

# A Missing Woman: the Hellenistic Leases from Thespieae Revisited

Joshua D. Sosin

**I**N THIS PAPER I examine a legal formula found in an inscription from Hellenistic Thespieae, on the basis of which a well-known contemporary inscription can be clarified. It reveals a highly visible, autonomous woman who was involved in a land-deal in which more than five talents changed hands.

In the last half of the third century B.C. at Thespieae in Boeotia the rental market in sacred land was flourishing. The city was busily letting properties sacred to Hermes and the Muses. A lengthy and complicated inscription—one of several—attests numerous leases of land.<sup>1</sup> The inscription contains seven documents:

- (1) record of leases of land sacred to the Muses (A.1–22)
- (2) record of the establishment of a monetary endowment by Louson to fund in part the Mouseia (A.23–27)
- (3) decree in honor of Gorgouthos for having endowed, by testament (κατὰ τὸν θεῖκ[ων]), a plot of land, to the benefit of the Muses (A.28–35)
- (4) record of leases of land sacred to Hermes, endowed for oil-acquisition (A.36–58)
- (5) record of leases of land sacred to the Muses (?) (B.1–9)
- (6) constitution enabling leasehold for a garden sacred to the Muses (B.10–28)
- (7) record of lease of another garden (B.29–32)

<sup>1</sup> M. Fevel, "Études d'épigraphie béotienne," *BCH* 60 (1936) 175–183, 389–415 (hereafter FEVEL); for the others see R. Osborne, "The Land-Leases from Hellenistic Thespieae: A Re-Examination," in *La Béotie antique* (Paris 1985) 317–323 (hereafter OSBORNE), esp. 317; also his "The Social and Economic Implications of the Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece," *Chiron* 18 (1988) 279–323, esp. 292–297.

Four separate hands inscribed Face A and two more Face B of the inscription,<sup>2</sup> which Osborne has described as a "rather mixed up document recording unrelated legacies as well as leases" (320). The content of the inscription is varied, but not incoherent. Three texts address endowments, one monetary (A.23–27), and two based on land (A.28–35, 36–58). The remaining four concern the lease of land sacred to the Muses. These four are, in legal formula and layout, identical to the record of leases of Hermes' endowed property (A.36–58), and so suggest that these properties too were endowed. The seven texts are not unrelated. All appear to concern endowed property, real or liquid, that belonged to the Muses or Hermes. The inscription is not a jumble, but an archive.

In the archive, property under lease carries the epithet *τὰν πᾶρ + personal name in the genitive*.<sup>3</sup> Feyel (394–395) thought the designation indicated the former tenant, from whom the lease was taken up. On Feyel's explanation, however, one tenant would have been the former tenant of 18 separate lots (A.36–45, 50–55).<sup>4</sup> Osborne thought this improbable, and raised several other objections. First, the inscription nowhere indicates that the properties had ever been let before and records no renewals, whereas another list of leases from Thespiae does indicate previous leasehold and is dominated by renewals.<sup>5</sup> Second, one "small plot" (A.47) would have had two former tenants, yet not one lease in the text is assumed by more than one person. Third, the *πᾶρ*-formula would have been a

<sup>2</sup> See Feyel 389–392.

<sup>3</sup> A.12 τὰν πᾶρ Διοποθέας, A.15 τὰν πᾶρ Μυρασιόπτορο, A.16 τὰν πᾶρ Ἀπιστογυρίδοος, A.18 τὰν πᾶρ Αἰ . . . Ιστοῖο, A.38 τὰν πᾶρ Ἀνδρέαο, A.45–46 τὰν πᾶρ Ἀπιστογυρίδοο, A.47 τὰν πᾶρ Θεώνοο κἠ Διοποθέας, A.48–49 τὰν πᾶρ Εὐρύχοω, A.52 τὰν πᾶρ . . . Ιν πᾶρ Ἀνδρέαο, A.55 τὰν πᾶρ Ἄγρο[ιστί]πτορο, B.6 τὰν πᾶρ Ε.[- - - -].

<sup>4</sup> Osborne 319 (this tenant would have shouldered a total annual rent of 1,351 drachmas, more than 3.5 times the amount of the next highest rent [375 drachmas per year, A.49]).

<sup>5</sup> G. Colin, "Inscriptions de Thespies," BCH 21 (1897) 551–571 no. 2.

"meaningless" system of naming the plots under lease as every property would have required a new name at the start of each new lease.<sup>6</sup> Finally, the same account gives the terms of lease of the garden ὄν ἀνέθειρε Σώστρατοο (B.10), but then refers to what scholars have assumed to be the same property as τ[ὸ]ν πᾶρ Φιλωρίδοο (B.29). In place of Feyel's theory Osborne suggested that *πᾶρ + personal name in the genitive* signaled location of the property with respect to a neighbor (319–320). The tendency in antiquity, however, was to list multiple neighbors, a more effective safeguard against encroachment.<sup>7</sup> I suggest instead that the formula indicated the origin of the property, the person who owned it before it became the sacred property of Hermes or the Muses.<sup>8</sup>

This interpretation is consistent with all of Osborne's observations. First, the properties need not have been let before. It is not unreasonable to think that Hermes and the Muses acquired groups of properties at one time. Similarly explosive real-estate markets are attested in fourth-century Athens and Hellenistic Mylasa.<sup>9</sup> And if the archive records the lease of newly dedi-

<sup>6</sup> Inefficient but not unattested. Ptolemaic cleruchs leased land that appears to have been so named; see e.g. *P.Tebt.* I 61.b.112, 61.b.202, 72.40, 85.53.

<sup>7</sup> Witness the lists of 11 (13–17) and 3 (20–21) neighboring plots in the Ptolemaic endowment discussed below. Compare the detailed descriptions of the boundaries in *I.Sardis* I: D. Behrend, *Altische Pachturkunden* (Munich 1970) 24; and the Laurion mine leases, none of which attests just one neighbor: M. Crosby, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 15–27, lines 40–83. Moreover, the parallel that Osborne cites, *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 79.5–6, τὸν Πέτρον τοῦ πᾶρὸ τὸ ὄστεοο, is unclear at best and may not mean "near" as he suggests (319 n.13), but perhaps "opposite from."

<sup>8</sup> It was common practice in antiquity for landed property to retain the name of a previous owner. The imperial estates of Roman Egypt furnish only the most famous examples: G. M. Parassoglou, *Am.Stud.Pap.* XVIII (1978). Crosby (*supra* n.7: 25) suggested that names of the Laureion mine cuttings in the fourth century B.C. derived from owners' names. The state let the galleries and so presumably owned them, perhaps acquired by forced sale; to Crosby's observation we should add the qualification "former" owners.

<sup>9</sup> Athens: S. D. Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum: Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens* (Amsterdam 1997) 263–264. Mylasa: *I.Mylasa* I 201–232, II pp.3–4, II 801–854, 905–905. SEG XLII 999. XLV 1538–1554; see now, with caution, B. Dignas, "The Leases of Sacred Property at Mylasa: An Alimentary Scheme for the Gods," *Kernos* 13 (2000) 117–126.

cated lands we would not expect to find renewals; if it does not, failure to signal renewals proves nothing. Second, it is easier to imagine that two people would have dedicated a small property to the god than that two people would have leased a small property—though neither is impossible. Third, if the *πάρ*-formula indicated the property's original owner, then it provided a naming system that was simple, efficient, and lasting.

Finally, the two gardens. The phrase τὸν κᾶρον τὸν πάρ + *personal name in the genitive* (B.29) was, I suggest, simply the logical and formulaic equivalent of the verbose τὸν κᾶρον ὃν ἀνέθευκε + *personal name in the nominative* (B.10). The latter appears in the constitution that enabled leasehold of the garden (B.10–28), where we expect length and precision, and the former in the formulaic record of lease (29–32), where we expect brevity. The one is unique, the other boilerplate. Moreover, two considerations suggest that the documents attest two different gardens, dedicated in the same year, one by a man named Sostratos, the other by a woman named Philotis. First, the terms of leasehold of the garden dedicated by Sostratos stipulate that the lessee furnish two sureties (B.15–17), but Nauphilos, the lessee of the garden τὸν Φιλωρίδος, furnished only one (B.30).<sup>10</sup> Second, while the enabling constitution (B.10–28) was drafted and Nauphilos' lease (B.29–32) contracted in the same year, the former must have been a unique document, written once, when Sostratos first handed over the garden, and not every time a new leasehold commenced.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup>It matters little that the gardens commanded the same rent, 121 drachmas. In such a flourishing market we would expect comparable properties to command comparable rents. Pantaklidas leased a property for 92 drachmas 1 obol (A.18–19) and Philias another for 90 drachmas 4 obols (A.19–20); Eneisias leased a property for 59 drachmas; Nonnos leased two for 60 drachmas each (A.42–44); Menon leased two for 64 and 60 drachmas (A.44–45). These clusters of close and identical prices may suggest that competition was vigorous and that the market set prices within fairly narrow ranges.

<sup>11</sup>Feyel (411) thought that the garden had already been let to Philotis before Nauphilos took up the lease, which would seem to imply that the enabling document was (re)written repeatedly.

Thus, the ellipsis is not τὴν πάρ (τὴν χώραν) τοῦ θεינוς (Osborne 319), "the plot next to [the plot] of X," but—if we must posit an ellipsis at all—"the plot (received) from X." The genitive governed by *πάρ* indicates the original owner of the plot of land, not a previous lessee, and not a neighbor.

With this in mind we can approach another problematic text.

At the end of the third century B.C. Ptolemy Philopator and Arsinoe dedicated a sum of money to the Muses at Thespieae. The people of Thespieae resolved to empanel a commission to use the money to purchase land, which was to be designated as sacred. The land appears to have been endowed upon being purchased: revenues accruing therefrom would thenceforth be earmarked for use in the celebration of the Mousaia. Jamot transcribed the document in 1895; two years later Holleaux applied his genius to it.<sup>12</sup>

- Θεοί. ἐπιτὶ Φιλωνος]  
 ἄρχοντος, βασιλευς Πτολεμῆος βασιλευς Πτο-  
 λεμῆω κῆ βασιλευσα Ἀλβρινόα συνεστασάστου]-  
 4 λαν ἐς τῶν καθιερωμένων τῆς Μάουης(?) τελευτών(?)  
 τὰς προθόδους ἀρρηρίω δραχμίας ΜΜΥΨ (?) ἔδοξε τῆ πό]-  
 λι οὐρίτων] τῶν χρεωμάτων γὰρ]ς ἰαπαρς ἀνεισάσθη]  
 8 κὰρ τὸ νόμισμα τῷ δάμω ἀρχὰ ἐπὶ τὰς γὰς τὰς ὠ]-  
 νίας· Δάουος Δασ[ύ]ω, Νικείας Κορρινιάδω, Ἐμ]-  
 μονος Ἐνεάω, Σιτυόλω Νέωνος, Μνάσ . . . . .  
 Δάουος, Περμενίας Φωντεία ἐν τῇ Ἀλλοιῆ γὰ]  
 κῆ] ἀνὰ σὺν τῇ ἐρικαρπῆ, βαέθρα ΠΕ[ΠΕ Δ],  
 12 ὄπρα ΔΓΓΙΙΙ· δραχμίων ΜΜΥΨ· [π]λατίος·  
 Αὐτο[κ]ρίπ[τε]ις Ἀθανάω, Π[ό]λων Ἀ[γ]λασιθέ[ω], Ἰ[σ]με[ι]-

<sup>12</sup>P. Jamot, "Actes relatifs à une concession de terres faite aux Thespiens par un roi Ptolémée," BCH 19 (1895) 326–385, at 379–382; M. Holleaux, "Questions épigraphiques II: Inscription de Thespieae," REG 10 (1897) 26–49 (= *Études* I 99–120). See D. Knoepfler, "La réorganisation du concours des Mousaia," in A. Hurst and A. Schachter, edd., *La montagne des Muses* (Geneva 1996) 141–167, 158 n. 61, on line 1. Holleaux's text has been reproduced by B. Laun, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (Leipzig 1914) 24, and K. Bringmann, W. Ameling, et al., *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligümer* (Berlin 1995) 85[El]. Knoepfler (145 n. 11, 158 n. 61) dates the document to ca 210–208, and probably 209; also *Chiron* 22 (1992) 427; cf. Bringmann and Ameling p. 135.

- νός (?) Εὐστράτω, Θέσπια ἄστυς, Φέλις, . . . . .] ,  
 Μνάστριος Μνασίπρω, Αὐτοκράτεις . . . . . [Παν]-  
 16 [τ]άπεις Μένιος, Φιλοκράτεις Ἀρτολλοδωδῆρα, [Ν]εϊ-  
 κριος [Φ]ίλωνος, Θεομνάστη Καλλισθένειος].  
 ἄλλαν γὰρ [τ]έ[ρ] . . . . . τ[ω] ἐν τῇ Ἀλλο[ι]φ[ι] . . . . . ]  
 ΣΙ, βλάβρα [Ε ΔΔΓ], ὄρα Γ[Ι] δ[ι]ρα[χ]μ[ι]άν Ψ[ΓΕ]Ε[ΓΕ]  
 20 [τ]λάριος: "Ερ[μ]ών" Ε[ρ]μ[ω]νός, εμελ εις Ὀμοδοιχ[ω],  
 Ἀγαθ[ι] . . . ος Καλλισθένης (?)

- ἐμισθώσατο π[ρ]ό[τ]ραν [γ]ὰν Παρμενίος, Φέτα  
 δέκα πέτραρα, τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον Ψ[ΓΕ]Ε[ΓΕ] τάλ[ν]  
 24 Ἀλοῖαν (τάν) [δευτέριον τάλν . . μ(?)]ο[κρ]ίτω Φέ[τ]ρα δέκα  
 [ἐ]μισθώσατο Ἀπ[ι] . . ἰδος Διο . . . . . [β]λάβ[θ]πο[λ]ν ἕκαστον  
 [Γ-Γ], πᾶσαν ΕΕΕ [ΓΕ] τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἄρχει τῷ χρόνῳ  
 ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς ἐπὶ Φιλωνος ἀρχοντος: Κεφάλαιον [τῶ]  
 28 ἐνιαυτῷ τὰς μισθώσιος Ψ ΓΕΕ ΕΕ Η-Η

On Holleaux's text the land-commission had six members (8-10). Of the 51 Thespiean offices recorded in the contemporary magistrate-list,<sup>13</sup> 13 (and perhaps 14, not including the 6, or 7, pairs of men) were held by boards of more than two magistrates.<sup>14</sup> Of these boards only two comprised an even number of magistrates.<sup>15</sup> Every other board had odd numbers, presumably to prevent stalemates in voting. The land-commission functioned here like the well-known Thespiean *hierarchai*, insofar as it appears to have let sacred land.<sup>16</sup> Roesch thought

<sup>13</sup>P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris 1965: hereafter ROESCH) 4-11; Roesch (221) dated the document to the last 20 years of the third century; cf. Knoepfler (*supra* n.12) 153-154, 159-160.

<sup>14</sup>From the table at Roesch 22-24: 3 polemarchs (62), 3 federal *synedroi* (1, 65), 7 (or 52) limenarchs (10, 72), 3 *katoptai* (14, 75), 4 *φύλαρχοι* (16, 77), 2 or 3 *δρυμόνες πελοπονήσης* (21), 4 *ἀρχικουατοί* (26), 2 *λοχίται* (28-29, 83), 2 *στρωτή* ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλικὸν (31), 2 ἐπὶ τὸν κελιασμένον στρωτή (33), 3 *οιτοπῶλη* (36), board of financial magistrates, number unknown (36-38), another board of financial magistrates, perhaps 2 (40-42), 3 treasurers of the city (44-45, 86), 2 *παιδονομοί* (45), 2 *gynaiakonnoi* (47), 3 gymnasiarchs of the elders (48), 3 gymnasiarchs of the youths (50), 3 agonarchs (51), 5 hendekarchis (54), 3 *hodagoi* (60).

<sup>15</sup>Both military: 4 *φύλαρχοι* (lines 16, 77) and 4 *ἀρχικουατοί* (line 26).

<sup>16</sup>Feyel A.5, B.1; Roesch 205.

that the commission was *ad hoc*, and that its members were recipients of an honor rather than performers of a function.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, the commission's role was similar to that of the five-member board of *hierarchai* and is likely to have been conceived on similar principles.<sup>18</sup> Thus, a board of six is unparalleled and suspect.

Moreover, Holleaux's text omits the name of the person from whom the first parcel of land was purchased. The seller of the other parcel, however, appears to have been named twice.<sup>19</sup> Parmenias, the last member of Holleaux's land-commission (10), is conspicuously homonymous with Holleaux's first lessee (22). Parmenias the lessee, however, lacks a patronym; the second lessee does not (25). In the numerous records of contemporary leases from Thespie the name of every lessee is accompanied by patronym.<sup>20</sup> Holleaux (38) explains this omission with the assumption that the lessee is the same person as the last member of the commission. Perhaps "insider trading" of this sort was not frowned upon. But there appears to be no overlap of commissioners and lessees in the many *Pachturkunden* from Mylasa and it is hard to believe that there was here.

Thus, Holleaux's text presents three serious problems. The seller of the first property is not named; the number of men on the land-commission is inconsistent with that on contemporary commissions at Thespie; and the naming of the lessee is inconsistent with contemporary formulae. All three problems

<sup>17</sup>Roesch 189; on the variety of commissions in Thespiean leases see Osborne 318.

<sup>18</sup>See M. Feyel, "Études d'épigraphie béotienne," *BCH* 61 (1937) 217-235, at 217-220 lines 8-10: 5 *hierarchai*. For an *ἀρχά* with three members, again an odd number, see Colin (*supra* n.5) no. 2 line 11.

<sup>19</sup>At 18, where Holleaux's restoration π[ρ]ό[τ]ραν is almost certainly correct (see his p.37) and again at 24, where Holleaux's restoration is, I suggest, incorrect (see his p.39); in both instances the text is admittedly fragmentary.

<sup>20</sup>Feyel A and B *passim*; Colin (*supra* n.5) no. 2 *passim*; Feyel (*supra* n.18) lines 8-10.

vanish if we repunctuate and print in line 10 *πάρ Μενίας* instead of *Παρμενίας*:

- 8 *νίας· Δάστος Δασ[ί]ω, Νικείας Κοριννά[β]ω, "Εμ]-*  
*μονος Ενεέω, Σιυόλος Νέωνος, Μνάσ . . . . .*  
*Δάσωνος· πάρ Μενίας Φανρείω, ἐν τῇ 'Αλοῖῃ γῆ]*  
*[κ]ῆ ἀυλά σὺν τῇ ἐρικρατῆι, βλάβρα ΠΕ [ΠΕ Δ],*  
 12 *δώρα ΔΤΙΙΙΙ· δορυμάων ΜΜΥΥΥ·*

The commission in charge of the lands to be purchased: Dasyos son of Dasyos, Nikeias son of Korrinadas, Emmonos son of Xeneas, Simylos son of Neon, Mnas . . . . . son of Dason. [sc. Was purchased] from Menia daughter of Phanteios in the Aloia a plot of land and courtyard with crop, 560 plethra, 19 dora, for 22,000 drachmas.

The feminine name Menia apparently is unattested elsewhere, but is simply the feminine form of the common man's name Menios.<sup>21</sup> It is worth noting that one of Menia's neighbors was [Παυρ]άπεις Μέν[ιος] (15–16). I do not know a name that gives Μένος in the genitive.<sup>22</sup> It is worth speculating that this neighbor's father was the son of a Menios (Μεν[ίου]), and that Menia's property was adjacent to that of a relative.<sup>23</sup>

Lines 22–25 are difficult. Perhaps we may offer some improvements on Holleaux's brilliant attempts to give sense. Holleaux's Parmenias leased the first plot of land, whose previous owner is not mentioned, and Ari . . . idas son of Dion . . . . . leased the second plot of land, whose previous owner . . . nokritos is mentioned (24; cf. 18). The missing previous owner can be restored by construing Holleaux's *Παρμενίας* (22) as *πάρ*

<sup>21</sup>Menios: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1622.479 (356/5); 1623.127 (mid-IV B.C.); *SEG* XVIII 36.A.187, 332 (330–320); *CID* II 79.A.128 (334); *Hdt.* 6:71.2. Menias: *I.Cret.* III IV 6.11; *IG* IX.2 1308 (IV B.C.). The name Parmenias does not appear to exist elsewhere. Parmenia: *IG* IX.2 104.9 (49/8 B.C.). Parmenia: well attested in Thessaly, *LGN* III.B s.v. (see also *LGN* III.A s.v.). Parmenis is attested in the Hellenistic period on Amorgos, Chios, Kos and Rhodes; see *LGN* I s.v.

<sup>22</sup>Nor, apparently, did Holleaux, who translated "Μέν[ης (?)]" (30).

<sup>23</sup>On the dense social networks underpinning contemporary landholding at Thespieae see Osborne 319–323.

*Μενίας*, as suggested for line 10. But on this rendering the first *ἐμισθώσατο* (22) lacks a subject; the two finite verbs (*ἐμισθώσατο* 22, 25) would have to be connected by a conjunction, which the end of line 23 would accommodate. Moreover, at 23–24 Holleaux's *τά[v]* | *'Αλοῖάν* is improbable. The property which the commissioners purchased from . . . nokritos is described as *ἐν τῇ 'Αλοῖῃ* (10, 18). Ari . . . idas son of Dion . . . . . leased the property, not the entire region in which the property was located. The other occurrences of the placename are partially in lacuna (*ἐν τῇ 'Αλλοῖῃ* 10; *ἐν τῇ 'Αλλο[ι]ῃ* 18). It is possible that the dative ending of the placename is *'Αλοῖά*. The description of the property in the Aloia at 23–24 should match those of 10 and 18. I suggest that at 23–24 we restore *τά[v δ' ἐν τῇ] | 'Αλοῖά (vel sim.)*, which in turn suggests *ἐν τῇ 'Αλλοῖά* at 10 and *ἐν τῇ 'Αλλο[ι]ῃ* at 18.

The letters after Holleaux's *'Αλοῖάν, ΑΕΙΠΕΤ . . .* are a crux. Holleaux lacked confidence in his own restoration, *'Αλοῖάν <τάν>* [δευρ]έ[βαν τ]ά[ν]: "je n'ignore pas qu'elle est incorrecte, mais il ne me paraît pas facile d'en trouver une meilleure" (39). And before this difficult string we must add the now-unaccounted-for *νι*. The phrase *'Αλοῖά γὰν τὰν* *πάρ* does not depart radically from Jamot's transcription and gives tolerable Greek. Absent Holleaux's "second" plot in line 24, there is no reason to retain his "first" in 22. At line 22 Jamot transcribed .AHPAΓANTAN, which Holleaux rendered *τὰν π[ρό]τ[αν] [γ]άν*. With minor emendation to *τά[v] ιαπό(ν) γὰν τὰν*, Jamot's text makes sense and also matches a formula found in numerous contemporary leases from Thespieae.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Feyel A.11 [τοι ἐμισθώσ]ατο τὰς γῆς τὰς ιαπὸς τὰν Μολορίων, 36 τοι ἐμισθώσατο τὰς γῆς [τὰ]ς ιαπὸς τῶ "Επιμαο, 57 κεφαλά τὰς μισθώστος τῶ ἐνισυτῶ τὰς γῆς τὰς ιαπὸς "Επιμαο τὰς ἐν τῶ ἐανοργίτριον, B.37 [κεφα]λά τὰς μισθώστος τῶ ἐνισυτῶ τὰς γῆς τὰς ιαπὸς; though this would be the only instance I know in which the two formulas, *τά[v] ιαπό[v]* *γὰν* and *τὰν* *πάρ*, are so closely joined. A.57 refers to the "Total from the rent of lands sacred to Hermes, for the purpose of oil-acquisition", each of the properties here mentioned is labeled *τὰν* *πάρ* above. The categories are not mutually exclusive.

Finally, on these restorations the phrases that describe the lease of the two properties reflect the contemporary leasing-formula attested at Thespieae, ἐμισθώσατο τὰν παρ + *personal name* in the *genitive*, which can be observed in the archive discussed above. The first plot carries the designation παρ Μενίας and the second π[ἀρ] ΑΛ. . . μ(?)|ο|κρί|τω. I propose then to render lines 22–26 as follows:

ἐμισθ[ό]σατο τὰ|ν ιαρά|ν| γὰν τὰν παρ Μενίας φέρεα  
 δέκα πέτραρα, τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον ὕ[THEHE]TE [I-], τὰ|ν δ' ἐν τῇ  
 Ἄλοιᾳ γὰν τὰν π[ἀρ] ΑΛ[... μ(?)|ο|κρί|τω φέ|τ|ρα δέκα|πέτραρα(?)|  
 [ἐ]μισθ[ό]σατο ἰ|Αρι...ιδας Διο ..... [β]λα[θ]πο|ν ἐκ|αστον  
 [I-], ῥάσαν HE HE [EE] τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν.

Αρι . . . idas son of Dion . . . . leased the sacred land (received) from Menia<sup>25</sup> for 14 years, 1,451 drachmas each year, and he leased the land in the Aloia, (received) from ΑΛ . . . mokritos for 14 years at 2 drachmas per *plethron*, totalling 250 drachmas 1 obol each year.

This solves some of the problems. π[ἀρ] ΑΛ. . . μ(?)|ο|κρί|τω (24) is troublesome in the light of Holleaux's [π|ἀρ] . . . μοκρίτω at 18, but neither stands on firm ground.<sup>26</sup> And the word-order in the two leases is not parallel: for the first plot we find verb + DO + origin + duration + cost (22–23), and for the second DO + origin + duration + verb + subject + cost (23–26). But the word-order fails to line up on Holleaux's rendering as well: for the first plot we find verb + DO + subject + duration + cost, and for the second DO + origin + duration + verb + subject + cost. Holleaux's text gives good Greek and bad formulaary (two verbs, two subjects and no origin for the first plot), mine slightly awkward Greek but essentially standard formulaary (two verbs,

<sup>25</sup>One formula describes legal status as concerns ownership (τάς γὰς τὰς ἰαράς), another origins (τὰν παρ), and another legal status as concerns acceptable use (ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ).

<sup>26</sup>Here, in keeping with formula, the lessee lacks a patronym. In the descriptive prose above (line 10), Menia is named with her father Phantios.

<sup>29</sup>Holleaux transcribed Α..ΜΟΚΡΙΤΩ at 18 and ΑΛ ΠΟΙΚΤΩ at 24.

one subject and the origin of the first plot). Either way, the word-order seems strange. It is worth speculating that an unusual scenario made for unusual execution of grammar and formula. Perhaps it was common for several people to lease sections of a single property, but less so for a single individual to lease multiple properties.<sup>27</sup>

The παρ-formula in the Thespiean archive gives us a tool with which to excavate Menia from the Ptolemaic endowment. She may now join the growing ranks of wealthy women in Hellenistic Boeotia.<sup>28</sup> She may even have known Nikareta, a fellow Thespiean, who only a decade before had lent more than 18,000 drachmas to the city of Orchomenos, and successfully sued the city when it balked at repaying.<sup>29</sup> A decade after Menia's dedication two women were persuaded to accept repayment of a loan to the small town of Kopai in the form of grazing rights for 400-head of livestock.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, we have long known that women were highly visible in ancient endowments. The two most famous Hellenistic endowments were established by women. Epikteta of Thera founded and endowed a cult association ca 200 B.C.<sup>31</sup> Two Corcyrans, Aristomenes and Psylla, who are considered husband and wife by convention rather than evidence or argument, created a famous endowment (III/II B.C.) to underwrite a biennial dramatic festival.<sup>32</sup> Hellenistic women created endowments at Mantinea, Aigosthena,

<sup>27</sup>Many people leasing sections of land παρ ΑΙ. . . Ιοίαι: Feyel A.18–22; παρ Ἀνδρέαι: A.36–45, 50–55. Eneisias (A.41–42), Nomnos (42–44), and Menon (44–45) each leased two plots; Saon leased four (A.52–55).

<sup>28</sup>P. Roesch, "La femme et la fortune en Béotie," in *La femme dans le monde méditerranéen* I (Lyon 1985) 71–84.

<sup>29</sup>IG VII 3172 [Migeotte, *L'empunt public dans les cités grecques* (Quebec 1984) 13]; though the agreement reached between the two parties left Nikareta with slim gains.

<sup>30</sup>Migeotte (*supra* n.29) 15. Presumably the two women, like Nikareta, would have preferred full repayment in cash; rich as they might have been, women were denied the political muscle that men enjoyed.

<sup>31</sup>Laun, *Stiftungen* 44.

<sup>32</sup>Laun, *Stiftungen* 1.

Thera, Amorgos, and Cyrene.<sup>33</sup> At least three and maybe four other Thespiean women divested themselves of properties which were endowed.<sup>34</sup> We may add Menia to the list.<sup>35</sup>

August, 2001

History Faculty  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
77 Massachusetts Ave.  
Cambridge, Mass. 02139  
jsosin@mit.edu

<sup>33</sup>Mantinea: Laum, *Stiftungen* 4; Aigosthena: Laum 21; Thera: Laum 44; Amorgos: Laum 50a + IG XII.7 237 (cf. L. Robert, "Trois inscriptions de l'archipel," REG [1929] 20-38); Cyrene: SEG XXXIII 1039, 1041.

<sup>34</sup>Fevel A.12 τὰν π[ί]π Δωροθέας, A.16 τὰν π[ί]π Ἀπιορτυτίδος, A.47 τὰν π[ί]π Θεωνος κ[α]ί Δ[ω]ροθέας (the same as at A.127), B.29 τ[ὸ]ν π[ί]π Φιλωρίδος.

<sup>35</sup>I am grateful to Kent Rigsby, Craig Gibson, and Kevin Uhalde for helpful criticism.