



National and Kapodistrian  
University of Athens  
School of Law  
Department of History and Theory of Law

## V<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF YOUNG HISTORIANS OF ANCIENT GREEK LAW

ATHENS, September 8 & 9, 2016  
The Athens University History Museum, Tholou 5, Plaka



Under the auspices of the Greek Society of Legal Historians



Ελληνική Εταιρεία Ιστορίας του Δικαίου

**Organizing Committee:**

Professor Edward Harris (Durham), [edward.harris@durham.ac.uk](mailto:edward.harris@durham.ac.uk)

Ass. Professor Athina Dimopoulou (Athens), [adimopoul@law.uoa.gr](mailto:adimopoul@law.uoa.gr)

Ass. Profesor Andreas Helmis (Athens), [helmand@law.uoa.gr](mailto:helmand@law.uoa.gr)

**Fifth Meeting of Young Historians of Greek Law (2016)**  
**NATIONAL AND KAPODISTRIAN UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, SCHOOL OF LAW**  
**September 8-9, 2016**  
 The Athens University History Museum, Tholou 5, Plaka

***Program***

***Thursday, September 8, 2016***

9.30: Opening session, Welcome address by the Organizers

President : TBA

10.00-10.40: Lisa Eberle (Oxford), Enforcing the *Polis*: territory, property, and the making of community in the archaic period

10.40-11.00: Discussion

11.00-11.40: Jakub Filonik (Warsaw), Who punished the 'impious': the role of magistrates and informers in Athenian legal system

11.40-12.00: Discussion

**12.00-12.15: Break**

12.15-12.55: Ben Clapperton (Durham), Did the Athenians apply differing standards of relevance in the Areopagus and the popular courts? A comparison of Lysias 3 and Demosthenes 54.

12.55-13.15: Discussion

**13.30: Lunch**

President : TBA

16.30-17.10: Donatella Erdas (Pisa), Rules governing and preventing the redistribution of land in ancient Greece between theory and practice

17.10-17.30: Discussion

17.30-18.10: Christina Carusi (Texas): On the vocabulary of building contracts in classical Athens

18.10-18.30: Discussion

**18.30-18.40: Break**

18.40-19.20: Robert K. Pitt (British School at Athens), "Enforcing the law in Greek building contracts"

19.20-19.40: Discussion

**Friday, September 10, 2016**

President : TBA

10.00-10.40: Peter Long (London), Guarantors and the Enforcement of Contracts between the Individual and the State in Classical Athens and Hellenistic Delos

10.40-11.00: Discussion

11.00-11.40: Sara Sanovello (Verona), Paramone and the Performance of Post Manumission Obligations

11.40-12.00: Discussion

**12.00-12.15: Break**

12.15-12.55: Jean-Mathieu Carbon (Copenhagen), 'Unlawful Assembly': Laws and Other Rules Against Associations

12.55-13.15: Discussion

**13.30: Lunch**

President : TBA

16.30-17.10: Eleni Volonaki (Kalamata), The role and identity of the public prosecutor in Athenian courts: the case of Lykourgos

17.10-17.30: Discussion

17.30-18.10: Eleni Karabatsou (Athens), Women as Litigants in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt

18.10-18.30: Discussion

**18.30-18.40: Break**

18.40-19.20: Jean-Sebastien Balzat (Oxford), Existait-il une législation interdisant l'usage des noms romains à Rhodes?

19.20-19.40: Discussion

19.40: Closing Remarks

**20.00: Dinner**

---

## V<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF YOUNG HISTORIANS OF ANCIENT GREEK LAW

ATHENS, September 8 & 9, 2016  
The Athens University History Museum, Tholou 5, Plaka

### ABSTRACTS

#### THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2016

**Lisa Eberle (Oxford), Enforcing the *Polis*: territory, property, and the making of community in the archaic period**

Scholars working on the “rise of the *polis*”, whether from a “state” or a “society” perspective (e.g. van Wees 2013 and Duplouy 2014), take the existence of fixed civic communities for granted. However, recent scholarship has de-centered *polis* communities to emphasize the multiplicity of overlapping group identities that were articulated in the archaic period (e.g. Morgan 2003). What is more, compared to the other forms of community at the time, *poleis* were clearly the most imagined; at the same time, they made the highest demands on their members, including taxes and military service. How was this possible? Why did so many people eventually choose to belong to a *polis* community?

This paper begins to explore these questions by focusing on Greek cities’ particular territoriality: the widely acknowledged but under-explored norm that in a *polis*’ territory only its members were allowed to own land. Drawing on recent critical approaches to law that emphasize law’s tendency to presume the existence of the people and things that it puts in relation to each other and its ability to create them in the process (Richardson 2012 and Herzog 2015), I use literary and epigraphical evidence from the archaic period to argue that the establishment of this norm was instrumental in bringing Greek cities as communities into being, since this territoriality made property rights dependent on permanently identifying as a member of a given community—an identification that provided the basis for all future claims that this community might make on its members. The maintenance and enforcement of this norm, I contend, was intimately connected to the material interests that it put in play.

Although evidence is sparse, we have several indications that the archaic period was formative for the development of Greek cities’ territoriality. Archaic literary and epigraphic material reveals a perception of the landscape in which expanses of land were perceived to belong to definite communities and were the object of conflicts between these communities, and whose dimensions became the subject of much record-keeping (e.g. *IC* I, ix, 1 and Tyrtaeus 10). The semantic history of *chōra* and *gē*, the words used for these territories, and the absence of known Mycenaean precedents for such a territorial conception of political power suggest that this was indeed a recent development in the archaic period. Furthermore, property in land was a steady obsession in archaic legal inscriptions and these texts also often specify rights as belonging to specific groups (e.g. *Nomima* I, nos. 16 and 21). This evidence not only suggests that the development of Greek cities’ particular territoriality was an important new phenomenon, but texts such as Theognis, ll. 865-68, also reveal that this development was a contested process rather than the simple consequence of the shift from pastoralism to arable farming as de Polignac (1995) suggested. The idea that only

Sicyonians, for example, owned land in Sicyonian territory was as much an aspirational claim as the suggestion, often made by archaic poets, that all members of the civic community considered it a good thing to go out and defend the civic *chōra*. Both these claims undoubtedly shaped the social reality that they purported to describe; and the former, I contend, was crucial in getting people who otherwise might not have cared about being Sicyonian—whether they be members of a regional elite or small farmers in what would become the Sicyonian countryside—to commit to this identity.

In conclusion, this paper attempts to move past the dichotomy between state and society centered approaches to the rise of the *polis*—approaches that either assume a complete state or its complete absence—by focusing on the interplay between normative pronouncements and individuals' self-perception. In so doing, it proposes a new role for such pronouncements in creating *polis* communities; they were not merely means to regulate power and conflict within such communities, but also served a crucial function in creating them in the first place.

### Bibliography

Duplouy, Alain. 2014. "Les prétendues classes censitaires soloniennes. À propos de la citoyenneté athénienne archaïque." *Annales HSS* 69: 629-658.

Herzog, Tamar. 2015. *Frontiers of Possession. Spain and Portugal in Europe and the Americas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morgan, Catherine. 2003. *Early Greek states beyond the Polis*. London: Routledge.

de Polignac, François. 1995. *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Richardson, Seth. 2012. "Early Mesopotamia. The Presumptive State." *Past & Present* 215: 4-49.

van Wees, Hans. 2013. *Ships and Silver, Taxes and tribute. A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*. London: Tauris.

### **Jakub Filonik (Warsaw) , Who punished the 'impious': the role of magistrates and informers in Athenian legal system**

Studies of impiety trials in classical Athens, both the just alleged and the well-attested ones, have generally focused on high-profile cases of public figures. This paper examines the less thoroughly studied process of bringing the crime to the magistrate's or the people's attention by the non-elite – average citizens, metics and foreigners, or in limited circumstances even slaves – who were unaccustomed to appearing in courts and less confident in their strengths as litigants. It highlights those parts of the Athenian legal framework that allowed more discreet aid in legal actions (especially for offences deemed to threaten the order of the state, such as impiety), thus adding to the debate on the openness of the Athenian legal system to individuals of different legal status and socio-political standing. It also examines the way in which the magistrates and informers in general could have played a crucial role in the Athenian administration of justice.

By reconstructing the legal process in historical trials and the proceedings suggested by literary and epigraphic material, this paper examines both the judicial procedures and the auxiliary means of prosecution which allowed a more limited involvement of the informant. This will include a discussion of the often-overlooked legal actions described by the sources as φράζειν ('pointing out'), φαίειν ('denouncing'), and μηνύειν ('informing'). It will stand in correspondence with Demosthenes' remarks (22.27) about the procedural measures available in prosecuting ἀσέβεια in mid fourth-century Athens, while confronting it with the cases attested by other sources, including a new tentative reading of a fourth-century law regulating the Mysteries (Clinton 2008 no. 138) that proposes a different conjecture of the inscription.

**Ben Clapperton (Durham), Did the Athenians apply differing standards of relevance in the Areopagus and the popular courts? A comparison of Lysias 3 and Demosthenes 54**

Lanni (2006) has argued that different standards of relevance were applied by the Athenians across different courts. The popular courts were prepared to consider a wide variety of both 'legal' and 'extra-legal' arguments. Appeals to pity from the judges, the financial impact of a guilty verdict on them and their family, extraneous background information, and reference to the speaker's good character and the poor character of their opponent, are all cited as examples of extra-legal information that the Athenians believed was relevant for a just verdict. The discretion of the judges to apply their judgement to the circumstances of each case overrode the consistent application of a standardised set of laws independent of circumstance. In the homicide courts, however, the emphasis was on legal arguments, with clearly defined and more substantive laws, and restrictions on introducing arguments which were not directly relevant to the case

Dem. 54 and Lysias 3 present lawcourt speeches given in trials for very similar offences, one of which was presented in a popular court, and the other in a homicide court. This paper compares the two speeches to show that not only did they employ very similar rhetorical strategies, demonstrating no difference in what the speaker considered relevant to their argument, but that the elements which would be considered as 'extra-legal' were in fact directly relevant to the case. The appeal to the judges' pity at 3.48 is predicated on the defendant's innocence, and the mention of the good works of the speaker's family at 54.44 is used to highlight how they are less important than giving the correct verdict based on the laws regardless of circumstance. These speeches demonstrate there was no difference in standards of relevance between popular and homicide courts, and that each judged cases based primarily upon the application of the laws.

**Donatella Erdas (Pisa), Rules governing and preventing the redistribution of land in ancient Greece between theory and practice**

Programs of redistribution of land (γῆς ἀναδασμός) are attested from the Archaic to the late Hellenistic period all over the Greek world. Different situations prompted the decision of redistributing the land, such as internal dynamics of a community (e.g. claims for land by the *demos*), political strifes and *staseis*, inclusion of new citizens into a civic body, settlement of *epoikoi*. However, although social and political backgrounds could be different from case to case, the various poleis developed similar procedures, as the ancient sources testify. The instances coming from the colonial world are particularly homogeneous.

In 1967 David Asheri dedicated a whole chapter of his book on the distribution of land in ancient Greece to γῆς ἀναδασμός, successfully identifying the legal features that regulated the phenomenon and its ideological significance in the ancient sources, with particular respect to the literary ones.

Starting from his pioneering work, in this paper I intend to compare the epigraphical corpus for γῆς ἀναδασμός, increased by some new documents over the last few decades, with examples coming from the literary sources, in order to investigate whether rules preventing the redistribution of land really existed in the Greek poleis. If so, a further step will be to identify the legal procedures that each polis put to use to maintain the existing agrarian layout. Finally, I will try to shed some light on the long-standing question whether or not the connection between the need to redistribute the land and revolutionary programs or tyrannical regimes is as tight as the ancient sources depicted it.

### **Cristina Carusi (Austin, Texas), On the vocabulary of building contracts in classical Athens**

In this paper I reconsider the peculiar vocabulary employed in Attic sources to define the contracting out of building works. By conducting a fresh analysis of the evidence, and with the aid of Roman law as a comparative tool, I propose a new view of the use of building contracts in classical Athens and try to find a more suitable explanation for the Attic terminology.

While in the rest of the Greek world the vocabulary of building contracts belongs to the lexical sphere of sale (cf. words like ἐργώνης "contractor" and ἐργωνέω "I contract for a work"), in Attica the contracting out of building works is defined as a transaction pertaining to the lexical sphere of μισθός, with contractors called μισθωταί or μισθωσάμενοι and the active and middle voices of the verb μισθόω indicating respectively the awarding and undertaking of building contracts.

Current scholarship usually links this vocabulary to the meaning of μισθός as "remuneration in exchange of a work performed" and interprets the Attic peculiarity as evidence that Athens originally preferred the direct hiring of workers to the contracting out of works. In places like Epidaurus, Delphi, and Delos, where the availability of skilled labor was scarce, the sale by auction of building contracts was necessary to attract and keep hold of skilled workers with the promise of important and long term jobs. By contrast, the large availability of skilled workers attracted to Athens by the ambitious projects of the 5th c. led the city to prefer the system of direct hiring. Only in the 4th c., when skilled labor became scarcer even in Athens, the contracting out of large portions of works to 'big firms' came into use, even if the terminology, originally shaped by the idea of μισθός, remained linked to the old practice.

Against this background I will argue that no significant change in the system of labor recruitment occurred in Athens between the 5th and 4th c. and that both direct hiring and building contracts were frequently employed to complete different parts of the same project in the 5th as well as in the 4th c. Since the peculiar terminology employed in Athens cannot have originated from a preference for the system of direct hiring, it is necessary to find a different explanation for it. In the relevant scholarship the Athenian practice is often equated with the *locatio-conductio* of Roman law, but this comparison has never been used, to my knowledge, to explore the original meaning of the Athenian terminology. Using the *locatio-conductio* of Roman law as a comparative tool and supporting my argument with Greek evidence (e.g. *IG* XII.6 172), I will argue that the μισθός-related vocabulary might point not to the wages of direct hired workers, but to the renting out of public money (μισθωσις ἀργυρίου), i.e. a procedure by which public commissioners allocated public money to contractors in order to complete the agreed upon works.

### **Robert K. Pitt (British School at Athens), Enforcing the law in Greek building contracts**

The corpus of inscribed building contracts and accounts from across the Greek world in the Classical and Hellenistic periods allows us to trace the development of contract law within the specific area of public-private partnerships between the polis, sanctuary, or federation on the one hand and the entrepreneur builder or craftsman on the other. The polis employed officials to oversee large building projects, often giving them wide powers to scrutinise and penalise the contractors, although their powers could at times be checked by recourse to higher authorities and courts. Many of the details of contracts and building specifications are surprisingly minute, and the involvement of a variety of architects and ναοποιοί in checking every stage of the progressing works can appear excessive. That such measures were taken seriously can, however, be traced in the inscribed accounts, where penalties for very minor infractions are recorded against the contractors.

The nature of the building trade necessitated a wide mobility of craftspeople, whose work can be

traced through the records of public projects. This peripatetic life of the contractor produced certain problems for a polis employing foreign workers in tying them down to their legal obligations when they did not have property or rights which could be confiscated from them. Contracts grew in complexity to address such difficulties, and this paper will assess a number of solutions to enforcing the law. One important element of security for the polis was the use of local guarantors, who acted as sureties for the contractor and who could be liable to heavy fines if the contractor defaulted or if the authorities were unable to recover penalties from him. The guarantors appear in our inscriptions only when they are being assessed as worthy of the potential risk or when they are being chased down by debt collectors, but their role must have gone much further than this, and we may perhaps glimpse within this system a trace of collective underwriters.

#### **FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2016**

#### **Peter Long (London), Guarantors and the Enforcement of Contracts between the Individual and the State in Classical Athens and Hellenistic Delos**

Guarantors could make a major contribution to ensuring that the contracts entered into by individuals with the city state were complied with. This paper will explore how the guarantee, and guarantors, operated in this respect in classical Athens and on independent Delos (314-166BC). There were many similarities between the laws and practices of the two city states regarding the role of guarantors in ensuring compliance by individuals with their obligations under contracts with the state or one of its subdivisions or gods or goddesses. This is perhaps not surprising when one considers that Delos was under Athenian domination for much of the fourth century BC, and before that. But there were also some important differences in the way guarantors operated in this area in the two communities.

The first part of the paper will discuss briefly the content of the obligation undertaken by guarantors and will review the rights available to guarantors against the “principal debtors” (i.e. the individuals whose obligations the guarantors had guaranteed) which enabled guarantors to protect themselves against their potential exposure to a call being made on their guarantees and to recover any sums paid out if a call was made. In these respects there were great similarities between the laws and practices of the two city states and here the guarantor’s role as “enforcer” of these contracts can be clearly seen. However, a guarantor could not be relied upon to fulfil this role if the state did not enforce the guarantees against the guarantor. The second part of the paper, therefore, will explore how guarantees could be, and were, enforced against guarantors of these transactions in Athens and independent Delos. Here some similarities but also some significant differences in law and practice can be found between the two city states. The paper will briefly suggest some reasons for these differences.

#### **Sara Sanovello (Verona), Paramone and the Performance of Post Manumission Obligations**

Many Greek sources show that, after manumission, ἀπελεύθεροι are 'free to go wherever they want and to do whatever they want' (e.g. SGDI II 1697), while others remain attached to their manumittors' household for a specific period of time and are obliged to perform further services which scholars define as παραμονή (typically, SGDI II 1703).

The imposition of post manumission obligations upon freedmen has puzzled scholarship: the idea that ἀπελεύθεροι under παραμονή are free has recently been challenged by scholars who describe them either as semi-slaves or half-free (Zelnick-Abramovitz [2005]: 244), or as slaves who become free only once παραμονή has ended (most recently, Sosin [2016]).



This paper focuses mainly on the Delphic manumission inscriptions, which provide the bulk of the evidence for παραμονή, and shows that παραμονή was a post manumission obligation imposed on freedmen in favour of specific individuals, and the object of an agreement between manumittors and manumitted slaves as legally free persons.

In order to show that the legal condition of ἀπελεύθεροι under παραμονή is one of freedom, this paper relies both on philological and grammatical data (the predominant use of the aorist imperative of the verb παραμένειν conveys the idea of an obligation that comes with manumission), and on the legal clauses which regulate the imposition and performance of παραμονή. Prohibition to sell those ἀπελεύθεροι who did not παραμένειν (SGDI II 2171), the necessity to recur to the decision of three arbitrators in case of a disagreement between manumittors and ἀπελεύθεροι (SGDI II 1689), the institution of ἀπόλυσις (FD III 3:354), reversion into slavery as a possible penalty for the non fulfilment of post manumission obligations (SGDI II 1702; Harp. s.v. ἀποστασίου), all suggest that ἀπελεύθεροι under παραμονή are legally free and capable of entering into binding agreements with their former masters.

### **Jan-Mathieu Carbon (Copenhagen), 'Unlawful Assembly': On Laws Against Associations and Similar Rules**

Freedom of assembly or of forming a private group seem like de facto or tacitly guaranteed rights in most of the ancient Greek world, yet some evidence may suggest that matters were not as simple. Inter alia, the danger posed by informal private groups is of course palpable in the different controversies, indeed the opprobrium surrounding the bands of comrades (hetairiai) attested in 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> century Athens (Arnaoutoglou 1998; cf. recently Gabrielsen 2016: 134-141). Another city with high politics, Rome, later displayed a strong aversion to private groups both locally and throughout the Empire, often intervening to prevent their formation altogether (Rome: Lex Iulia; Pontus: Plin. Ep. 10.34 and 10.96; Egypt: Philo, in Flaccum 4, with Arnaoutoglou 2005; etc.). Was this a general trend in Greece too or only specific to some contexts? And what do we know more generally of rules and laws against associations?

A famous passage reporting the words of King Nikokles to the inhabitants of Cyprus testifies to a large-scale prohibition against the formation of any independent and unauthorised associations: “make no camaraderies (hetairiai) nor any gatherings (synodoi) without my sanction”, the reason being that such assemblies become “dangerous in monarchies, avaricious and predatory in other constitutions” (Isocr. 3.54). Whatever its actual validity, this precept finds more specific parallels in many civic oaths attested in epigraphic sources, where in forbidding alternative public meetings (sylogoi—perhaps collectives of a military character) the concern of the city was to preserve its essential integrity and harmony (homonoia), and to prevent any dissent, notably stemming from groups bound by oath and from political conspiracies (synomosiai): cf. IG XII,4 132.125-137 (oath of the Telians, ca. 300 BC), IC III iv 8.9-18 (Itanos, beg. 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC); cp. IosPE I2 401.36-47 (Chersonesos), IC I ix 1.60-75 (Dreros). An Athenian law (eisaggeltikos nomos) either of the period 410-404 or post 404/3 BC similarly seems to have aimed to ban hetairika (Hyp. 4.7-8; [Dem.] 46.26), but it almost certainly also focussed only on those synagogai that sought to dissolve the state (ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου). Indeed, there is no evidence that any such laws were actually enforced, and many transgressive groups of this sort apparently persisted. It would thus be too bold to claim that in oaths of citizenship or oaths of office the citizen promised to fulfill “public responsibilities and disregard private interest” (cf. e.g. Perlman 1995: 163); for instance, one could still manifestly form or join private associations ad libitum, even ones bound by potentially dangerous corporative oaths (cf. e.g. IG II2 1289, 1291.9-10; cp. IG II2 1258).

With considerable freedom naturally came many responsibilities. Associations enjoyed widespread

success from approximately the beginning of the fourth century BC onwards, in as much as they manifestly strove to present themselves as a ‘world of well-ordered societies’ (cf. IG II2 1369 with Arnaoutoglou, in Gabrielsen and Paganini forthc.). While it can certainly be illuminating to focus on the continued negative publicity or disruptive potential of associations—later in the Roman empire, for example, discord regularly reared its ugly head, primarily involving professional groups (bakers at I.Ephesos 215; Dio Chrys. 34.21-23 on linen-workers in Tarsos; cp. Lib. Or. 17.2 and 18.141 on the otherwise neutral term *φαιρία*)—this is also not the whole picture. Indeed, we would be hard pressed to find any sweeping legislation against these groups in the Greek world. One instructive case-study is formed by a few religious regulations against *thiasoi*, often in female cults, which occasionally aimed to limit the access of private groups to the sanctuary, except in specific circumstances such as state sacrifices (cf. IG II2 1177, deme decree of Piraeus, ca. 350 BC; cp. e.g. SEG 56, 1017 from Thasos). Such rules were almost certainly intended as utilitarian. Other regulations sought to maintain the priority of the city over other competing *thiasoi* (LSAM 48, Miletos), but these did not in any other way challenge the freedom of association and assembly of the groups in question. Overall, we should conclude that the only direct targets of Greek laws were overtly political or dangerous associations, while others were regulated in strictly practical terms and tolerated, even encouraged, as long as they did not overstep the mark.

#### Selected References

Arnaoutoglou, I. 1998. “Between *koinon* and *idion*: legal and social dimensions of religious associations in ancient Athens”, in: P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden eds., *Kosmos*, Cambridge: 68-83.

Arnaoutoglou, I. 2005. “*Collegia* in the Province of Egypt in the first century AD”, *AncSoc* 35: 197-216. Gabrielsen, V. 2016. “Associations, Modernization and the Return of the Private Network in Athens”, in:

C. Thiersch ed., *Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart: 121-162.

Perlman, P.J. 1995. “*Invocatio* and *imprecatio*: The Hymn to the Greatest *Kouros* from Palaikastro and the Oath in Ancient Crete”, *JHS* 115: 161-167.

#### **Eleni Volonaki (Kalamata), The role and identity of the public prosecutor in Athenian courts: the case of Lykourgos**

According to Solon’s legislation, any Athenian citizen who wished (*ho boulomenos*) could initiate a legal procedure against public officials, *rhetores* and politicians in the interests of the city to protect the democratic constitution. The citizens who were actually involved in court trials as public prosecutors were mostly men of power. They were acting on the name of law to protect the city of Athens from criminals, traitors, supporters of oligarchic regimes etc. It is worth exploring how their cases were connected with the idea of enforcing the law of the city and to what extent they even attempted to impose new interpretations of laws in court.

One case of a public prosecutor who attempted to influence the judges and direct their role in court is Lykourgos – a man of political power who himself introduced new laws on issues of religion, theatre, culture and education of the youth. His prosecutions aimed at the punishment of criminals through an *eisangelia* and the question to examine is whether Lykourgos used the courts to implement his political programme, to introduce new modes of education and legislation, to employ rhetorical strategies that were meant to create civic consciousness and identity.

On balance, the present paper will explore the argumentation and status –political and social– of public prosecutors, their motivation varying from personal rivalries to altruistic views of innovating the city, the constitution and the legal system.

### **Eleni Karabatsou (Athens), Women as Litigants in Hellenistic Egypt**

This paper briefly examines the applicable laws as well as the judiciary system in Ptolemaic Egypt. Emphasis is laid on the distinction between collegiate courts on one hand and royal magistrates endowed by the king with a judicial authority of an administrative and coercive character on the other: the king and his court of *chrématistai*, Greek courts of the three autonomous Greek cities and Greek courts of the *chôra*, *laokritai*, *koinodikion*. After examining the papyrological evidence of Ptolemaic era, the study reaches the following conclusions: women had the right to appear as litigants in front of the Greek courts of the *chôra* assisted by their guardian (*kyrios*). The assistance of the *kyrios* is also attested for the royal court of *chrématistai* but not in petitions to the king (*enteuxeis*, 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. B.C.) or to the royal magistrates, i.e. in documents which could possibly initiate a trial. The applicable laws and the judiciary system are also briefly examined for Roman Egypt, where the *praefectus Aegypti* or *princeps* appears as the supreme judge with general jurisdiction all over the province, whilst dignitaries such as the *juridicus*, the *idiologos*, the *epistrategos*, the *strategos*, the *dioiketês* and others exercise a more limited jurisdiction as *iudices delegati* of the prefect (with the exception of the *juridicus* and *idiologos* who were delegated directly by the emperor). The study concludes with the examination of the *ekdikos*: the latter, in contrast with the woman's guardian (*kyrios*), is attested by the papyrological evidence of the Principate to act *ad hoc*, without constituting a permanent judicial representative of the woman; in any case his presence is not necessary for conducting the case.

### **Jean-Sébastien Balzat (Oxford), Existait-il une législation interdisant l'usage des noms romains à Rhodes?**

Il y a vingt ans, Alain Bresson constatait que l'usage de l'onomastique latine chez les Rhodiens n'apparaît dans la documentation épigraphique qu'à partir du milieu du 1er s. et qu'à l'époque flavienne une irruption brutale de l'onomastique latine se produit dans les inscriptions de Rhodes. Il dressait un constat similaire à Lindos. Il voyait dans ce phénomène onomastique l'existence d'une résistance rhodienne, voire d'un refus de l'onomastique latine. Il en tenait pour responsable le conservatisme de la cité, allant jusqu'à suggérer l'existence d'une législation interdisant aux Rhodiens devenus citoyens romains le port des tria nomina. C'est la privation de la liberté de la cité par Claude à la suite de l'empalement de citoyens romains dans la cité qui aurait été la cause d'un changement soudain d'attitude et expliquerait un affaiblissement de la résistance onomastique des Rhodiens. L'onomastique serait donc un aspect d'une résistance culturelle propre à la cité.

Afin de donner une interprétation plus nuancée de l'usage de l'onomastique romaine à Rhodes et ailleurs, je vais montrer en quoi la diffusion de l'onomastique romaine dans les cités grecques représente un phénomène onomastique original. Je placerai l'évolution de cette diffusion dans la longue durée (2 s. av. J.-C. - 3 s. apr. J.-C.). J'analyserai deux groupes d'usagers des noms romains dans l'épigraphie des cités: les élites locales et la diaspora romaine. Je tenterai notamment de montrer comment avec la diffusion de la citoyenneté romaine aux élites locales, la période julio-claudienne pourrait représenter une période de transition dans l'adoption de l'onomastique latine dans les cités grecques. Il faut attendre la période flavienne pour voir une nette diffusion de l'onomastique latine.