

might find themselves judged as private citizens before the courts; *Syll.*³ 141, l. 12: *etas* opposed to *archōn*); b) in opposition to the civic community as a whole (Aesch. fr. 281a: *etēs* vs. *dēmos*; IG IX 1² 2, 573, l. 9, where, notably, the noun is partially restored).

Particularly significant is *InvO* 9, in which (*W*)*etas* denotes a private citizen who holds no magistracy (and is thus not a *telestēs*), considered separately from the people assembled in the *ekklesia* (and/or from the civic body as a whole: *damos*). In a rather late document (first-third centuries CE) from Nubia, finally, *etēs* occurs with the meaning of “free citizen” in opposition to “slave” (Bernard, *Inscriptions métriques* 167, l. 9: καὶ ἔτας καὶ δμώας).

[G. Falco]

Gēs anadasmos (γῆς ἀναδασμός)

Anadasmos, or less frequently *anadaithmos* (Himera, SEG 47.1427, l. 14, γέεζ ἀναδαιθμό), or *daithmos* (δαithμόν, IG IX 1² 3, 609, l. 10; cf. also l. 13 γαδαισίας), in combination with *gē* or, more rarely, *chōra*, denotes a civic process involving the total or partial redistribution of land within a *polis* among its citizens. Agrarian redistribution programs are attested across the Greek world from the Archaic period through the late Hellenistic age.

A variety of circumstances could prompt a *polis* to revise its existing agrarian structure and undertake a new division and allocation of land. These were often internal dynamics, such as demands—frequently attributed in the sources to the *dēmos*—for a more equitable distribution of land allotments, episodes of civil strife (*staseis*), or the incorporation of new citizens into the civic body; in the case of *apoikiai*, the settlement of new colonists (*epoikoi*) within the civic territory. Such measures always carried significant political weight, as they directly engaged the central issue of the relationship between the *politēs* and landownership (see Faraguna 2024; Malkin 2023). In modern scholarship, the phenomenon has been discussed in connection with the principle of the inalienability of the *klēros*, and, by extension, with the preservation of the original system of land distribution within the *polis* (Asheri 1966; Finley 1968; Malkin in Malkin, Blok 2024, 260-64).

Asheri (1966) distinguished between primary distributions and those implemented at a later stage, as well as between total and partial redistributions. However, when both literary and epigraphic evidence are considered from the standpoint of the historical and political motivations underlying agrarian reform, two broad tendencies emerge across the history of the Greek *poleis* from the Archaic period to the fifth century BCE.

The first tendency shows the *polis* resorting to *gēs anadasmos* at the instigation of the *dēmos* in contexts of economic crisis and marked inequality. Such measures were typically imposed by individuals invested, for various reasons, with

full powers—most notably lawgivers and, above all, tyrants (Brandt 1989). These political experiences presuppose specific conditions of social pressure: at Sparta under Lycurgus (Plut. *Lyc.* 8.1; Arist. *Pol.* 1306b 37-1307a 2); or shortly thereafter, in the first half of the 7th century BCE: Arist. *Pol.* 1306b 37-1307a 2 (Cecchet 2009); at Athens, in connection with a redistribution that Solon declined to implement: Plut. *Sol.* 16.1; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 12.3 (Rosivach 1992); and at Cumae under the tyrant Aristodemos: Dion. Hal. 7.8 (Orth 1986).

All these cases are transmitted by sources much later than the events they describe, and they appear to reflect a conservative view of *gēs anadasmus* as a practice at odds with democracy, insofar as it was thought to facilitate the transition from a democratic system to radical democracy and ultimately to tyranny (*Schol. Dem.* 24.299: ἀναδασμόν] οἶον ἀναμερισμόν· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶωθε γίγνεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἀτακτούσαις δημοκρατίαις).

Within this framework, agrarian redistribution tends to carry negative connotations and is almost invariably associated with debt cancellation (*chreon apokope*; cf. Rosivach 1992). The report of a redistribution of land (together with debt remission) attributed to Lycurgus at Sparta is clearly a retrojection to the age of the *patrioi nomoi* of the agrarian reforms carried out in the third century BCE by Agis IV and Cleomenes III (Plut. *Agis* and *Cleomenes*).

The second tendency, attested in both literary and epigraphic sources, concerns demands for the redistribution of land (total, though more often partial) driven by the need for land under specific circumstances, such as the admission of new citizens into a *polis*—for instance, *epoikoi* arriving from the metropolis and settling in a colonial territory, or exiles resettled as new citizens after expulsion from their own communities. *Poleis*, and especially *apoikiai*, were frequently confronted with the need to assign land to new citizens, returning exiles, or new segments of the civic body originating from the metropolis.

Since the right to private property had to be guaranteed to all *politai*, both old and new, this issue was addressed in different ways: for example, by allocating to new citizens portions of land that had remained undivided and reserved for such contingencies—an arrangement that presupposes a certain degree of land availability on the part of the *polis*; or by assigning new plots drawn from the *eschatia* or from *eremos chora* (Asheri 1966, with examples). However, when none of these options was feasible—i.e. when land resources were insufficient to meet the minimum requirements for access to citizenship (see *s.v.* *enktēsis*, *politeia*)—it became necessary to plan a redistribution of both urban and extra-urban land.

The evidence from the colonial world is both predominant and remarkably homogeneous. To this context belongs the clause prohibiting redistribution after a certain period in the Locrian *apoikia* attested in the so-called Pappadakis bronze (*IG IX* 1² 3, 609, l. 10: Zurbach 2017, 549; Erdas forthcoming), as well as the proposal—ultimately not implemented—of Arcesilaus III at Cyrene (Hdt. 4.162-164). Far from representing an exception within the broader

documentation on land redistribution, colonial cases in fact constitute its most substantial core (Lombardo 2001; Dreher 2007; Malkin 2023; Erdas 2025 and forthcoming; *contra* Link 1991). Particularly numerous are proposals for agrarian redistribution from Siceliote *poleis*: probably at Himera in the early fifth century BCE (*SEG* 47.1427, although the law concerns the allocation of urban land; see Lombardo 2001; De Vido 2023; Erdas forthcoming); at Syracuse under Gelon (Diod. Sic. 11.25.5); and at Leontini in 424–422 BCE (Thuc. 5.4.2; for further cases see Asheri 1979). The documentation spans from the late Archaic period to the Hellenistic age, the latest example being the decree of the *apoikia* of Kerkyra Melaina in Croatia, dating to the early third century BCE (*Syll.*³ 141 +; see Lombardo 2002). This text contains provisions for the allocation of urban plots to the first settlers, as well as additional *kleroi* to be assigned to newcomers (ll. 9–10: τοὺς ἐφέρποντας). Once these allocations had been completed, the decree stipulates that no further *gēs anadasmus* was to take place (ll. 10–13).

More generally, this second group of documents shows that there existed rules aimed at avoiding recourse to the redistribution of urban and extra-urban land. These rules, however, were grounded in practical concerns—such as the risk of disrupting a functional and well-organized system of land allocation relative to the number of citizens—rather than in any principled objection to redistribution itself. In essence, there was no inherent prejudice against agrarian redistribution: *poleis* resorted to it only in serious and exceptional circumstances, always connected with the admission of new citizens into the community.

In none of the cases belonging to this second group is land redistribution proposed or rejected as a means of equalizing citizens' property holdings, as is instead characteristic of the first group of evidence, which reflects various forms of social injustice. In those cases, land redistribution, together with the closely associated slogan of debt cancellation, serves to alleviate the political tensions generated by economic inequality within the *polis*. It follows that this latter group of testimonia—preserved in literary sources—is shaped by the rhetorical and philosophical discourse on radical democracy and tyranny that developed from the late fifth century BCE onward. This discourse, largely negative in tone, established a sharp distinction regarding the political appropriateness of land redistribution and influenced the interpretation of *gēs anadasmus* even in relation to Archaic contexts.

The defining features of this ideological construct, as already noted, are the close association between land redistribution and debt cancellation, and the interpretation of both measures as symptoms of *stasis*, which in turn leads to the linkage of *gēs anadasmus* with radical democracy and tyranny. Thus, Isocrates (*Panath.* 12.59) identifies *gēs anadasmus* and *chreōn apokopē* as the first signs of civil upheaval, while Plato (*Leg.* 684d) characterizes them as political measures of the demagogue aspiring to tyranny; elsewhere he assigns to the *agronomoi* the task of punishing anyone who attempts to remove boundary markers (*boroī*)

from the land, treating such an act as a form of *gēs anadasmos*. See also Plat. *Resp.* 565e-566a; Arist. *Pol.* 5.1305a 4 ff.; 5.1307a 1; 1309a 14; *Ath. Pol.* 40.3. One of the earliest testimonies to this line of thought appears in [Arist.] *Rhet. ad Alex.* 2.17 (fourth century BCE), where the enactment of strict laws is recommended in order to prohibit land redistribution and the confiscation of property from those who have served the *polis* well. The prohibition of *gēs anadasmos* as an anti-democratic measure also appears in the oath of the Athenian *beliastai* preserved in Demosthenes' *Against Timocrates* (Dem. 24.149), although this passage is almost certainly interpolated (Canevaro 2013, 174-78).

On a practical level, the negative view of agrarian redistribution—often associated with debt remission—begins to appear, in the form of sanction clauses, in official documents addressed to the citizens of a *polis*. This is the case at Delphi in the law of Kadys regulating loans at interest (*Choix Delphes* 28, col. VII, ll. 2-6, early fourth century BCE). Even more significant, with regard to the relationship between the *politēs* and land rights on the one hand, and between the citizens collectively and the preservation of democracy (in an anti-tyrannical sense) on the other, is the presence of a clause prohibiting the redistribution of land and houses and the cancellation of debts in the oath of the citizens of Itanos in Crete (*IC III iv* 8, ll. 21-24: οὐ | [δὲ γὰρ] ἀναδασμὸν οὐδὲ οἰκιᾶν | [οὐδὲ] οἰκοπέδων, οὐδὲ χρεῶν ἂ | [ποκ]οῖαν ποιησέω). Here *gēs anadasmos* and *chreōn apokopē* function as ideological markers associated with the risk of civil strife, and citizens are bound by oath not to pursue such measures precisely because they might lead to the dissolution of the *polis*.

The association between the prohibition of *gēs anadasmos* and the degeneration of radical democracy into tyranny—rooted in anti-tyrannical ideology—is also evident in certain Siceliote cases reported by literary sources far removed from the events they describe. These include the agrarian reforms implemented by Dionysius I at Syracuse after the peace treaty with Carthage in 405 BCE (Diod. Sic. 14.7.4-5), and the proposal by Heracleides—opposed by Dion—for land redistribution, which was voted on but never carried out (Plut. *Dion* 37.5; 48.6-9; see Fuchs 1968). Taken as a whole, the evidence discussed above shows that the ideological framing of *gēs anadasmos* and *chreōn apokopē* as signs of political subversion and indicators of the emergence of authoritarian rule had, by this stage, become fully integrated into Greek political thought.

D. Asheri, *Distribuzioni di terre nell'antica Grecia*, Torino 1966.

D. Asheri, "Rimpatrio di esuli e redistribuzione di terre nelle città siceliote, ca. 466-461 a.C.", in Φιλίας χάριν. *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni*, I, Roma 1979, 143-58.

H. Brandt, "Της αναδασμός und ältere Tyrannis", *Chiron* 19, 1989, 207-34.

M. Canevaro, *The Documents in the Attic Orators: Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*, Oxford 2013.

- L. Cecchet, “Τῆς ἀναδασμός: a real issue in the archaic and classical poleis?”, *Athenaeum* 55, 2009, 185-98.
- S. De Vido, “Spazio civico e spazio urbano. Ancora sulla lamina di Imera”, *Kokalos* 60, 2023, 33-51.
- M. Dreher, “Das Bürgerrecht im griechischen Sizilien zwischen Recht und Politik”, in E. Cantarella (ed.), *Symposion 2005. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Salerno, 14.–18. September 2005)*, Wien 2007, 57-78.
- D. Erdas, “Protezioni legali sulla terra nelle clausole di accesso alla cittadinanza: osservazioni preliminari”, in S. De Vido, A. Esposito, A. Pollini, C. Weber-Paliez (eds.), *TeMAES I. Territoires multiples. Espaces, définitions, expériences dans le monde grec (VII–Ie siècle av. J.Chr.)*, Bordeaux, forthcoming.
- D. Erdas, “Redistribuzioni di terre nei giuramenti di cittadini tra aspirazione all’uguaglianza e protezione della *politeia*”, *Erga-Logoi* 13.2, 2025, 143-65.
- M. Faraguna, “Land and Citizenship in the Greek *Polis*: Real Property, Public Control, and Institutionalisation”, *Dike* 27, 2024, 121-74.
- M.I. Finley, “The Alienability of Land in Ancient Greece”, *Eirene* 7, 1968, 25-32 (= *The Use and Abuse of History*, London 1975, 153-60).
- A. Fucks, “Redistribution of Land and Houses in Syracuse in 356 B.C., and Its Ideological Aspects”, *CQ* 18, 1968, 207-33.
- S. Link, *Landverteilung und sozialer Frieden im archaischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart 1991.
- M. Lombardo, “La documentazione epigrafica”, in *Problemi della chora coloniale dall’Occidente al Mar Nero. Atti del XL Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia (Taranto, 29 settembre – 3 ottobre 2000)*, Taranto 2001, 73-114.
- M. Lombardo, “I Greci a Kerkyra Melaina (*Syll.*³ 141): pratiche coloniali e ruolo degli indigeni”, in *Grčki utjecaj na istočnoj obali Jadrana – Greek Influence along the East Adriatic Coast. Proceedings of the International Conference held at Split from september 24th to 26th 1998*, Split 2002, 121-40.
- I. Malkin, “Lottery and Mixture in the Greek Polis”, in V. Pirenne-Delforge, M. Węcowski (eds.), *Politeia and Koinōnia: Studies in Ancient Greek History in Honour of Josine Blok*, Leiden 2023, 179-87.
- I. Malkin, J. Blok, *Drawing Lots: From Egalitarianism to Democracy in Ancient Greece*, Oxford 2024.
- W. Orth, “Die Frage einer umfassenden Grundbesitzumverteilung im Meinungsstreit des griechischen Altertums”, in *Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag am 4 August 1981 dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, II, Rom 1986, 717-41.
- V.J. Rosivach, “Redistribution of Land in Solon, Fragment 34 West”, *JHS* 112, 1992, 153-7.
- J. Zurbach, *Les hommes, la terre et la dette en Grèce c. 1400 – c. 500 a.C.*, II, Bordeaux 2017.
- [D. Erdas]