

## **16 Moires and Miri lands: Some linguistic coincidences and a discussion about land ownership**

**Ferda Donmez-Atbasi, Irene Sotiropoulou**

### **ABSTRACT**

The paper belongs to a greater research programme related to economic knowledge that exists outside academia and is created and shared by communities through informal routes. One of the sources of this economic knowledge is language itself, especially non-academic language(s). The use of language as a source is also based on the fact that the *lingua franca* of economics is English and this leads to distortions in our economic education and research, because the economic knowledge that other languages contain goes unnoticed. Therefore, we use our own native languages to (re)search economic knowledge that exists outside academia and can inform economics about contemporary practices but also about historical precedents of political economic importance.

In particular, this paper analyses the use of the word “Moirā” (“Fate” and “Share” in Greek) and Miri (Land owned by the Ottoman state leased to subjects for cultivation) and raises questions about the similarities and differences in the practices they represent. What is most important though, is that the words refer to perceptions about land ownerships and management that defy our contemporary understandings of land property. Moreover, the paper investigates the use of the words in everyday language, in previous historical eras or even today under certain circumstances, and how both words and the terms related to them connect land practices to various political economic activities and phenomena.

### **Μοίρες και Γαίες Μιρί: Μερικές γλωσσολογικές συμπτώσεις και μια συζήτηση για την ιδιοκτησία γης**

**Φερντά Ντονμέζ-Ατμπασι, Ειρήνη Σωτηροπούλου**

### **ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ**

Η μελέτη ανήκει σε ένα μεγαλύτερο ερευνητικό πρόγραμμα που σχετίζεται με την οικονομική γνώση που υπάρχει εκτός ακαδημαϊκής κοινότητας και δημιουργείται και χρησιμοποιείται από κοινού από τις διάφορες κοινότητες μέσω ανεπίσημων οδών. Μια από τις πηγές αυτής της οικονομικής γνώσης είναι η ίδια η γλώσσα, ιδιαίτερα η μη ακαδημαϊκή γλώσσα, η οποία περιέχει οικονομικές γνώσεις που αποκλείονται από την οικονομική ορολογία και πολύ περισσότερο από την οικονομική *lingua franca*, η οποία είναι η αγγλική.

Στην ανάλυσή μας, καταλαβαίνουμε τον καπιταλισμό ως μια μορφή πατριαρχίας και την πατριαρχία ως κοινωνικό και οικονομικό σύστημα. Στις καπιταλιστικές κοινωνίες επικρατεί ο θεσμός της ατομικής ιδιοκτησίας με όλες τις επιπτώσεις της: αποκλεισμός από την πρόσβαση και τον έλεγχο της χρήσης γης, ιεράρχηση των χρήσεων γης ώστε να αποφέρουν το μεγαλύτερο κέρδος, στερήσεις και διάλυση ολόκληρων κοινοτήτων και υποβάθμιση του εδάφους και των οικοσυστημάτων. Η ατομική ιδιοκτησία

αποτελεί βασικό χαρακτηριστικό της πατριαρχίας, ενώ άλλα κοινωνικοοικονομικά συστήματα δεν διαθέτουν αυτό τον θεσμό. Αντίθετα, η γη είναι, εξ ορισμού, όχι μόνο κοινή, αλλά και η πρόσβαση σε αυτήν προσαρμόζεται στις ανάγκες της κοινωνίας/των μελών της κοινότητας.

Η μελέτη αναλύει τη χρήση των λέξεων "Μοίρα" και "Μιρί" (η γη που ανήκει στο οθωμανικό κράτος και εκμισθώνεται για καλλιέργεια) και εγείρει ερωτήματα σχετικά με τις ομοιότητες και τις διαφορές στις πρακτικές που εκπροσωπούν. Παρατηρήσαμε ότι πέρα από την ομοιότητα του ήχου μεταξύ αυτών των δύο λέξεων, συνδέονται επίσης με τις αντιλήψεις και τις πρακτικές σχετικά με την ιδιοκτησία και τη διαχείριση της γης που αφηφούν τις σύγχρονες αντιλήψεις μας για την έγγεια ιδιοκτησία.

Μοίρα και Μοίρες είναι μια λέξη που χρησιμοποιείται στην ελληνική γλώσσα από την αρχαιότητα μέχρι σήμερα και έχει δύο βασικές έννοιες: η θεά του πεπρωμένου, Μοίρα, ή Μοίρες στον πληθυντικό, οι Θεές της μοίρας. Η άλλη έννοια είναι το «μερίδιο», το μέρος ενός κοινού πράγματος που αποδίδεται σε κάποιον. Ακόμη και στον σύγχρονο ελληνικό νόμο, μοίρα είναι το μερίδιο κληρονομιάς ενός ατόμου του οποίου ο συγγενής ή ο σύζυγός του έχει πεθάνει. Επιπλέον, οι αποφάσεις της Μοίρας ή των Μοιρών είναι αναπόφευκτες, αν και στον λαϊκό πολιτισμό βρίσκουμε Μοίρες που αλλάζουν γνώμη ή λυτούνται τους ανθρώπους στους οποίους αρχικά προκάλεσαν δύσκολες καταστάσεις.

Για να κατανοήσουμε την κοινωνικοοικονομική έννοια των Μοιρών, χρησιμοποιήσαμε το έργο του G.D.Thomson, όπου εξηγεί ότι οι Μοίρες είναι η μνήμη των προπατριαρχικών κοινωνιών που δεν είχαν ατομική ιδιοκτησία. Σε αυτές τις κοινωνίες, η γη ή ο πλούτος της κοινότητας αναδιανεμόταν τακτικά μεταξύ των μελών της. Επιπλέον, η επιμονή στο πρόσωπο της Μοίρας/Μοιρών, είναι επίσης μια προσδοκία για τιμωρία από τις Μοίρες / συλλογικά καθεστώτα, για την απώλεια της (συλλογικής) ισχύος και για τις ανισορροπίες που η πατριαρχία έφερε μεταξύ των μελών της κοινωνίας.

Από την άλλη πλευρά, στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία, ένα μεγάλο μέρος των εδαφών ήταν δημόσια ιδιοκτησία. Αυτά τα δημόσια εδάφη ονομάστηκαν "μιρί/miri" και διανεμήθηκαν με ένα σύστημα που συνδέει τους αξιωματικούς του ιππικού με τους αγρότες, προκειμένου να παράσχουν αγροτικά προϊόντα για το στρατό και για τα αστικά κέντρα, κυρίως την Κωνσταντινούπολη ως πρωτεύουσα της αυτοκρατορίας. Οι αγρότες είχαν δικαιώματα χρήσης στη γη, τα οποία δεν ήταν δικαιώματα ατομικής ιδιοκτησίας. Τα δικαιώματα ήταν τίτλοι επικαρπίας και ήταν αποκλειστικά για την οικογένεια του χωρικού που μπορούσε να κληροδοτήσει τη γη στα παιδιά του για τα ίδια δικαιώματα χρήσης και επικαρπίας και όχι για περισσότερο από αυτά. Το ίδιο συνέβαινε και με τα δικαιώματα γης των αξιωματικών του ιππικού.

Παρά τη στρατιωτικοποίηση αυτή, διαπιστώνουμε ότι το σύστημα των μικρών γαιοκτησιών του μιρί κατέστησε αρκετά δύσκολο για τον καπιταλισμό να επεκταθεί στην οθωμανική αυτοκρατορία και υποστήριξε τους μικρούς παραγωγούς λόγω της τάσης αποκέντρωσης που δημιουργεί στον έλεγχο της γης. Μόλις τον 19ο αιώνα με το Tanzimat / Μεταρρύθμιση, η νομοθεσία για την ιδιωτική ιδιοκτησία επεκτάθηκε επίσημα στα δικαιώματα χρήσης που ορισμένες οικογένειες είχαν γενιά από γενιά

Άλλες παρόμοιες λέξεις που σχετίζονται με τη δημόσια γη ή με κοινά συστήματα διαχείρισης βρίσκονται στις σλαβικές γλώσσες και στην αραβική γλώσσα. Είδαμε σε διάφορες περιπτώσεις ότι στη Μεσόγειο και στην Ανατολική Ευρώπη / Βαλκάνια το θέμα της εξουσίας και της κατανομής / διανομής, της εξουσίας ως διανομής, διανομής ως εξουσίας, αναδύεται μέσα από λέξεις που έχουν αλληλένδετες ή και παρόμοιες έννοιες. Αυτές οι λέξεις μπορούν να αντιπροσωπεύουν από μεταφυσικά όντα μέχρι νομικές

έννοιες και εκτάσεις γης, και από πολιτικούς θεσμούς μέχρι πρακτικές κοινής χρήσης γαιών. Με αυτή την έννοια, οι διάφορες αντιλήψεις για τη γη, ως κάτι που χρησιμοποιείται και ελέγχεται συλλογικά, φαίνεται ότι είναι ζωντανές μέσα από τις λέξεις που εξακολουθούμε να χρησιμοποιούμε ακόμη και σήμερα.

## **0 Introduction**

The paper belongs to a greater research programme related to economic knowledge that exists outside academia and is created and shared by communities through informal routes. One of the sources of this economic knowledge is language itself, especially non-academic language(s), which contain economic knowledge which is excluded by the economic terminology and much more by the economic *lingua franca*, which is English.

Our paper analyses the use of the word “Moirā” (“Fate” and “Share” in Greek) and Miri (Land owned by the Ottoman state leased to subjects for cultivation) and raises questions about the similarities and differences in the practices they represent. We observed that beyond the similarity of sound among those two words, they are also linked to perceptions and practices about land ownerships and management that defy our contemporary understandings of land property.

The next section presents the context of the paper and section two (2) presents the general theoretical background of our investigation. Section number three (3) examines the case of Moira/moira in Greek language and section number four (4) investigates the miri system of land management during the era(s) of the Ottoman Empire. Section five (5) presents the findings concerning the same linguistic theme mir in other languages. Section six (6) discusses our findings and instead of conclusions we present directions for further research in section seven (7).

## **1 The context of the paper**

The paper belongs to an ongoing research programme we run since 2010 on economic knowledge that exists outside academia. The discipline of economics is being produced mostly in Western European and USA institutions and how the rest of academic centres need to conform to this knowledge. This economic knowledge is historically and socially relevant to the societies it has been produced in, while we want to understand the economic activity performed by real people in real societies which have completely different historical and contemporary contexts than the ones mainstream economics has. We decided to turn to

the people around us because we wanted to learn this economic knowledge that is relevant to our societies.

Local languages, instead of English as lingua franca of economics, are among the sources we use for this project. In this paper, we mostly used words from the Turkish/Ottoman and Greek/ancient Greek languages that we speak well, but we also used findings from Arabic and from literature concerning Slavic terms for collective land cultivation.

We have been honoured to have been granted a 12-month Newton Mobility Grant by the British Academy, titled “Researching and teaching grassroots economics: A pilot project” that allows us to open up the research programme to other researchers, and to the greater society. This paper is one of the outputs that came out of this grant.

## **2 Theoretical background of the paper**

For our analysis, we understand capitalism as a form of patriarchy. Patriarchy is a social and economic system, because the institutions of private property, even property over human bodies, and the state/central authority are fundamental for its existence. Apart from common main institutions, capitalism shares with patriarchy the strategy of depriving its slaves/labourers of means of production. The methods of deprivation comprise expropriation of bodies, lands and raw materials, as well as the devaluation of everything related to the reproduction of society. Therefore, patriarchy and capitalism even more, devalue nature and basic reproductive tasks from giving birth to preparing food, and from educating children to cultivating the land [6] [12] [14].

In our capitalist societies, we see various ways of understanding access and control of land. Given the capitalist and patriarchal structures that define our economies, we see that the institution of private property prevails, with all its implications: exclusionary access and control of the land use, prioritisation of land uses that bring the most of profit, deprivation and dispossession of entire communities. To those problems, one should add the intensive character of land use and the degradation of soil and the ecosystems of the area where the land is used following the maximisation of profit principle [2] [7].

We do not claim that the perceptions of property are the same in all capitalist (and/or) patriarchal societies. We recognise, first, that due to legal, political, social or environmental conditions, private property might differ from country to country and from community to community. Second, the differences do not only refer to formal constructions of property, but they also exist in grassroots perceptions and practices about property [11] [13] [21] [22] [23].

At this point, we need to distinguish between capitalist and non-capitalist (private) property

regimes. Capitalism has several types of property, among which there is the prominent type of private property. It also has several types of private property, where the exclusionary rights but also the intensiveness of use of the propertied thing (especially land) can vary.

We are not sure though, whether those variations are characteristics of capitalist systems or whether those variations are signs of resistances that mitigate the aggressiveness of the institution of private property. The other thing we are not sure about is whether the resistances to capitalist private property are resistances to the capitalist form of property, to the private form of property or to the very core of property itself. Thus, we also need to distinguish among patriarchal and non-patriarchal resistances to capitalist private property.

We know already that private property is a core trait of patriarchy and that other socio-economic systems do not have this institution. Even if some of the non-patriarchal systems have private property as an institution, this private property practice is limited to low value/input objects dedicated to everyday use, like clothes or small utensils. In those same systems, land is by definition, not only a common, but also something the access to which needs to be adaptable to the needs of the society/community members [3] [24].

This is where our interest in the Mir-Moir linguistic complex or root comes up as a potential direction of further research. To understand the patriarchal or non-patriarchal character of resistances, we would need to understand what non-patriarchal systems do with land. We observed that the words for sharing land or shared land or for sharing, but also commanding, have similar sound in the Mediterranean area, in the Middle East and Eastern Europe. Mir-Miri-Emr-Moir seems to be too much of a commonality to be a mere coincidence.

### **3 Moira, Moires, moira and moires**

Moira and Moires (moira and moires) is a word used in Greek language since antiquity till today and has two basic meanings: One is the Goddess of fate, Moira or Moires in plural, the Goddesses of fate (Moirae or Moirai in ancient Greek). The other meaning is “share”, the part of a shared thing that is attributed to someone.

Even in contemporary Greek law, moira is the inheritance share of someone, whose relative or spouse has died<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, moira is also linked to sharing that takes place within tribal

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Greek Civil Law Code (Αστικός Κώδικας) <https://goo.gl/BHWLrn>

understandings of society<sup>2</sup>. We also find the same meaning (inheritance share) as *moirasi* in local dialects of Greek language, e.g. the Cretan dialects. It is the same word *miras* or *mirath* in Islamic law concerning the share of inheritance for a relative [8].

The Goddess of fate, *Moirai*, is the Goddess of sharing, therefore. She distributes the life conditions and life paths to humans. The triple Goddess or three Goddesses, *Moires/Moirai*, were also specialising in the shares they were giving: *Klotho*, the weaver *Moirai*, was giving the share of life. *Lachesis*, the lottery *Moirai*, was giving the incidents one encounters with in life. Finally, *Atropos*, the scissor-cutting *Moirai*, was giving the share of death [24] [25].

In folk culture of Greece, *Moires* and *Moirai* are interchangeable as well. Sometimes, they are represented as three women (or more), sometimes, it is just one woman. Just like the ancient *Moirai*, *Moirai* and *Moires* can be very tough and strict and can put the protagonists of the folk tales or of folk songs and stories into tests [4] [5] [9].

Moreover, *Moirai*'s or *Moires*' decisions are unavoidable, although in folk culture, we find *Moires* who change their mind or pity humans upon which they initially inflicted difficult situations. The impossibility to escape *Moires/Moirai* and one's *moira*, the Goddess and the share, is deeply embedded in the perceptions of both ancient and contemporary grassroots thinking of Greek culture.

It is also very interesting that the inescapable situation is often something that in patriarchy is considered an abomination. For example, there are folktales where despite the father's preventive efforts, the daughter, as *Moirai* predicts, gets pregnant by having an affair outside marriage, or gets married to a poor man [4] [5] [9]<sup>3</sup>.

To understand the social-economic meaning of *Moires*, we used G.D.Thomson's work [24] [25], where he explains that *Moires* have been the memory of pre-patriarchal, pre-property regimes. In those societies, the land or the wealth of the community was regularly redistributed among its members. It seems that the transition from matrifocal to patriarchal societies and from commonly managed wealth to private property did not erase that memory.

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, most people even outside the legal profession know the νόμιμη μοίρα/legal share, which is the secured by law legal share of inheritance for a close relative of the deceased, even if the deceased wanted to bequeath the wealth to another relative or to non-kin people.

<sup>3</sup> In patriarchy, women's agency and personal life is not considered to be of their own decision. Much less when the relationship with a man includes people who originate in different social classes.

Moreover, the persistence of the persona of Moira/Moires, the powerful, inescapable, tough and fearful female is also an expression of the fear for the injustices brought by patriarchy compared to the old regimes. It is also an expectation for punishment by Moires/collective regimes, for the loss of (collective) power and for the imbalances patriarchy brought among the members of society. It is as if Moira and Moires, moira and moires, are inescapable the same way that the wish for redistribution of accumulated wealth is (desired as) inescapable.

#### **4 Miri lands and the Ottoman way of access to land for small land-holders**

The other case we study comes from Ottoman history. In the Ottoman Empire, a major part of the lands were public property. The word “miri” in Ottoman language is of Persian origin and means the land that belongs to the state<sup>4</sup>. Still other meanings are “the Treasury”, rent and land tax<sup>5</sup>. The public lands named “miri” were distributed under a system that linked cavalry officers to peasants, in order to provide agricultural produce for the army and for the urban centres, mostly Istanbul as capital city of the empire. The peasants had rights of use on the land but those were not private property rights. At least, as long as this system was implemented, the rights were titles of usufruct and were exclusive for the family of the peasant who could bequeath the land to their children (& spouse). This bequeathing just meant that the heirs would also have the same use and usufruct rights and not more than those. If a family was changing place of living (migration) or their population was reduced (e.g. due to plague epidemics), the land as state-owned land, was distributed to other peasants [16] [17].

Same with the land rights of the *Timarli Sipahiler*, i.e. the cavalry officers. If they did not provide the state with the military services and wheat required by the imperial army, they would lose their rights to the miri lands assigned to them and other officers would take hold of the lands and the peasants who lived there. So, the *timar* wasn't providing any private property and inheritance rights but just the right to tax the peasants that were assigned to the same Miri lands [20]. Accordingly, even though the basic characteristics of a Western style feudal society persisted, the state abrogated all personal dependencies between the peasant and the local military, land titles and taxation. Moreover, the relations between the assigned peasants and the *timar* holders were strictly regulated by the sultan's laws under

---

<sup>4</sup> The word has the exact same meaning in Persian as well (<http://www.sozce.com/nedir/228852-miri>).

<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, Miri also means “being the *bey* (land lord)- beylik”, and beylik still means “common, ordinary” in today's Turkish.

the tight control of a central bureaucracy [16] [17].

We can see in those two cases that the same-sounding word can be linked to land-sharing practices. However, in the case of the Ottoman Empire, the sharing systems was very well embedded into the hierarchical<sup>6</sup>, patriarchal and very militarized structure of the empire.

Nevertheless, despite this militarisation, we can see that the system of miri lands made it quite difficult for capitalism to advance in the Ottoman Empire and supported small producers given its decentralisation tendency concerning land control. It was only in 19<sup>th</sup> century with the *Tanzimat*/Reform, that private property legislation was extended officially to the use rights that some families had generation after generation (and unfortunately, those had already started to be concentrated in the hands of the few) [16] [17].

## 5 The mir theme of sharing and political power in other languages

We would need to add at this point that the theme “mir” exists in other languages too, like Slavic and Arabic languages. For example, we know the mir system of collective cultivation in Slavic communities, that was a way of agricultural management in Eastern Europe that has been included in the writings of Marx, too [1] [10].

We also see that in the Arabic language the theme emr/mer/mir is the theme for Amer/Amir-Amira (prince-princess), Imarat (emirates). Imaret/Imarat is also a word that is used with its original meaning (public works, public improvements, public construction) in Ottoman language<sup>7</sup> as well and refers to public food houses built by the state since the beginning of the Ottoman State well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century [15]. The land that the Emir-Amir rules is a mir or Amir land, i.e. the same word represents the ruler and the public land that is given to the people under a system of usufruct rights, same as the one described in section 4. It is the same theme, therefore, for the ruler, the ruled land and the welfare distribution. As already mentioned in section 3, the word miras or mirath in Islamic law is the share of inheritance for a relative [8] [18] [19].

## 6 Discussion of findings

In the previous sections, we have seen in various cases that in the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe/Balkans, the theme of power and sharing/distributing, power as distribution,

---

<sup>6</sup> Depending on the annual revenue of the land in question the miri lands were classified into three: Has, Zeamet and Timar in a descending order. The biggest lands were assigned to higher rank military officers [20].

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.nisanyansozluk.com/?k=imaret&x=0&y=0>



distribution as power, emerges through words that have interlinked or even similar meanings. Those same words may represent from metaphysical beings to legal entities and land plots, and from political institutions to welfare practices and common use of lands.

Particularly about land, it seems that, because land is the major source of survival means and of means of production, its sharing was a major institution under *mir-moir* system (just like private property of land defines in capitalist patriarchal societies the entire economic system). The memory or persistent practices of this type are powerful enough to counteract, if not the proliferation of private property as such, at least the mindset that private property is the only possible arrangement for wealth creation and use in a society.

In that sense, various perceptions of the land as commonly and collectively used and controlled thing, seems to be alive through the semantic ties of words that we still use today in various languages. It also seems that private property is an institution that evolved parallel to other ways of perceiving humans’ relationship to land. Even if the other, pre-patriarchal non-property-based perceptions were suppressed or forgotten as such in a conscious way, the belief, the fear and/or the summoning of the *Moirai/Moires* represent the belief/fear/desire that the private-property regimes, with all their imbalances and problems, will encounter the collective will. It is very interesting to see that the collective will is depicted by the powerful female creatures that decides about everyone’s share, and the encounter is something that the individuals cannot avoid.

## **7 Instead of conclusions: Directions for further research**

More research is needed to investigate further linguistic, semantic, historical, archaeological and socio-economic evidence, plus to analyse better the findings ways that would explain not only what the words mean and how they evolved, but also how socio-economic phenomena evolved parallel to those words. Of major importance is the need for field research, to see how sharing practices and grassroots or communal arrangements for access to land are linked to popular words about land sharing that can have different meanings depending on the actual practices of a community. We are also aware that neither the words themselves nor the lack of private property institutions should escape critical analysis, as the case of the *miri* system of the Ottoman era teaches us. We would finally encourage and welcome contributions and research work by other scholars of various disciplines that would enrich this discussion and enable us to refine our research work.

## **Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to the British Academy, as this paper stemmed from the joint work that the Newton Mobility Grant awarded by the British Academy allowed us to do for the year March 2017-February

2018, within the framework of the project “Researching and teaching grassroots economics: A pilot project”. All deficiencies of this paper as well as all opinions expressed through this paper remain the sole responsibility of the authors.

## 8 References

- [ 1] Anderson, K. *Marx at the margins – On nationalism, ethnicity and non-western societies*. (2016), Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- [ 2] Baland, J.-M. and François, P. Commons as insurance and the welfare impact of privatization. (2005) *Journal of Public Economics*, 89: 211–31.
- [ 3] Borneman, E. *Η πατριαρχία – Η προέλευση και το μέλλον του κοινωνικού μας συστήματος [Patriarchy – The origin and the future of our social system]*. Trans. D.Kourtovik. Athens, National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation [MIET].
- [ 4] Chourdakis, A. *Τα παραμύθια των Μαλών Ιεράπετρας [The folktales of Males of Ierapetra]*. (1998). Herakleion.
- [ 5] Chourdakis, A. *Τα παραμύθια της Σητείας [The folktales of Siteia]*. (1999). Herakleion.
- [ 6] Dalla Costa, M. & James, S. *Women and the subversion of the community*. (1975) Falling Wall Press & individuals from Women’s Movement in England and Italy, Bristol, UK.
- [ 7] Demsetz, H. The exchange and enforcement of property rights. (1964) *Journal of Law and Economics*, 7 (October): 11–26.
- [ 8] Doi, A.R.I. *Sharia – Islamic Law*. (2008) London: Ta-Ha Publishers.
- [ 9] Doundoulaki-Oustamanolaki, E. *Κρητικά παραμύθια [Cretan folktales]*, vol I. (1986). Athens, Patakis Publishing.
- [10] Engels, F. & Marx, K. *Η Ελλάδα, η Τουρκία και το Ανατολικό Ζήτημα [Greece, Turkey & the Eastern Question]*. (1985) Transl – Editing P.Kondylis. Athens, Gnessi/Γνώση, Publishers,
- [11] Fafchamps, M.. Solidarity networks in preindustrial societies: rational peasants with a moral economy. (1992) *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 41(1): 147–74.
- [12] Federici, S. *Revolucion en punto cero: Trabajo domestico, reproduccion y luchas feministas [Revolution at point zero: Domestic labour, reproduction and feminist struggles]*. (2013) Traficantes de Suenos-Mapas, transl: Scriptorium.
- [13] Fraser, N. *Fortunes of feminism – From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis*. (2013) Verso, London & New York.
- [14] Fitzpatrick, D.. Evolution and chaos in property rights systems: the Third World tragedy of contested access. (2006) *Yale Law Journal*, 155: 996–1048.
- [15] Gürbıyık, C. *Osmani imaretlerinin (asevleri) tipolojisi uzerine bir deneme [An Essay on the Typology of Ottoman Imarets (Soup Kitchen)]*. (2015) *Sanat Tarihi Dergisi* 24/1 23-51
- [16] Inalcik, H. *The Ottoman Empire - The Classical Age 1300-1600*. (2001) London, Orion Publishing

- [17] İnalcık, H. & Quataert, D. eds. *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [18] Lim, H. *Land, law and Islam: Property and human rights in the Muslim world*. (2006) London, Zed Books.
- [19] Messick, B. Property and the private in a Sharia system (2003). *Social Research*, 70/3, 711-734.
- [20] Özçelik, Selçuk. "Avrupa Feodalitesi ile Türklerin Tımar Teşkilatının Mukayesesi." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası* 17.3-4 (1951): 847-861.
- [21] Platteau, J.-P. Solidarity norms and institutions in village societies: static and dynamic considerations. (2006) in: S. Kolm and J. Mercier-Ythier (eds), *Handbook on Gift Giving, Reciprocity and Altruism*, vol. 1, no. 1. North Holland: Elsevier.
- [22] Sotiropoulou, I. Everyday practices in Greece in the shadow of property: Urban domination subverted (?), in A.Allen, A.Lampis & M.Swilling (eds) (2015) *Untamed Urbanisms*, Taylor & Francis- Routledge, London & New York: 270-283.
- [23] Sotiropoulou, I. Greek economy as a failure of capitalist patriarchy and the choice of dystopia, “Greece and austerity policies: where next for its economy and society?”, (2014) online, WEA (20.10-21.12.2014) <http://greececonference2014.worldeconomicsassociation.org/>
- [24] Thomson G.D. *Aeschylus and Athens*. (1978). Lawrence & Wishart.
- [25] Thomson, G.D. *Η αρχαία ελληνική κοινωνία – Το προϊστορικό Αιγαίο. [The Ancient Greek society – The pre-historic Aegean]* Trans. G.Vistakis. (1959). Athens, Publishing Institute of Athens [Εκδοτικό Ινστιτούτο Αθηνών].
- [26] Zick, T. Property, place and public discourse. (2006) *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy*, 21: 173–223.

#### **Άγγλο-ελληνικό γλωσσάρι**

Non-capitalist = μη καπιταλιστικός  
Non-patriarchal = μη πατριαρχικός  
Collective = συλλογικός  
Usufruct = επικαρπία  
Matrifocal = μητροκεντρικός

#### **Ferda Donmez-Atbasi**

Associate Professor  
Department of Economics, Ankara University  
E-mail: donmez@politics.ankara.edu.tr

#### **Irene Sotiropoulou**

Researcher  
E-mail: irene.sotiropoulou@gmail.co