλλου ἑξαθηραπεύου[τ]ος, «in the fifth year, when Artaxerxes [III] was King, when Maussollos was satrap» (355/4 or 354/3 BC).³⁵ A Greek inscription from Tralleis (I.Tralleis 3) begins with the dating formula ἔτεος IIIIII, μηνὸς ἑβδόμῳ, βασιλείοντος Ἀρταξέσσει, ἑξατραπεύοντος Ἰδριέως, «in the seventh year, in the seventh month, when Artaxerxes was King, when Idrieus was satrap»: this text presents particular problems, which are dealt with in an Appendix below.

Dating by regnal year and satrap is now also attested in Achaemenid Lydia. A recently published Lydian inscription from the upper Kaystros valley begins with the dating formula «Year 17 of King Artaxerxes [III], when Rhosakes was satrap» (=343/2 or 342/1 BC).³⁶ Three other Lydian inscriptions (and one Greek inscription from Sardis) are dated by regnal years of a King Artaxerxes (probably all Artaxerxes II or III), but none give the name of the satrap.³⁷ Two Lydian documents are dated by regnal

tion, on the basis that the Gambreion text is dated «selon un mode macédonien». This assumes exactly what needs to be proved.

³⁵ I.Mylasa 3. Exactly the same formula is found in I.Mylasa 1 (Year 39 of Artaxerxes II), I.Mylasa 2 (Year 45 of Artaxerxes II), and HTC 90 (unknown year of Artaxerxes III, with specification of the month Artemision). In I.Mylasa 4 (unknown year of Artaxerxes II, Hekatomnos son of Hyssaldomos as satrap: S. HORNBLLOWER, *Mausolus*, 1982, 36 n. 6; H. KLINKOTT, *Der Satrap*, 2005, 273 n. 48), a local eponym is named at the outset ([ἐπι - - Ἀ]ρθουασσιος), and in I.Mylasa 5 (Year 7 of Artaxerxes III), the patronyms of both Artaxerxes and Maussolos are given. Most scholars confidently date these documents to a single year (e.g. «I.Mylasa 3, Artaxerxes III Year 5 = 355/4 BC»). This is quite unwarranted, since we have no idea when the Carian New Year fell, and hence cannot say whether Artaxerxes III Year 5 in Caria represents 355/4 (New Year in autumn, as in Egypt) or 354/3 (New Year in spring, as at Babylon). By way of comparison, A. E. COWLEY, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century BC*, 1923, no. 25, written on the night of December 16/17, 416 BC, is dated to Year 8 of Darius II in the Babylonian calendar and Year 9 of Darius II in the Egyptian calendar, due to the three-month lag between the Babylonian and Egyptian New Year. Compare B. PORTEN, *The Calendar of Aramaic Texts from Achaemenid and Ptolemaic Egypt*, in: *Irano-Judaica II*, 1990, 21.

³⁶ R. GUSMANI – Y. AKKAN, *Bericht über einen lydischen Neufund aus dem Kaystrostal*, *Kadmos* 43, 2004, 139–150. Rhosakes is mentioned as satrap of Lydia and Ionia by Diodoros, 16. 47. 2, in the course of his (misdated) account of the Persian invasion of Egypt in 343/2 BC – almost exactly contemporary, as it happens, with the inscription from the Kaystros valley.

³⁷ R. GUSMANI, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, 1964, no. 1 (Lydian-Aramaic bilingual, with the royal date extant in the Aramaic text only: 5 Marḥešuān, Year 10 of King Artaxerxes); no. 2 (Year 15 of King Artaxerxes, in the month *cuvelli-*); no. 41 (Year 16 of King Artaxerxes, in the month *kanlala-*); SEG 29, 1205 (Year 39 of King Artaxerxes: see further Appendix below). The Lydian-Aramaic bilingual is dated on paleographic grounds to the reign of Artaxerxes III by J. NAVEH, *The Development of the Aramaic Script*, 1970, 57.

years of Alexander the Great, one to Year 5 and the other to Year 12; in the latter instance a month-name is also given, but once again, neither carries the name of the satrap.³⁸

The dating formula in the Gambreion inscription – «the eleventh year of the reign of Alexander, when Menandros was satrap» – thus emerges as entirely Achaemenid in style. The Gambreion prescript is very closely comparable to the prescripts of the new Lydian inscription from the Kaystros valley (343/2 or 342/1 BC) and (for example) the Greek inscription I.Mylasa 3 (355/4 or 354/3 BC):

Kaystros valley (343/2 or 342/1):

(a) *borl* ς III III I (b) *artaksaqer*sal qalmluul *dāv* (c) *rasakaś śatrabaś*

Mylasa (355/4 or 354/3):

(a) ἔτει πέμπτῳ (b) Ἀρταξέρξευς βασιλεύοντος (c) Μουσώλλου ἑξαθεραπέου[τ]οϛ
Gambreion (326/5 or 325/4):

(b) βασιλεύοντος Ἀλεξάνδρου (a) ἔτει ἑνδεκάτῳ (c) Μενάνδρου σατραπέοντος

This form of dating, by regnal year and satrap, persisted in the years immediately after Alexander's death. We have five texts from Caria with a «dual dating» by regnal years of Philip Arrhidaios and the satrap Asandros, ranging from Year 1 to Year 6: so, for instance, a decree of the Koarendeis from Lagina begins with the dating formula [-ἔτο]υϛ πρώτου Φιλίππου βασιλεύοντος, Ἀσάνδρου σατραπέοντος.³⁹ All five documents indicate the year in the genitive (ἔτους πρώτου *vel sim.*), a form which becomes standard for regnal years throughout the entire Hellenistic period.⁴⁰ In one document alone, an inscription from Pladasa (Year 6, 319/8 or 318/7), we find the dative still being used in the old «Achaemenid» style: [Φ]ιλίππου βασιλεύοντοϛ, ἕκτῳ ἔτει ἐπὶ Πισ[.]νω Σαναμῶ Κυδώρου, μηγὸς Κοροβαλλισιοϛ. The Pladasa inscription is anomalous both through the absence of a named satrap and in the placement of the year-numeral *after* the name of the King.⁴¹ No later documents take quite this form; to the best of my knowledge, Asandros was the last satrap ever to be named as part of the dating formula of any document from western Asia Minor. There is no need to labour the point further: I note only that in this particular circumscribed field – dating formulae on public documents in western Asia Minor – the evidence presents us with ab-

³⁸ GUSMANI (above, n. 37) no. 3 (Year 5); no. 50 (Year 12). See further BOIY (above, n. 29) 165–174.

³⁹ I.Stratonikeia 501. The same formula in I.Amyzon 2 (Philip Year 4, with specification of the month Marsellios); I.Stratonikeia 503 (Philip Year 6, with specification of the Macedonian month Dios and local eponymous ἄρχοντες); I.Mylasa 21 (year uncertain); SEG 33, 872 (Hierakome, year uncertain, with specification of the Macedonian month Gorpaios). Since we do not know the date of the Carian New Year, we have no way of knowing whether (e.g.) Philip Year 2 in Caria represents 323/2 (New Year in autumn) or 322/1 (New Year in spring).

⁴⁰ See e.g. J. and L. ROBERT, *Opera Minora Selecta* V, 1989, 449–464.

⁴¹ HTC no. 47. The confidence of the editors of HTC about the date of the document (p. 159) is misplaced, for the reasons outlined in nn. 35 and 39 above.

solute continuity from the Achaemenid period into the reigns of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaios.⁴²

Our text is also dated by a civic eponym, the prytane Isagoras. Most scholars have assumed that Isagoras acted as prytane of the city of Gambreion, on the reasonable basis that the stone was discovered by Fellows very near the modern village of Poyrazcık (ancient Gambreion) along with a *lex sacra* of the third century BC which certainly derives from Gambreion (Syll.³ 1019, LSAM 16). However, a case has been made that Isagoras instead acted as prytane of the nearby city of Pergamon, on the basis that the third-century *lex sacra* shows that the eponymous magistrate at Gambreion carried the title of στεφανηφόρος.⁴³ The point is not decisive. A change from πρύτανις to στεφανηφόρος as the normal title of the eponymous magistrate is attested at both Priene and Magnesia on the Maeander in the late fourth century, and at Chios around a century later; there is no difficulty in assuming a similar development at Gambreion in the late fourth century.⁴⁴

Lines 7–12: Krateuas' conveyance to Aristomenes

The Kaïkos valley was already dotted with large Persian estates in the fifth and fourth century BC. At the turn of the fourth century, the estate of the Persian Asidates was centred around a fortified manor (τύρσις) in the Kaïkos plain a couple of hours' march from Pergamon; nearby lay the residence of another Persian, Itamenes, who could draw on the services of 80 Assyrian hoplites and Hyrcanian cavalry from Komana (probably a small village in the vicinity).⁴⁵ The Great King had also granted estates to two prominent Greek exiles in precisely this region: Gongylos the Eretrian, who possessed Gambreion, Palaigambreion, Myrina and Gryneion, and Demaratos the Spartan, at Teuthrania and Halisarna.⁴⁶ It is easy enough to see how in the wake of the Macedonian conquest of 334 there could have been large, newly vacant estates in

⁴² In HTC no. 48 (ca. 316–314 BC), we learn that the city of Pladasa has attempted to revoke a grant of fiscal immunity granted to Dion of Kos in the years before Alexander's conquest. Dion's son Diokles has appealed to Kassandros' general Eupolemos, who has confirmed that the grant is to stand. The original decree of Pladasa granting immunity to Dion is then reproduced in its entirety, including the satrapal dating formula (Πιξωδάρο[υ] ξαιτραπεύοντος); it is very striking that the mason chose to omit the Achaemenid king's name and regnal year, which must certainly have stood immediately before this in the original text.

⁴³ RIGSBY (above, n. 28) 246–250. For the πρύτανις as eponym at Pergamon, see M. WÖRRLE, Pergamon um 133 v. Chr, *Chiron* 30, 2000, 550–554.

⁴⁴ Thus, correctly, PH. GAUTHIER, *BE* 1990, 264, citing J. VANSEVEREN, *Inscriptions d'Amorgos et de Chios*, *RPh* 11, 1937, 344–347; for the date of the change at Priene and Magnesia, see C. V. CROWTHER, *Priene 8 and the History of Priene in the Early Hellenistic Period*, *Chiron* 26, 1996, 205–206.

⁴⁵ Xen. *Anab.* 7. 8. 9–23, with DEBORD (above, n. 29) 183–184; CHR. SCHULER, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*, 1998, 66–69.

⁴⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 3. 1. 6; *Hdt.* 6. 70. For the interrelations between the descendants of the two families, see D. M. LEWIS, *Sparta and Persia*, 1977, 54; DEBORD (above, n. 29) 189–191.

the neighbourhood of Gambreion, ripe for redistribution among the Macedonian nobility. The background to the document at hand is very likely to be the grant by Alexander III of an estate or parcel of estates around Gambreion to Krateuas.

The precise character of Alexander's putative land-grant to Krateuas is by no means obvious. In later periods, when a monarch granted a stretch of royal land in western Asia Minor to a relative or dependent, the regular procedure seems to have been for the land to be attached to the civic territory of the nearest appropriate πόλις, thus becoming subject to such additional fiscal dues as the πόλις chose to levy upon it.⁴⁷ Some scholars have argued that this procedure reflects a fundamental principle of land-tenure in post-Achaemenid Asia Minor: in instances where a property was granted under conditions of hereditary usufruct alone, the land remained part of the King's own patrimonium; in instances where ownership of the land itself (including the right of full alienation) was transferred to the beneficiary, the land was *necessarily* removed from the register of directly-administered royal land and attached to the territory of a πόλις, since (it is argued) private property did not exist outside πόλις-territory.⁴⁸ Even if this distinction were a valid one – which is by no means certain – it would be perilous to assume without argument that it also applied to the land-grants of Alexander III performed in the very earliest months and years of his Asiatic campaign.

What can we infer about Krateuas' tenure-conditions from the document itself? First, as we have seen, the eponymous prytane of the city of Gambreion, Isagoras, is named as part of the dating formula at the head of the document.⁴⁹ The date would have been sufficiently indicated by Alexander's regnal year; that the prytane is mentioned at all would most naturally imply that the estate lay within Gambreian civic ter-

⁴⁷ G. G. APERGHIS, *The Seleukid Royal Economy: the Finances and Financial Administration of the Seleukid Empire*, 2004, 99–107; L. CAPDETREY, *Le pouvoir séleucide: Territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique (312–129 avant J.-C.)*, 2007, 151–153. The key examples are WELLES, RC 10–13 (ca. 277–261 BC: land-grant of Antiochos I to Aristodikides of Assos); I.Priene 18 (ca. 270 BC), with PH. GAUTHIER, *Les honneurs de l'officier séleucide Larichos a Priène*, JS 1980, 45–47; WELLES, RC 18 (254/3 BC: land-grant of Antiochos II to Laodike). CAPDETREY regards the practice as a Hellenistic innovation, but cf. J. GIBSON, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions III: Phoenician Inscriptions*, 1982, no. 28: in the early fifth century BC, the Achaemenid king gives Dor and Joppa to the King of Sidon, «and we added them to the borders of the land, that they might belong to the Sidonians forever».

⁴⁸ For this distinction, see most recently F. PAPAZOGLU, *Laoi et paroikoi: Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique*, 1997, 100–112. See, however, the detailed critiques offered by SCHULER (above, n. 45) 159–194; CHR. MILETA, *The King and his Land*, in: D. OGDEN (ed.), *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives*, 2002, 157–175; CHR. SCHULER, *Landwirtschaft und königliche Verwaltung im hellenistischen Kleinasien*, in: V. CHANKOWSKI – F. DUYPAT (ed.), *Le roi et l'économie*, 2004, 514–519; MILETA (above, n. 2)

⁴⁹ L. RUBENSTEIN, in: M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 2004, 1041, comments that «it is suggestive that there is no mention of any Gambreian decision-making body. The inscription suggests that the Makedonians may have controlled land-ownership directly». I do not see how this follows: the document is not a civic decree.

ritory.⁵⁰ Second, Aristomenes is expected to pay φόρος on the κῆπος attached to the estate (lines 17–19). The only possible meaning of the term φόρος is «impost due to the King».⁵¹ The estate was, therefore, subject to tribute. Third, the document records the conveyance by Krateuas of this estate (or a part of it) to a certain Aristomenes. This transaction shows that Krateuas possessed, at a minimum, the right to sublet parts of the estate to a third party (a right which was also possessed by the Achaemenid *mhhsn*, as we have seen).⁵²

In the first clause of the conveyance, we are specifically told that Krateuas has given Aristomenes a plot of land «on which to settle» (ἔδωκεν ... ἐποικίσαι). The use of the verb ἐποικίζειν, «to settle the property», i.e. to build a house on the property and live in it, is of critical importance for the tenure-conditions of the estate. That the verb has the specific sense of «to construct a building on the property» may be inferred from a land-lease from Thespiiai in Boeotia, dating to ca. 215 BC, in which it is stated that if a lessee has built anything on a κᾶπος which he holds under lease, he has the right to take the building materials away with him once the lease comes to an end: ἡ δὲ κά τι ἐπιφοικίξ[ε]ιττη, ἐπί κα δ[ι]εσσέλθει ὁ χρόνος, ἀ[π]ίσειττη λαβῶν ὃ κα ἐπιφοικοδομ[ε]ισει.⁵³ As ROSTOWZEW recognised, the formulation in the Gambreion text ought to indicate that Aristomenes has taken over the emphyteutic leasehold of part

⁵⁰ Thus RIGSBY (above, n. 28) 248: «If the king's agent were dealing here with the king's land, there would be no need to refer to a civic government.» W. W. TARN, *Alexander the Great II: Sources and Studies*, 1950, 221–222, suggests that Gambreion may have been the «registration centre» for the district; compare the evidence for a royal land-registry at Sardis in the mid-third century BC (WELLES, RC 18. 27–28).

⁵¹ This is denied by HATZOPOULOS (above, n. 10) 35, who takes this phoros to be rent payable to Krateuas; thus also G. CASANOVA, *I contratti d'affitto fra privati nelle epigrafi greche*, in: E. BRESCIANI et al., *Scritti in onore de Orsolina Montevicchi*, 1981, 94. I know no parallels for this alleged usage of φόρος = μίσθωμα; in a fourth-century context, the term φόρος can only mean «tax, tribute». See, above all, CHR. SCHULER, *Tribute und Steuern im hellenistischen Kleinasien*, in: H. KLINKOTT et al. (ed.), *Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribute: Antike Abgabenformen in Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, 2007, 372–405, and further O. MURRAY, *Ο ΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ ΔΑΣΜΟΣ*, *Historia* 15, 1966, 142–156; M. CORSARO, *Tassazione regia e tassazione cittadina dagli Achemenidi ai re ellenistici*, *REA* 87/1, 1985, 73–95.

⁵² See above, pp. 368–369.

⁵³ M. FEYEL, *Études d'épigraphie béotienne*, *BCH* 60, 1936, 175–183, B 24–26 (H. W. PLEKET, *Epigraphica* I, 1964, no. 45); for the date, see D. ΚΝΟΕΠΦΛΕΡ, *Sept années de recherches sur l'épigraphie de la Béotie*, *Chiron* 22, 1992, 470. For construction-work undertaken by a lessee, FEYEL compares IG II² 2499 (lease of sanctuary of Egretes, 306 BC): ἐνοικοδομήσει δὲ καὶ κατασκευᾶ καὶ ἄλλ' ὅταν τι βούληται Διόγνητος ὅταν δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἐξίηι αὐτῷ τῆς δεκαετίας, ἄπεισιν ἔχων τὰ ξύλα καὶ τὸν κέραμον καὶ τὰ θυρώ[μ]ατα. In case of breach of contract, however, these are to be confiscated. See further O. SCHULTHESS, *RE* 15, 2, 1932, s.v. μίσθωσις, cols. 2099, 2107, 2122. The verb is also found, in a slightly different sense, in SEG 37, 1003. 13 (ca. 197 BC), where ἐποικίσαι τὸν τόπον means «to settle/resettle the place» (a city which has been destroyed in war): J. MA, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 1999, 352–353. The suggestion of RIGSBY (above, n. 28) 247, that we might read ἐπ' οἰκίσαι in the Gambreion text is quite unnecessary.

of Krateuas' estate.⁵⁴ Emphyteutic leases were normally conditional on lessees cultivating and improving the land, and that appears to be the case here; Aristomenes' physical presence on the estate, and probably his construction of a residence on it, was one of the conditions of the land-conveyance.⁵⁵

The constituent parts of the estate conveyed to Aristomenes are listed most fully in lines 12–17. We learn from this passage that the farm consists, at a minimum, of three elements: a plot of arable land (τῆς γῆς, described more fully in line 9 as γῆν ψιλὴν ἀγρόν),⁵⁶ a group of housing-plots (οἰκόπεδα),⁵⁷ and a garden (κῆπος).⁵⁸ In lines 9–12, however, Aristomenes is merely said to have received a plot of arable land (γῆν ψιλὴν ἀγρόν) on which to settle/build a house (ἐποικίσαι: see above, p. 376). This ἀγρός is further described as πρὸς τῶι φυτῶι τῶι ἐπὶ Κρατεῦα φυτευθέντι (lines 10–12). The sense of φυτὸν φυτεύειν can be determined on the basis of two further land-leases from the eastern Aegean. A contract of the late fourth century BC from Arkesine on Amorgos lays down the terms on which a tract of sacred land is to be leased out: «In the month Eiraphion, (the lessee) will dig planting-holes, wherever the νεωποῖαι indicate, at four-foot and three-foot intervals, and will put in the plants (φυτά) in the presence of the νεωποῖαι, planting twenty vine-plants each year, at the

⁵⁴ ROSTOWZEW (above, n. 13) 267–268; see further below, p. 380.

⁵⁵ In Achaemenid Babylonia, vacant building plots on crown property could be sub-let by the lease-holder for construction work: M. STOLPER, Buildings on Bow Land and Encumbrances on Buildings, in: R. DITTMANN et al., Variatio Delectat: Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für P. Calmeyer, 2000, 667–680.

⁵⁶ DARESTE – HAUSSOULIER – REINACH, Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques I, 1891, 257 n. 1, wished to assume a mason's error and to read ἀ(ργ)όν, «the uncultivated arable land» (accepted by GUARDUCCI). This is not impossible: ἀργός is attested in precisely this sense in a near-contemporary document from Philippi (SEG 46, 787 A 4–7, ca. 330 BC). However, the fact that the arable plot is defined in lines 12–15 in terms of grain-seed requirements surely implies that it is already under cultivation (see further below). HATZOPOULOS (above, n. 10), 36–37, argues that ἀγρός is a technical term meaning «agricultural domain», which does not specify the particular character of the domain in question (indicated, on this interpretation, by γῆν ψιλὴν); compare IG I³ 427. 74 (ἀγρὸς γῆς φσιλῆς), and see further SCHULER (above, n. 45) 62–66.

⁵⁷ SCHULER (above, n. 45) 127–130. In the Mnesimachos inscription (Sardis VII 1, 1), οἰκόπεδα are clearly distinguished from the οἰκίαι in which the work-force resides; in one instance, οἰκόπεδα are described as requiring a certain volume of seed per annum (A 15–16, οἰκόπεδα σπόρου ἀρταβῶν τριῶν). The land-grant in SGDI 1365 (Dodona) includes both an οἶκος (including its furniture) and an οἰκόπεδον.

⁵⁸ This tripartite composition of a residential farmstead is standard. The 2000 Jewish families settled in Phrygia and Lydia by Antiochos III each received a plot on which to build a house (εἰς οἰκοδομίας οἰκίων ... τόπον) and a plot of land (χώραν) for arable cultivation (γεωργίαν) and vine-cultivation (φυτεῖαν ἀμπέλων): Jos. AJ 12. 151. In the Athenian πωληταί-lists, one of the farms of Euphiletos is described as χωρίον ἐμ Μυ[ρρινόττει καὶ κῆπ]ος [κ]αὶ [ο]ικία (IG I³ 430. 17). See further G. M. COHEN, The Seleucid Colonies, 1978, 47–50, for the composition of Seleucid military κληροί. In the early fifth century BC, the Bergaioi allotted to Timesikrates two vineyards and two allotments of γῆ ψιλὴ (SEG 51, 797).

spacing ordered by the magistrates, and ten fig-trees ... if he does not plant the plants (ἐμφοῦτ[εῦση] τὰ φυτὰ), he shall pay a fine of one drachm per plant.»⁵⁹ In two land-leases from Amos in the Rhodian Peraia dating to the late third century BC, the lessee is required to plant (φυτεύσει) no fewer than 1,000 vine-plants (φυτὰ) and forty fig-trees for each *mina* of the lease, once again with specific instructions on the spacing of the plants and the depth to which they are to be dug in.⁶⁰ Leases of this kind, requiring the lessee to plant a specific number of vines, fruit-trees, or olives, are fairly common across the Greek world from the fifth century onwards.⁶¹ (The use of the singular φυτόν in the Gambreion text is odd, and I cannot find an exact parallel. Presumably the sense is «a place in which φυτὰ are cultivated», a garden or nursery; the termination -φυτὰ is not uncommon for Anatolian villages, such as the villages of Azaphyta and Mernouphyta near Thyateira, or Dideiphyta in the Cayster valley).⁶²

Πρός with the dative can signify either «near» or «in addition to». All commentators, to my knowledge, have understood πρὸς to mean «near»: «prope fundum sub possessore Crateua consitum» (ΒΟΕΚΚΗ), «vicino al terreno piantato al tempo di Krateuas» (GUARDUCCI), «die Grenzen nur durch das obige ganz allgemeine πρὸς τῶι φυτῶι bestimmt» (ROSTOWZEW).⁶³ But this specification, if rightly understood, would be a distinctly curious one. It is true that inscriptions recording leases or conveyances of property usually (though not invariably) indicate the physical location of the property concerned by reference to neighbouring properties or landmarks.⁶⁴ But

⁵⁹ IG XII 7, 62; CHR. CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce (fin V^e-fin I^{er} s.a.C.)*, 2003, 143–147. The exact meaning of the phrase τὰς τράφας ὀρύξει ... τετράποδας καὶ τρίποδας (lines 27–29) is not at all clear: see L. FOXHALL, *Feeling the earth move: cultivation techniques on steep slopes*, in: G. SHIPLEY – J. SALMON, *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity*, 1996, 50–51. Four feet seems too deep for a planting-hole (see SALVIAT, next note), and hence I cautiously take the phrase to refer to the spacing of the plants.

⁶⁰ A. BRESSON, *Recueil des inscriptions de la Péree rhodienne*, 1991, no. 49 a, lines 32–36, and no. 50 a, lines 3–12, with F. SALVIAT, *Le vin de Rhodes et les plantations du dème d'Amos*, in: M.-CL. AMOURETTI – J.-P. BRUN, *La production du vin et de l'huile en Méditerranée*, 1993, 151–161.

⁶¹ IG XII Suppl. 353 (Thasos, early III BC), lines 12–13: the lessee of a κῆπος is to plant it with ten fig-trees, ten myrtle-bushes, and ten nut-trees. I.Rhamnous 180 (339/8 BC), lines 26–28: the lessee of a temenos is to cultivate the trenches for plants (τοὺς ὄ[ρ]χους τοὺς φυτταίου(ς) φυτεύ[ει]), «not neglecting the fig-trees». IG I³ 84. 33 (418/7 BC): the lessee of the temenos of Kodros, Neleus and Basile is to plant (φυτεύσαι) no less than 200 olive trees, «and more if he wants to».

⁶² Azaphyta: TAM V 2, 859; Μερνούφυτα: TAM V 2, 959. Διδείφυτα (ethnic Διδειφυτηνοί): I.Ephesos 3851–2, 3854–8, 3804, 3806, with some variation in the form of the name (Διδει-, Τιτει-, Ιδει-); SCHULER (above, n. 45) 300. Note also the village of -δδοφυτών near Ephesos (I.Ephesos 2551c, with BE 1981, 477), and the village of *Νεόφυτα in Pisidia (ethnic Νεοφυτηνός: W. M. RAMSAY, *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 1906, 337–339 no. 16, lines 5 and 48).

⁶³ ΒΟΕΚΚΗ, CIG II 3561; M. GUARDUCCI, *Epigrafia Greca III*, 1974, 311; ROSTOWZEW (above, n. 13) 267–268.

⁶⁴ See above, n. 16.

why is it relevant that the neighbouring property was one which was «planted in the time of Krateuas»?⁶⁵ And how would we then explain the absence of the κήπος of lines 16–17 in the description of the grant in lines 9–12?

Significantly for our purposes, the closest parallel for this clause is provided by a text dating to the last years of Achaemenid rule in western Asia Minor: the trilingual Xanthos stele (337 BC). Here the city of Xanthos grants to the newly-appointed priest of the Kaunian King and Arkesimas a «tract of civic land» (ἀγρός/*hrīmmada ttaraha*) which had previously been «worked» (Gk: κατηργάσαντο) or «irrigated» (Lyk: *χbaitē*) by Kesindelīs and Pigres.⁶⁶ As in the Gambreion text, it is not merely the previous *owner* or *tenant* of the land who is indicated, but specifically the person or persons responsible for having *brought the land under cultivation*.

Hence, in my view, we ought to understand πρὸς in the sense «in addition to», and thus take the φυτόν in line 11 as being identical to the κήπος in lines 16–18: «in addition to the nursery which was planted while Krateuas was in possession» (literally, «in the time of Krateuas»). This has the advantage that all three elements of the estate (arable plot, building plot, garden) would thus find a mention in each of the two halves of the text (9–12 and 12–17). The reason why the whole estate should be described twice is presumably that in lines 9–12 Krateuas is interested simply in listing *the constituent elements of the estate* being leased to Aristomenes – an arable plot, a group of building-plots which Aristomenes is expected to build upon, and a garden which Krateuas has recently brought under cultivation – while in lines 12–17, Krateuas is informing Aristomenes of *the estate's fiscal liabilities*.

An important consequence follows from this. We saw that the evidence for land-grants in the Chalkidike peninsula shows complete continuity from the reign of Philip II down to the mid-280s BC: beneficiaries receive plots of land in full hereditary possession, with unlimited right of alienation (a right exercised by the younger Ptolemaios in selling his κλήρος to Perdikkas). These tenure-conditions emphatically do *not* apply to Alexander's putative land-grant to Krateuas at Gambreion. The fact that Krateuas' has «given» (ἔδωκεν) the land to Aristomenes superficially recalls the clause in Lysimachos' land-grant to Limnaios, by which the beneficiary and his descendants have the right to «sell, exchange, and give» (πωλεῖν καὶ ἀλλάσσεισθα[ι] καὶ διδόναι) the land to whomsoever they may wish; in Lysimachos' grant, the verb is synonymous

⁶⁵ The natural meaning of ἐπὶ Κρατεῦα would be «in the time of» or «during the period of of-fice of». ROSTOWZEW (above, n. 13) 268, compared a proconsular edict from Thisbe (Syll.³ 884. 2–3), dating to the early third century AD, where ἐπ' ἐμοῦ seems to mean «under my jurisdiction». RIGSBY (above, n. 28) 248 n. 9, argues that «the phrase need mean no more than that Crateuas, rather than planting the ... land himself (ὑπό), had permitted someone else to do so», and translates «planted on authorization of Crateuas».

⁶⁶ H. METZGER et al., Fouilles de Xanthos VI: la stèle trilingue du Létôon, 1979, 66–68. On this text, see further P. BRIANT, Cités et satrapes dans l'empire achéménide: Xanthos et Pixôdarios, CRAI 1998, 305–347, and the mises au point at <http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/grecs/trilingue.pdf> (Greek text) and <http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/lyciens/letoon.pdf> (Lycian text).

with ἀποδόσθαι, «alienate».⁶⁷ But this apparent parallel is treacherous. The verb δίδοναι need not necessarily imply full alienation; it can also quite regularly be used of the concession of a domain's revenues or usufruct, even in cases where the «granter» is merely a lease-holder with no right of alienation on the estate.⁶⁸ Crucially, the specification that one element of the estate, the φυτόν, was «planted while Krateuas was in possession» (ἐπὶ Κρατεῦα φυτευθέντι) strongly implies that Krateuas was not the owner of the estate, but, like Aristomenes, an emphyteutic lease-holder. In «giving» the plot of land to Aristomenes, Krateuas did not alienate the estate altogether. As a lease-holder, he would have had no right to do so; he did not own the land.

A close parallel for the situation here envisaged in the Gambreion text (and, indeed, for this use of the verb ἔδωκεν) is provided by a text from early Achaemenid Egypt, the joint-venture agreement between Padi and Aha in 515 BC (described above, p. 369).⁶⁹ Padi, the lease-holder of a royal domain, is said to have «given» (Aram. *ntnt*) his field to Aha «for sowing and division»: Aha acts as cultivator for Padi, with an equal share in profits, losses, and fiscal liabilities. Nonetheless, from the perspective of the royal administration, Padi continues to hold the status of sole lessee of the domain in question. In the Egyptian document, «giving» the land simply means «conveying» the usufruct (or a part thereof), since Padi does not possess the legal right to alienate his estate. I conclude that, in Achaemenid terms, Krateuas was, like Padi, a hereditary lease-holder (*mhhsn*), holding a royal domain in usufruct, subject to fiscal liabilities (*ilku*) and, crucially, potential reclamation by the king (see further below); our document records the sub-lease of his domain to a third party, Aristomenes.⁷⁰

We now turn to consider what the precise fiscal liabilities of the lessee Krateuas and his sub-lessee Aristomenes might have been.

⁶⁷ See HATZOPOULOS (above, n. 10) 29 n. 2. δίδοναι = ἀποδόσθαι: compare the phraseology of Lysimachos' grant to Limnaios (κυρίοις οὔσι κα[ι] πωλεῖν καὶ ἀλλάσσεισθα[ι] καὶ δίδοναι οἷς ἂν βούλωνται) with that of Kassandros' grant to Perdikkas (κυρίοις οὔσι κερτήσθαι καὶ ἀλλάσσεισθαι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι).

⁶⁸ When Greek authors wish to express the concession of a domain's revenues by the Achaemenid King to a private individual, the standard phraseology is simply δίδοναι πόλιν/χωρίον/κώμην. This does not mean that the beneficiary receives any property rights or sovereignty over the domain. See BRIANT (above, n. 20) 69–70.

⁶⁹ SZUBIN – PORTEN (above, n. 24); see especially p. 74, for the use of the verb *ntnt*.

⁷⁰ The material benefit that Krateuas obtains from the transaction is not at all clear. The use of the verb δίδοναι renders it unlikely that Aristomenes has «bought» the leasehold from Krateuas, and there is no indication that Aristomenes is required to pay rent to Krateuas for the estate. It is conceivable that Krateuas and Aristomenes had a joint-tenancy agreement comparable to that between Padi and Aha, but it is best to acknowledge that we simply do not know.

Lines 12–19: Aristomenes' fiscal liabilities

In lines 12–15, the size of the arable plot is expressed in terms of κύπροι of grain seed (σπόρου κύπροι).⁷¹ The κύπρος had been in use as a measure in the eastern Aegean since at least the early sixth century BC.⁷² Our clearest evidence for its use as a dry measure comes from Caria and Lydia and dates to the Roman imperial period. At Carian Sebastopolis, a benefactor sold 2000 κύπροι of grain at 2 *denarii* per κύπρος at a time when the regular grain-price was 4 *denarii* per κύπρος.⁷³ The term also appears in three confession-*stelai* from eastern Lydia, once again as a grain-measure: as part of their propitiatory offerings, sinners could be asked to provide «one κύπρος of grain», «one and a half κύπροι of grain», or suchlike.⁷⁴

By extension, the κύπρος could also be used to refer to the area of land sown with one κύπρος of grain. At Aphrodisias, an inscription of the mid-second century AD indicates the sizes of four plots of land in terms of κύπροι of grain-seed (σπόρου κύπρων: 240, 65, 40, and 15 respectively).⁷⁵ The κύπρος should not, however, be understood as a true areal measure, since the true area of a given plot of land indicated in terms of «κύπροι of grain-seed» would vary depending on the quality of the soil and the kind of grain being used (wheat or barley).⁷⁶ Similarly, in an inscription of the mid-fourth century from Lagina in Caria, a plot of land under mixed cultivation, both planted with olive trees and sown with grain, is described first in terms of the number of olive stands (forty) and then in terms of the volume of seed required *per annum* (twenty μέδιμοι).⁷⁷ The actual surface area of the land was of secondary importance to its potential productivity.

What was the size of the dry-measure κύπρος?⁷⁸ A metrological text of the late fourth century AD states that the Pontic κύπρος was a dry measure equal to (a) two

⁷¹ DITTENBERGER (Syll.³ 302) and ΗΑΤΖΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ (above, n. 10) 27, take γῆς and σπόρου together, «arable land». The only parallels cited by DITTENBERGER are taken from land registers of the Diocletianic period (Thera and Mytilene: on these registers, see ΘΗΟΝΕΜΑΝΝ [above, n. 5]). The alleged parallels are not convincing. In the Diocletianic land-registers, the rubrics for «arable land» are all abbreviated (γῆς σπορ.); in each case the abbreviation represents not γῆς σπόρ(ου) but γῆς σπορ(ίμου).

⁷² Pollux 4. 169 = Alkaios fr. 312 (LOBEL-PAGE); Hipponax fr. 148 a (WEST).

⁷³ L. and J. ROBERT, *La Carie II: le plateau de Tabai et ses environs*, 1954, no. 172.

⁷⁴ G. PETZL, *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens*, EA 22, 1994, nos. 5, 6, 8.

⁷⁵ I.Aphrodisias 2007, 12. 26 c.

⁷⁶ Correctly emphasised by J. LEFORT et al., *Géometries du fisc byzantin*, 1991, 216–217.

⁷⁷ I.Stratonikeia 502 (ca. 350 BC): γῆν ἔνδενδρον ... ἐλαίτιν, ἀριθμῶι δένδρη τεσσεράκοντα, σπόρου μεδίμων εἴκοσι. In the Mnesimachos inscription (Sardis VII 1, 1), several παράδεισοι and οἰκόπεδα are described in terms of σπόρου ἀρταβῶν (col.1, lines 15–16).

⁷⁸ The only recent study known to me is that of M. HELTZER, *The Early Relations of Cyprus and Anatolia, the Κύπρος measure and the Achaemenian Land-Tax*, RDAC, 1991, 157–163, whose methodology seems to me to be misguided.

ordinary or «small» μόδιοι and (b) 20 Alexandrian ξέσται.⁷⁹ The equivalence one κύπρος = two μόδιοι seems to be standard for the early imperial period, to judge from an early imperial *ponderarium* from Uşak in eastern Lydia, where the κύπρος dry measure is apparently equivalent to two μόδιοι.⁸⁰ If we assume that an ordinary μόδιος (ca. 8.75 litres) was in use in Lydia and Caria, the Asiatic κύπρος in the Roman imperial period would then be equivalent to 17.5 litres.⁸¹ Assuming (and it is a large assumption) that the size of the Asiatic κύπρος had not changed since the fourth century BC, we can make a hypothetical estimate of the size of the arable plot included in Aristomenes' lease. On a sowing rate of 5 μόδιοι of grain to one *iugerum* (= one κύπρος to ¼ acre or 1/10 hectare), 170 κύπροι of grain would be sufficient to sow an arable plot of ca. 42½ acres (17 hectares), just within the upper size-bracket for the Classical Greek family farm.⁸² The estate leased by Aristomenes was generously sized, but was evidently residential, not latifundial.

The reason why the size of the arable plot is expressed in terms of seed-requirement rather than surface area is no doubt because Krateuas is primarily interested in indicating the real value of the leased estate – and hence, as we shall see, its tax-liability – rather than its physical size. It follows that this value was primarily determined not by surface area but by productivity. This makes practical sense. An inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander of the very late fourth or early third century BC records the sale by auction of seven plots of land on Magnesian territory, measuring 333 σχοῖνοι in total.⁸³ Four of the seven plots up for sale at Magnesia measured exactly 50 σχοῖνοι; another two measured 20 and 30 σχοῖνοι respectively; and the seventh plot made up the total with 83 σχοῖνοι. The fact that the land for sale was largely divided up into neat 50-σχοῖνοι plots surely reflects a system of quadration in Magnesian territory at this period.⁸⁴ However, the price raised on each plot of land sold at Magnesia varies

⁷⁹ F. HULTSCH, *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*, 1864–1866, I 264, 269–270, II 106. The straightforward reading of the passage in HULTSCH, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, 21882, 572–575, is preferable to the wild interpretation of A. OXÉ, *Kor und Kab*, BJ 147, 1942, 156–158.

⁸⁰ M. WAGENER, *Notice sur un monument métrologique*. *Mémoires des savants étrangers*: Académie royale de Belgique 27, 1856. Alas, the actual capacity of the relevant hole was not recorded.

⁸¹ On the basis of the equation of the Pontic κύπρος with 20 Alexandrian ξέσται, HULTSCH proposes a Pontic κύπρος of 14.6 litres (thus one Pontic μόδιος = 7.3 litres).

⁸² Sowing rate of 5 μόδιοι of wheat per *iugerum* in Roman Italy: RE 7, 1, 1910, s.v. Getreide, col. 1343. Farm sizes: V. D. HANSON, *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilisation*, 1995, 181–193 (45–70 acres attested, but unusual).

⁸³ I.Magnesia 8. For the date, CROWTHER (above, n. 44) 206 n. 45.

⁸⁴ Epigraphical and archaeological evidence for quadration in the late Classical period, often on a base of 36 or 50 πλέθρα: U. HEIMBERG, *Griechische und römische Landvermessung*, in: *Bauplanung und Bauvermessung in der Antike*, DiskAB 4, 1984, 277–296. At neighbouring Priene, some time in the first decades of the third century BC, Philaios the Athenian was granted 100 σχοῖνοι of arable land, perhaps reflecting two full 50-σχοῖνοι plots: I.Priene 6.

relatively widely, from 38 to 100 δραχμαί per σχοῖνος.⁸⁵ Of course, these plots of land may have been under mixed cultivation, but variable drainage, soil quality, and gradient may well also be factors here.⁸⁶ Given the wide range of land-values attested for otherwise uniform 50-σχοῖνοι plots at Magnesia, a fiscal valuation of the arable plot at Gambreion in terms of productivity (in the form of annual seed-requirement) is entirely comprehensible.

An importance consequence follows from this for the way in which the fiscal liability of Krateuas' estate was calculated. One of the most surprising aspects of the text is that the tax-liability of only a *part* of the estate is explicitly stated: only the φόρος payable on the κῆπος is registered, and moreover as a suspiciously round figure (one gold stater *per annum*). It is very hard to imagine that the garden on Krateuas' estate was subject to taxation but that his arable land was not.⁸⁷ It is far more likely that the taxation on the two productive parts of his estate was assessed in two different ways. The κῆπος was subject to a flat-rate tax: one gold stater *per annum* (or, more likely, the equivalent in silver or in kind: see further below), independent of the real productivity of the garden in any given year. The arable plot (ἀγρός, γῆ), by contrast, was subject to a proportional tax, assessed as a proportion of the annual harvest rather than as a fixed annual sum. Given the highly variable productivity of arable land (see above), a flat-rate tax on arable land based on surface area would be grossly inequitable; a sliding tax-assessment based on annual productivity would be both practical and equitable. That would explain why no fixed φόρος is listed for the arable plot: the rate of taxation was universal and well-known (probably a rate of $\frac{1}{10}$, or conceivably $\frac{1}{12}$), but the actual tax payable (in cash or in kind) would vary year on year depending on the annual harvest.⁸⁸ Hence the transfer document records the crucial variable in determining the tax payable on the arable plot: the plot's productivity, expressed in terms of annual seed requirement. On this hypothesis, the actual tax payable on the arable part of

⁸⁵ By way of comparison, in 352/1 BC, a plot of three σχοῖνοι at Spartolos in Chalkidike was sold for 100 δραχμαί, with an additional sales-tax of 10 dr., a price closely comparable to that of the cheapest land at Magnesia: GAME (above, n. 16) no. 37. We may infer that the Magnesian estates were relatively intensively cultivated.

⁸⁶ On the breadth of variation in grain yield per unit area, see R. SALLARES, *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World*, 1991, 372–389.

⁸⁷ To my knowledge, only ROSTOWZEW (above, n. 13) 268, has addressed this problem directly, but his explanation (that the arable land, but not the garden, was subject to a universal νόμος πωλητικός) is plucked out of the air. HATZOPOULOS (above, n. 10) 35, supposes that only the κῆπος is subject to φόρος, since it is the only part of the estate which is actually productive at the moment of the transfer. This seems very unlikely; the description of the arable plot in terms of «κύπροι of grain-seed» surely implies that it is already under regular cultivation.

⁸⁸ The rate of $\frac{1}{10}$ (δεκάτη) is well-attested in Hellenistic Asia Minor: see e.g. OGIS 229. 101 (Seleukid cleruchs are to be ἀδεκάτευτοι); WELLES, RC 51 (Attalid cleruchs pay an εἰκοστή on vines, a δεκάτη on grain and other crops); see further SCHULER (above, n. 48) 528–535. However, there is some evidence that in the Achaemenid period taxes were assessed at a rate of $\frac{1}{12}$: see below, pp. 386–387.

Aristomenes' estate in any given year could be expressed as «a tenth of the annual yield of the arable land sown with 170 κύπροι of grain-seed». With all due caution, this basic guiding principle of variable taxation based on yield can be applied to the entire Hellenistic royal tax-system: «Die von den Königen erhobenen Abgaben waren überwiegend nicht in absoluten Zahlen festgelegt, sondern als Quoten an die Erträge gekoppelt.»⁸⁹

Alexander's fiscal system in western Asia Minor

This hypothesis, if correct, has wide-ranging consequences for our understanding of the early Hellenistic land-tax in western Asia Minor. The manner in which tribute and taxes in the former Achaemenid empire were assessed and collected in the Hellenistic period – in particular, the question of whether taxes were primarily collected in cash or in kind – has attracted surprisingly little attention from scholars. A detailed case for a highly monetised Seleukid economy has recently been made by G. G. APERGHIS (above, n. 47). However, APERGHIS certainly underplays the evidence for the assessment and collection of taxes in kind.⁹⁰ Particularly suggestive is the scale and political significance of the royal grain-stocks in western Asia Minor, as indicated by the vast quantities of grain distributed or sold to the Greek cities of the west coast by the Hellenistic monarchs.⁹¹ To take only a single example: in ca. 303 BC, while Antigonos Monophthalmos was attempting (ultimately without success) to bring about the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos on the Ionian coast, the King urged the cities not to bother setting up a fund for importing grain, «since the territory which is subject to φόρος (ἡ φορολογουμένη χώρα) is nearby, so that if any need for grain arises, we believe that as much grain as anyone could wish for can be imported easily from this territory.»⁹² The natural way of reading this passage is that the «territory subject to φόρος» in the hinterland of Teos and Lebedos pays its φόρος precisely in the form of grain, which the King is then able to redistribute, at a price, to Greek cities on the fringe of his realm.

The system of taxation in force in the early Hellenistic kingdoms must have reflected the practical needs of the royal administration. What a Hellenistic king wanted from his tenants and taxpayers was not only cash, but also grain and olive oil, in vast quantities. The tax levied on the arable land associated with Krateuas' estate was, therefore, a proportional tax ($\frac{1}{10}$ or $\frac{1}{12}$) on the annual harvest, assessed and collected

⁸⁹ SCHULER (above, n. 51) 372.

⁹⁰ F. DE CALLATAÏ, *La richesse des rois séleucides et le problème de la taxation en nature*, in: CHANKOWSKI – DUFRAT (above, n. 48) 35–44; G. LE RIDER – F. DE CALLATAÏ, *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées*, 2006, 261–266; MILETA (above, n. 2) 57–62.

⁹¹ DE CALLATAÏ (above, n. 90) 35–39; SCHULER (above, n. 48) 536–538; L. CAPDETREY, *Le pouvoir séleucide: Territoire, administration, finances d'un royaume hellénistique (312–129 avant J.-C.)*, 2007, 423–425.

⁹² WELLES, RC 3/4, lines 83–85.

in kind. Had the estate possessed any olive groves, these too would no doubt have been taxed in the same way. However, it would have been grossly economically irrational for the royal administration to attempt to stockpile and redistribute the miscellaneous produce of a small provincial κῆπος like that of Krateuas' estate. The King had no interest in accumulating small quantities of perishable tree-crops, such as figs, pears, and cherries. Hence all the non-arable parts of Krateuas' estate – and *only* the non-arable parts of the estate – were assessed in terms of a cash φόρος. In this case, the φόρος was fixed at an arbitrary figure of one gold stater *per annum*. No doubt, given the extreme rarity of gold coinage, Aristomenes was expected to pay this sum in the form of silver coinage (20 dr. *p.a.*) or, for that matter, a fixed quantity of grain (on the basis of some widely-known system of equivalences).⁹³

Once again, this system of «mixed» φόροι can be directly paralleled from the Achaemenid period. A tax-receipt from Babylon dating to 420 BC records that the royal dues collected on a single stretch of «bow-land» (*bit qašti*) were made up of «one barrel of beer, one sheep, 2 pan 3 sutu [= 90 litres] flour and barley, and 2 minas of silver».⁹⁴ We ought not to be surprised to see a similar system continuing into the early Hellenistic period. Indeed, in the final part of this article, I would like to suggest that this way of understanding the early Hellenistic φόροι in western Asia Minor receives some confirmation from a well-known inscription of a slightly later period, the mortgage of Mnesimachos at Sardis (Sardis VII 1, 1).

The exact circumstances of the mortgage remain controversial, but the general situation is clear enough. At the time of the «division» (διαίρεσις) of something – probably a large tract of royal land in Lydia – Mnesimachos has been granted the usufruct of an estate (οἶκος) in the plain of Sardis by Antigonos Monophthalmos.⁹⁵ This οἶκος consists of two kinds of property: villages (κῶμαι) and allotments (κλήροι). At some stage, Mnesimachos has taken out a loan of 1,325 gold staters from the temple of Artemis at Sardis on the security of his οἶκος, which he has been unable to repay. The οἶκος has thus become forfeit, and Mnesimachos is required to convey the entire οἶκος to Artemis, apparently in the form of a transfer of usufruct subject to redemption (not, of course, a «sale» subject to redemption: Mnesimachos does not own the

⁹³ DE CALLATÄY (above, n. 90) 42, with n. 102; LE RIDER – DE CALLATÄY (above, n. 90) 265–266. In HTC 47 (Pladasa, 319/8 or 318/7 BC: for the date, see above, nn. 35 and 39), Kratesippos of Plataea remits 210 «gold staters of Alexander» (χρυσσοῦς Ἀλεξανδρείου) from the debt owed to him by the city of Pladasa. Once again, we need not suppose that the loan was either made or repaid in gold staters: assuming a gold:silver value ratio of 1:10 (HTC, p. 164), this would represent a remittance of 4,200 δραχμαί.

⁹⁴ A. KUERT, *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period II*, 2007, 680.

⁹⁵ So I understand the opening words of column I, ἐπερωτήσαντος Χαίρεο[υ ὑπ]ἐ[ρ] τοῦτ[ω] [v διαρ]έσε[ω]ς | γεγενημένη]ς καὶ ὕστερον ἐπέκρινέ μοι τὸν οἶκον Ἀντίγονος (I 1–2), plausibly restored on the basis of τῆς διαρέσεως γενομένης in I 12.

οἶκος).⁹⁶ The situation seems to be very similar to that implicit in P.Dura 15 (early second century BC). The precise nature of the contract underlying P.Dura 15 is not entirely clear, but it appears that a loan of 120 δραχμαί, which has already (for unknown reasons) incurred a 100% default penalty (ἐπίτιμον), is being settled by means of a conveyance of land, subject to redemption, from the debtor to the creditor (ἀπέδοτο λύσιμα).⁹⁷

Much of the first column of the Mnesimachos inscription consists of a list of the various constituent parts of the οἶκος now being handed over to the temple of Artemis, with the annual taxes (φόροι) ordinarily payable to the local officers of the royal administration:

1) The κώμη Tobalmoura and dependent κῶμαι:	50 gold staters <i>p.a.</i>
2) κληρος at Kinaroa near Tobalmoura:	3 gold staters <i>p.a.</i>
3) The κώμη Periasostrā at the water of Morstas:	57 gold staters <i>p.a.</i>
4) κληρος at the water of Morstas at Nagrioa:	3 gold staters 4 gold obols <i>p.a.</i>
5) The κώμη Iloukome at Attouda:	3 gold staters 3 gold obols <i>p.a.</i>
TOTAL:	116 gold staters 7 gold obols <i>p.a.</i>

DESCAT has plausibly argued that the total annual φόρος payable on the οἶκος as a whole (116 staters 7 obols) is likely to represent an original annual tax-assessment of $116 \frac{2}{3}$ gold staters, reflecting a $\frac{1}{12}$ rate of taxation on a theoretical cash valuation of 1400 staters. DESCAT ingeniously interprets the one-obol discrepancy (at 12 obols to the Macedonian stater, $116 \frac{2}{3}$ gold staters ought to represent 116 staters 8 obols) as the consequence of a conversion from an original Achaemenid-era tax-assessment expressed in Persian darics and payable in Persian σίγλοι into a post-Achaemenid tax-

⁹⁶ That the agreement between Mnesimachos and Artemis took the form of a sale (*sic*) subject to redemption was argued in the editio princeps, W. H. BUCKLER – D. M. ROBINSON, *Greek Inscriptions from Sardes I*, AJA 16, 1912, 16–22, and accepted by W. K. PRENTICE, *The Mnesimachos Inscription at Sardis*, AJA 16, 1912, 526. This interpretation is rejected by K. T. M. ATKINSON, *A Hellenistic Land-Conveyance*, *Historia* 21, 1972, 45–74, at 54–55, on the basis that column II begins with the words [μηθ]ἐ[ν ἐξέστω μή]τε ἐμοὶ μήτε [τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐκγόνοις μή]τε [-] μήτε ἄλλ(λ)ωι μηθενὶ μηκέτι ἀπολύσασθαι, «let it no longer be permitted for me, my descendants, [...], or anyone else to redeem anything/dissolve the contract». ATKINSON asks: «How then can this possibly be a »sale subject to dissolution« (ἐπὶ λύσει)? How indeed can it be any form of mortgage, the whole essence of which is that it is a contract terminable at the will of the mortgagor, so long as he carries out its other conditions?» The simple answer is that the clause μηθὲν ἐξέστω ... μηκέτι ἀπολύσασθαι is the apodosis of a conditional clause (as in II 4–5) envisaging a breach of the mortgage conditions: «[if I fail to keep to the terms of the mortgage, then let the property pass to the treasury of Artemis] and let it *no longer* be permitted for me to redeem the property». ATKINSON did not pay sufficient attention to the force of the adverb μηκέτι: redemption *ceases* to be permissible under certain circumstances. See, correctly, SCHULER (above, n. 45) 175–177.

⁹⁷ It appears that, as in the Mnesimachos inscription, the original loan was not subject to interest.

assessment expressed in Macedonian gold staters and payable in Attic-weight silver.⁹⁸ The estate granted to Mnesimachos is, therefore, a former Achaemenid lease-hold domain, retained as an administrative unit and re-allocated to a member of the Macedonian élite after the fall of the Achaemenid dynasty.⁹⁹

Mnesimachos goes on to specify that «after the division (*sc.* of the estate) took place», two individuals by the names of Pytheos and Adrastos «received as an ἐξάιρημα a farmstead (αὐλή) at Tobalmoura ... and housing-plots (οἰκόπεδα) at Periasostrā». The text does not explicitly state that this bi-partite ἐξάιρημα is identical to the two κλήροι listed in the register of the estate's tax-liability, but geographically that causes no difficulties: the κλήρος at Kinaroa is described as «near Tobalmoura», and both the κλήρος at Nagrioa and the village of Periasostrā were located at the water of Morstas.

Starting from the assumption that the two κλήροι were identical to the ἐξάιρημα granted to Pytheos and Adrastos, DESCAT noted that the remaining elements of the estate, the three κῶμαι (Tobalmoura, Periasostrā and Iloukome), had a total annual tax-liability of 110 gold staters 3 gold obols (probably reflecting an original tax-assessment of $110\frac{1}{3}$ gold staters). Once again, assuming a $\frac{1}{12}$ rate of taxation, this assessment would reflect a hypothetical total valuation for the three κῶμαι of 1324 gold staters ($12 \times 110\frac{1}{3}$). It is encouraging to find that this valuation is almost identical to the loan of 1325 gold staters taken out by Mnesimachos on the security of his estate.¹⁰⁰ That is to say, we may reasonably hypothesise that Mnesimachos took out a loan at 100% of the theoretical cash valuation of the three villages of Tobalmoura, Periasostrā and Iloukome.

DESCAT's hypothesis is elegant, economical, and to my mind almost certainly correct. Naturally, it depends absolutely on the identification of the κλήροι of I 6–9 with the ἐξάιρημα of I 14–18. Two major objections to this identification have been raised. Firstly, «the two κλήροι are repeatedly specifically included as part of Mnesimachos' estate ... whereas the whole point about the ἐξάιρημα of Pytheos and Adrastos was that it was excluded from the estate as not belonging to Mnesimachos and hence presumably not conveyed to Artemis.»¹⁰¹ This objection rests on a basic misunderstanding of the nature of the οἶκος assigned to Mnesimachos. None of the οἶκος «belonged» to Mnesimachos. As I understand it, at the point when Mnesimachos was assigned the entire οἶκος (τῆς διαίρεσεως γενομένης, I 12), it was stipulated that two parts of the οἶκος, the two κλήροι, should be sub-let (ἐξάιρημα ἔλαβεν, I 13) on a perpetual em-

⁹⁸ R. DESCAT, Mnésimachos, Hérodote et le système tributaire achéménide, REA 87, 1985, 99–102.

⁹⁹ P. BRIANT, L'Asie Mineure en transition, in: P. BRIANT – F. JOANNÈS, La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques, 2006, 336–342.

¹⁰⁰ Already noted by ATKINSON (above, n. 96) 72.

¹⁰¹ R. BILLOWS, Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism, 1995, 122. BILLOWS' other objections do not seem to me to be serious.

phyteutic lease to Pytheas and Adrastos.¹⁰² Mnesimachos henceforth received no direct benefit from the two κληροί, since their surplus revenues went to the two emphyteutic lease-holders, Pytheas and Adrastos, who were also responsible for the payment of the φόροι on the κληροί. Hence, understandably, the two κληροί were not taken into account in the calculation of the original loan taken out by Mnesimachos, which was based only on the φόροι payable by Mnesimachos himself. However, the two κληροί remained integral parts of the οἶκος. They were, therefore, included in the list of securities for the loan, since the loan was taken out on the security of the οἶκος as a whole. When Mnesimachos defaulted on his loan, the two κληροί were conveyed to Artemis along with the rest of the οἶκος; needless to say, this conveyance did not affect the rights of Pytheas and Adrastos in the least.

The second objection is at first sight more significant.¹⁰³ The φόροι payable on the two plots of land listed as κληροί are almost identical: 3 gold staters *p.a.* for the κληρος at Kinaroa near Tobalmoura, and 3 1/3 gold staters *p.a.* for the κληρος in the Water of Morstas at Nagria. However, the stated seed-requirements of the ἐξαιρημα granted to Pytheas and Adrastos are significantly different. The land associated with the ἀλλή at Tobalmoura is said to require 15 artabas of seed, while the land associated with the οἰκόπεδα in the Water of Morstas requires only 6 artabas of seed. To judge by the annual seed-requirement, the arable productivity of the first plot of land was two and a half times that of the second; yet the two κληροί are liable to almost identical φόροι.

However, this objection can be met if we assume, on the parallel of the Gambreion inscription, that the φόροι payable on the two κληροί are not identical to, *nor need even be proportional to*, the total tax-liability of the properties concerned. Why does Mnesimachos' mortgage specify the annual seed-requirement for the arable land attached to each κληρος at all? If annual arable produce was included in the assessment for the estate's φόροι, this specification would be entirely otiose. I suggest, rather, that the produce from the arable land was taxed in proportion to the annual yield at a fixed rate (probably of 1/10 or 1/12). Hence, as in the Gambreion inscription, it was necessary to specify the annual seed-requirement for each κληρος in lieu of the (indeterminable) real annual tax-payment in kind. As a consequence, and again on the parallel of the Gambreion inscription, we may infer that the listed φόροι in Mnesimachos' mortgage represent only the flat-rate taxes levied on the property (on non-arable agricultural produce, and perhaps immovable property and manpower).¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² N. SEKUNDA, *Achaemenid Colonization in Lydia*, REA 87/1, 1985, 27, plausibly suggests that these two κληροί may already have been circumscribed and detached from the larger οἶκος in the Achaemenid period. The Lydian names of the two κληρος-holders may support this hypothesis: could these even be hereditary leases granted to the ancestors of Pytheas and Adrastos before the Macedonian conquest, and *renewed* at the time of the assignment of the οἶκος to Mnesimachos?

¹⁰³ APERGHIS (n. 47) 139.

¹⁰⁴ Or even ground-rent. In I.Magnesia 8 (above, n. 83), the saleable value of uniform 50-σχοίνοι plots varies from 38 dr. per σχοῖνος to 100 dr. per σχοῖνος. So at Magnesia, the value

Slight confirmation of this interpretation may come from two clauses in the second column of the inscription. In the event of a failure by Mnesimachos or his descendants to act as warrantors against any external claim to the property (or any other breach of contract), then Mnesimachos' right of redemption is waived and he is required to repay double the amount of the original loan.¹⁰⁵ Most interestingly, Mnesimachos also agrees that «concerning the produce and the fruits, if they have not been harvested in that year, we shall pay to the temple of Artemis whatever sum they are valued at (ὀπόσου οὖν χρυσίου ἄξια ἦ); and concerning the new buildings and newly cultivated plants introduced by (the representatives of) Artemis, or any other improvements they may have made, we shall pay whatever sum they are valued at» (II 8–11). The same provision is repeated in the event that the King chooses to reclaim the estate from Mnesimachos, in which case the temple of Artemis would naturally lose its claim to the estate's usufruct.¹⁰⁶ The crucial point for our purposes is that Mnesimachos promises to pay the value of the «produce and fruits» for that given year to Artemis, *whatever that value may be*. The annual harvest was sufficiently variable that the real value of the estate to its possessor in any given year could only be determined retrospectively.

The consequence is that the 1325-stater mortgage taken out by Mnesimachos on his estate does not, as DESCAT believed, reflect the total theoretical value of the οἶκος (excluding the two κληροί, from which Mnesimachos received no direct benefit), but the valuation of *only* those parts of the οἶκος which were subject to the φόρος ἀργυρικός.

Conclusion: Macedonia and Asia

The conclusions which follow from this are of some interest. We have seen that the mortgage of Mnesimachos includes a clause envisaging the reclamation of the οἶκος from the temple of Artemis by the King «through Mnesimachos» (ἐὰν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφέλῃται τῆι Ἀρτέμιδι διὰ Μνησίμαχον). Even though the temple of Artemis is in possession of the usufruct of the οἶκος, it is nonetheless «through Mnesimachos» that the property reverts to the crown. Despite the facts that (a) two parts of the estate (the κληροί) have been on emphyteutic lease to Pytheos and Adrastos as an ἐξαίρημα since the time of the original land-grant (and possibly for many generations previously),

(and hence, presumably, productivity) of the poorest land is $\frac{19}{50}$ that of the best quality land. The seed requirement of the land in the Water of Morstas (6 artabas) is exactly $\frac{2}{3}$ that of the land at Tobalmoura (15 artabas). Hence on the parallel of I.Magnesia 8, the two κληροί could, theoretically, have been of precisely equal size.

¹⁰⁵ I take the phrase εἰς τὰ Ἀρτέμιδος ἐχέτωσαν (II 5) to be synonymous with μηθὲν ἐξέστω ... μηκέτι ἀπολύσασθαι (II 1): Mnesimachos loses the right of redemption, and the οἶκος thus passes into the possession of the temple of Artemis. See also n. 96 above.

¹⁰⁶ Εὰν δὲ τὰς κόμας ἢ τοὺς κληρούς ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τι τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἐὰν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφέλῃται τῆι Ἀρτέμιδι διὰ Μνησίμαχον (II 12–13). As we have seen, in the Achaemenid period the King could reclaim his property whenever he wished (above, n. 21).

and (b) the remainder of the estate has, through Mnesimachos' bad financial management, fallen into the hands of the temple of Artemis, nevertheless it is still Mnesimachos who is regarded by the royal administration as the lease-holder of the entire οἶκος. Similarly, we may suppose, even though Krateuas has granted a part of his estate on emphyteutic lease-hold to another tenant (Aristomenes), from the perspective of the royal administration he remains the sole holder of the grant. The lease-holder can mortgage his estate (Mnesimachos) or sub-let it to another party (Krateuas), but he is unable to alienate it altogether. In each case, the original beneficiary remains, in a very real sense, *permanently tied to his estate*.¹⁰⁷

These tenure-conditions stand in sharp contrast to the conditions under which land on the Chalkidike peninsula was granted by Macedonian kings. As we have seen, the estates on European soil handed out by Philip II, Alexander III and Lysimachos to their subordinates became the private property of the beneficiary, inheritable and fully alienable. In Asia Minor, by contrast, the «land-grants» of Alexander III to Krateuas and of Antigonos to Mnesimachos were grants of the land's usufruct alone. The domains could, in theory, be reclaimed by the king whenever he wished. However unlikely this reclamation might be in practice, this system reflects a fundamentally different approach to the granting of land from that which we see in fourth-century Macedonia. So far as we can judge, Alexander's policies in relation to tax, tribute, and the granting of land in western Asia Minor owed nothing to earlier Macedonian royal practice, and everything to the practices of his Achaemenid predecessors.

Appendix: «Aramaic» numerals in Greek inscriptions

I.Tralleis 3, now in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, is a Greek inscription dating to the first century AD, purporting to be a re-inscription of a decree of Tralleis of the late Achaemenid period.¹⁰⁸ The prescript reads as follows:

ἔτεος ΙΙΙΙΙΙ, μηνὸς ἑββδόμῳ,	Year 7, the seventh month,
βασιλέοντος Ἀρταξέσσε-	when Artaxerxes was king,
ω, ἑξασατραπεύοντος Ἰδριέ-	when Idrieus was satrap.
ως.	

Two peculiarities speak strongly in favour of the authenticity of the text: the use of «tallies» to express «Year 7», and the spelling of the genitive of the King's name, Ἀρταξέσσεω. The form of the King's name (found only here) is a far more accurate transliteration of the Old Persian *A-r-t-x-š-ç* and the Aramaic *ʾrthšš* than the usual Greek form Ἀρταξέρξης. The normal Greek form has an intrusive *rho*, derived from a

¹⁰⁷ THONEMANN (above, n. 5) 439–440.

¹⁰⁸ L. ROBERT, *Collection Froehner I. Inscriptions grecques*, 1936, no. 96; F. SOKOLOWSKI, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, 1955, no. 75; I.Tralleis 3.

false etymological parallel with the name Ξέρξης (OP *X-š-y-a-r-š-a*, Aramaic *ḫšyrš*); exactly the same confusion is found in fifth-century Lycian (*Ertaxsiraza*, TL 44b 59–60). However, in a Lydian text from Sardis dated to Year 15 of the reign of King Artaxerxes (probably either II or III), the name is accurately spelled *Artakśassa*.¹⁰⁹ The accurate phonetic reproduction of the King's name in the Tralleis inscription is an excellent indication that the text is indeed a genuine relic of fourth-century Achaemenid Caria.¹¹⁰

More interesting still is the indication of the year-numeral by means of «tallies», seven parallel vertical strokes. Greek parallels for this kind of numerical notation are few and far between; some scholars have gone so far as to suggest that the stone-cutter might have accidentally inscribed seven vertical strokes (IIIIII) in place of a *pi* and four vertical strokes (IIIII).¹¹¹ It seems not to have been noted that this mode of numerical notation is quite standard in Achaemenid-era Aramaic documents.¹¹² Numerals from 1–9 are regularly expressed by tallies clustered in groups of three (III III III); a separate sign (∩) is used for the number 10.¹¹³ This notation would have been familiar to inhabitants of Achaemenid Asia Minor: the Aramaic text of the Lydian-Aramaic bilingual from Sardis is dated to the fifth day (IIIII) of the month *Marḫešuān*, Year 10 (∩) of King Artaxerxes; an Aramaic inscription from the fortress of Kirshu (*Meydancikkale*) in Kilikia, dating to the late fifth or early fourth century

¹⁰⁹ GUSMANI (above, n. 37) no. 2, with R. SCHMITT, *Iranisches Personennamenbuch V. 4: Iranische Namen in den indogermanischen Sprachen Kleinasien*, 1982, IV/29–30. In the new inscription from the Kaystros valley (above, n. 36), the name is incorrectly spelled *Artakśaerśa*-, with an intrusive *-r*-.

¹¹⁰ HORNBLOWER (above, n. 35) 42 n. 40: «According to M. Mayrhofer, *Aus der Namenswelt Irans* [1971], Ἀρταξέσσης is the Elamite form of Artaxerxes' name, turned into Greek. The connection between fourth-century Tralles and Elam is obscure, but that between Roman Tralles and Elam is obscurer still.» This makes things unnecessarily complicated. The form Ἀρταξέσσης is simply an *accurate* rendering of Artaxerxes' name, whether in Old Persian, Elamite, Aramaic, Lydian or Greek; there is no need to postulate a «connection» between Tralles and Elam.

¹¹¹ HORNBLOWER (above, n. 35) 42–43, with nn. 41–44, following M. N. TOD, *The Greek Numeral Notation*, *ABSA* 18, 1911/12, 122, 131.

¹¹² DEBORD (above, n. 29) 136, apparently unaware that this numerical notation is standard in Aramaic papyri and inscriptions, merely notes that «sur certaines monnaies de Sidon émises par Mazday/Mazaios dont les légendes sont en araméen la dix septième année du pouvoir du satrape ... est notée comme suit: IIIIIII.» Dated coins of Phoenicia are not restricted to Mazaios: Tyre, Arados, Sidon and Ake all minted numerous silver coins with Aramaic numerals marking regnal years. See J. ELAYI – A. G. ELAYI, *Systems of Abbreviations used by Byblos, Tyre and Arwad*, *JNG* 37/38, 1987/88, 11–22; *idem*, *Abbreviations and numbers on Phoenician pre-Alexandrine coinage: the Sidonian example*, *NAC* 17, 1988, 27–36; E. T. NEWELL, *The Dated Alexander Coinage of Sidon and Ake*, 1916, 42–67.

¹¹³ For the use of the Aramaic numeral-system for regnal years in documents of the Achaemenid period, see PORTEN (above, n. 35) 13–32; M. L. FOLMER, *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period*, 1995, 25–28.

BC, is dated Year 17 (I III III ◊) of King Artaxerxes.¹¹⁴ The Lydians, too, took over the Aramaic system of numeration wholesale: for example, in the new Lydian inscription from the Kaystros valley, the numeral 17 is represented exactly as in Aramaic (I III III ◊).¹¹⁵

It seems very likely, then, that the Tralleis text is an accurate copy of a Greek inscription of the mid-fourth century BC carrying a «Aramaic-style» date.¹¹⁶ However, on any hypothesis, the numeral 7 in the prescript cannot be correct, since the satrap Idrieus did not come to office until the Athenian archon year 351/0 BC, the eighth or ninth regnal year of Artaxerxes III.¹¹⁷ Hence I should like to suggest that the numeral IIIIII in the Tralleis inscription is in fact an attempt to reproduce the number 16 inscribed in the «Aramaic» style: ἔτεος III III ◊. The copyist of the first century AD, while carefully reproducing the unfamiliar «Aramaic» form of the date, was baffled by the sign ◊, and so simply transformed it into another tally. This would give a date of 344/3 or 343/2 BC, the last year of Idrieus' tenure of the satrapy of Caria (the Athenian archon-year 344/3 BC).

A Greek inscription from Sardis presents comparable problems. The text concerned dates to the first or second century AD, and is a reinscription of an Achaemenid-era document of the fifth or fourth century BC, commemorating the dedication of a cult-statue by a certain Droaphernes.¹¹⁸ The prescript reads: ἔτεων τριήκοντα ἑννέα, Ἀρταξέρξω βασιλεύοντος, «37 of years (*sic*), when Artaxerxes was King». As LOUIS ROBERT noted in his original publication of the text, the use of the genitive plural ἔτεων, combined with a cardinal rather than ordinal number for Artaxerxes' regnal year, is highly anomalous: «Comment s'explique ce génitif pluriel avec un nombre cardinal? Pourquoi pas ἔτους ou ἔτει avec l'ordinal? Question de traduction servile [of a putative Aramaic original]? D'autres le diront. Ou des parallèles en grec ont-ils échappé à mon souvenir?»¹¹⁹ It is possible that ROBERT was right to invoke an Aramaic (or perhaps more likely, Lydian) original, but even that hypothesis is not

¹¹⁴ Sardis: Sardis VI 2, no. 1. For the date (350/49 or 349/8), see J. NAVEH, *The Development of the Aramaic Script*, 1970, 57. Meydancikkale: A. LEMAIRE – H. LOZACHMEUR, in: A. DAVESNE – F. LAROCHE-TRAUNECKER (ed.), *Gülner I: Le site de Meydancikkale*, 1998, 308–314.

¹¹⁵ GUSMANI – AKKAN (above, n. 36): *borl ◊ III III I artaksæršal qalmlul dāv*. Compare GUSMANI (above, n. 37) no. 2 (II III ◊ = 15), no. 3 (II III = 5), no. 41 (III III ◊ = 16), no. 42 (I ◊ = 11), no. 50 (II ◊ = 12).

¹¹⁶ That the original text was in Greek, not Aramaic or any other language, is certain. Note especially the use of the Greek month-name ἑβδόμω: the Trallians evidently numbered their months, as practised in Phokis and Achaia.

¹¹⁷ HORNBLOWER (above, n. 35) 41–45: Idrieus' tenure of the satrapy ran from 351/0 to 344/3.

¹¹⁸ ROBERT, OMS V, 485–509 (SEG 29, 1205); P. BRIANT, *Droaphernès et la statue de Sardes*, in: M. BROSIUS – A. KUHR, *Achaemenid History XI: Essays ...* David M. Lewis, 1998, 205–225; DEBORD (above, n. 29) 367–374.

¹¹⁹ ROBERT, OMS V, 489.

strictly necessary. On the parallel of the Tralleis inscription, the cardinal number τριήκοντα ἑννέα (rather than the normal ordinal, [ἔτει] τριακοστῶι καὶ ἑνάτωι) can easily be explained as an expansion of an «Aramaic»-style cardinal numeral (III III III ̄ =) in an original Greek text.¹²⁰ As for the anomalous genitive plural ἔτεων, I have no suggestions to offer.

Wadham College
Oxford – OX1 3PN
peter.thonemann@wadh.ox.ac.uk

¹²⁰ BRIANT (above, n. 118) 222 no. 44, correctly notes the parallel use of cardinal numbers in the dating formulae of Aramaic texts.

