

WOMEN IN THE MANUMISSION INSCRIPTIONS AT DELPHI

C. WAYNE TUCKER
Hampden-Sydney College

Of the more than twelve hundred slaves whose manumissions are preserved in the inscriptions at Delphi, dating roughly from the last two centuries B.C. and the first century A.D., the majority were female.¹ While there are manumission inscriptions from other areas of the Greek world, Delphi provides the largest body of inscriptions from any single site. With two exceptions,² the manumissions take the form of a sale of the slave to Pythian Apollo by the owner.³ Approximately one third of the manumissions contain a clause requiring that the new freedman “remain” (*παραμένειν*) with the manumittor or someone else, sometimes for a specified number of years, most often for as long as the manumittor lives. There are regularly provisions for the punishment of the former slave

¹ Keith Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge 1978) 140: of 1213 slaves whose sex is known, 737 (61%) were female. The percentage is the same in the computations, based on fewer inscriptions, of Moritz Bloch, *Die Freilassungsbedingungen der Delphischen Freilassungsinschriften* (Strasburg 1914) 16, note 14 (where the total for males should be 391, not 331): of 1012 persons manumitted, 621 (61%) were female.

The major collections of manumission inscriptions from Delphi are in Johannes Baunack, *Die Delphischen Inschriften*, in Hermann Collitz, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* 2 (Göttingen 1899), nos. 1684–2342 (“Die Freilassungsurkunden”), hereafter referred to as *GDI*; and in the various parts of Volume 3 of *Fouilles de Delphes* (Paris 1909–), abbreviated in the text as *FD*.

² *GDI* 2097 (140–100 B.C.): the manumission of a female slave by consecration, on which form of manumission see Aristide Calderini, *La Manomissione e la Condizione dei Liberti in Graecia* (Rome 1965 [1908]) 96–102.

GDI 2101 (December/January, 182/181 B.C.): the will of a man of Calydonia; among other clauses is one in which he leaves “to the god and to the city τὰν ἰδίαν θεράπωναν to be free, if he dies.”

³ Calderini 103–4. Alan E. Samuel, “The Role of *Paramone* Clauses in Ancient Documents,” *JJP* 15 (1965) 268, believes that the statement that the slave is being sold to the god is a fiction intended to obviate the legal prohibition against a slave’s owning property; the purchase price, of course, was usually provided by the slave. Since the Greeks did not perceive their gods as slave-holders, the slave was free on being “sold” to Apollo: William L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia 1955) 45–46; “The *Paramone* as General Service Contract,” *JJP* 2 (1948) 9.

who does not live up to the agreement to remain with and obey the manumittor, as well as for any children born to the freedwomen who continue to serve in *paramonê*. Some inscriptions contain provisions for early release from *paramonê*. In addition, there are also inscriptions commemorating the release from *paramonê*, some of which can be compared with the original manumission inscriptions.

For the most part, the inscriptions commemorating the acts of manumission of female slaves vary little from those for male slaves. But some provisions, especially in the acts containing *paramonê* clauses, were obviously inspired by the fact that the newly-freed person was female. In addition, there are other variations which seem to have nothing to do with the sex of the former slave but rather with the specific persons and situations.

The cost of manumission for female slaves was approximately 20% less than that for males.⁴ The price of manumission for females in the great majority of cases falls into the three-to-five-mnae range. When the price varies very much from that range, one would like to know the reason, but for the most part the inscriptions fail to provide one. In at least two instances, the fact that the slave was bought from someone else is mentioned, possibly with the intention of justifying the manumission prices of eight (*GDI* 1863) and ten (*FD* 3.6.31) mnae. That the slave was of foreign birth seems not to have made an appreciable difference. One Syrian female might have been manumitted for eight mnae (*GDI* 2019), but others for only three (*GDI* 1717; *FD* 3.2.234). Seldom is the occupation or skill of a manumitted person mentioned in the contracts; that it is mentioned in *GDI* 1842 (*τεχνίτης ἀλλοτρίης*) may explain the price of ten mnae paid by Sosikrateia, the eleven mnae paid by Hellas (*GDI* 2177: *τεχνίτης*), and the eight mnae which the Galatian Athenaiis paid (*GDI* 2154: *τεχνίτης*). Two seamstresses (*τεχνίτης ῥαφιδήα*) paid only five mnae (*FD* 3.2.230) and four mnae, thirty staters (*FD* 3.3.26), while the cost of another flute-player's freedom is missing from her inscription (*FD* 3.3.54). The highest prices paid for manumission by female slaves were thirteen mnae (*FD* 3.3.318) and fifteen mnae (*GDI* 2283).⁵ While the price of freedom gradually rose during the period represented in the inscriptions,⁶ the general increase cannot explain these high prices: *GDI* 2283 is from the decade, 150–140 B.C. Nor is a high payment a guarantee of unconditional freedom; two women who paid eight mnae (*FD* 3.4.480B; *GDI* 2019), one who paid ten (*FD* 3.6.31), and the woman

⁴ Hopkins 159.

⁵ Other inscriptions with high prices for manumission are *GDI* 1921, 1927, 2211, 2221, 2279; *FD* 3.3.18: eight mnae; *GDI* 1850, 2188; *FD* 3.2.130: nine mnae; *GDI* 1900, 1929, 2089, 2133, 2134, 2318 (= *FD* 3.6.93): ten mnae.

⁶ Hopkins 159–62.

already mentioned who paid thirteen mnae—all were subjected to *paramonê*.

At the other end of the price scale are those acts of manumission in which no price is mentioned for the original manumission⁷—though the absence of a figure need not mean that no payment was made—and at least two acts in which freedom was granted to women explicitly “as a free gift” (*δωρεάν*); free, that is, if the requirement to remain is not counted (*FD* 3.3.364, 45). In *FD* 3.3.364 there is a provision for early release from *paramonê* for a payment of three mnae, *τροφέα*, presumably a repayment of the cost of raising the newly-freed girl (*κοράσιον*). The other inscription (*FD* 3.3.45) identifies the slave manumitted as *τὴν ἰδίαν θρεπτὰν*. It may be that in both instances the affection of the manumittors—both women—for the young slaves they had raised explains the gift of manumission.

There must have been variable factors about which the inscriptions are silent: the age of the slave, the skills and talents with which she was endowed, her original cost—as well as the cost of replacement—the economic status of the manumittors, not to mention the degree of avarice which might have affected the size of the payment required for manumission. There is also the intangible factor of the affection, or the lack thereof, attached to the relationship of slave and owner, as well as the effect such personal feelings may have had on the manumission provisions. It may also be that a very high price reflects the effort of an owner to keep a favorite slave in the household by attempting to place the cost of manumission out of the slave’s reach. The last explanation, however, might suggest some customary right of a slave to purchase freedom for which there is no evidence at Delphi.

A discussion of prices naturally raises the question of how female slaves acquired the money to purchase their manumission. Craftswomen and entertainers—and there were certainly more than the inscriptions explicitly acknowledge—would have been able to earn their manumission price. In many cases an owner must have contributed to the slave’s fund in appreciation for services rendered and in encouragement of continuing good service. Young slaves were undoubtedly redeemed by parents who had already redeemed themselves⁸ or who, free themselves, had been forced to sell a child into slavery out of need.⁹ Some women were probably bought out of slavery by someone else for the purpose of marriage, perhaps in continuation of a relationship begun while they were both slaves; there

⁷ *GDI* 1960, 2199 (early release from *paramonê* for three mnae), 2192 (early release from *paramonê* for five mnae).

⁸ Or perhaps were still slaves: cf. *GDI* 1708 (below, p. 229). Cf. also *FD* 3.2.216 (below, p. 229).

⁹ See below (p. 229) on *GDI* 2123.

are many examples of similar situations reflected in the epitaphs of Rome.¹⁰ In most cases, however, there is no indication of the source of the money.¹¹

The inscriptions at Delphi in many instances indicate that family relationships among slaves were recognized—at least at the time of manumission—especially the relationship of a mother and her offspring. There are inscriptions advertising the joint release of a mother and her daughter¹² and of a mother and her son.¹³ One multiple manumission includes a mother with both her daughter and her son (*GDI* 2041), and others note the manumission of a mother and two daughters (*GDI* 1722), a mother and two sons (*GDI* 1879; *FD* 3.6.130), a mother with two sons and a daughter (*FD* 3.2.233), and a mother and her two daughters and a son (*FD* 3.6.6). One inscription (*FD* 3.1.566) records the manumission of a woman, her three daughters, her son, *καὶ ἄλλο ἀνδρείον σῶμα*. The implication of their being manumitted together is that the man was the *de facto* husband of the woman and the father of the children. The entire group is to remain with the manumittor until her death, on which occurrence they are to be free.

In *FD* 3.3.413 the manumission of a woman and a young boy, Lykiskos, who presumably was her son, is recorded. The act has special interest because, while there is a provision requiring that the woman remain with the manumittor, there is an explicit statement that Lykiskos is not to remain but is to be free. A mother and her son are manumitted in *GDI* 1984, with *paramonê* imposed only on the son; and in *FD* 3.6.6 a mother is freed unconditionally, but her three children are required to remain with the son of their manumittors. Only in *FD* 3.3.413, however, is it expressly stated that someone is not to remain.¹⁴

The fact that the relationship of mother and offspring is the only familial relationship normally recognized at Delphi reflects, on the one hand, the status of slaves in antiquity as property and, on the other, the impossibility of denying the mother-child connection. But we should probably assume that in other inscriptions recording the manumission together of more than one person, there was some relationship. When

¹⁰ Cf. Beryl Rawson, "Family Life Among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire," *CP* 61 (1966) 71–83; and "Roman Concubinage and Other *De Facto* Marriages," *TAPA* 104 (1974) 279–305; and Susan Treggiari, "*Contubernales* in *CIL* 6," *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 42–69.

¹¹ Hopkins (168) makes the suggestion that many slaves were connected in some way with the Delphic shrine's prosperity.

¹² *GDI* 2059, 2074, 2093, 2314 (= *FD* 3.6.84); *FD* 3.2.174, 222; 3.6.47.

¹³ *GDI* 1689, 1869, 1895, 1954, 1984, 2055, 2096, 2122, 2154, 2163; perhaps also *FD* 3.6.133.

¹⁴ Cf. *GDI* 1716, in which two women are manumitted, but only one is required to remain; there is no statement that the other should not remain.

male and female adult slaves were manumitted together,¹⁵ they may have been *de facto* husband and wife, what the Romans would have called *contubernales*. However, the only example of an acknowledged relationship of husband and wife which I am able to find is in *GDI* 2183, which records the manumission of Chresimos καὶ τὰν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, Zoīs. *FD* 3.3.326 is the act of manumission of one male and two female slaves. There is no indication of a relationship, but they may have formed a family of mother, father, and daughter, speculation which is encouraged by the fact that all three were to remain with the two manumittors and that they later attained early release from *paramonē* together (*FD* 3.3.327).¹⁶ Another inscription (*GDI* 1693) recording the sale to the god of two women and a male also suggests that there was some relationship from the names of one of the females and of the male, Aristoboula and Aristoboulos; as does a similar inscription (*GDI* 1780) in which Boiska, Boiskos, and Antiochis are freed and referred to in line 7 as αὐτὰν καὶ τὰ παιδάρια, probably a mother and her two children. Another inscription records the manumission of two women, two men, and two girls, all of whom were to remain and serve their manumittor until he died (*FD* 3.3.294); the freed persons may have comprised two families.

GDI 2123 is the act of manumission of a young female slave, τὰν ἐπίστευσε ἡ μήτηρ αὐτᾶς. In all probability a needy mother sold her daughter or simply handed her over into slavery because of her inability to provide for her; the manumission price may have come from the mother. Another inscription (*FD* 3.2.216) indicates that a young girl was freed by her father, or perhaps by her mother.¹⁷ The only clear acknowledgement of a slave's father is found in *GDI* 1708, in which a clause of the act of manumission requires that the young girl being freed, on reaching adulthood, take care of Σωσίβιον τὸν ἴδιον πατέρα καὶ τὰμ ματέρα Σωσῶ, if they have any need of food or care, whether they are still slaves or have been freed. If she does not take care of them, they are to have the power to punish her in whatever way they wish. It would be interesting to know whether the slave parents had provided the money for the child's release from slavery—either because they hoped for her a better life than they had had or simply because the child's manumission

¹⁵ E.g., *GDI* 1772, 1786, 2237; *FD* 3.3.12, 24.

¹⁶ That slaves freed together need not have attained release from *paramonē* together is shown by *FD* 3.3.340 and 341, the *apolyseis*, widely separated in time, of two of the three women whose manumission is recorded in *FD* 3.3.337 (below, note 28).

¹⁷ The inscription reads Πίστιος πατὴρ λύσει. The editor emends it to read ματὴρ both because names in *-is* are usually feminine and because a female Pistis is freed in *FD* 3.2.215 by the same manumittor who is found in 216. The editor also suggests that the statement may indicate that the father of Pistis freed the girl. In support of the emendation is the probability that only in *GDI* 1708 (below) of all the Delphic manumissions is the father of a slave acknowledged as such.

was cheaper (two *mnae*) than either of theirs would have been—and, therefore, placed the obligation of their care on her as recompense.

The relationship of owner and slave can sometimes be inferred from statements in the inscriptions. In *GDI* 1798 there is an explicit provision that the freedwoman keep whatever she acquired while in *paramonê*, possibly indicating some special affection of the former owner for the former slave. There are inscriptions naming freedwomen the heirs of their manumitters,¹⁸ and a regular provision of release from *paramonê* on the death of the manumitter is that the freedwoman arrange the funeral.¹⁹ Perhaps we learn more than we need to know from *FD* 3.3.26 in the threat of punishment for a freedwoman if she violates the prohibition against speaking badly of her manumitters.

In *GDI* 1803 one Nikon manumits Hedula and directs that she be considered the daughter of Dorema, probably his daughter,²⁰ and that she do such things as it is customary for children to do.²¹ Another man manumitted a female slave with the stipulation that she do the customary things for him as for a father (*GDI* 1806).

A more intimate relationship of slave and owner may be implied in *GDI* 1715, wherein is recorded the manumission of the Thracian female slave, Zopyra, and two home-born males, Agamestor and Telestas; the manumitter is one Agamestor, the son of Telestas. All three are to remain with Agamestor as long as he lives.²²

An even clearer indication of the concubinage of a slave is found in two inscriptions dating from the end of the first century B.C. In the first (*FD* 3.3.329) Kleomantis manumitted Eisias for the price of two *mnae*, requiring that she remain with him all of his life, “doing everything that is ordered like a slave.”

If Eisias does not remain or does not do what is ordered, let
Kleomantis have the power to punish her in whatever way he
wishes, by beating her and selling her.

The act is straightforward and in the formulaic mold of the large majority of manumission inscriptions at Delphi. It would have no special

¹⁸ E.g., *FD* 3.2.243; 3.3.24.

¹⁹ E.g., *FD* 3.2.243; 3.3.24, 269, 364; 3.6.40.

²⁰ Cf. *GDI* 1945, where the manumitter is Dorema, the daughter of Nikon.

²¹ The editor (*ad FD* 3.3.8) suggests that the same women appear in *FD* 3.3.8, where it is recorded that “Dorema, with the agreement of her daughter Hedula, has sold . . .” Cf. Hopkins 167.

²² Cf. *GDI* 2144, wherein Βάχιος Βαχιάδα manumits a young girl named Βαχίς; *FD* 3.6.125, in which both the manumitter and the manumitted are named Herakleitos; *FD* 3.3.287, with Aphrodisia manumitting a young girl Aphrodisia; and possibly *FD* 3.3.372, in which the slave's name is Herakleidas and the preserved part of the manumitter's name is Ἡρακλει-. There is certainly the possibility that owners bestowed their own names on their slaves without intending to signify anything other than affection.

significance for us had the *apolysis* from *paramonê* not also been recorded and preserved (FD 3.3.333): a couple of priesthoods later Kleomantis released Eiasias from *paramonê* and remitted the sum she had paid for her manumission. He also freed the son born to her while in *paramonê*, whose name she had changed from Nikostratos to Kleomantis. The inscription, in addition, names Eiasias and the younger Kleomantis the heirs of the elder Kleomantis in second place to his wife. It is clear that at some point before or after her original manumission Eiasias had become the concubine of Kleomantis, and that the change of the name of their son and the naming of the mother and son as heirs acknowledged publicly the intimate relationship of former owner and former slave.

How many of the acts of manumission of women should be viewed as reflecting relationships similar to that of Eiasias and Kleomantis is impossible to determine. But there should be no hesitation to assume that in Greece, as in Rome, the relationship of concubinage involving an owner and a slave, or a former owner and a freedwoman, was more common than the one acknowledgement might lead one to think.

While the cost of unconditional freedom rose over the course of the three centuries represented in the Delphic manumission inscriptions, with a consequent increase in the proportion of those inscriptions containing *paramonê* clauses, the cost of manumission with *paramonê* remained constant, but the conditions for release from *paramonê* became more severe.²³ The *paramonê* formula was standard for men and women, with slight variations:

Παραμεινάτω δὲ παρὰ Ἀνδρόνικον Εὐταξία καὶ Παρνάσιος
ἄχρι οὗ καὶ ζῶνι Ἀνδρόνικος ποιέοντες τὸ ποτιτασσόμενον πᾶν
τὸ δυνατὸν ἀνεγκλήτως. (GDI 2163)

If the two do not remain and do what is ordered, Andronikos, or someone else acting in his behalf, is to have the power to punish the newly-freed pair τρόπῳ ᾧ καὶ αὐτοὶ θέλῳντι, πλὴν μὴ πωλέοντες. In some instances, the failure to remain and perform what is ordered is to result in the voiding of the contract,²⁴ thus effecting the re-enslavement of the person manumitted. It is sometimes specified that the newly-freed woman remain “within” (GDI 1775)—that is, within the house of the manumittor—or that she not have the power to leave the manumittor (FD 3.3.45, 364), or that she not go and live in another city without the manumittor’s knowledge (FD 3.3.26). In one act (FD 3.3.21), the woman

²³ Hopkins 158–62; cf. L. P. Marinovich, “Paramone in the Delphic Manumissions of the Roman Period,” *Vestnik Drevni Istorii* 118 (1971) 27–45 (in Russian with a summary in English on p. 46).

²⁴ ἄκυρος ἔστω ἂν ὡνά (GDI 1747).

in *paramonê* is not to live in another household until the daughter of the manumittor is grown and married.

Occasionally the tenure in *paramonê* is specified rather than being simply “as long as [the manumittor] lives.” The terms designated range from two years (*GDI* 1955, 1984) to ten years (*GDI* 1764).²⁵ In *GDI* 1742 the newly-freed woman is required to remain with the manumittor until he dies and then with his sons for six years.²⁶ Phalakra in *GDI* 1747 is to remain, after the death of her manumittor, with the manumittor’s son until he marries. In *GDI* 1867 the requirement of *paramonê* is to allow the freedwoman to pay the three-mna price of manumission at the rate of one-half mna in each of the six years of *paramonê*. Dorema in *GDI* 2084 is to remain with Nikon for eight years, if he lives that long; if he dies before the eight years are up, she is to pay to his daughter one-half mna for each year remaining in the specified eight, living “outside” and having authority over herself.²⁷ Eiasias, however, is to be free if her manumittor dies before the appointed ten-year period of *paramonê* is completed (*GDI* 2209).

All of these inscriptions in which a limit is set on the time in *paramonê* come from the second century B.C. Later inscriptions with *paramonê* clauses state that the freed person should remain with the manumittor for as long as the latter lives. But even when there is no limit set on the time in *paramonê* or no provision for early release is included, the *apolyseis* which have survived and which can be compared with surviving acts of manumission for the same persons indicate that release from *paramonê* often came before the death of the manumittor.²⁸

²⁵ Cf. *GDI* 1743, 1843: five years.

²⁶ Cf. *GDI* 2015: eight years, with a provision that if the manumittor dies before the term is completed, the woman should remain the rest of the term with another person, named but not identified by relationship, if any, to the manumittor.

²⁷ Hopkins (150, note 30) gives an inaccurate report of the terms of this *paramonê* clause.

²⁸ In each of the following pairs, the first inscription is an act of manumission without a provision for early release; the second is the *apolysis* with an indication of payment, if any. Even when the *apolysis* states that a payment was made “in accordance with the contract,” there was no provision in the act of manumission. There should be no assumption *ex silentio* that no payment was made for *apolysis*. The priesthoods (on the average ten years in duration) are indicated in order to get a rough estimate of the time spent in *paramonê*.

GDI 1918 (Pr. III)

GDI 2168 (Pr. XIV)

GDI 2151 (Pr. XVI)

FD 3.3.280 (Pr. XIX)

291 (Pr. XIX)

GDI 1919 (Pr. IV) (λαβόντες ἀργυρίου MMM)

GDI 2167 (Pr. XV) (λαβοῦσα λύτρα ἐκ πολεμίων (=ἐκ τῶν πόλεος νόμων?))

FD 3.3.43 (Pr. XVI)

FD 3.3.281 (Pr. XIX)

292 (Pr. XIX) (ἐπεὶ ἀπέδωκε τὰ ἐν τῇ ὥνῃ καταγεγραμμένα)

The provisions which set the women at Delphi apart from the men are concerned with the status of children born under *paramonê* and with the requirement that women provide offspring at their release from *paramonê*.²⁹ In some cases a child born to a woman in *paramonê* is explicitly directed to be free;³⁰ in others, there is the requirement that children born to a woman in *paramonê* be handed over to the manumittor (*FD* 3.2.129; 3.6.9); in still others, there is the statement that a woman who bears a child should be released from *paramonê* (*FD* 3.2.246): the implication is that she left the child with the manumittor as a replacement slave. Most common is the provision that the woman in *paramonê* give to a son or daughter of the manumittor a child; regularly the handing over of a child is to come after the manumittor's death in return for release from *paramonê*, sometimes with an additional payment in money.³¹ Perhaps the most complicated provision of this kind is found

401 (Pr. XXI)	400 (Pr. XXIV)
318 (Pr. XXII)	319 (Pr. XXIV)
326 (Pr. XXII)	327 (Pr. XXIV) (ἀπολαβόν- τες τὸ ἐν τᾷ ὠνᾷ χρῆμα)
300 (Pr. XXV)	302 (Pr. XXVI)
303 (Pr. XXVI)	304 (Pr. XXVI) (ἀπολα- βοῦσα τὸ ἐν τᾷ ὠνᾷ γεγρα- μένον χρῆμα)
3.6.19 (Pr. XXVI)	3.6.18 (Pr. XXVII)
29 (Pr. XXVII)	30 (Pr. XXVII)

Three females are manumitted in *FD* 3.3.337 (Pr. XVI) with the provision that if the manumittor bears a child, the freedwomen should each give a *mna* to the child and be free; otherwise, they will be free from *paramonê* at the manumittor's death. *FD* 3.3.340 is the *apolysis*, in the following priesthood (XVII), of one of the three; no payment is indicated. *FD* 3.3.341 is the release of one of the other two; the manumittor received a payment of three *mnae*, and the *apolysis* came in Priesthood XX.

²⁹ At Calymna, men as well as women were required to provide a child in order to be released from *paramonê*: *Tit. Calymn.*, no. 176; cf. no. 186 (*apolysis* through a two-year-old child). The editor, Mario Segré, expresses the view that at Calymna all those freed, male and female, had to provide a child by law (pp. 177–78); cf. Samuel (above, note 3) 291–92; and, in opposition, Hopkins 157, note 42.

³⁰ *GDI* 2225; *FD* 3.3.280, 296, 303, 307, 318, 439, 3.4.496; 3.6.13, 33, 43, 48. Cf. *GDI* 1798, wherein it is stipulated that if the freedwoman gives birth while in *paramonê*, she and the offspring are to be free; cf. *GDI* 2136.

Hopkins (146, 155) believes that most children born to women in *paramonê* were considered free, though until the mid-first century B.C. an explicit provision was not normally written into the contract. From the mid-first century on, Hopkins (155–56) finds that the explicit references to the children of women in *paramonê* are divided evenly between those stipulating that the child be free and those requiring that the child be given over to the manumittor.

³¹ *FD* 3.3.291: at the death of the manumittors, three *mnae* and a one-year-old child to their daughter.

FD 3.3.273: three *mnae* and a child to the son of the manumittor.

in *FD* 3.6.38 from the early first century A.D. recording the manumission with *paramonê* of two women, Epiphanea and Epaphro. After the manumittor's death,

δότω Ἐπαφρῶ τῷ ἐγγόνῳ μου Γλαυκία Λύσωνος βρέφη διετῇ
τρία. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃ τὰ βρέφη, δότω δεινάρια διακόσια. Καὶ
Ἐπιφάνεα δότω τῷ νύῳ μου Σωστράτῳ μετὰ ἔτη πέντε
παιδίον τριετές, καὶ μετὰ ἔτη τρία καὶ τῷ ἐγγόνῳ μου Γλαυκία
παιδίον τριετές, καὶ ἔστωσαν ἐλεύθεραι Ἐπαφρῶ καὶ Ἐπι-
φάνεα.

Another inscription (*FD* 3.6.39) from the same period provides that children born to a freedwoman during her time in *paramonê* remain with the manumittors of their mother, unless the manumittors wish to sell them *πρὸς ἔνδειαν*.³² In a much earlier inscription (*GDI* 1719) a freedwoman is required to remain after manumission and to rear two slaves for the manumittor, but she is still to be free from *paramonê* only at the death of the manumittor.

That the children of women who continued to serve their former masters after manumission were subject to the control of the manumittors is clear from the inscriptions cited. It can be assumed that both the payment for freedom and the handing over of a child in order to obtain *apolyxis* were the means for the manumittor to replace the former slave. An inscription of the second quarter of the second century B.C. (*GDI* 1717) makes clear the relationship between the cost of manumission and that of a replacement slave. The woman being freed, Aphrodisia, is to remain with her manumittors until their death, when she is to give one *mna* to their son and be free. If she wishes to be released from *paramonê* while her manumittors are still alive, she is to purchase in her place a female slave of the same age. When the manumittors die, Aphrodisia is to give to their son the *mna*, or the slave she purchased previously to take her place. (The last clause implies that the purchased slave remained the property of Aphrodisia even while she served the manumittors.) There is

FD 3.3.332: two *mnae* or a one-year-old child to the daughter (?) of the manumittors.

FD 3.6.22: two children, one two-year-old and one one-year-old, or a payment which the manumittor will determine.

FD 3.6.39: a two-year-old child to the son of the manumittors:

FD 3.6.43: a one-year-old child to the son of the manumittor in three years.

FD 3.6.57: two two-year-old children to the daughter of the manumittor.

Payments alone are specified in *GDI* 2186 and *FD* 3.3.387 (one *mna* to the son of each manumittor), and in *FD* 3.3.311 (each of three freedwomen to give three *mnae* to the son of the manumittor on the latter's death). In *FD* 3.3.6 the *paramonê* clause requires that three of the four persons freed remain with the manumittor's son; if the latter dies leaving children, each freed person should give sixty denarii, presumably to the children. Cf. *FD* 3.3.337 (above, note 28).

³² Cf. 3.3.306.

no parallel for the provision that a freed person provide another to take his place if after manumission he wants to be released from *paramonê*. However, females on attaining their freedom increasingly were required to produce the offspring who could take their place in the service of their manumittors or of their manumittors' heirs.

I want to consider one final inscription which is of considerable interest, both for the questions it raises and for the answers it may provide. *GDI* 2171, which is dated in the first half of the first century B.C., records the sale to Pythian Apollo of the female slave Dioklea, home-born, for the price of three mnae. The inscription includes a *paramonê* clause: Dioklea is to remain with Kleopatra, the mother of the manumittor. The length of the *paramonê* is not specified; rather, Dioklea is to be free on Kleopatra's death. The inscription is relatively straightforward and certainly familiar to anyone who has perused even a few of the acts of manumission at Delphi, until line 16, where there begins the provision for any child born to Dioklea while she is in *paramonê*:

εἰ δέ τι γένοιτο ἐγ Διοκλέας τέκνον ἐν τῷ τᾷς παραμονᾷς
 χρόνῳ, εἴ κα μὲν θέλῃ ἀποπνέϊζαι Διόκλεα, ἐξουσίαν ἔχέτω, εἰ
 δὲ θέλοι τρέφειν, ἔστω τὸ τρεφόμενον ἐλεύθερον. εἴ κα μὴ αὐτὸ
 θέλῃ, πωλήσῃ δὲ τὸ γεννηθέν, μὴ ἔχέτω ἐξουσίαν Διόκλεα
 μηδὲ ἄλλος μηθείς.

So far as I have been able to discover from examining the manumission inscriptions, the provision that a freedwoman be allowed to kill a child born during her time in *paramonê* is unparalleled.³³ Infanticide is not a subject which is frequently and freely discussed in antiquity, and the question is whether the mention of the subject in this inscription should be considered an anomaly, arising from some special circumstance about which we are not told, or rather reflects a relatively common practice which simply is not mentioned in other inscriptions. If infanticide was a common practice among women of servile and freed status in Greece, the use of the verb ἀποπνέιγω, "choke" or "suffocate," suggests one method which may have been common.

Whatever the speculation about infanticide in general in Greece in the first century B.C., within the context of this inscription the question is why Dioklea is given the alternative of rearing a child in freedom or killing it, but not of selling it. The answer must lie in the entire system of manumission at Delphi, of the commitment which the newly-freed person makes to remain and serve, and of *apolyxis* from *paramonê*. The case of Dioklea may represent the practice by freedwomen in *paramonê* of selling infants for money to purchase their release. We know from the

³³ Baunack (*ad loc.*) calls it "singulär." Bloch (above, note 1) says that *GDI* 2171 "uns zeigt wie minimal man das Leben eines solchen Sklavenkindes bewertete" (29, note 8).

surviving inscriptions that women attained early release from *paramonê* in the face of the explicit requirement that they remain and serve until the death of the manumittor. We also know that early release from *paramonê*, as well as release on the death of the manumittor, was sometimes, especially in the later period, "purchased" by handing over a child. It is not unreasonable to infer that there were instances in which women sold their children to acquire money to purchase *apolysis*—not unreasonable especially in a society in which a slave was property and infanticide, even among the free, was common.

The manumittor of Dioklea had no interest in any children the former slave might bear while in *paramonê*. His interest lay in the care of his mother until her death. Therefore, he provided in the contract of manumission that Dioklea kill or rear any child she might have, but that she not have what may have been the only means at her disposal to purchase her way out of *paramonê*.

And although children of slaves were presumed to be the property of the slaves' owners, slave women, either surreptitiously or with the consent of their owners, may also have sold their children to buy their way out of slavery in the first place.

Women whose manumissions are recorded in the inscriptions at Delphi are distinguished from their male counterparts by generally lower prices paid for their "sale" to Apollo, by the acknowledgement of their relationship to their offspring born during their time in *paramonê*, and by the requirement that they hand over children on their release from *paramonê*. Just as a payment for freedom was probably intended to provide to the manumittor the means to purchase a replacement for the manumitted man or woman, so the requirement that a freedwoman give a child to her manumittor, or to the heir at the death of the manumittor, in order to obtain *apolysis* was intended to provide the replacement for the former slave. As the purchase price of slaves increased, the cost of unconditional freedom increased; as the latter cost increased, the proportion of slaves who purchased conditional freedom rose. And as the cost of release from *paramonê* increased, that cost, at least for freedwomen, was figured increasingly in human lives.