

# 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 θείκ[αυ]), 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. Feysel, "Études d'épigraphie béotienne," *BCH* 60 (1936) 175–183, 389–415 (hereafter FEYSEL); for the others see R. Osborne, "The Land-Leases from Hellenistic Thespieai: 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 πὰρ + *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 Thespieae 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 πὰρ-formula would have been a

<sup>2</sup> See Feyel 389–392.

<sup>3</sup> A.12 τὰν πὰρ Δωροθέας, A.15 τὰν πὰρ Μνασιστρότω, A.16 τὰν πὰρ Ἀριστογίδος, A.18 τὰν πὰρ Α[ . . . ]σίαο, A.38 τὰν πὰρ Ἀνδρέαο, A.45–46 τὰν πὰρ Ἀριστάνδρω, A.47 τὰν πὰρ Θεώνος κὴ Δ[ω]ροθέας, A.48–49 τὰν πὰρ Εὐτύχω, A.52 τὰ[ . . . ]ν πὰρ Ἀνδρέαο, A.55 τὰν πὰρ Ἀγασ[ιστ]ρότω, B.6 τὰν πὰρ 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 ὃν ἀνέθεικε Σώστρατος (B.10), but then refers to what scholars have assumed to be the same property as τ[ὸ]ν παρ Φιλωτίδος (B.29). In place of Feyel’s theory Osborne suggested that παρ + *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 boundaries in *I.Sardis* 1; D. Behrend, *Attische 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 Ἰετὸν τὸμ παρὰ τῷ ἄστεος, 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 Centesimalium: 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  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho$ -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  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho$  + *personal name in the genitive* (B.29) was, I suggest, simply the logical and formulaic equivalent of the verbose  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon$  + *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  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \Phi\iota\lambda\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ , 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 Phileas 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 πᾶρ (τὴν χώραν) τοῦ δεινός (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 πᾶρ 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 Mouseia. Jamot transcribed the document in 1895; two years later Holleaux applied his genius to it.<sup>12</sup>

- Θεο[ί. ἐ]π[ὶ Φίλωνος]  
 ἄρχοντος, βασιλεὺς Π[τολεμῆος βασιλείος Πτο]-  
 λεμήω κὴ βασίλισσα Ἀ[ρσινόα συνεσσαπέστι]-  
 4 λαν ἐς τῶν καθιαιρωμέν[ων τῆς Μώσης(?) τεμενῶν(?)]  
 τὰς ποθόδως ἀργυρίω δραχ[μὰς MM 1 (?). ἔδοξε τῆ πό]-  
 λι οὐτ[ῶν] τῶν χρεϊμάτων γὰ[ρ] ἰαράς ὠνεισάσθη]  
 κὰτ τὸ ψάφισμα τῶ δάμω. ἀρχὰ ἐ[πὶ τὰς γὰς τὰς ὦ]-  
 8 νίας· Δάσυος Δασ[ύ]ω, Νικείας Κορρινά[δαο, Ἔμ]-  
 μονος Ξενέο, Σιμύλος Νέωνος, Μνάσ . . . . .  
 Δάσωνος, Παρμενίας Φαντεῖω ἐν τῆ Ἀλ[οιῆ γὰ]  
 [κ]ῆ ἀλλὰ σὺν τῆ ἐπικαρπῆ, βλέθρα GHE[GE D],  
 12 δόρα D11111· δραχμάων MMCC· [π]λατίος·  
 Αὐτο[κ]ρά[τει]ς Ἀθανίαο, Π[ά]γων Ἀ[γ]ασιθέ[ω], Ἴσ[μει]-

<sup>12</sup> P. Jamot, “Actes relatif 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 Thespies,” *REG* 10 (1897) 26–49 (= *Études* I 99–120). See D. Knoepfler, “La réorganisation du concours des Mouseia,” 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. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (Leipzig 1914) 24, and K. Bringmann, W. Ameling, et al., *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer* (Berlin 1995) 85[E]. 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 (?) Εὐστρ[ότω, Θ]εομνάστα Λύσωνος, Φέ[λιξ. . . . .],  
 Μνάσιππος Μνασίππω, Αὐτοκράτεις . . . . . , [Παν]-  
 16 [τ]άρεις Μέν[ιος], Φιλοκράτεις Ἀπ[ολλοδώ]ρω, [Ν]εί-  
 κηος [Φ]άνε[ιος, Θεο]μνάστη Κα[λλ]ισθένειο[ς].  
 ἄλλαν γὰν [π]ά[ρ] . . . . . μοκρίτω . . . . . τί[ω] ἐν τῇ Ἀλ[ο]τι[ῆ]. . . . . ]  
 ΣΙ, βλέθρα [HE DD1], δόρα 1I[II· δ]ρα[χμ]άων CC[GE]THE·  
 20 [π]λάτιος· Ἐρ[μω]ν Ἐ[ρμ]μ[ω]νος, . εμελ εις Ὅμολωίχ[ω],  
 Ἄγαθι . . . ος Καλλι[α]σ[θένε]ιος (?)
- ἐμισθώ[σατο π]ρά[τ]αν [γ]ὰν Παρμενίας φέτεα  
 δέκα πέτταρα, τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον C[THE]HE[GE]8 τὰ[ν]  
 24 Ἄλοιαν <τάν> [δευτ]έ[ραν τ]ὰ[ν . . . μ(?)ο]κρίτω φέ[τ]εα δέκα  
 [πέτταρα]  
 [ἐ]μισθώ[σατο] Ἄρι . . . ιδας Διο . . . . . , [β]λέ[θ]ρο[ν ἕκ]αστον  
 [88], πᾶσαν HE HE [GEI] τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν. ἄρχει τῷ χρόνω  
 ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς ἐπὶ Φίλωνος ἄρχοντος. Κεφάλαι[ι]ον [τῶ]  
 28 ἐνιαυτῷ τὰς μισθώσιος C GE HE HE 8I

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 5?) limenarchs (10, 72), 3 *katoptai* (14, 75), 4 *φίλαρχοι* (16, 77), 2 or 3 *ἀγεμόνες πελοποπόρης* (21), 4 *ἀρχικουναγύ* (26), 2 *λοχαγὸν ὀπλίτης* (28–29, 83), 2 *σιτῶνη ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλικόν* (31), 2 *ἐπὶ τὸν καθιαρωμένον σιτῶνη* (33), 3 *σιτοπῶλη* (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 *paidonomoi* (45), 2 *gynaikonomoi* (47), 3 gymnasiarchs of the elders (48), 3 gymnasiarchs of the youths (50), 3 agonarchs (51), 5 hendekarchs (54), 3 *hodagoi* (60).

<sup>15</sup> Both military: 4 *φίλαρχοι* (lines 16, 77) and 4 *ἀρχικουναγύ* (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 Thespieae 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 Thespieae; and the naming of the lessee is inconsistent with contemporary formulary. All three problems

<sup>17</sup> Roesch 189; on the variety of commissions in Thespieae 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]ὰ[ρ 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 *παρ Μενίας* instead of *Παρμενίας*:

- ... ἀρχὰ ἐ[πὶ τὰς γᾶς τὰς ὠ]-
- 8 νίας· Δάσυος Δασ[ύ]ω, Νικείας Κορρινά[δαο, Ἔμ]-  
 μονος Ξενέασο, Σιμύλος Νέωνος, Μνάσ . . . .  
 Δάσωνος. *παρ Μενίας Φαντείω, ἐν τῇ Ἄλ[οιῆ γᾶ]*  
*[κ]ῆ ἀυλὰ σὺν τῇ ἐπικαρπίῃ, βλέθρα GFE [GE D],*
- 12 δόρα DGIII· δραχμῶων MMCC·

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 [Παντ]ᾶρεις Μέν[ιος] (15–16). I do not know a name that gives Μένιος 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 . . . mokritos is mentioned (24; cf. 18). The missing previous owner can be restored by construing Holleaux's *Παρμενίας* (22) as *παρ*

<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.i.28 (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.). Parmeneia: well attested in Thessaly, *LGPN* III.B s.v. (see also *LGPN* III.A s.v.). Parmenis is attested in the Hellenistic period on Amorgos, Chios, Kos and Rhodes; see *LGPN* I s.v.

<sup>22</sup> Nor, apparently, did Holleaux, who translated "Μέν[ès (?)]" (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 τὰ[v] | Ἀλοιὰν is improbable. The property which the commissioners purchased from . . . mokritos is described as ἐν τῇ Ἀλοιῇ (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 Ἀλ[οιῇ 10; ἐν τῇ Ἀλ[οι]ῇ 18). It is possible that the dative ending of the placename is Ἀλοιᾶ. 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 τὰ[v δ’ ἐν τῇ] | Ἀλοιᾶ (*vel sim.*), which in turn suggests ἐν τῇ Ἀλ[οιᾶ at 10 and ἐν τῇ Ἀλ[οι]ᾶ at 18.

The letters after Holleaux’s Ἀλοιὰν, ΑΞΙ1ΕΤ . . ., are a crux. Holleaux lacked confidence in his own restoration, Ἀλοιὰν <τὰν> [δευτ]έ[ραν τ]ὰ[v: “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 *nu*. The phrase Ἀλοιᾶ γὰν τὰν πὰρ 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 .ΛΗΡΑ1ΑΝΤΑΝ, which Holleaux rendered τὰν π]ρά[τ]ᾶν [γ]ᾶν. With minor emendation to τὰ[v ἰαρά(v) 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 [τοιὶ ἐμισθώσ]αντο τὰς γὰς τὰ[ς ἰαράς τὰν Μω]σίϊων, 36 τοὶ ἐμισθώσαντο τὰς γὰς [τὰ]ς ἰαράς τῷ Ἑρμαῖο, 57 κεφαλὰ τὰς μισθώσιος τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τὰς γὰς τὰς ἰαράς Ἑρμαῖο τὰς ἐν τὸ ἐληοχρίστιον, B.32 [κεφα]λὰ τὰς μισθώσιος τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τὰς γὰς τὰς ἰαράς; though this would be the only instance I know in which the two formulas, τὰ[v ἰαρά[v] γὰν and τὰν πὰρ, 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 πὰρ 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[αρ] ΛΛ[. . . μ(?)]ο[κρί]τω. I propose then to render lines 22–26 as follows:

ἐμισθώ[σατο τὰ]ν ἰαρά[ν] γὰν τὰν παρ Μενίας φέτεα  
 δέκα πέτταρα, τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον C[THEHE]GE [8], τὰ[ν δ' ἐν τῆ]  
 Ἄλοιᾶ γὰν τὰν π[αρ] ΛΛ[... μ(?)]ο[κρί]τω φέ[τ]εα δέκα[πέτταρα(?)]  
 [ἐ]μισθώ[σατ]ὸ Ἄρι...ιδας Διο ..... , [β]λέ[θ]ρο[ν ἕκ]αστον  
 [88], πᾶσαν HE HE [GEI] τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν.

Ari . . 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 ΛΛ[ . . . mokritos for 14 years at 2 drachmas per *plethron*, totalling 250 drachmas 1 obol each year.

This solves some of the problems. π[αρ] ΛΛ[. . . μ(?)]ο[κρί]τω (24) is troublesome in the light of Holleaux's [π]ᾶ[ρ] . . 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 formulary (two verbs, two subjects and no origin for the first plot), mine slightly awkward Greek but essentially standard formulary (two verbs,

One formula describes legal status as concerns ownership (τὰς γὰς τὰς ἰαράς), another origins (τὰν παρ), and another legal status as concerns acceptable use (ἐν τὸ ἐληοχρίστιον).

<sup>25</sup> Here, in keeping with formula, the lessee lacks a patronym. In the descriptive prose above (line 10), Menia is named with her father Phanteios.

<sup>26</sup> Holleaux transcribed .Λ..ΜΟΚΡΙΤΩ at 18 and ΛΛ 1ΡΟΙΚΤΩ 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 formulary. 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  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho$ -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  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho$  A[ . . . ]σίαιο: Feyel A.18–22;  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho$  Ἀνδρέαιο: A.36–45, 50–55. Eneisias (A.41–42), Nonnos (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'emprunt 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> Laum, *Stiftungen* 44.

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

Thera, Amorgos, and Cyme.<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); Cyme: *SEG XXXIII* 1039, 1041.

<sup>34</sup> Feyel A.12 τὰν π]ὰρ Δωροθέας, A.16 τὰν πὰρ Ἀριστογιτίδος, A.47 τὰν πὰρ Θέωνος κὴ Δ[ω]ροθέας (the same as at A.12?), B.29 τ[ὸ]ν πὰρ Φιλωτίδος.

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