

TWO ESTATES OF DELIAN APOLLO ON MYKONOS AND THE DATE OF *ID* 452 + 467

DURING THE PERIOD of independence of the island of Delos (314–167 B.C.), Delian Apollo owned almost two dozen estates that were rented out on ten-year leases. The details of these transactions are known entirely from inscriptions found on Delos, mostly by the French excavations of the late 19th and early 20th centuries and published in *Inscriptiones Graecae* XI, ii and *Inscriptiones de Délos*. The estates and the documents concerning them were studied exhaustively by John H. Kent, whose monograph on the subject remains the standard work.¹ Since Kent, a number of new readings and joins have added to our knowledge of the estates; the most important recent contribution stems from the report in 1986 by Jacques Tréheux of a join between *ID* 452 and 467. The two fragments join at line 19 of 452 and line 2 of 467; 467 is part of the left edge of the inscription.² Michèle Brunet used Tréheux's brief discussion to reconstruct a full text of lines 16–26 (numbering following that of 452).³ Her text, which is certainly correct,⁴ provides important new information about the estates of Delian Apollo, including the first preserved inventory for the Delian estate Epistheneia.

Brunet ends her text with the first word of line 26: Ἐμισ[θώσαμεν. . . , κτλ. The rest of the line reads [-----] Χερσόνησο[ν-----έν καθήκο]υσιν χρόνοις κα. The next three lines (27–29), though very fragmentary, preserve a name in the nominative, [Τηλέμ]νηστος Ἀριστείδ[ου], and an enumeration of 2750 vines, a palm tree, and one or more laurels. These lines clearly preserve the inventory of an estate, exactly like those occurring just before in the inscription.

Inventories of estates appeared in the Delian accounts whenever a new renter came into possession of the lease, either at the beginning of a new rental period or when a current renter defaulted and the estate had to be leased again. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that line 26 records the beginning of a new lease. Chersonesos was one of the estates owned by Apollo, located on Mykonos. It is usually, but not always, paired with Dorion.⁵

¹ Kent 1948 with Kent 1939. More recently, see Osborne 1988 and Brunet 1988, pp. 1–102, 151–162, 181–188.

I want to thank the anonymous readers for this journal, whose comments considerably improved this paper. Responsibility for any remaining deficiencies is of course mine.

² Tréheux 1986, p. 431.

³ Brunet 1990, pp. 678–679.

⁴ Though at line 21 her Μει]λιχι[δην και Σίλη-?] seems too short.

⁵ *ID* 346A, line 13, 366A, line 101, 401, line 25, 440B, line 22, 461Bb, lines 54–55; cf. Kent 1948, pp. 287–289. The name of Dorion appears in two forms, as an indeclinable Δωριούς and as Δωρίου, the genitive of Δώριον (cf. Dürrbach, comm. to *ID* 346, p. 117). For convenience I adopt the transliteration Dorion and call the complex Dorion-Chersonesos, following Kent 1948, p. 288.

On this basis it is possible to offer a restoration of line 26: Ἐμισ[θώσαμεν τὰ χώρια?] Χερσόνησο[ν καὶ Δωριοῦς ἐν καθήκο]υσιν χρόνοις κα[ὶ ἐμισθώσατο -----].⁶ This restoration occupies 70 letter spaces. In general, the inscription has 70 to 76 letters per line;⁷ there is, therefore, room for up to six letters at the end, although the line could be complete. The formula for rental which we have restored here requires that ἐμισθώσατο be followed by the name of the renter.⁸ If this hypothesis is correct, the new join provides us with two letters of that name, since line 27 begins ΠΟ before the fragment breaks off.⁹

If we had nothing more than these two letters and the knowledge that up to about six letters might precede them, it would be a futile task to restore the name. But in fact two further pieces of information help. Tréheux has shown that *ID* 452 + 467 must date to 178–175 B.C.¹⁰ In 174 B.C. Dorion-Chersonesos changed hands because of a default by its then current renter, Melesippos.¹¹ Melesippos' name contains the elements ΠΟ preceded by seven letters (one of which is an iota), and *ID* 452 + 467 must be dated before 174 B.C. It is therefore possible that Melesippos is the name which belongs at the end of line 26 and beginning of line 27.

If this view is right, then Melesippos' name and patronymic should be followed by the rent, which would have been 310 drachmas,¹² and by the names of the guarantors. We may restore the lines as follows:

26 Ἐμισ[θώσαμεν τὰ χώρια?] Χερσόνησο[ν καὶ Δωριοῦς ἐν καθήκο]υσιν χρόνοις κα[ὶ ἐμισθώσατο
Μελήσιπ]-
27 πο[ρ[ι]-?ένου ΗΗΗΔ· ἔγγυοι] ΙΣ.ΑΧΑ[------ca.15-----, Τηλέμ]νηστος Ἄριστειδ[ου]

There are two oddities in this restoration. First, the names of the guarantors appear in the nominative, whereas the practice of the hieropoioi elsewhere in this inscription was to give them in the accusative as in line 18: the renter Meilichides κ[αὶ ἐγγύου]ς κατέστησεν Φωκ[αίεα, κτλ]. Second, the phrase [ἐν καθήκο]υσιν χρόνοις is unique in this context;¹³

⁶ Cf. *ID* 366A, lines 99–100: Ἐμισθώσαμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ χώρια τὰ ἐν Μυκόνωι ὥστε τοὺς μισθωσαμένους καθιστᾶν τοὺς ἐγγύους κατ' ἐνιαυτόν· καὶ ἐμισθώσατο, κτλ. There is room between *ID* 452 and 467 at line 26 for about 15 letters. Either τὰ χώρια or ἐν Μυκόνωι would fit the space, but there is not room for both.

⁷ Brunet 1990, p. 679.

⁸ Compare Brunet's text at lines 17, 21, 24–25.

⁹ *ID* 467, line 10. Dürrbach dotted the pi in the *editio princeps* (1905, pp. 523–524, no. 178, line 10), but in fact it is perfectly legible on the photograph provided for study purposes by the École Française d'Athènes, for which I am grateful.

¹⁰ Tréheux 1986, p. 431; accepted by Brunet (1990, p. 678).

¹¹ *ID* 440B, lines 22–27: Χερσόνησον [καὶ] Δωρ[ιου]ς, οὐ καθισταντος τοὺς ἐγγύους Μελ[ησιπ]που [1-2]ένου, ἀν[ε]μισθώσαμεν, καὶ ἐμισθώσατο Ἀντίγονος Μενύλλου τοῦ ἴσου ΗΗΗΔ (lines 22–23). Rent read by Kent (1939, p. 244); and for Μελέσιππος silently corrected to Μελήσιππος, see Kent 1948, p. 331, no. 150. I suppress Kent's conjecture of [Διογ?]ένου for the patronymic, which is too long; see p. 108 below. Melesippos' problem was common; see Kent 1948, p. 274.

Tréheux has joined *ID* 440 and 456. He publishes a photograph of 456B + 440A in Tréheux 1985, p. 486, fig. 1; the text has yet to be published. While Tréheux may have improved the reading for B, lines 22–27, the join cannot have affected the text since the lines are complete (B, line 22, 65 letters; B, line 23, 68 letters; B, line 24, 65 letters; cf. face A, where complete lines run to about the same length).

For the date, see Tréheux 1985, p. 493, note 29; cf. Tréheux 1986, p. 431.

¹² See note 11 above.

¹³ Cf. F. Dürrbach, *ID* 366, comm. pp. 167–168: “never employed for the rental of estates.”

it typically indicates the payment of funds to the epistatai, who are to carry out sacrifices “at the accustomed time” (cf. *ID* 366A, line 131, 442A, line 208, 461Ab, line 29). What could account for these peculiarities?

The best explanation is that this text records the rental of Dorion-Chersonesos at the beginning of a normal rental period, rather than a re-rental during the run of a lease. That three other estates, Epistheneia, Panormos, and Phytalia, are being re-rented poses no problem. Unlike the estates on Delos and Rheneia, which came up for rent in years ending in the Julian calendar with zero, Dorion-Chersonesos and the other Mykonian estate, Thaleon, were rented in years ending in seven.¹⁴ A re-rental for other estates could therefore easily occur in the same year as a normal rental for the Mykonian estates.

The start of a regular new lease would also account for the appearance of the guarantors' names in the nominative, since the formula at the start of a regular rental period typically gave the names of the guarantors in the nominative following the word ἔγγυοι.¹⁵ Moreover, re-rental in this period invariably followed the renter's failure to secure guarantors, who had to be renewed each year.¹⁶ Our text cannot accommodate the formula to express this failure, which always comes directly after the name of the estate, a position excluded in line 26 by lack of space.

Finally, a rental of Dorion-Chersonesos at the normal time in the context of re-rentals of estates on a different cycle could explain the unexampled expression [ἐν καθήκο]υσι χρόνοις. Its appearance here should probably be attributed to the fact that the normal rental of the Mykonian estates follows directly the re-rental of other estates during the course of their leases: hence the emphasis of the hieropoioi that “we have leased the estates Chersonesos and Dorion at the accustomed time.”¹⁷

This line of argument, which makes Melesippos the original renter at the start of a rental period, also imposes a certain date for *ID* 452 + 467: 177 B.C., in the Delian archonship of Οἰνεύς.

The rest of the inscription, which contained an inventory of Dorion-Chersonesos, is woefully incomplete. Two other inventories for the estates, however, are preserved in *ID* 440B, lines 22–27 (174 B.C.) and 461Bb, lines 55–57 (169 B.C.).¹⁸ They can be combined with *ID* 452 + 467 to produce a fairly complete accounting of the capital equipment of these estates (Table).

¹⁴ Kent 1948, p. 287.

¹⁵ E.g., *IG* XI, ii, 287A, lines 142–180, 250 B.C.; *ID* 351, lines 6–24, 220 B.C.; *ID* 356bis B, lines 19–48, 210 B.C. (cf. P. Roussel *apud* Lacroix 1932, pp. 381–382; Kent 1939, p. 241, note 3; Tréheux 1986, p. 431); *ID* 374A and B, 200 B.C. (for a new unpublished fragment, inv. no. Γ761, joining face A, see Tréheux 1986, p. 431); *ID* 373 A and B, 180 B.C. (Kent 1939, pp. 241–242).

¹⁶ Kent 1948, p. 274, note 97. The formula is τοῦ δεῖνα οὐ καθιστάντος τοὺς ἐγγύους; cf. lines 20, 24.

¹⁷ If Gustave Glotz has correctly restored lines 31–32 as a re-rental of Soloe and Korakiai (see p. 109 below), then this explanation would gain additional force. Dürrbach's interpretation of this phrase (*ID* 452, comm. p. 211) is not satisfactory, as he recognized, and is now definitely excluded by the association of *ID* 467 with 452.

¹⁸ The inventory at *ID* 366B, lines 8–25 probably applies to Thaleon, as recognized in the *editio princeps* by Schulhof (1908, p. 458); cf. also Kent 1948, p. 288. I do not know on what basis it is attributed to Chersonesos by Dürrbach (*ID* 452, comm. p. 211; cf. also Bruneau and Fraisse 1981, p. 142). The name of the renter, Thymias, and the incompatibility of this inventory with those certainly attributed to Chersonesos suffice to prove the point.

Table: Capital Equipment of Dorion-Chersonesos

<i>Equipment</i>	<i>Attestations</i>
κλείσιον τεθρωμένον	461Bb, lines 55–56, 440B, lines 24–25
βούστασις	461Bb, line 56, 440B, line 25
ἀχυρών	461Bb, line 56, 440B, line 25
ὑπερώιδιον	461Bb, line 56, 440B, line 25
ἀνδρώνιον	461Bb, line 56
ἱπνῶν ἄθυρος	461Bb, line 56
συκαί 37	440B, line 26
ἄμπελοι 2750	461Bb, line 56 (fig. missing), 452 + 467, line 28
ἀγριέλαιοι 25 (+?)	Kent 1939, p. 244 (440B, line 26), 452 + 467, line 29
μυρσίνας 2	461Bb, line 57, 440B, line 27
καρύαι 3 or 2	461Bb, line 57, 440B, line 27
μηλέαι 50 and 6	440B, line 27 (50), 461Bb, line 57 (6)
φοῖνιξ	452 + 467, line 29
δάφνημ[α]	452 + 467, line 29

ID 440B, lines 26–27 should be restored [---· ἀμπέλους, XX]ϞHHϞ, yielding the same number of vines as in 452 + 467, line 28. The variation in number of μηλέαι seems to represent a purposeful destruction, as befell vines on Rhamnoi and Nikou Choros between 250 and 200 B.C.¹⁹ A third καρύαι was planted between 174 and 169 B.C.

These inventories now permit a fairly full restoration of *ID* 452 + 467, lines 25–29:

[---α.8-12---. Καί]

26 ἔμισ[θώσαμεν τὰ χώρια?] Χερσόνησο[ν και Δωριοῦς ἐν καθήκο]υσιν χρόνοις κα[ι ἔμισθώσατο
Μελήστυ]-

27 πο[ς ἰ-?ένου? ΗΗΗΔ· ἔγγυοι] ΙΣ.ΑΧΛ [-----α.13-19-----, Τηλέμ]νηστος ἼΑριστείδ[ου·
και παρέλαβεν]

28 [κλείσιον τεθρωμέ]γον β[ούστασις, ἀχυρῶνα, ὑπερώιδιον, ἀνδρώνιον, ἱπνῶνα ἄθυρα, ἀ]μπέλους
XXϞHHϞ,

29 [συχᾶς ΔΔΔΠΙΙ, ἀγριελαίους ΔΔΠ, μυρσίνας ΙΙ, μηλέας Ϟ,] φοῖνικα, δάφνημ[α ---, καρύας ΙΙ,---]

Line 26: See p. 106 above. There is space for about 13 or 14 letters between 467 and 452.

Line 27: There is space for about 14 to 16 letters between 467 and 452; I restore 16 counting the iota. The patronymic must be very short; Kent does not explain the basis of his suggestion [Διογ?]ένου, which is too long.²⁰ The only possibility seems to be Ξένου. A Xenos is attested on Delos; cf. *IG XI ii* 144A, line 85.

ΙΣ.ΑΧΛ: These traces should be the name of one of the guarantors, but it is very difficult to offer a restoration. The alpha, though not dotted, cannot be certain since the letter cutter of this stone did not cross his alphas.²¹ Between the sigma and the alpha there is little room; probably only an iota could be missing. Finally, neither the chi nor the lambda is certain.²² The name could easily be anything beginning ΙΣ.Α or ΙΣΑ, such as Ἴσι[ι]άς, Ἴσαγ[ό]ρας, etc. Compare Ἴσι[ι]άς Δωρ -- (*ID* 2618 b, II, line 8, although this inscription is about 75 years later); Ἴσι[ι]άς (*ID* 1442A, lines 62, 72; B, line 60, 145/4 B.C.).

Line 28: ἄθυρα refers to at least two of the series βούστασις, ἀχυρῶνα, ὑπερώιδιον, ἀνδρώνιον, and ἱπνῶνα, as earlier in the same text at line 23; cf. Brunet's commentary *ad loc.* (1990).

Line 29: On the variation in the number of μηλέαι, see above. Since the third καρύαι was apparently planted between 174 and 169, I have restored only two here. I have simply restored the same numbers for other plants

¹⁹ Kent 1948, pp. 310–311; Bruneau and Fraisse 1981, pp. 143–144.

²⁰ Kent 1939, p. 244; cf. Kent 1948, p. 331, no. 150.

²¹ Dürrbach 1905, p. 522, no. 176 (= *editio princeps* of *ID* 452, fr. b; the *editio princeps* for fr. a is *ID*).

²² I base my observations on a photograph, here unfortunately not easily legible; cf. note 9 above.

as appear in 440B and 461Bb since there is no evidence of changes; but of course given the variation in numbers of *μηλέαι* such changes cannot be absolutely ruled out.

Somewhat fuller restorations of the other two inventories are now also possible:

1. *ID* 440B, lines 22–27

Χερσόνησον [καί] Δωρ[ιοῦς], οὐ καθιστάντος τοὺς ἐγγύους Μελ[ησι]του [Ξ?]ένου, ἀν[ε]-
μισθώσαμεν, καὶ ἐμισθώσατο Ἀντίγονος Μενύλλου τοῦ Ἰσου ΗΗ[Η?]Δ· καὶ ἐγγύο[υς] κατέσ[τη]-
σε Τελέσανδρον Τελεσάνδρου, Ἀσ. . ΛΥ. Ι. . . . δου καὶ παρέλαβ(ε)ν κλείσιον τεθυρ[ω]-
25 μένον, βούστασιν, ἀχυρῶνα, ὑπερώιδιον, [ἀνδρῶνιον, ἱπνῶνα ἄθυρα ----- *ca.* 14–17 -----
ας ΔΠ, σύχᾱς ΔΔΔΠΙΙ, ἀγριελαίους ΔΔΠ[--- *ca.* 6–7 ---] καί? .ΛΛΛ.Ι [----- *ca.* 8–12 -----
ἀμπέλους, ΧΧ]
[^ΓΗΗ^Π, μυρσίνας ΙΙ, καρύας ΙΙ, μηλέας ^Π. *vacat*

Line 22: Cf. Kent 1939, p. 244.

Line 26: ἀγριελαίους, ΔΔΠ Kent 1939, p. 244. Perhaps [φοίνι]κα instead of καί?

Lines 26–27: Although the order of the inventory here is different from those in the other inscriptions, there can be no doubt that vines must be restored, since no other plants or buildings even approach numbers over 700 on any estates at any time.

2. *ID* 461Bb, lines 55–57

τεθυρωμένον, βούστασιν, ἀχυρῶνα, ὑπερώιδιον, ἀ[ν]δρῶνιον, [ι]πνῶνα, ἄθυρα, ἀμπ[έλους ΧΧ^ΓΗΗ^Π,
συχᾱς ΔΔΔΠΙΙ, φοινικα, δάθνημα ----- ἀγρι[ελαίους ΔΔΠ, -----]
[μυρσίνας ΙΙ, καρύας ΙΙΙ, μηλέας ΠΙ (?). *vacat*

Unfortunately none of these entries is complete, and it is impossible to decide what of the possible capital equipment is missing.²³ The space available for all three entries is about the same: 461Bb has space for roughly 170 letters and 440B for about 180 letters. Lines 28–29 of 452 + 467 accommodate about 150 letters, with plenty of room at line 30 for the balance of the inventory.

The last three lines of 452 + 467 are woefully fragmentary. Glotz restored lines 31–32 to yield a re-rental of Soloe and Korakiai, which were normally rented in years ending with zero: [Σολόη]γ? καὶ τὰς [Κορακίας?, οὐ καθιστάντος τοὺς ἐγγύους Ἀριστίωνος, ἐμισθώσατο Ἀπατούρι]ος Φέλ[υος ?].²⁴ This restoration is very appealing, since Soloe-Korakiai was rented by Aristion in 180 B.C. but was in the hands of Apatourios by 174 B.C.²⁵ Aristion would then have defaulted in 177 B.C. by failing to renew his guarantors.

This leaves a bit of a puzzle at line 30. The remains appear to record the rental of another estate: καὶ ἐγγύ[might be καὶ ἔγγυ[οι followed by names and patronymics of guarantors.²⁶ While a rental for the other Mykonian estate, Thaleon, would seem appropriate here, the space available is insufficient for even an abbreviated version of the inventory at *ID* 366B,

²³ Possibilities include other farm buildings or structures, or additional plantings, like olives.

²⁴ *Apud ID* 452, comm., p. 211.

²⁵ These changes are attested by the inscriptions of the following years, *ID* 442A, line 146 (179 B.C.) and 456A, line 20 (173 B.C.).

²⁶ Dürrbach has restored καὶ ἐγγύ[ους κατέστησεν], as if the entry recorded another re-rental after a default. But there is not enough space in line 30 to accommodate the necessary formula.

lines 8–23. Sometimes, however, the hieropoioi dispensed with the inventory if the renter had chosen to avoid an auction and to keep possession by accepting a 10 percent increase in rent, the ἐπιδέκατον. This was the practice in 250 B.C., when the hieropoioi recorded only the name of the renter, the old rent, the amount of the increase, the new rent, and the names of the guarantors.²⁷ There is plenty of space in lines 30–31 to accommodate such a renewal without an inventory. In that case the rent ought to appear at line 30; the reading there, however, ΥΣΕΝ?, does not yield any obvious interpretation as a number.²⁸ Further, a very similar puzzle recurs at *ID* 374B, line 4, of 200 B.C. Again in the context of estate renewals, but in the very badly effaced beginning of face B, appear the letters ωνευσει. . . φιλι. It is very tempting to associate these two passages and restore at 374B, line 4, ὠνευσειν [καὶ] Φιλι---? and in our text [---ὠνε]υσειν καὶ ἐγγυ[---]. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find a verb that fits the traces and the context, nor have the other possibilities I have considered yielded any sure sense.²⁹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bruneau, P., and P. Fraisse. 1981. “Un pressoir à vin à Délos,” *BCH* 105, pp. 127–153
- Brunet, M. 1988. “Chôrai grecques antiques, 2ème parte: Le territoire délien” (diss. Université de Rennes 1988)
- . 1990. “Contribution à l’histoire rurale de Délos aux époques classique et hellénistique,” *BCH* 114, pp. 669–682
- Dürnbach, F. 1905. “Fouilles de Délos. Inscriptions,” *BCH* 29, pp. 417–573
- ID = Inscriptions de Délos*, F. Dürnbach, ed., Paris 1926–1950
- Kent, J. H. 1939. “Notes on the Delian Farm Accounts,” *BCH* 63, pp. 232–245
- . 1948. “The Temple Estates of Delos, Rheneia, and Mykonos,” *Hesperia* 17, pp. 243–338
- Lacroix, M. 1932. “Notes sur les comptes des hiéropes déliens,” *BCH* 56, pp. 372–387
- Osborne, R. 1988. “Social and Economic Implications of the Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece,” *Chiron* 18, pp. 279–323
- Schulhof, E. 1908. “Fouilles de Délos. Inscriptions financières (1904 et 1905),” *BCH* 32, pp. 5–132, 449–498
- Tréheux, J. 1985. “Les hiéropes déliens de 171 avant J.-C.,” *BCH* 109, pp. 485–497
- . 1986. “Notes de lecture,” *BCH* 110, pp. 425–432

GARY REGER

TRINITY COLLEGE
Department of History
Hartford, CT 06106

²⁷ *IG* XI ii 287A, lines 174–180. But in *ID* 373B the inventories are given. On the ἐπιδέκατον, see Kent 1948, pp. 270–271, on Thaleon, p. 288.

²⁸ Only two rent figures for Thaleon are known: 356 drachmas paid by Thymias in 207 B.C. and 381 drachmas as rent again by Thymias for the decennium 206–197 B.C. (*ID* 366A, lines 101, 100). The inventory for Thaleon was not recorded with the rental but on the side of the stone (B, lines 8–23). Is it possible that Thymias renewed by accepting the 10 percent increase and that the 381 drachmas recorded should have been 391 drachmas?

²⁹ For example, *ID* 374B, line 4 might be read as ωνεύς· ἔγ[γυοι] Φιλι---, taking ωνεύς as the end of a proper name or an ethnic. But this solution will not work for line 30 unless we assume a double scribal error: [---ωνε]ύς {εν} καὶ ἔγγυ[οι ---], supposing the letter cutter looked ahead to ἔγγυοι and in writing its first two letters wrote υ for γ.