

Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz

Kabeiroi, manumitted slaves and *xenoi*:
the manumission inscriptions from Lemnos (*)

Abstract

This article discusses the group of thirty-eight inscribed manumission documents, emanating from the Kabeirion in north-east Lemnos. This corpus is of a great importance for the study of the island, its Athenian and other population, and the role of the sanctuary and the cult celebrated there, as well as to the study of manumission. While the work done by scholars who studied the inscriptions has shed light on this lesser-known site of manumission, thus adding valuable information to what is known on manumission practices and manumission documents in the Greek world, there are some important questions related to this corpus that still remain to be elucidated. In this article I will briefly review the main features of these manumission documents that emerge from previous studies and consider in greater detail the questions that remain unsolved, suggesting some answers where such can be given.

Questo articolo discute il gruppo di trentotto documenti epigrafici di manomissione ritrovati nel Kabeirion situato nella parte nord-orientale di Lemno. Questo corpus riveste grande importanza per lo studio dell'isola, della sua popolazione ateniese e non, del ruolo del santuario e del culto ivi celebrato, così come per lo studio della manomissione. Benché il lavoro degli studiosi che si sono occupati delle iscrizioni abbia fatto luce su questo luogo poco conosciuto adibito a manomissioni, accrescendo così le nostre conoscenze riguardo alle pratiche di manomissione nel mondo greco e

* I am very grateful to the anonymous reader of *Dike* for useful criticism and suggestions.

alla relativa documentazione, restano aperti alcuni importanti interrogativi sollevati da questo corpus. In questo articolo intendo brevemente passare in rassegna le principali caratteristiche di questi documenti di manomissione già emerse grazie ai precedenti studi, ed esaminare più da vicino le questioni ancora aperte, suggerendo, dove possibile, qualche risposta.

Introduction

The group of thirty-eight inscribed manumission documents, emanating from the Kabeirion in north-east Lemnos, not far from Hephaestia,¹ which have been dated between the second century BCE to the first century CE, is of a great importance for the study of the island, its Athenian and other population, and the role of the sanctuary and the cult celebrated there, as well as to the study of manumission.

The inscriptions were found during the excavations conducted at the site of the Kabeirion by the Italian Archaeological School at Athens from 1937. The archaeologists discovered two *telesteria*, built on two terraces: the older one, situated on the southern terrace, had been in use since at least the seventh century BCE throughout the classical period. Another *telesterion* was built (but never completed) in the Hellenistic period on the northern terrace and was in use until ca. 200 CE, when it was destroyed by fire.² In the third century CE, a new *telesterion* was built on top of the archaic one, on the southern terrace.

¹ Kabeiria with Mystery cults are also known from Thebes, Imbros, Miletus, and Pergamon, and perhaps also in second- and third-century CE Macedonia (*SEG* 29 601 from Kassandreia; *IG* X (2) 1 199, *SEG* 48 853, and *SEG* 49 817 from Thessalonike). Other sanctuaries of the Kabeiroi are mentioned in the sources, e.g. in Anthedon in Boiotia and in Delos (e.g. *IG* XI (2) 144, l. 90; *ID* 1562 = *SEG* 40 654, l. 1; *ID* 1574, l. 5). Also, the Megaloi Theoi, the Great Gods, of Samothrake have been often identified with the Kabeiroi. On the Kabeiroi (and their different names) and the Kabeiria see Hemberg 1950; Levi 1966; Schachter 1986; Cole 1984; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000); Daumas 1997; Daumas 2005. On the Kabeirion in Lemnos: Accame 1941-1943 (1948); Beschi 1994; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 79, who suggest that when the Athenians occupied Lemnos they adopted the indigenous cult of the Kabeiroi but infused it with Athenian elements; Beschi 2003, esp. 965-969; Rocca 2012a; Blakely 2012, and 2013 (in analogy to the Great Gods of Samothrake). For a review of the Mystery cults see also Bowden 2015, who, however, doubts that the Great Gods of Samothrake were the same as the Kabeiroi or the Dioskouroi.

² For a useful description, see Rocca 2012a, 289-292.

The four stelae inscribed with manumission documents were found in the context of the third-century CE *telesterion* but were probably moved there from the burnt Hellenistic site. Three of them, containing seven manumission acts, were published by Silvio Accame (*ASAtene* 19-21, 1941-43 [1948], 94-99, nos. 14-16, with some new readings by Francesca Rocca, *ASAtene* 88, 2010 [2012], 296-297 = *SEG* 60 935-937).³ A large stela containing 31 manumission inscriptions was published by Luigi Beschi (*ASAtene* 74-75, 1996-1997 [2000], 46-66, no. 25 = *SEG* 50 829), with some new readings by Dan Dana, *REG* 120 (2007), 770-775, and by Rocca 2012a, 297-298.⁴ In 2014 (*Historiká* IV, 145-164) Rocca re-published two further fragments, which she associated with Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14.

While the work of these scholars has shed light on this lesser-known site of manumission, thus adding valuable information to what is known on manumission practices and manumission documents in the Greek world, there are some important questions related to this corpus that still remain to be elucidated: What was the connection between the manumissions and the Kabeirion? Since most of the manumitters bear Attic demotics, were they Athenians living in Lemnos (descendants of the cleruchs sent to the island) or Athenians visiting the place either on an official mission or for commercial or religious purposes; and were the manumitters with foreign ethnics residents of Lemnos (that is, of a metic-like status) or just visiting there (again, perhaps for commercial or religious purposes)? The possible answers to the last two questions raise another issue: what was the status of manumitted slaves in Lemnos and Athens in the Hellenistic and Roman times? In this article I will briefly summarize the main features of these manumission documents that emerge from the Italian scholars' work and consider in greater detail the questions that remain unsolved, suggesting some answers where such can be given.

1 The Religious Context

³ In 2009 Enrica Culasso Gastaldi identified a fragment, preserved at the museum of Myrina (inv. MMyrina X375) as belonging to Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14, but has not yet published it (Rocca 2012a, 292). Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25 XXXI has only traces of words; no. 32 (p. 68) is a fragment (now lost) that most probably came from a manumission inscription; cf. *SEG* 50 832.

The fact that all the inscriptions come from the site of the Kabeirion may indicate that the divine sanction and protection of the Kabeiroi or other divinities connected with the sanctuary were invoked.⁵ Yet, as we shall see, these manumissions were not of the type called ‘sacral’: none of the slaves was sold or consecrated to the deities for the purpose of freedom, modes of manumission that were widespread in the same period especially in central Greece.⁶ Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 16 opens with a reference to a decree (*psēphisma*, ll. 1-8), passed in the year of the archon Pheidantides,⁷ according to which the elected sacred herald Menekrates son of Chairephilos inscribed the names of those who were set free during the festival of the Horaia (τούσδε ἐστηλογράφησεν... ἠφειμένους ἐν τοῖς Ὁραίοις ἐλευθέρους). This decree was probably voted by the demos of the initiates or the demos of the Athenians in Hephaistia.⁸ As noted by Accame (p. 98) and Rocca 2012a, 299 and n. 23), inscribed lists of manumitted slaves made (or proclaimed) by heralds are known from other places in the Greek world such as Beroia, Delos and Thera.⁹ Salomon (1997, 106) seems to infer that manumission of slaves was an integral part of the Horaia festival in Lemnos, and that each year the herald officially announced the names of the manumitted slaves, later to be engraved on a stela and placed under the protection of the Kabeiroi.

Details about the Lemnian festival of the Horaia and when in the year it was celebrated are not known, nor is it clear whether it had any connection to the Kabeiroi, in whose sanctuary the manumissions were inscribed (and perhaps also publicly made). Inscription no. 3 in Accame (1941-1943 [1948], 79-81) is apparently a decree of the demos of the initiates in Hephaistia, passed during the office of the archon Demetrios, in honour of the *theōroi* sent by “the demos of the Athenians in Myrina” when Aristides was the archon, for the purpose of “sacrificing to the Kabeiroi of the Horaia” (εἰς τὴν

⁵ See Accame 1941-1943 (1948), 99.

⁶ For a general survey see Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 91-99.

⁷ This archon, as argued by Cargill 1995, 152, was probably a local magistrate. But the date is unknown.

⁸ Accame 1941-1943 (1948), 98. According to Salomon 1997, 108-109, 118, the Kabeirion was managed independently from Hephaistia, having its own Assembly (of the initiates) and a Council. Officials of the Kabeirion included *hieromnemes*, the *hieropoioi*, and the *hierokeryx* (the sacred herald), elected by Hephaistia. Decrees voted by the Assembly of the initiates were dated by the eponymous archon (probably the same as that of Hephaistia). See also Parker 1994, 345; Cargill 1995, 181, who argues that the Assembly of the initiates was convened at the time of the celebration of the Mysteries in the Kabeirion.

Rocca also adduces Aeschin. 3.41, and 44 as an example from Athens; but although these passages refer to manumissions proclaimed by a herald (in the theatre during the Dionysia), these were not inscribed as a list. On manumissions proclaimed by heralds in theatres see also Rocca 2015.

θυσίαν τοῖς Καβείρο[ι]ς τῶν Ὠραίων, l. 5). Accame (who dates this decree to the second half of the third century BCE), suggests that the Horaia was an annual festival, comparing it to an inscription from Cos (*Syll.*³ 1025 [= *IG* XII(4) 278, Herzog, *HGK* 1]), where line 36 says ἐνιαύτια ὠραῖα ἐορτάζν,¹⁰ and argues that it was celebrated in the spring – on the assumption that the archons mentioned in the Lemnian inscription (Demetrios, in whose office the decree was passed, and Aristides, in whose office the *theōroi* came) entered their office in the spring as in Athens.¹¹ Beschi (1996-1997 [2000], 43) suggests that the Horaia was celebrated on the seventh day of the month Hekatombaion, a date also mentioned in two other inscriptions from the Kabeirion (Beschi, no. 23,¹² and Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 4) and which may fit the beginning of the year and the assumption of office by the new archons.

Accame, Beschi and Rocca also refer to Hesychius, s.vv. ὠραῖα; ὠραῖα θύειν and ὠραῖα ἡμέρα. Hesychius (Schmidt) explains ὠραῖα θύειν as τελετή τις, ἐν ἣ τῶν ὠραίων ἀπάντων ἐγίνοντο ἀπαρχαί (“a rite of some kind, in which the first fruits of all the seasonal [products] were produced,” or “were sacrificed”).¹³ Since τελετή sometimes refers to Mysteries, if this is the meaning in Hesychius then the Lemnian Horaia would be appropriate for the Kabeirion and therefore may have been celebrated for the Kabeiroi. On ὠραῖα ἡμέρα Hesychius says only: ἡ ἐορτή (“a festival”). But it is his definition of the simple word ὠραῖα that is of special interest. Hesychius says: ὠραῖα· νεκύσια. Οἱ δὲ †δαιμόνια. Τάσσεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ γῆς ὠραίων. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν καθ’ ὄραν συντελουμένων ἱερῶν. (“Festival of the dead. And the divine powers(?). And prescribed for the first fruits of the earth. And also for the sacrifices paid in season”). Again, if the Horaia in Lemnos was concerned with the earth, fruits and death, this festival seems to suit be appropriate for the Kabeiroi, who were the children of Hephaistos—hence connected to the earth, and perhaps also to the cycle of life and death, as will be suggested below.¹⁴

¹⁰ See also Rhodes-Osborne 2003, 298-311, no. 62: an annual festival to Zeus Polieus.

¹¹ The question whether Myrina and Hephaistia each had its own archon is still unsettled: see Accame 1941-1943 (1948), 80; Salomon 1997, 109-119; Rocca 2012a, 299 n. 23.

¹² This stela, recording an honorary decree, issued by the initiates of the cult of the Kabeiroi, was considered lost by Beschi and others but is currently preserved at the Myrina Museum (MM41257): see Culasso Gastaldi 2011, who studied the inscription and announces a forthcoming critical edition.

¹³ On first-fruits see Burkert 1985, 66-68.

¹⁴ This festival might also have been connected with the Horai—the goddesses who keep the seasons and hours; for their cult in Athens, see Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 5b, 173, and *IG* II² 4877. See also Burkert 1985, 67 (*horaia* as seasonal gifts), 174. As noted above, Salomon (1997, 106) claims that each spring at Lemnos, during the Horaia festival, “the rites of manumission

So far, no other Mystery centre has produced evidence of manumission done or publicized there. But manumissions in sanctuaries are well known from other places, most notably Delphi, and the manumissions may have been made and/or inscribed in the Kabeirion simply in order to receive divine protection, not as part of the initiation rite. We also have evidence of manumission during other festivals, for example, *IG XII* (3) 336 (Thera, 250-200 BCE), which lists manumissions done during the Karneia: [οἷδε] ἀπηλευθέρωσα[ν] | [τὸς] αὐτῶν οἰκέτας | [Καρν]είοις ἐν τῷ ἀγῶ[νι] (ll. 9-11). There might, however, be a further connection between the Kabeiroi, the Horaia and slaves.

Philostratos (*Heroikos* 53.5-7) describes an annual fire ritual at Lemnos, during which all fires throughout the island were extinguished for nine days as an act of purification (the *aition* being the Lemnian women's murder of their husbands).¹⁵ On the tenth day, a ship brought new fire from Delos and was permitted to sail into the harbour after the offerings for the dead had been given. This new fire was distributed around the island, including to the forges of the artisans, and "they say that then new life begins" (καينوῦ τὸ ἐντεῖθεν βίου φασὶν ἄρχεσθαι). Walter Burkert, reviewing the extant evidence and the scholarship on this topic, associates the fire ritual at Lemnos with the myths surrounding Hephaistos, the Lemnian women's crime, and other rituals (including Athenian) that symbolize the cycle of abnormal, barren life, represented by the extinguishing of all the fires on the island, and the return of normal life, represented by the bringing of the new fire.¹⁶ The question whether the new fire was brought from Delos, as Philostratos says, or from a local source, since at Philostratos's time Delos was no longer under Athenian control, need not concern us here, like the question whether Lemnos was a site of volcanic activity, from which new fire could be

of slaves" were celebrated. For rituals connected with manumission see Patterson 1982, 214-219. Clinton 2003, 57, doubts that a Mystery cult was celebrated in the Kabeirion, because the inscriptions from the Kabeirion contain no mention of the term *mystes*, the only mention of the term in connection to Lemnos being a fragment from Accius' *Philoctetes*, 200-204 (= Varro, *Ling.* 7.11). He also doubts the restoration of [μν]ηθ[ῶ - -] in *SEG* 399, line 12 (a letter of Philip V to the Athenians in Hephaistia; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 40-42, no. 22, restores [δε]ηθ[ῶ]). However, Dumas 2005, 872, argues that such an impressive building (the Hellenistic *telesterion*) would not have been built in a place so difficult to access unless it was meant as a special Mystery sanctuary.

¹⁵ For this myth see e.g. *Apollod.* 1.9.17; *Ap. Rhod.* 1.607-909; *Hdt.* 6.138.

¹⁶ Burkert 1970; cf. Burkert 1983, 192-195; and 1985, 61. On the cult of Hephaistos, esp. in its connection to Lemnos, see Delcourt 1982, 172-187; Marchiandi 2016. See also Parker 1994, 345, on a possible identification of Artemis, whose cult was prominent in Lemnos, as the Athenian settlers' name for the native Great Goddess.

produced.¹⁷ In either case, the ritual of new fire symbolized and re-enacted new birth, the return to life, themes of transition that may be linked to the festival of the Horaia, as defined by Hesychius, to the Mystery cult at the Kabeirion, and to manumission. Although Philostratos's text is late and the purification ritual he describes refers to the very ancient myth of the Lemnian women's crime, and while there is no direct evidence of the fire-festival in the classical and Hellenistic periods and its use as a context for manumission, such a connection should not be ruled out. Born on Lemnos, Philostratos had a first-hand knowledge of the island's history, cults and myths. Moreover, he describes the Lemnian fire-festival as one in a series of rituals that combine initiation and propitiation. Thus, he says, the Thessalians mix "something of an initiatory rite with their offerings to the dead (τελετῆς τι ἐγκαταμινύοντες τοῖς ἐναγίσμασιν), as both the Lemnians and the Peloponnesians descended from Sisyphus practice" (52.3). Hence, although manumission might not have been the main reason why the manumitters came to the sanctuary, a connection between the Kabeirion, the fire-festival and manumission—which can be seen as re-birth—is not implausible.¹⁸ As Burkert remarks, "as the ritual mirrors the complexity of life, various aspects of reality, i.e. different deities, are concerned", and the ritual of new life would affect all the gods who played their part in the life of the Lemnian community.¹⁹ So it seems reasonable

¹⁷ Burkert 1970 rejects the arguments that Lemnos had a volcano or even "earth fires", perpetual flames nourished by gas. Less skeptical are Young Forsyth 1984; Martin 1987; Marchiandi 2016. See also below on a possible connection with Delos in the late second century BCE, which might support Philostratos' report of the source of the new fire. Delos had its own Kabeirion (or even two): see Hemberg 1950, 140-153; Bruneau 1970, 381-399; Roussel 1987, 230-232; and see *ID* 1562, 1581, 1582, and 1902 for Helianax son of Asklepiodoros, the priest-for-life of Poseidon Aisios and also priest of the Samothrakian Great Gods, the Dioskouroi, and the Kabeiroi. Priests of the Kabeiroi on Delos are likely to have participated in such a sacred mission.

¹⁸ On this possible connection see Burkert 1983, 194-195, also associating the Kabeiroi with the Dioskouroi, who were among the Argonauts coming to Lemnos, thus being another manifestation (in Greek guise) of the ship bringing the new fire. Another possible connection might be seen in the figure of Aithalides, Hermes' son and the Argonauts' herald, about whom Apollonios Rhodios (1.641-652) says that his soul was ever changing its abode, at one time numbered among those who live beneath the earth, at another in the sunlight among the living men (lines 646-648: ἀλλ' ἢ γ' ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἀμειβομένη μεμόρηται, | ἄλλοθ' ὑποχθονίοις ἐναρίθμιος, ἄλλοτ' ἐς ἀγὰς | ἠελίου ζωοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν), and that "he persuaded Hypsipyle to receive the newcomers, since the day was waning" (ἤματος ἀνομένοιο διὰ κνέφρας, l. 651), that is, the Argonauts arrive at twilight—at the undecided time between light and darkness. Marchiandi 2016, 748, n. 25 (and cf. pp. 756-757, n. 85), doubts a possible connection between the fire-festival described by Philostratos and the Lemnian (or volcanic) fire.

¹⁹ Burkert 1970, 4; see also n. 1 there, where he reminds us that sacrificial calendars regularly combine different deities in the same ceremonies.

to assume that slave-owners used the occasion of the festival to manumit their slaves, or intentionally chose this particular ritual for this purpose.²⁰

2. The Manumission Documents

The Lemnian inscriptions show some features and phrasing typical of manumission inscriptions found in other places. They contain the names of the manumitters and the manumitted slaves, a declaration of freedom by using a verb and indicating the following status of the manumitted slave, and protection clauses.²¹ Most of the manumitters bear Attic demotics, but six are of non-Athenian origin, including three women married to Athenians.²² The verb used in these inscriptions is invariably ἀφίημι, in most cases followed by ἐλεύθερον / ἐλευθέρων and the name of the slave. Although made during a religious festival and in a sanctuary, the manumission texts contain no religious elements such as we find in sale- and consecration-manumissions, nor are any gods invoked. It seems that the location sufficed for conferring divine sanction; in two cases (see below) the manumission document was deposited in the sanctuary of Sarapis. In five cases the agreement of another person was required (phrased as the genitive participle of συνευδοκέω),²³ and where women were the manumitters, the manumission was made in the presence of a *kyrios* (μετὰ κυρίου).²⁴ There are also twenty-six cases of *paramonē*, that is, of conditional manumission obligating the manumitted slave to remain with the manumitter (or another person) for a fixed term and perform services.²⁵

²⁰ See Kamen 2012 for evidence of the so-called sacral manumission, in which Apollo, Asklepios, and Sarapis were dominantly involved; she suggests that what accounted for these gods' popularity in manumission was their quality as healers: "Once the socially dead slave was freed ... he regained his Personhood" (p. 189). Kamen also mentions Isis as a healer goddess in the same capacity regarding slaves. We note that both Sarapis and Isis may have had a cult in Lemnos (Rocca 2012a, 305-308), and they—like the Kabeiroi, the Great Gods of Samothrake and the Dioskouroi—had their Mystery cults. As mentioned above, we do not have any other evidence of manumission in sanctuaries where Mystery cults were celebrated, but this does not mean that such a possibility should be rejected. See also below on the possibility that slaves and freed slaves were initiated at the Lemnian Kabeirion.

²¹ For an overall review of these elements, see Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, and for a review of the Lemnian inscriptions Rocca 2012a, 298-302.

²² Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14b II; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, VI, XIII, XVII, XXIb, XXII. See below.

²³ Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, III, V, XVIII, XX, XXIV.

²⁴ Accame 1941-1943 (1948), nos. 14c, d II, and 15 (in no. 14b II, the couple manumit together and the husband is mentioned first); Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, IV, V, VI, VIII, X, XVI, XXIb, XXVII, XXX.

²⁵ The cases are: Accame 1941-1943 (1948), 15, 16; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, I, III, IV, V, VI, VII (for two slaves), VIII, IX, X, XI, XIII, XIV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXIb (for two slaves), XXII, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX; in no. XXI a, b, and c (= Rocca 2012a, 297-298,

The origin of the slaves manumitted in Lemnos is known in only two cases: Isidora “of a Thracian *genos*” (Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], no. 25 XXIb, ll. 6-7 = Rocca 2012a, 297-298, no. XXb) and Syros, whose name indicates a Syrian origin (Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], no. 25 XXIa = Rocca 2012a, XXa).

Except for Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 16, no other manumission inscription from Lemnos mentions an archon or any other magistrate. The names of manumitters also pose prosopographical problems.²⁶ Therefore, the dating of these documents rests almost entirely on palaeographic grounds. Beschi dates three documents (his no. 25, XII, XIX and XXVI) between the middle of the second and the first decades of the first century BCE and suggests that all the documents on this large stela belong in this wide time frame.²⁷ In contrast, Rocca suggests the first century BCE for the majority of the inscriptions, with some exceptions (Accame 1941-1943 [1948], no. 14, whose text II b she dates to the first/second century CE, and side d to the early years of the first century CE).²⁸ As Rocca correctly notes, the date is critical for trying to reach any conclusion regarding the status of the manumitted slaves, especially because of a unique formula used in some of the documents, which I will discuss shortly.

3 The Domicile and Origin of the Manumitters

The dominance of Attic demotics among the manumitters and the belief that the Sarapeion, which is mentioned in two of the documents (see n. 25 above) as a place where the manumission documents are to be deposited, was located in Athens, led

no. XX), the manumitted slaves are given the right to buy release from the *paramonē* for 300 drachmas, which one of them, Euphrosyne, did in no. XV: Εὐφροσύνῃη ποσὰ ἀπὸ τ[ῶν] | ἄλλ[ω]ν καταβολέων Δ(ρ) (see Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], 56, and cf. also Rocca 2014, no. 1, l. 3, and p. 154). Rocca 2012a, 298, suggests to ascribe the last words on XXI c, ἐὰν δὲ βούληται to Beschi’s no. 25 XV. No. XV must be later than no. XXI c, but we do not know how much time elapsed. For the nature of the *paramonē* and some of the competing views see e.g. Westermann 1945; Westermann 1950; Westermann 1955, 35, 55-56; Samuel 1965; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 222-248; Sosin 2015; Rocca 2015b; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2019. In two cases (Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], no. 25, XVI, XX) the *paramonē* obligation is said to follow the *ὁμολογία*, the written agreement, and to be deposited in the temple of Sarapis (on the location of which see below). A written agreement in connection with the *paramonē*-clause is also mentioned in manumission inscriptions from Delphi: *FD* III 3.333, 337, 365.

²⁶ See Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 64, and see below; Rocca 2012a, 303-305. See also below.

²⁷ Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 65.

²⁸ Rocca 2012a, 302-303.

Beschi to believe that the acts of manumission were made in Athens and only proclaimed in Lemnos.²⁹ Beschi also identifies two manumitters with persons mentioned in Delian inscriptions: Archikles son of Archikles of the deme Lakiadai, the manumitter in no. 25, XII, is mentioned in *ID* 1898, ca. 159 – 147 BCE; and Theodoros son of Theodoros of the deme Aithalidai, the manumitter in no. 25, XIX, is mentioned in *ID* 2229 and 2248, 112/11 BCE. Beschi also suggests that the person manumitted by Theodoros (no. 25, XIX, ll. 3-5), whose name he restores as Eukleon, is Eukleon the kleidouchos of Theodoros in *ID* 2248, line 12. If he is right, Theodoros came to Lemnos before 112/11 BCE.³⁰ In contrast, on the basis of a prosopographic inspection of all the Lemnian and the relevant Delian and Attic inscriptions, including epitaphs, Rocca argues that the manumissions were made on the island, that a cult of Sarapis and hence a Sarapeion existed in Lemnos, and that all the manumitters bearing Attic demotics were resident in Lemnos, belonging to the Athenian cleruchic population rooted in Lemnos since at least the middle of the fifth century BCE. She also argues that Archikles son of Archikles and Theodoros son of Theodoros were not the same people as their namesakes who are mentioned in the Delian inscriptions, but belonged to Athenian families that after 167/6 BCE provided cleruchs to Lemnos and Delos; another manumitter, Hierokles son of Lysimachos, seems to belong to a family, which appears in an Attic inscription (*IG* II² 1952 = *SEG* 45 156), dated to the first half of the fourth century BCE, which seems to be a list of cleruchs sent to Hephaistia.³¹ Rocca infers the existence of a cult of Sarapis on Lemnos from a marble head (displayed at the museum of Myrina), which may with high probability be identified as the head of Sarapis, in addition to other artefacts that also suggest a cult of Isis, traditionally associated with Sarapis, and from evidence attesting the existence of people of Alexandrian origin buried in Hephaistia (*IG* XII Suppl. 339)³² or appearing among the manumitters

²⁹ Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 64. Beschi infers the existence of a Serapeion in Athens from Pausanias 1.18.4.

³⁰ On this Theodoros see also Roussel 1987, 264-265; Bruneau 1970, 468.

³¹ Rocca 2012a, 303-305; cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2010b, 362-363; Rocca 2014, 156-157. See also below. On the cleruchy in Lemnos see Cargill 1995, *passim*; Marchiandi 2002; 2008; Culasso Gastaldi 2009; Marchiandi 2010; Culasso Gastaldi 2010a; 2010b, 348; Salomon's thesis (1997, 96-101), who distinguishes between the Athenian inhabitants of Lemnos and Skyros (the original *apoikoi* sent in the sixth century BCE), who, she argues, were granted Athenian citizenship after the King's Peace of 386/5 BCE, and the cleruchs, who were not incorporated into this structure, has been critically rejected: see Osborne 1999.

³² Rocca 2012a, 304, and 2014, 157, also suggests that a certain Dies, buried in Hephaistia (Segre 1942, 311-312, no. 16 = Susini 1955, 325-326, no. 5), might be the Dies manumitted in Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, II, l. 4. Cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 628, and see below.

(Accame 1941-1943 [1948], no. 14 b II). We may also note that among the manumitters are two women from Miletos (Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], no. 25, VI and XIII), one woman from Thrace (ib. no. XXI), one man from Priene (ib. no. XVII) and one man from Nikomedia (ib. no. XXII). The two Milesian women's husbands bear Attic demotics, as does the husband of the Thracian woman, but, again, we do not know whether these couples of mixed origins lived in Athens or in Lemnos.³³ We are also ignorant about the domicile of the men from Priene and Nikomedia: were they foreign residents in Lemnos or visiting from abroad?³⁴

4 After Manumission

The question of the manumitters' domicile is important also for deciding why they manumitted in the Kabeirion and for trying to elucidate the status of the manumitted slaves. To do so, first I will discuss another feature of the inscriptions. As mentioned above, the Lemnian manumission inscriptions contain protection clauses of a kind, or kinds, similar to what we find elsewhere:³⁵

First, the manumitted slave is protected from any claim by others: μηδενὶ μηδέν + the verb προσήκω in the infinitive or participle ("belong to no one in any matter"), with some variants.³⁶ This formula is widely attested in manumission inscriptions elsewhere.³⁷ It was meant to vouch for the slave's new free status, but no less important—it was meant as a warning against attempts to re-enslave the manumitted slave by any person, including the manumittor's heirs. In Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14 b I + Rocca 2014, 151, following this formula, the text reads: μηδὲ

³³ Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 627-628, argues that they were residents of Lemnos. The question of the legal status of foreign women married to Athenian men and of the children born to such couples cannot be discussed here. For intermarriage in Hellenistic Athens, see Niku 2004; 2007, 18-19; Oliver 2010.

³⁴ Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 627-628, seems to infer that they, as well as the women, were residents in Lemnos. On manumission of and by women in the Hellenistic period see Rocca 2012b, who correctly argues that chronology and geography play a fundamental role in appreciating women's economic and legal capacity: whereas in some places in central Greece women could manumit independently, in Lemnos (like in Athens) they needed a *kyrios* (252-253).

³⁵ See Rocca 2012a, 300-302; 2014, 154.

³⁶ Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14 b I + Rocca 2014, 151; d I (with the dialectal form: μηθενὶ μηθὲν); Beschi 1996-1997 (2000) (using the variants [μηθενὶ] μηθὲν προσήκοντα / προσήκουσαν μηθενὶ μηθὲν / μηθενὶ μηθὲν προσήκουσαν κατὰ μηθένα τρόπον), no. 25, I, II, III, IV, VI, VII, XXIIb, XXIII.

³⁷ See Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 267 and nn. 158 and 159.

ἀπολ[εῖ]πεσθαι μήτε ἀντίληψιν μή[τε] | ἀντίρρησιν αὐτωῖ μηδεμί[αν] | ἀντιδιάλεξιν εἰς ἑαυτόν... (Il. 5-8 Accame = Il. 12-15 Rocca). Rocca offers a tentative translation: “do not leave behind any contradiction, nor controversy and no one can make any opposition to him”.³⁸ Although there are no exact parallels, a comparison with the vocabulary of protection in other manumission inscriptions might help. In the Bosphorus Kingdom and in Leukopetra we find the adjective ἀνεπίληπτος, “not subject to seizure”.³⁹ Since ἀντίληψις comes from the same root (**lab-*), it might signify the obligation of others, including the manumittor, not to leave behind (neglect) any help against attempts to lay hold on or re-enslave the freed person. In Delphi and other places this obligation is formulated more elaborately and explicitly.⁴⁰ Likewise, ἀντίρρησις in the Lemnian inscription might correspond to the adjective ἀνεπηρέαστος, “free from insult” or “unmolested”, which derives from the verb ἐπηρέαζειν, to treat or speak abusively towards someone, to be insolent;⁴¹ μηδὲ ἀπολείπεσθαι ἀντίρρησις might then be understood as the obligation not to leave the freed person without a counter-reply to any insult hurled at him/her. A similar adjective is ἀνέγκλητος or ἀνεπέγκλητος “not to be reproached”.⁴² Finally, μηδὲ ἀπολ[εῖ]πεσθαι ... μηδεμί[αν] ἀντιδιάλεξιν seems to mean the obligation to reply to any saying hurled against the freed person (perhaps in a legal dispute).

Second, the manumitted slave is free to go anywhere s/he wishes (and hence, also do as s/he wishes): ἀπιέναι οὗ ἂν βούληται. This formula appears with some variants (ἀπιέναι γῆς / γῆς ἀπιέναι / ἀπιέναι γῆς οὗ ἂ βούληται, and ἀπιέναι ἂν αὐτοὶ προαιρῶνται) and is often combined with protection clause of type (a).⁴³ Where a *paramonē* clause is included, this formula follows it, thus emphasizing that now the slave is really free. This formula also is well attested elsewhere, with many variants.⁴⁴

³⁸ Rocca 2014, 154.

³⁹ *CIRB* 70, 71, 73 from Pantikapaion; *SEG* 43 510; Petsas 2000, nos. 6, 31 from Leukopetra.

⁴⁰ See Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 268.

⁴¹ E.g. *CIRB* 74 (Pantikapaion), 1127 (Gorgippia); see Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 268.

⁴² E.g. Petsas 2000, nos. 5, 19, 22, 23 from Leukopetra.

⁴³ Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14 b I + Rocca 2014, 151; Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 14 d I + Rocca 2014, 152; Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 15 + Rocca 2012a, 296; Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 16 + Rocca 2012a, 296; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XVIII, XX + Rocca 2012a, 297; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, XXIb, XXII (corrected by Francesca Rocca in her doctoral thesis *Il santuario degli Dei Cabiri a Lemnos. Le epigrafi di manomissione*, 2007/2008, pp. 117-118; I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for bringing this to my notice), XXIII, XXV, XXVI.

⁴⁴ The same verb appears in third-century BCE Beroia (EKM 1. Beroia 45 = *SEG* 12 314) in the form: παθόν<τος> δὲ Ἀρτίνα (the manumittor) ἐξέστω ἀπιέναι οὗ ἂν βούλωνται (Il. 13-14); and third-century BCE Oropos (M.T. Mitsos, *Arch. Eph.* 1952, no. 25 = *SEG* 15 293) in the form:

However, in five manumission documents the freedom of movement is phrased in a unique way, unattested in any other place: ἀπιέναι ξένον/ξένην μετὰ ξένων, “(free) to go away, a foreigner among foreigners”.⁴⁵ This phrase, which has the appearance of a formula granting a legal status, has puzzled scholars. Since I believe that its meaning depends on other questions raised above, I will now discuss it in more detail.

In the five documents containing this formula the owner is said to manumit his or her slave as free (ἀφιείναι + name of slave + ἐλεύθερον / ἐλευθέραν), hence this formula is not a substitute for the declaration of manumission. Beschi believes that it equated the manumitted slaves’ status to that of metics.⁴⁶ But this hypothesis depends on the assumption that at this time the words *metoikos* and *xenos* were used interchangeably in Athens or Lemnos, for which we have no information (see further below). Moreover, as Rocca has noted, if this was a grant of a legal status or a privilege we should expect it to be formulated εἶναι αὐτὸν/αὐτήν ξένον/ξένην⁴⁷ as, for example, in the grant of proxeny (εἶναι αὐτὸν πρόξενον), or to have recourse to formulas using μετὰ + genitive plural—e.g. καὶ στρατεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς τὰς στρατείας καὶ εἰσφέρειν τὰς εἰσφορὰς μετὰ Ἀθηναίων (*IG* II³ 367, ll. 20-22 (325/4 BCE—a clause which, however, disappears from Attic inscriptions after 229/8)).⁴⁸ In this connection, mention should be made of another peculiar phrase, ξενικῆ λύσει / λυτρώσει, which appears in manumission

ἐλεύθερο[ς] | ἀπίτω Μόσχος οὗ ἂν αὐτὸς βούληται (ll. 5-6). Other verbs are used in other places: in Doliche in Thessaly (*SEG* 23 462, first century BCE/CE) the manumitted slave is given, among other things, the right “to flee from his manumittor’s heirs and live on his own wherever he wishes (φυγεῖν καὶ οἰκῆσαι κα[τ’] ἰδ[ίαν] οἶ[ον] | [ἂν αὐτὸς βούληται, ll. 9-11). The verb τρέπεσθαι is used in the north Black Sea region: *CIRB* 70 (Pantikapaion, 81 CE: [τ]ρέπεσ<θ>αι αὐτὸν ὅπου ἂν βούλη[η]ται, ll. 11-12); *CIRB* 1126 (Gorgippia, 68? CE: τρ[έ]πεσ[θ]αί τε αὐτοὺς [ὄπ]ου ἂν βούλωνται, ll. 13-14); *NE* 9 (1971), 3, no. 1 (Gorgippia, 93-124 CE?: καὶ τρέπεσθαι αὐτοὺς] τ’ ἐξουσίως | [ὅπου ἂν βούλωνται). The verb ἀποτρέχεσθαι is used in Thespiai in Boiotia (Darnezin 1999, 103, no. 138, second century BCE: ἐλεύθερος | ἀποτρέχέτω, ll. 14-15) and extensively in Delphi (e.g. *BCH* 66/67, 1942-1943, 76, no. 5 [153/2-144/3 BCE]: ἀποτρέχουσα | οἷς κα θέλη, ll. 17-18), Naupaktos (e.g. *IG* IX 1² 3.624, ca. mid-second century BCE), Doris (e.g. *SEG* 25 606 = *BCH* 93, 1969, 82-85, second century BCE); Dodona (Cabanes, 1976, 588, no. 74 = *SEG* 32 1705(2), 342-330 BCE), and Epiros (*I. Bouthrotos* 104 (after 163 BCE). The right to live wherever the manumitted slave wishes can also be seen as the grant of freedom of movement; see e.g. *FD* III 6.20 (Delphi, 20-1 BCE), and *AJPh* 92 (1971), 669, no. 1 = *SEG* 39 494 (Echinos, 130-150 CE). On the various wording of the clause granting freedom of movement see also Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 271-272.

⁴⁵ This phrase is found in Accame 1941-1943 (1948), no. 15 + Rocca 2012a, 296 (= *SEG* 60 936), l. 10; Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, III, VIII, XXIV, XXIX.

⁴⁶ Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 49.

⁴⁷ Rocca 2012a, 300.

⁴⁸ See also, from Amorgos, *IG* XII (7) 44, ll. 1-3: εἶνα]ι δὲ αὐτοῦ[ς προξ]έν[ους] καὶ εὐεργέ[ε] [τας τῆς] πόλ[ε]ως τῆς Ἀρκεσ[ινέω]ν μετὰ [τῶν ἄλλων εὐ][εργε]τῶν; no. 45, ll. 3-5: [εἶναι δὲ αὐ]τοὺς πολ[ί]τας καὶ προξένους καὶ | [εὐεργέ]τας τῆς Ἀρκεσιν[έων πόλεως μετὰ τῶν] | [ὑπαρχόντων].

inscriptions and had been widely believed to refer to the grant of the status of a *xenos* or to a mode of manumission.⁴⁹ But since the phrase appears on a gravestone (e.g. *IG IX(2) 851, 866* from Larisa), it seems unlikely that people would pride themselves on being non-citizens, hence it must indicate a privilege worthy of commemoration. It should also be remembered that manumitted slaves, like all free non-citizens, were *xenoi* in the polis where they lived (unless they were Greek and returned to their home-cities to regain citizenship). Therefore, it is doubtful that the formula ἀπιέναι ξένον/ξένην μετὰ ξένων meant that these freed persons were granted a distinct legal status of *xenos*, unless such a defined status existed in Lemnos or in Athens at the time when these documents were inscribed.

Here comes into play a question already mentioned above: the place of residence of those manumitters who bear Attic demotics. Were they Athenians who, after manumitting their slaves in Athens, decided to inscribe the acts on stelae in the Lemnian Kabeirion (as Beschi argues) or were they local inhabitants who belonged to cleruchic families, resident in Lemnos since at least the second quarter of the fifth century BCE (as Rocca argues)? If they were inhabitants of Lemnos, it makes sense that they would use the local Mysteries and not go to neighbouring Imbros or Samothrake, but if Beschi is right, that the manumissions were made in Athens and only published in Lemnos, or even if the manumitters came from Athens to manumit in Lemnos, we need to ask why. Was it because the Mysteries were suitable for manumission? Then, why not go to Eleusis, or even the much closer Kabeirion of Thebes? And if they went to Lemnos on business, why not make a detour to Samothrake? Did they decide to manumit and/or publish in Lemnos because in Athens it was not customary? The fact that no manumission inscription has been found in Attica may indicate that unlike other places this type of publication was not practiced there.⁵⁰

As noted, Rocca dates most of the inscriptions to the first century BCE.⁵¹ On the basis of this dating she rejects Beschi's identification of the manumitter Theodoros son

⁴⁹ For a study of this formula, reviewing the previous scholarship and discussing the various interpretations that have been offered, see Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005b, who suggests seeing this phrase as exempting manumitted slaves from taxes imposed on *xenoi*. See also Dimopoulou-Piliouni 2008, 42-44; Rocca 2012a, 300-302.

⁵⁰ The so-called *phialai exeleutherikai*, inscribed records of the outcomes of apparently fictive trials brought by ex-owners against their ex-slaves, are nothing like manumission inscriptions known from elsewhere. For these lists see below.

⁵¹ Her reasoning about the origins of the manumitters is persuasive, but since her dating rests mostly on paleographic considerations, it cannot be taken as definite.

of Theodoros of the deme Athalidai (1996-1997 [2000], no. 25, XIX) with his namesake, a priest of Aphrodite in Delos in 112/11 BCE (*ID* 2229, ll. 1-2, and 2248, l. 7). Rocca suggest that these two men belonged to an Athenian family, who provided cleruchs to Delos and Lemnos after 167/6 BCE, when Athens recovered the islands by decision of the Roman senate.⁵² In that case, Beschi's further identification of the slave manumitted by Theodoros in Lemnos (...]ωνα) with the Delian Theodoros's *kleidouchos* of 112/11, Eukleon (*ID* 2248, ll. 11-13: κλειδουχοῦντος | Ἐὐκλέωνος τοῦ Θεοδώρου Αἰθαλί[δου]),⁵³ is also wrong. Still, the possibility that Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], no. 25, XIX is earlier than the date argued by Rocca, and that the manumittor Theodoros is the same person mentioned in Delos—perhaps coming as an initiate to the Kabeirion (on this possibility see below) or on the occasion of a festival, or even in a sacred mission to bring new fire from Delos—is not improbable; in such a case, he manumitted his slave before 112/11 BCE (but after 167/6).

Whether the manumittors were Athenians or Lemnians, this corpus of inscriptions is of great importance. If the manumittors who bear Athenian demotics were only visiting Lemnos, we see evidence for the use of a publication method that did not exist in Athens but was widespread in this same period elsewhere in Greece; so one of the reasons that these Athenians had for manumitting in Lemnos may have been their wish to give a wider and permanent publication to their acts by inscribing them in the Kabeirion. If, however, they were residents of Lemnos and belonged to the cleruchic population there, these inscriptions are valuable evidence both of local manumission and publication methods, different from those in the metropolis, and of the local servile population.

The question of the manumittors' domicile, however, acquires an additional importance when we try to explain the formula ξένον/ξένην μετὰ ξένων. Were the manumitted slaves to “go away as foreigners among foreigners” in Athens or in Lemnos? If being a *xenos* meant belonging to a defined legal status, different from that of a slave but also from that of a citizen, where was this status established? As already noted, some scholars believe that this formula simply stressed the fact that the manumitted slaves' status was that of metics. In Athens, as argued by Maria Niku, the

⁵² Rocca 2012a, 303 and n. 51; Rocca 2014, 156-157; cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2010b, 362. See Polyb. 30.20. On Theodoros son of Theodoros of Aithalidai, see also n. 30 above.

⁵³ Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), 58, no. 25, XIX, l. 5. The phrasing rather suggests that Eukleon was Theodoros's son.

metoikia as an official status no longer existed after 229/8 BCE (although some limitations persisted),⁵⁴ hence a free non-citizen could be legally described as a *xenos*—including manumitted slaves. The fact that in the second century BCE sons of wealthy foreign families were admitted to the Athenian *ephebeia* but were listed in honorary decrees separately, under the title *xenoi*, may indicate that *xenoi* constituted a defined status.⁵⁵ But was this an indication of a legal status or simply, as before, a general label for all those who were not citizens?⁵⁶ Much earlier, a mid-fifth-century BCE anonymous text, the so-called Old Oligarch, complains that in everyday life in Athens one cannot tell between a citizen, a slave and a manumitted slave; but his complaint arises from what he believes is misconduct and too much liberty, not because of a lack of legal distinctions (1.10). In the last years of the fifth century the *apeleutheroi*, the manumitted slaves, still appear as a distinct category, to judge by a decree, probably regulating contributions of agricultural products (*IG I³ 237*, ll. 9-10; 410-404? BCE). In the middle of the fourth century BCE, ξένοι appear in the Athenian law concerning Chalkis, where this word evidently describes the status of the citizens of each city in the other (*IG I³ 40*, ll. 52-53; 446/5 BCE). A century later, a distinction is made between *xenos* and *astos* in *IG II² 125* (= *IG II³, 1 399* = Rhodes & Osborne, no. 69, l. 3; 357/6, 348 or 343 BCE?).⁵⁷ In 117/16 BCE ξένοι competed as a separate category in the torch-race in the Diogeneia and Ptolemaia, alongside πολῖται and στρατευόμενοι (*SEG 43 68*, ll. 4, 7, 10), but as in the case of the *ephebeia*, *xenoi* here seem to describe non-citizens in general. We can also trace to some degree the lives and status of certain manumitted slaves in Athens,⁵⁸ mostly in the fourth century BCE, while the Attic orators and the corpus of inscriptions commonly referred to as the *phialai exeleutherikai*⁵⁹ enable us to learn about the occupations and domiciles of manumitted slaves in the last third of the

⁵⁴ Niku 2004; 2007, esp. 18-20, 63-66.

⁵⁵ See *IG II² 1006 + 1031 + 2485* = *SEG 38 114*, Col. V, of 122/1 BCE; and cf. *IG II² 1008*, of 119/8 BCE; *IG II² 1009*, of 116/5 BCE; *IG II² 1011*, of 106/5 BCE; *IG II² 1028*, of 102/1 BCE, etc. Cf. Tracy 1988; Niku 2007, 20.

⁵⁶ Note that in many places *xenoi* also described mercenaries; e.g. *IG II² 1299*, l. 41 (after 236/5 BCE).

⁵⁷ For the term *astos* see also below.

⁵⁸ The best-known manumitted slaves in Athens are Pasion and Phormion; see Davies 1971, 429-442; Cohen 1992, 81-106; Trevett 1992.

⁵⁹ The debate on the nature of these inscriptions is still ongoing. For recent reviews see Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a, 282-290; 2013, 94-105; Kamen 2013, 20-21. Meyer 2010 has produced a new edition of this corpus, arguing against connecting them with manumission. Rocca 2011 re-examined *IG II² 1560* (= Mayer 2010, no. 10) and confirms the relevance of this series of inscriptions to manumission.

fourth century. But manumitted slaves in Athens were usually labelled *apeleutheroi* when there was a need to legally distinguish between them and other *xenoi*.

Outside Athens the picture is similar. *Apeleutheroi* and *xenoi* appear in inscriptions as two distinct categories, alongside citizens, slaves, and other categories of free non-citizens, such as *πάροικοι*, *κάτοικοι* and *παρ/ἐπιδημοῦντες*, and *xenoi* is often used as a general term for all the other categories.⁶⁰ It seems that the terminology of free non-citizen populations was not homogenous in all places and periods, and was often confusing. This is also true of Lemnos in the Hellenistic and Roman times. But we know very little about the status and labels of the non-citizen groups on the island. A dedication to the Great Gods (on whom see below), found in the Lemnian Kabeirion and dated to the middle of the fourth century BCE (Accame 1941-1943 [1948], no. 11), commemorates a man of Methymne who was elected to the position of *βοώνης* (official buyer of oxen for sacrifices) and was granted a crown by “the *ισοτελεῖς* and the demos of the initiates”. The stone served as a base for some dedication. Accame identified these *isoteleis* as equivalent to the privileged metics in Athens, who paid the same taxes as the citizens, and he inferred that the Methymnian was himself an *isotelēs* in Hephaistia. If this interpretation is correct and there was a group of *isoteleis* in Hephaistia (who seem to have formed an association of some kind), there must also have been ‘ordinary’ metics.⁶¹ Indeed, there is evidence of foreign residents at Lemnos who were granted privileges by the poleis.⁶² Also, a gravestone may suggest that at least one manumitted slave was buried in Lemnos, if Rocca is right in identifying the

⁶⁰ E.g. *IG XII* (5) 721 ll. 18-19, 26-27 (Andros, first century BCE); *IG XII* (5) 818, ll. 11- (Tenos, second century BCE); *IG XII* (7) 67B, 515, ll. 55-58 (Aigiale in Amorgos, end of the second century BCE) + Gauthier 1980, 210-218 (= *SEG* 30 1084): *πολιται, πάροικοι, ξένοι*, and Romans; cf. *IG XII* (7) 390, l. 12 (Aigiale, second century BCE). For the terminology of non-citizens in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, see Herz 2001; Strubbe 2001; Sugliano 2001; Gagliardi 2009/2010.

⁶¹ See also Cargill 1995, 68. In Skyros, another Athenian cleruchy, a fourth-century BCE decree mentions the *κατοικοῦντες*, alongside the *Ἀθηναῖοι* [*IG XII* (8) 668, ll. 2, 5]. Salomon 1997, 102-103, argues that these were the permanent residents of the island, who were sent there by Athens 476/5 BCE and were granted Athenian citizenship after 386 BCE. But it might be significant that although these people are referred to as [τῶι δήμῳ | τῶν Ἀθηναίων] τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν Σκύρῳ in ll. 1-2, the phrasing in ll. 4-5 is εἷς τε τὸν δῆ[μον] | [τὸν Ἀθηναίων] καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Σκύρῳ, as if the two groups were distinct.

⁶² E.g. *IG XII* (8) 4, ca. mid-fourth century BCE—a group of persons from Chalkidike, residing (*οικοῦντες*) in Myrina, in whom Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 623 suggests seeing a small organized community, comparable to the community of merchants from Kition who received land for building a sanctuary to Aphrodite (*IG II*² 337). See also Culasso Gastaldi 2006, no. 13, l. 4 and p. 541, who suggests that the banker Agathokles is a non-citizen because he appears without a demotic, whereas the second person has one. For the composition of the foreign population in Lemnos see generally Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 622-628, who believes that the non-Athenian names among the manumitters belonged to people who were residents in Lemnos.

gravestone of Dies (Segre 1942, 311, no. 16; Susini 1955, 325-326, no. 5), who was married to a woman from Smyrna, with the Dies manumitted in the Kabeirion (Beschi 1996-1997 [2000], no. 25, II).⁶³ So after he was granted his freedom, and although given the right to go where he wished (ll. 4-5: ἀπιέναι γῆς οἷ ἂν αὐ|τὸς βούληται), Dies stayed in Lemnos; as a manumitted slave he certainly was not a citizen, but his exact status is not known. There are also two examples of manumitters bearing foreign ethnics, and the formula follows a *paramonē* clause; but we do not know whether such manumitters were cleruchs resident in Lemnos (as argued by Culasso Gastaldi 2015), non-citizen residents of Lemnos or simply visitors, so, again, the question of the place of *paramonē* or where the slaves could go to after its term cannot easily be answered.⁶⁴ Even if, as Rocca argues, the manumitters who bear Attic demotics were inhabitants of Lemnos, we have no evidence that the formula ἀπιέναι ξένος/ξένη μετὰ ξένων indeed refers to a distinct status in Lemnos.

However, ἀπιέναι ξένος/ξένη μετὰ ξένων may perhaps be seen as indicating a non-resident status, that is, neither citizen nor “metic”, so that the manumitted slaves were herewith given freedom of movement, but not the right of residence (see also below). As already noted by Dimopoulou-Piliouni, this formula may have been no more than an additional stock phrase, “stressing the complete freedom of movement the freedman acquires only after the expiration of the *paramonē* condition, being finally able to leave and establish himself as ‘a foreigner among foreigners’”.⁶⁵ This suggestion seems borne out by the fact that only five manumission documents contain this formula, which may indicate that in most cases other protection clauses seemed sufficient to the parties involved so that they did not find it essential to spell out what was taken for granted.⁶⁶ Further support for this conclusion may be found in the only other evidence we have of a similar formula, though referring to the other end of the scale of statuses. In Aristophanes’ *Birds* Euelpides explains to the audience the reason why he and

⁶³ Rocca 2012a, 304; Rocca 2014, 157. Cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 628. For resident foreigners in Lemnos, see Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 622-623; for tombstones of foreigners in Lemnos see also *IG XII Suppl.* 339 (with Cargill 1995, no. 896 and Rocca 2012a, 304 n. 58)—a woman from Alexandria; *IG XII* (8) 33—a couple from Herakleia Pontika and Sinope; cf. Culasso Gastaldi 2015, 625.

⁶⁴ Beschi 1996-1997 (2000), no. 25, VI and XIII (two women from Miletos), and XXII (a woman from Nikomedia). However, in the cases where women are manumitters, their husbands, who act as *kyrioi*, bear Attic demotics, which fact has led Culasso Gastaldi (2015, 627-628) to assume that these were mixed couples who belonged to the cleruchic population, resident in Lemnos.

⁶⁵ Dimopoulou-Piliouni 2008, 45. Cf. Rocca 2012a, 301.

⁶⁶ Rocca 2012a, 300.

Pisthetairos fled from Athens, contrasting their condition, their “disease”, to that of Sakas, a tragic poet often slandered for being of foreign origin:⁶⁷ ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὄν οὐκ ἄστος ἐσβιάζεται, | ἡμεῖς δὲ φυλῆ καὶ γένει τιμώμενοι, | ἄστοι μετ’ ἄστων, οὐ σοβοῦντος οὐδενός | ἀνεπτόμεσθ’ ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἀμφοῖν ποδοῖν (“For he, not being a citizen, tried to force his way in, whereas we, of an honourable tribe and stock, *astoi* among *astōn*, though scared away by no one, have determinedly fled away from our fatherland”; ll. 32-35). I have deliberately left this formula untranslated, because the exact political and legal content of *astos* is disputed, but here it is clearly antithetical to a foreigner who lacks citizenship but is of a free status.⁶⁸ Therefore, this passage may suggest that being “X among Xs” was, at least in Athens, an idiomatic expression, which, although based on and deriving from legal concepts, did not necessarily express in its immediate context a legal status. The label *xenoi* described non-citizens, freeborn and freed persons; the latter were specifically labelled *apeleutheroi* when a more precise differentiation between various statuses was needed. In light of the antithesis *astoi/politai* – *xenoi*, still attested both in and outside Athens even in the first century BCE,⁶⁹ we may infer that manumitted slaves became free *xenoi* but not citizens or *astoi*.

5 Concluding Observations

The nature of our evidence makes it impossible to establish with certainty any of these possible explanations of this formula. Nevertheless, I would like to suggest a different direction of interpretation. Inscribed lists of names found in the sanctuary of the μεγάλοι θεοί, the Great Gods on the neighbouring island of Samothrake, the site of the famous Mysteries,⁷⁰ show that slaves and manumitted slaves were among the

⁶⁷ This Sakas, whose real name was Akestor, appears in the Attic sources, especially in comedy, as feigning citizenship: Metagenes fr. 13; Kratinos fr. 92 K.-A.; Kallias fr. 17 K.-A.; Theopompos Com. Fr. 60. In Ar. *Wasps* 1221 he is described as *xenos*. Cf. the Suda s.vv. Σάκας and Νομάδες. His nickname Sakas derived from the ethnic name Sakai, a Thracian or Skythian tribe, but in Metagenes and Theopompos he is described as Mysian.

⁶⁸ Cohen 2000, 50-63, reviews the occurrences of the word in the ancient sources, including its juxtaposition with *xenos*, along with modern opinions; he argues forcefully against the more prevalent idea that *astos* and *politēs* conveyed the same meaning of “citizen” and proposes that *astoi* in Athens were “a recognizable group of free local persons ... including but not identical with the *politai* and including some but far from all the metics” (61). *Astoi* are also differentiated from foreigners and slaves, e.g. Thuc. 6.27.2.

⁶⁹ E.g. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge* 19, col. II, l. 8 (Rhodes); *IC* II 4.10, ll. 3-4 (Crete).

⁷⁰ On Samothrake, the cult of the Great Gods and the inscriptions, see Fraser 1960; Cole 1984; Burkert 1993; Graham 2002; Gočeva 2002; Dumas 2005.

initiates and could even attain the stage of *epoptai*.⁷¹ For example, in *IG XII (8) 195 + Suppl. P. 149* (37? BCE), ll. 13-14, five names are listed after the heading ἀπελεύθεροι, “manumitted slaves”.⁷² Slaves are listed either by their designation as δοῦλοι or *ser(vus)* (e.g. Fraser 1960, nos. 41, line 9; 47, line 9; 59, line 7; *IG XII(8) 174*, line 9), or we can surmise their status because they appear without patronymics and/or ethnics (e.g. *IG XII(8) 205* = Fraser 1960, no. 34). Similar lists were found in Imbros, where another Kabeirion existed. Unlike the Samothrakian lists, *IG XII(8) 84* and *85* (probably from the fourth or third century BCE) contain only first names, with no patronymics, demotics or ethnics, so there is no way of knowing the origins of these people or their status, but it is assumed that these inscriptions are lists of initiates.⁷³ Side A of *IG XII(8) 87*, however, reads: μύ[σ]της ἐὺ|σεβῆς Καλ|λὴν σπου|δαιογέλο[ι]|ος; side B contains four names in the same format as side A. The clear indication that these are lists of initiates, the word *mystai*, is also found in *IG XII (8) 88* (where the word is restored) and *89*, which records patronymics.

No clear evidence for such lists comes from Lemnos, although Culasso Gastaldi suggests that the fragmentary list of sixteen single names found near Hephaistia (now lost), dated on palaeographic and morphological grounds to sometime before the middle of the fourth century BCE,⁷⁴ could be a list of initiates, comparable to the lists from Imbros.⁷⁵ There are no traces in Lemnos of initiation terminology similar to that found in Samothrake and Imbros. Furthermore, we do not even know whether slaves and manumitted slaves could actually be initiated in the Lemnian Kabeirion as in Samothrake, since the fragmentary inscription mentioned above contains no categories of the kind we find in Samothrake and in one of the inscriptions from Imbros, and all the names in it appear without patronymics or demotics. Yet, since the Great Gods of Samothrake have been identified since antiquity with the Kabeiroi,⁷⁶ we should

⁷¹ See Bömer 1961, 145-149; Cole 1984, 42, 91, 93-99; Dimitrova 2008, 6, and *passim*.

⁷² For manumitted slaves see also *IG XII (8) 206*, line 13 (first century BCE/first century CE); *220*, line 18 (first century CE); and in Latin, *libertus*: e.g. *IG XII (8) 173*, ll. 3, 5 (66 BCE); *174*, l. 10 (first century BCE). See Cole 1984, 47, 91-99.

⁷³ *IG XII (8) 86* is too fragmentary and preserves only one complete name. See Cargill 1995, 103-104; Dimitrova 2008, 79.

⁷⁴ Culasso Gastaldi 2012: 237-241, with a photo on p. 244, reproduced from Segre 1932-1933 (ed. pr.), 304-305 no. 10, who thought that this was a list of cleruchs. Susini 1952-1954, 318-319 notes that this inscription, together with some others published by Segre, was already lost when he visited the island. Cf. Cargill 1995, 94.

⁷⁵ Culasso Gastaldi 2012: 239.

⁷⁶ Hdt. 2.51; Stesimbrotos of Thasos *FGrH* 107 F 20; Burkert 1993; Graham 2002, 249-250, who also summarizes the ancient and modern opinions for and against this connection. The Kabeiroi were also worshipped in Imbros: Hemberg 1950, 37-43; Ruhl 2010, 463. A Kabeiros is

consider the possibility that slaves or, at least, manumitted slaves were also initiated at the Kabeirion at Lemnos.

The participation of slaves and manumitted slaves—and foreigners, *xenoi*, in general—in public religious activities was not permitted everywhere. The Eleusinian Mysteries were open to all people of any status, as were those in Samothrake and in Andania.⁷⁷ Opinions are divided concerning the Kabeirion of Thebes,⁷⁸ but slaves and foreigners were excluded from the Mysteries in Komyria.⁷⁹ I would like to suggest that in the Lemnian Kabeirion, *xenoi*, including manumitted slaves, could be initiated.⁸⁰ This possibility is corroborated by Beschi’s assimilation of the Lemnian Mystery cult of the Kabeiroi to the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁸¹ If this hypothesis is valid, the formula ξένος/ξένη μετὰ ξένων would confirm these former slaves’ right to be initiated in the

mentioned in an epitaph from Samothrake: Dimitrova 2008, 83-84, no. 29, l. 14 (second-first century BCE?); see her explanation on pp. 87-88.

⁷⁷ On the admission to Eleusis see Bömer 1961, 149; Burkert 1983, 281; Bremmer 2014, 22. On Andania: Gawlinski 2012, 27.

⁷⁸ Schachter 2003, 118 believes that manumitted slaves could be initiated at the Theban Kabeirion, based on a late third-century BCE list of dedications, which mention the dedication of silver hand- and foot-shackles by two people (*IG VII 2420*, lines 26-28: ...μανος κῆ Μέ|νανδρος χειριπέδας κῆ πεδίσκας | [ἀρ]γουρίας, ὀλκὰ τρις δραχμῆ). Daumas 2005, 859-860, however, argues that the fact that the dedicated shackles were of silver suggests that shackles were part of the ritual; she compares them to a vase painting of the classical period, featuring initiates dancing with their feet shackled (she refers to Pl. 27, 1 in her book: *Cabiriaca. Recherches sur l’iconographie du culte des Cabires*, Paris, 1998), and infers that being chained was one of several activities that constituted the initiation ritual in the Theban Kabeirion. These chains may perhaps also be explained as analogous in a way to the iron rings, found both in Samothrake and in Lemnos and interpreted as artefacts worn by the initiates and linked to the role of metallurgy connected with the Kabeiroi and Hephaistos; for references and discussion see Bremmer 2014, 29-30, and more fully Blakely 2012; 2013. To this may also be adduced Pl. *Ion* 533d-536d, where Socrates compares the link established between spectators, actors and poet to a long chain of rings magnetized by the “Herklean stone” (see Blakely 2012: 62-64; 2013: 169-170). Against Daumas’s interpretation we may mention the Attic *phialai exeleutherikai*, the 100-drachmas weight *phialai* dedicated by manumitted slaves being acquitted in (fictitious or real) trials initiated by their former masters—an expensive dedication as well. For these inscriptions, see above, nn. 50 and 59. Bremmer 2014, 44 accepts that slaves were initiated at Thebes.

⁷⁹ Roussel 1927, 132 n. 1, 133; Graf 2003, 251; and see *SEG* 29 1081. Slaves were also excluded from other sanctuaries and rituals: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 16 (*Mor.* 267d) says that slaves and Aitolians were barred from the temple of Leukothea in Chaironeia. On inscriptions from the Cycladic prohibiting slaves’ participation see Butz 1996. But in many other places evidence points to slaves’ inclusion in the polis’s religious activity: see Bömer, 1961, 150, on the Roman period; Roussel 1987, 264-268, Bruneau 1970, 472, and Bruneau 1989, 51, on the participation of slaves in oriental cults in Delos, including serving in minor priestly offices.

⁸⁰ See, however, *IG XII (3)* 1294 from Thera (ca. end 2nd c. BC), which makes a clear distinction between *xenoi* and *apeleutheroi*.

⁸¹ Beschi 1994, 38; and cf. Graham 2002, 254-255; Marchiandi 2008, 31; Ficuciello 2013, 242-249. Culasso Gastaldi 2010a, 145-146 and n. 66, argues that the Lemnian Kabeirion does not show particular openness towards worshippers coming from outside the community of the local residents, in contrast to the Mystery cult of Samothrake. However, besides the absence of any solid proof for such exclusiveness, the similarity between the Lemnian and the Eleusinian cults may suggest that as in Eleusis, the Kabeirion in Lemnos was open to foreigners and slaves.

sanctuary where they had just been manumitted. As noted above, there was a non-citizen population living in Lemnos. The foreign ethnics of some of the manumitters are further evidence that foreigners, *xenoi*, lived in or visited Lemnos and participated in the rituals there. It therefore seems plausible that foreigners could come to the Kabeirion and manumit there, and that manumitted slaves could participate and be initiated as *xenoi*. The fact that evidence of manumission in a Kabeirion comes only from Lemnos might be explained by assuming that this was a local version of the cult.

In this article I hope to have shown the importance of the Lemnian manumission inscriptions and the intricate questions they raise in the context of the cult of the Kabeiroi and of manumission practices in Lemnos and/or Athens in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, and to have drawn attention to possible ways of understanding them. Hopefully, future epigraphic finds will add to our understanding of these issues and help in contextualizing these inscriptions within the broader study of slaveholding and manumission in the ancient Greek world.

Bibliography

- Accame 1941-43 (1948) = S. Accame, "Iscrizioni del Cabirio di Lemno", *ASAtene* 19-21 1941-43 (1948): 75-105.
- Beschi 1994 = L. Beschi, 1994. "I Tirreni di Lemno alla luce dei recenti dati di scavo", in *Magna Grecia, Etruschi e Fenici*. Atti del trentatreesimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 8-13 ottobre 1993 (1994): 23-50.
- Beschi 1996-1997 (2000) = L. Beschi, "Il cabirio di Lemno: testimonianze letterarie ed epigrafiche", *ASAtene* 74-75, 1996-1997 (2000): 7-145.
- Beschi 2003 = L. Beschi, "Il primitivo Telesterio del Cabirio di Lemno (campagne di scavo 1990-1991)", *ASAtene* 81 (2003): 963-1022.
- Blakely 2012 = S. Blakely, "Toward an Archaeology of Secrecy: Power, Paradox, and the Great Gods of Samothrace", *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 21.1 (2012): 49-71.
- Blakely 2013 = S. Blakely, "Daimones in the Thracian Sea: Mysteries, Iron, and metaphors", *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 14.1 (2013): 155-182.
- Bowden 2015 = H. Bowden, "Nameless Gods: Mystery Cults, Myth, Ritual and Greek Polis Religion", *Kodai* 16 (2015): 31-42.
- Bremmer 2014 = J.N. Bremmer, *Initiation into the Mysteries of the Ancient World*, Berlin: De Gruyter 2014.
- Bruneau 1970 = Ph. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris : Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 1970.
- Bruneau 1989 = Ph. Bruneau, "L'esclavage à Délos", in M.-M. Mactoux and E. Geny (eds.), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, Vol. 3 (1989), Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 404, Paris, 41-52.
- Burkert 1970 = W. Burkert, "Jason, Hypsipyle, and New Fire at Lemnos. A Study in Myth and Ritual", *CQ* 20.1 (1970): 1-16.
- Burkert 1983 = W. Burkert, *Homo Necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, translated from German by Peter Bing, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press 1983.
- Burkert 1985 = W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, translated from the German, Oxford: B. Blackwell 1985.

- Burkert 1993 = W. Burkert, “Concordia Discors: The Literary and Archaeological Evidence on the Sanctuary at Samothrace”, in: N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London: Routledge 1993, 178-191.
- Butz 1996 = P. Butz, “Prohibitory Inscriptions, Ξένοι, and the Influence of the Early Greek Polis”, in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis*, Stockholm: Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, 8 (1996), XIV, 75-95.
- Cabanes 1976 = P. Cabanes, *L’Epire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête romaine*, 272-167 av. J.C., Paris : Belles Lettres 1976.
- Cargill 1995 = J. L. Cargill, *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth century B.C. (Mnemosyne SUPPL. 145)*, Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill 1995.
- Clinton 2003 = K. Clinton, “Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries”, in M.B. Cosmopoulos (de.), *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, London and New York: Routledge 2003, 50-78.
- Cohen 1992 = E.E. Cohen, *Athenian Economy and Society*, Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press 1992.
- Cohen 2000 = E.E. Cohen, *The Athenian Nation*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2000.
- Cole 1984 = S.G. Cole, *Theoi Megaloi: The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace*, Leiden: Brill 1984.
- Cole 1989 = S.G. Cole, , *The Mysteries of Samothrace during the Roman Period* II.18.2 (1989) 1564-1598.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2006 = E. Culasso Gastaldi, “Lemnos: i cippi di garanzia”, *ASAtene* 84 (2006): 509-550.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2009 = E. Culasso Gastaldi, “Cleruchie? Non cleruchie? Alcune riflessioni sugli insediamenti extraterritoriali di Atene”, in R. Scuderi and C. Zizza (eds.), *In ricordo di Dino Ambaglio*, Atti del convegno Università di Pavia, 9-10 dicembre 2009, Pavia: Pavia University Press, 115-146.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2010a = E. Culasso Gastaldi, “Lemno e il V secolo”, *ASAtene* 88 (2010): 135-147.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2010b = E. Culasso Gastaldi, “L’isola di Lemnos attraverso la documentazione epigrafica”, *ASAtene* 88 (2010): 347-364.

- Culasso Gastaldi 2011= E. Culasso Gastaldi, “Una storia di marmi riscoperti”, *Historiká* 1.2 (2011): 67-74.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2012 = E.Culasso Gastaldi, “Ancora sui *Catalogi generis incerti*: una riflessione lemnia”, *Historiká* 2 (2012) 233-245.
- Culasso Gastaldi 2015 = E.Culasso Gastaldi, “Composizione e mobilità sociale di una cleruchia: l’esempio di Lemnos e non solo”, in A.P. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *Axon. Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, Athine: Hellēnikē Epigraphikē Hetaireia, Vol. II (2015), 599-637.
- Darnezin 1999 = L. Darnezin, *Les affranchissements par consécration en Béotie et dans le monde grec hellénistique*, Nancy : A.D.R.A., Paris : Diffusion De Boccard 1999.
- Daumas 1997 = M. Daumas, “Des Cabires thébains aux Grands Dieux de Samothrace : aspects d’une recherche sur un culte à mystères”, *Revue archéologique* 1 (1997): 201-209.
- Daumas 2005 = M. Daumas, “De Thèbes à Lemnos et Samothrace : Remarques nouvelles sur le culte des Cabires”, *Topoi* 12/13 (2005) : 851-881.
- Davies 1971 = J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971.
- Delcourt 1982 = M. Delcourt, *Héphaïstos ou la légende du magicien*, Paris : Belles Lettres 1982.
- Dimitrova 2008 = N.M. Dimitrova, *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace, Hesperia Supplements* vol. 37 (2008), The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Dimopoulou-Piliouni 2008 = A. Dimopoulou-Piliouni, “Apeleutheroi: Metics or Foreigners?” *Dike* 11 (2008): 27-50.
- Ficuciello 2013 = L. Ficuciello, *Cultura, storia, archeologia, topografia di un’isola del nord-Egeo* (Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente 20, 1/1), Athens: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene 2013.
- Fraser 1960 = P.M. Fraser, *Samothrace: The Inscriptions on Stone*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1960.
- Gagliardi 2009/2010 = L. Gagliardi, “I paroikoi delle città dell’Asia Minore in età ellenistica e nella prima età romana”, *Dike* 12/13 (2009/2010): 303-322.
- Gauthier 1980 = Ph.Gauthier, “Études sur des inscriptions d’Amorgos”, *BCH* 104 (1980): 197-220.

- Gawlinski 2012 = L. Gawlinski, *The Sacred Law of Andania. A New Text with Commentary*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Gočeva 2002 = Z. Gočeva, “Le culte des Grands Dieux de Samothrace à la période hellénistique”, *Kernos* 15 (2002) : 309-315.
- Graham 2002 = A.J. Graham, “The Colonization of Samothrace”, *Hesperia* 71.3 (2002): 231-260.
- Hemberg 1950 = B. Hemberg, *Die Kabiren*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells 1950.
- Herz 2001 = P. Herz, “Das Bürgerrechtsdekret von Ephesos: Inschriften von Ephesos 8. Gedanken zur Gesellschaft im spätrepublikanischen Kleinasien”, in H. Bellen and H. Heinen (eds.), *Fünfzig Jahre Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei an der Mainzer Akademie, 1950–2000, Miscellanea zum Jubiläum*, F. Steiner, Stuttgart 2001: 185–207.
- Kamen 2012 = D. Kamen, “Manumission, Social Rebirth, and Healing Gods in Ancient Greece”, in S. Hodkinson and D. Geary (eds.), *Slaves and Religions in Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Modern Brazil*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2012: 74-194.
- Kamen 2013 = D. Kamen, *Status in Classical Athens*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press 2013.
- Larson 2007 = J. Larson, *Ancient Greek Cults*, New York and London: Routledge 2007.
- Levi 1996 = D. Levi, “Il Cabirio di Lemno”, in: *Χαριστήριον εἰς Α.Κ. Ὠρλάνδον*, vol. 4 (1996), Athēnai: Archaiologikē Hetaireia, 110-132.
- Marchiandi 2002 = D. Marchiandi “Fattorie e periboli funerari nella chora di Efestia (Lemnos): l’occupazione del territorio in una cleruchia ateniese tra V e IV sec. a. C.”, *ASAtene* 80 (2002): 487-583.
- Marchiandi 2008 = D. Marchiandi, “Riflessioni in merito allo statuto giuridico di Lemno nel V secolo A.C. La ragnatela bibliografica e l’evidenza archeologica: un dialogo possibile?” *ASAtene* 86 (2008): 11-39.
- Marchiandi 2016 = D. Marchiandi, “Efesto a Lemno: ‘la più cara tra tutte le terre’ e il fuoco automaton”, in F. Longo, R. Di Cesare, S. Privitera (eds.), *ΔΡΟΜΟΙ. Studi sul mondo antico offerti a Emanuele Greco dagli allievi della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene*, Vol. II (2016), Athens–Paestum: Pandemos, 743-772.
- Martin 1987 = R.P. Martin, “‘Lysistrata’ and the Lemnian Women”, *Classical Antiquity* 6.1 (1987): 77-105.

- Meyer 2010 = E. Meyer, *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-Inscriptions: A Study in Athenian Epigraphy and Law. Historia Einzelschriften* vol. 208. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2010.
- Niku 2004 = M. Niku, “When and Why did the Athenian μετοικία System Disappear? The Evidence of the Inscriptions”, *Arctos* 38 (2004): 76–93.
- Niku 2007 = M. Niku, *The official status of the foreign residents in Athens, 322–120 B.C.* Helsinki 2007.
- Osborne 1999 = R. Osborne, Review of N. Salomon, *Le cleruchie di Atene. Caratteri et funzione.* Pisa: Edizioni ETS 1997, in *JHS* 119 (1999): 207.
- Parker 1994 = R. Parker, “Athenian Religion Abroad”, in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994: 339-346.
- Patterson 1982 = O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1982.
- Petsas 2000 = Ph.M. Petsas, *Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux Autochtone de Leukopetra*, Athènes : Centre de Recherches de l’Antiquité Grecque et Romaine, Fondation Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique ; Paris : Diffusion de Boccard 2000.
- Rhodes-Osborne 2003 = P.J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*, Oxford University Press 2003.
- Rocca 2011 = F. Rocca, “IG II² 1560 e la pratica della manomissione ad Atene: alcune osservazioni”, *Historiká* 1 (2011): 247-268.
- Rocca 2012a = F. Rocca, “Le iscrizioni di manomissione dal Cabirio di Lemno”, in E. Culasso Gastaldi and D. Marchiandi (eds.), *Gli Ateniesi fuori dall’Attica: Modi d’intervento e di controllo del territorio*, Proceedings of the Congress at Torino 2010, Athens: Scuola archeologica italiana di Atene (*ASAtene* 88) 2012: 289-308.
- Rocca 2012b = F. Rocca, “La manomissione al femminile. Sulla capacità economica delle donne in Grecia in età ellenistica: l’apporto degli atti di affrancamento”, *Historiká* 2: 247-272.
- Rocca 2014 = F. Rocca, “The Manumission Inscriptions from Lemnos: Some News”, *Historiká* 4 (2014): 145-164.
- Rocca 2015 = F. Rocca, “La liberazione degli schiavi e il teatro”, *Epigraphica* 77 (2015): 9-37.

- Roussel 1927 = P. Roussel, "Les mystères de Panamara", *BCH* 51 (1927): 123-137.
- Roussel 1987 = P. Roussel, *Délos, colonie athénienne*, a revised reprint, Paris : De Boccard 1987 (originally published in 1916).
- Ruhl 2010 = B. Ruhl, "Gli ateniesi sull'isola di Imbro", *ASAtene* 88: 454-508.
- Salomon 1997 = N. Salomon, *Le cleruchie di Atene. Caratteri e funzione*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS 1997.
- Samuel 1965 = A.E. Samuel, "The Role of the Paramone Clauses in Ancient Documents", *JJP* 15 (1965): 221-311.
- Schachter 1986 = A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, Vol. II (1986), *BICS Supplement* 38.2, London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies: 66-110.
- Schachter 2003 = A. Schachter, "Evolution of a Mystery Cult. The Theban Kabeiroi", in M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, London and New York: Routledge 2003: 112-142.
- Segre 1932-1933 = M. Segre, "Iscrizioni greche di Lemno", *ASAtene* 15-16 (1932-1933): 289-314.
- Sosin 2015 = J.D. Sosin, "Manumission with Paramone: Conditional Freedom?", *TAPA* 145: 325-381.
- Strubbe 2001 = J.H.M. Strubbe, "Bürger, Nicht-Bürger und Polis-Ideologie", in: K. Demoen (ed.), *The Greek City from Antiquity to the Present. Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation*, Louvain: Peeters 2001: 27-39.
- Sugliano 2001 = A. Sugliano, "Cittadini, pareci, stranieri: le categorie giuridiche e sociali nelle città greche d'Asia Minore fra III e I secolo a.C.", *MedAnt* 4 (2001): 293-324.
- Susini 1952-1954 = G. Susini, "Note di epigrafia lemnia", *ASAtene* 30-32 (1952-1954): 317-340.
- Tracy 1988 = S.V. Tracy, "Ephebic Inscriptions from Athens: Addenda and Corrigenda", *Hesperia* 57.3 (1988): 249-252.
- Trevett 1992 = J. Trevett, *Apollodorus the Son of Pasion*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1992.
- Westermann 1945 = W.L. Westermann, "Between Slavery and Freedom", *American Historical Review* 50 (1945): 213-27.
- Westermann 1950 = W.L. Westermann, "Extinction of Claims in Slave Sales at Delphi", *JJP* 4 (1950): 49-61.

Westermann 1955 = W.L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Philadelphia.

Young Forsyth 1984 = Ph. Young Forsyth, "Lemnos Reconsidered", *Echos du monde classique: Classical Views* n.s. 3, 28.1 (1984): 3-14.

Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005a = R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*, Leiden and Boston: Brill 2005.

Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005b = R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, "The Phrase ξενικῆ λύσει in Manumission Inscriptions", *ZPE* 153 (2005): 108-113.

Zelnick-Abramovitz 2013 = R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Taxing Freedom in Thessalian Manumission Inscriptions*, Leiden and Boston: Brill 2013.

Zelnick-Abramovitz 2019 = R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, "The Status of Slaves Manumitted under Paramonē: A Reappraisal", in: G. Thür, U. Yiftach, and R. Zelnick-Abramovitz (eds.), *Symposion 2017*, Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte, Band 27, Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 377-401.