

Notes

1. This article represents a further elaboration of a theoretical approach presented by me for the first time in the article 'Dowry and Brideprice in Nuzi', in *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians In Honor of E.R. Lacheman*, M.A. Morrison and D.I. Owen (eds.), Winona Lake, 1981. Since it is based on the same textual corpus, available in cuneiform copies only, I have avoided exact references to texts or quotations from them here. Readers wishing to consult original sources are therefore referred to this publication for detailed bibliographical references and tables.

2. For a bibliography of published texts cf. Wilhelm (1970), pp. 2ff.

3. The *ilku* obligation, attested throughout almost the whole of Mesopotamian history, was a duty connected with land tenure. It was owed to the king and could be both military and non-military in character. The exact nature of this obligation is still disputed, and it is possible that it varied from period to period. For a discussion of the term cf. *RLA*, vol. 5, s.v. *ilku*.

4. These documents are, with rare exceptions, available only in cuneiform copies.

5. Cf. §138, §§ 163-4 of the Code of Hammurabi (Driver and Miles, 1955).

6. The documents are available in cuneiform copies only.

7. For a presentation of these adoptions cf. Koschaker (1928), pp. 82-91; Cardascia (1959).

8. For a transliteration and translation of a marriage contract cf. Pfeiffer and Speiser (1936), p. 55.

13 INFANTICIDE IN HELLENISTIC GREECE¹

Sarah B. Pomeroy, New York

The subject of infanticide has been frequently explored by historians and philosophers both in antiquity and the present. More than many topics in ancient history, it is likely to elicit an emotional response and to reveal a writer's biases and values. All discussions of the practice which admit that it existed are either neutral or condemnatory; no one praises this form of population control. Greek and Roman authors used infanticide as a topos of social criticism. They reported that it was practised by their own corrupt compatriots, but not by aliens including Egyptians and Jews (Cameron, 1932). Infanticide is not only a secular issue. Before Islam, it is said, unwanted females could be buried alive (Saleh, 1972, p. 124). But the extent of this practice was doubtless exaggerated by those who wished to demonstrate the benefits of Islam. Catholic scholars too have found much to condemn in this practice. To the Greeks and Romans abortion was the same as late contraception (Hopkins, 1965, pp. 136-42). To press this line of reasoning one step further — infanticide is simply late abortion. In antiquity it was certainly preferable to late abortion from the standpoint of the mother's health.

Infanticide is thus a form of family planning, but unlike any other device available before the invention of amniocentesis, it permits parents to select the offspring they will raise on the basis of their sex. The Greeks did have their methods for determining the sex of the foetus *in utero*. They believed that the male was more active than the female, that the male quickens after 40 days and the female after 90, that the male foetus leans to the right, the female to the left (Aristotle, *GenAn* IV 6 775a, *HA* VII 3 583b), and that a pregnant woman has a good complexion if the foetus is male, a poor complexion if it is female (Hippocrates, *Aphorisms* 48, 42). These signals were probably considered by women contemplating whether to carry a pregnancy to term. When they proved incorrect, as they frequently must have done, infanticide was an option. We should also observe that of all the forms of family planning (contraception, abortion and infanticide) it is infanticide that is most likely to involve the father, for he is the parent who must decide whether or not an infant is to be a member of his family. Children belonged to their fathers, not their mothers. Greek and

Roman law codes stated that when a father died, a newborn infant must be offered to its father's family. Only after its agnates refused it, might the mother dispose of it as she pleased (Pomeroy, 1975).

Among social historians, those who study women's history have been especially interested in this topic, since infanticide affects women as mothers and since it selects more daughters than sons. Moreover, the subject of infanticide raises a variety of discomfiting questions about the value of women. Myths about Amazons may tell of women warriors who preferred girl babies to boys. When a son was born he was either killed immediately or sent to his father. But the evidence of history and anthropology tells a different story. No known society positively prefers girl babies to boys (Dickemann, 1979).

Even where infanticide is not explicitly practised, neglect of female children by the denial of adequate care produces the same result. Everywhere more boys are born than girls, but in developed countries the survival rate and life-expectancy is higher for girls than for boys. Yet in countries like India more young girls than boys die. Since this sex ratio is contrary to the dictates of physiology, other factors must be operating. Some demographers explain this sex ratio by the preference for sons and the reluctance to raise daughters. Others believe that girls are not killed or neglected and propose that women, like other under-classes, are not adequately counted by the census (India, 1974). If this be the case it gives yet another example of the neglect of women in such countries; for those who are not counted are those who 'do not count'; and who therefore do suffer neglect.

Literary evidence for infanticide from classical antiquity is abundant.² The sources range from authors like Plato, Plutarch, Apuleius and Seneca (to name just a few) down to a letter written on papyrus in 1 BC from a soldier in Alexandria to his wife in Oxyrhynchus in which he instructs her that if she gives birth to a son she should rear it, but if she has a daughter she is to expose it (*P. Oxy.* 744). These bits of written testimony demonstrate in themselves a tolerance of infanticide in classical antiquity (Pomeroy, 1975).

But the major challenge confronting the historian who would discuss the subject of infanticide in Greek antiquity is the lack of census data comparable to that available from modern India. Sources that can yield statistics for the study of the demography of the ancient world are rare. Few numbers are large enough to impress a modern cliometrician. For the study of Roman demography historians can analyse census data, tax rolls, tombstones and figures for the army and slave familia, but there is little such material available for the Greeks. Athens, as usual, has

provided most of the data. Using inscriptions and literary evidence (especially private orations), historians have been able to trace the genealogy of families who are wealthy and noteworthy enough to get into such sources. Because of the Athenians' well-known reluctance to give the names of respectable women in public, women who must have existed are not mentioned. Thus the stemmata published in J.K. Davies' *Athenian Propertied Families* (1971) realise the hopes of Hippolytus or Zeus that children be born from fathers alone, for often descent is traced solely through the male line. Earlier generations of historians, including J.J.B. Mulder (1920) and A. Zimmern (1931), used material of this nature as the basis of demographical studies.³ Not only are the sources defective, but the historians themselves did not divulge their methods. For example: Did they allow for a sister whenever a brother-in-law is mentioned? Did they add a mother to every group of children? On the other hand, to have supplied missing women could have been to inflate the number of women without justification. Many upper-class women, especially those of proven fertility, married more than once, some even three times (Thompson, 1972). Nevertheless, their names are not known (Schaps, 1977). A thrice-married anonymous woman would thus show up as three women.

Another body of evidence derives from a set of inscriptions from Miletus (*Milet* 3, 34-93). Most of these date from 228 to 220 BC. Others come from the end of the third century and the beginning of the second. A few are later. Miletus was prosperous and did not suffer from the urban decline that beset many of the older Greek cities in the Hellenistic period. The magnificence of the public buildings and the employment of mercenary soldiers, from time to time, to maintain an offensive in external relations bear testimony to the wealth of the city.

In the Hellenistic period, the Milesians hired mercenaries from the Greek islands and from Ionia, from south-west Anatolia and other areas in the Greek world. The majority of those whose place of origin is known came from Crete, famous as a nursery for Hellenistic mercenaries. The mercenaries were enrolled as Milesian citizens and were settled nearby in Myus, a city under Milesian control.

The names of the immigrants were inscribed on the walls of the Delphinion, the sanctuary of Apollo. The Delphinion inscriptions differ from the Athenian sources in the obvious respects that they derive from a different period and not only from a different place but from a different sort of place, for Crete and the other places of origin of these mercenaries were provincial backwaters compared to Athens. Moreover, the Athenian material largely reflects those groups wealthy or influential

enough to get into the historical sources. There is no specific information on the class from which the soldiers derive. But from the fact that they are mercenaries to whom citizenship in Miletus offered upward social and economic mobility, it may be deduced that they are members of a lower class than the Athenians.

The lists of immigrants provide the largest single body of statistics available for the study of demography in Hellenistic Greece. W.W. Tarn examined inscriptions in *Milet* 3, 34-93 and reported the following results:

[For] the prevalence of infanticide . . . for the late third and second centuries the inscriptions are conclusive. . . . Of some thousand families from Greece who received Milesian citizenship c. 228-220, details of 79, with their children remain; these brought 118 sons and 28 daughters, many being minors; no natural causes can account for these proportions (1952, pp. 100-1).

M.I. Rostovtzeff (1941, pp. 1464-5) accepted and cited Tarn's work, and such is the authority of Rostovtzeff that his work is still being quoted in turn — for example by E. Will (1975, p. 512, n. 2). Tarn's work is referred to in a recent study by R.P. Duncan-Jones (1982), and it apparently served as the inspiration for Claude Vatin, who wrote:

en 228/227 et en 223/222, quinze puis vingt et une familles crétoises ont été admises à bénéficier du droit de cité à Milet. [*Milet* 3, 34, 38]. Ces trente-six familles ont, au total, soixante-trois enfants; sept d'entre elles ont plus de trois enfants, douze ont deux enfants; ce taux de natalité est déjà légèrement insuffisant pour maintenir la population à son niveau; mais surtout on constate qu'il y a deux fois plus de garçons que de filles: quarante-deux contre vingt et un (1970, p. 231).

The inscriptions are fragmentary. In their publications neither Tarn nor Vatin indicate whether or how they took cognisance of the lacunae. The editors of the inscriptions state that a total of more than 1,000 people were enfranchised in the decrees of 228/227 and 223/222 (*Milet* 3, p. 75 [199]). Tarn's allusion to 1,000 *families* is a major mistake (but if correct it would have strengthened his argument). Although there is space for more than 1,000 names, owing to the fragmentary condition of the inscriptions, fewer than 1,000 are totally, or even partially, extant. Some people are listed as individuals and some as

members of family groups. The members of a family are with very few exceptions listed in the same formal order: husband, wife (her name followed by *gunē* 'wife'), male children, and, last, female children. The lists are continuous, and are not skewed — as are some lists on papyrus⁴ — by a recurrent loss of the names of females listed on the bottom. Because of the pattern in which family members were listed, it has been possible to reconstitute some families by adding people who were problematic insofar as their names or family roles were fragmentary or totally absent. Sex was deduced from the name, family relationship and physical placement in the inscription. The results of this study appear in Tables 13.1 and 13.2; (pp. 220-22).

The most striking feature of the Delphinion population is the disproportion between the sexes, with males outnumbering females by more than two to one. The sex ratio is more skewed among the children than among the adults. The small number of daughters contributes to a second noteworthy phenomenon: the small size of families. Several hypotheses can be presented to explain the sex ratio.

The first hypothesis is that suggested by the census report from India discussed above: the daughters existed but were not counted. Women are usually undercounted in census-type lists, but the difficult problem is how to assess how far the tendency can go. The recorded sex ratio in a list like the one on the Delphinion results from the interests of the heads of household giving the information and of the government officials taking it down. Historians and anthropologists have noted many characteristics of Greek society that might lead a father to omit mentioning a daughter or two. The ambiguity of the Greek language fosters the invisibility of women (Pomeroy, 1977, p. 52; 1982a, pp. 3-4). *Pais* means both son and child of either sex. To be really specific about a daughter, she would have to be called *thugater*. When fathers in rural Greece nowadays are asked how many children (*paidia*) they have, they may enumerate only the sons. The engendering of sons is a tribute to a man's masculinity; a father may wish to conceal a proliferation of daughters. Thus, in Table 13.2, line 11, it may be observed that only eleven fathers dared to list a daughter when they had no sons at all. On line 16, 15 fathers are listed with unspecified children. These may simply be fathers who failed to show up on the appointed day to make their report, or they may be men who are ashamed of having two or more daughters and no sons. Similarly, the higher valuation placed on males than on females could have led the magistrates to be more careful about recording the names of boys than of girls, even when the information was given to them.

These arguments are, however, general in nature. The specific situation in Miletus was such as would motivate a father to list all his daughters. These inscriptions record grants of citizenship and women were the recipients of such grants in the Hellenistic period. From the fact that adult women who are alone are inscribed as citizens, it may be deduced that girls and boys are listed not merely as daughters and sons of citizens, but as citizens in their own right. In imitation of the Athenian citizenship law, citizenship in many Hellenistic cities depended upon descent from both a citizen father and mother. The enrollment of some of the new immigrants with the label 'nothē' or 'nothos' suggests that the double parent requirement existed in their cities of origin. *Nothos* is often translated 'bastard'. All these *nothoi* do have patronymics, and the only *nothos* who is married named his son for the child's paternal grandfather (*Milet* 3, 78). However, all the *nothoi* lack ethnics. It is likely that *nothos* in these inscriptions, as in Demosthenes and elsewhere, refers to a child of a citizen father and an alien mother.⁵ The second-class status of such children is indicated by the fact that the only married *nothos* and *nothē* are married to each other (*Milet* 3, 78). The *nothoi* who came to Miletus then had a good deal to gain in the form of citizenship in a leading Greek city. The Delphinion inscriptions themselves, by the very fact that they list women, often carefully identified by patronymic and ethnic, indicate that the double citizen-parent requirement existed at Miletus. Therefore, fathers who, as new immigrants, had little standing in the community would certainly want to leave no ambiguity about the status of their daughters. What might happen otherwise is made clear by the case of Neaera, from fourth-century Athens. Neaera was accused of having been born a slave, moving to Athens from Corinth, and then having the audacity to pass herself and her daughter off as Athenian citizens ([Demosthenes], 59). It would be impossible to so challenge the citizenship of any woman whose name was inscribed on the Delphinion.

Only one of the families has two daughters and none have more than two. This statistic is not surprising. Among the Greeks, a large number of daughters was a rarity. It was a manifestation of great wealth and pride on the same scale as owning horses that raced at pan-Hellenic festivals. The Athenian Callias, who won three victories in chariot racing — two of these in a single year — had three daughters. Themistocles had five. Adimantus, commander of the Corinthian fleet at Salamis, had three.⁶ Two of the highest-ranking members of the Ptolemaic aristocracy also had a remarkable number of daughters. Polycrates had three, and he was so wealthy that not only did he own racehorses himself, but his

wife and daughters had horses which won at the Panathenaia some time after 197 BC. Later on in the second century, Theodorus, who like Polycrates served as a governor of Cyprus, had a family that included at least three, and probably four, daughters. Dryton, a well-to-do reserve officer who lived in Pathyris in the second century BC, had five. In contrast, families with three or more sons were common enough. Even Socrates, who advertised his poverty, had three.

The figures from Miletus may be evidence for selective female infanticide, but they need not be a direct numerical reflection of it. The life cycles of girls and boys are different. The official designations of a boy as *anēbos* (prepubertal) or *hēbon* (mature) and of a girl as *korē* (maiden), marked the different stages. Offspring, designated simply as *huios* (son) or *thugater* (daughter) without qualifying titles, may be beyond the ages covered by them. The age at which boys changed from *anēboi* to *hēbontes* at Miletus is not known. In fact, the official age of maturity for boys, even for a city like Athens where there is ample documentation, is a matter for debate (Golden, 1979). If the Milesians followed the Athenian practice, then the boys presumably became *hēbontes* after their *ephēbeia*, or sometime between 18 and 20. If, on the other hand, *hēbon* was not an official age class at this time in Miletus, but simply connoted a male who manifested the outward signs of puberty, then boys as young as 14 might have been so designated.⁷ Girls leave their families of origin for marriage at 14 more or less. Before this they are called *korai*. Starting from equal numbers, if we allow for both boys and girls to be counted up to 14, we would expect equal numbers. If boys are counted up to 18 and girls up to 14 we would expect one and one-third as many boys as girls. If boys are included up to 20 and girls up to 13 we would expect one and one-half more boys. These are artificial and mathematically convenient postulates. Daughters of migrants might have been married at even earlier than usual ages, before the departure of their parents, since the pool of old friends and relatives among whom bridegrooms would be found would be larger in one's native polis than in Miletus. The average age at which women will marry for the first time is due partially to the sex ratio in a given society. Where women are in short supply, they will marry young.

On the other hand, the figure of 14 as the age of menarche⁸ and marriage in antiquity comes to us from medical and literary sources that are biased toward the upper classes. Menarche is related to nutrition. Xenophon (*Lac. Pol.*, I 3) reports that among Greeks, only the Spartans nourished girls as well as they did boys. Aristotle (*HA IX 1*

608b) asserted that women need less food than men. Among the upper classes, Greek girls probably were well fed; but the daughters whom mercenaries left at home or took along with them in their campaigns were less well-nourished than, say, the wife of Ischomachus in Xenophon's Athens, and may have reached maturity later in their teens. If the figures from Miletus include daughters up to the ages of 16, 17 or 18, they must indicate a high rate of infanticide. We could easily play around with different ages for girls and boys, but there is no reasonable combination that will account for the sex ratio among the children at Miletus.

Another factor of note is how few the children are in proportion to the entire population. It must have been difficult for children to survive the rigorous life endured by these people before they settled in Miletus. Moreover, husbands who are absent on campaigns cannot impregnate their wives. Most important is the consideration that many women will not have completed their childbearing years at the time of the migration. The couples without children noted in Table 13.2, line 1, are either infertile or are upwardly mobile young couples. They are not likely to be elderly folks with an empty nest, for older people without the security of children are not eager to undertake changes. Moreover, that most of the parents are young is suggested by the infrequency of broken marriages, although the completed families could be the result of remarriage after the death of a former spouse.

Knowing what we do of Greek life expectancy,⁹ we must assume that most of the parents and the children who came to Miletus were young. If there had been a large number of sons designated as *hēbontes* we would have to assume a large number of fathers who were at least 40. There is only one *hēbon* (and he is part of an extended family group including his parents [*Milet* 3, 62]), who is married, he is unusual. Generally, Greek men married around 30. Thus only the men who are fathers of *hēbontes* were definitely over 40. Therefore we ought not explain the sex ratio by the fact that men in antiquity enjoyed a longer life span than women and posit that the single men are elderly widowers. A migrant population tends to be comprised of young male adults (Sorrell, 1955, pp. 198-9). The Delphinion inscriptions do record twice as many males as females among the adults. Doubtless these men were young.

We should also ask ourselves whether families with the good fortune to have more sons than daughters were more likely to migrate to Miletus, leaving behind their hypothetical statistical counterparts in which the daughters outnumbered the sons. Of course we can only

speculate about whether the group would have been self-selecting in this way. It is certainly possible that families that happened to have many sons, but insufficient resources, would want a fresh start in a pre-eminent city that offered them a brighter future. Moreover, it is conceivable that parents, bolstered by the security of many sons, would venture to leave their ancestral home. Yet there is no evidence, not even a plot of new comedy, that may be adduced to corroborate the existence of such an attitude. Moreover, if the departure of young single men created a surplus of unmarried women in their places of origin, the existence of such women would have discouraged parents from raising daughters. No Greek society ever had room for respectable spinsters.

There are two categories of parents whose special experience affected the sex ratios of their children. The first of these are the ones who probably had led a harder life than the rest. Crete was the place of origin for most of the migrants whose ethnics are known.¹⁰ Since ten men are listed twice, once alone and once with their families, it appears that they had left their families behind when they undertook military service on behalf of Miletus (*Milet* 3, p. 47 [171]; Launey, 1949, p. 256). When they accepted the Milesians' offer of citizenship they brought their families from Crete in several large contingents. In contrast to the women and children who simply had to make one voyage from Crete to Miletus in the company of compatriots are those from Caria, Anatolia, and more distant places in the Greek world. There are 23 such married couples who did not come from Crete, and whose place of origin is known. They may have started out as members of a cohort of soldiers all from the same neighbourhood, for mercenaries were often recruited in groups. But by the time they showed up at Miletus, they appear as the sole couple from a particular city. Most of these people had probably travelled about a great deal. Mercenaries lived like nomads, bringing their families and all their material property along with them wherever they went. Female infanticide is a characteristic of migratory people (Sorrell, 1955, p. 45). Thus the sex ratio is more skewed among the children of parents whose ethnics are given and who do not come from Crete than among the rest of people listed on the Delphinion. The 21 families with children have among them 37 sons and five daughters.¹¹

Life in a Hellenistic army must have been unfavourable to the raising of female children. There was little incentive for a professional soldier to raise a daughter. On a farm, a daughter could be helpful doing women's work, but in an army she was simply another mouth to feed.

In a settled community it might be useful to have a daughter so that one might make a marriage alliance with another family, but for a soldier to provide a dowry for a daughter whom he was likely to marry off to another soldier was tantamount to throwing his money away. Among the intangibles to consider is the negative effect that being in an intensely masculine milieu like an army has on the value of a daughter.

Another group of parents whose special experience affected the sex ratio of their offspring were those without spouses. The only single mothers are part of extended family groups. One is a mother of two sons accompanied by her own father and mother, and the other migrated with her adult son and his wife. Both these women are probably widows. According to Greek law, in cases of divorce the children belong to the father not the mother. Thus the single mother with two sons must be a widow and have them by default. There are eight single fathers with children; only one single parent has a daughter, and they are members of a large extended family group (*Milet* 3, 62). It is important to observe that all the other children of single parents are male. Then, as now, it must not have been easy to be a single parent. Under the pressure of raising children without a spouse, parents divested themselves of daughters, perhaps leaving them at home in the care of relatives or friends, or perhaps taking more drastic measures.

Thirty-six children lack a family and are listed as individuals. These are probably orphans who remained with the group of mercenaries after their fathers died. The hazards of a military career added to the normally low life expectancy of people in antiquity will have left many children as orphans. Since according to Greek law they inherited their father's property — at the very least a suit of armour, a wagon, draught animals and their own household equipment — they were not poor. The Greek word '*orphanos*' means a fatherless child. The existence of a mother does not affect the status of an *orphanos* (Pomeroy, 1982a). Because new citizens at Miletus are listed with patronymics not matronymics, it is impossible to determine whether any *orphanos* actually had a living mother.

Despite the presence of single fathers, who, presumably, should be eager to remarry, and the abundance of single men, there are a surprising number of unmarried women. These are the 11 adult daughters in families and another 17 women travelling alone. The latter group are probably, for the most part, widows, left stranded with the contingent of mercenaries when their husbands died.

Among the Greeks there is a long tradition of caring for a soldier's orphans, and at times for his parents as well, but ignoring his widow

(Pomeroy, 1982b). In the funeral oration, Pericles comforted the parents of the dead, and he declared that orphans would be supported at the expense of the state. But to the widows all he could say was that the greatest glory of a woman is to be least talked about by men, whether in praise or blame. In a settled community, a widow would return to the care of her natal family, who would find another husband for her. Of the 11 Athenians who are known to have remarried after the death of their spouses, eight were women (Thompson, 1972). But the widow of a Hellenistic mercenary was in a more vulnerable situation since she lacked male relatives who could arrange another marriage. Unlike an orphan, a widow did not inherit from her husband unless he had left a will with a specific bequest for her, and she probably had to spend her dowry when she was left a widow. An impoverished widow was not an attractive bride, certainly not in the Hellenistic period, when many men chose not to marry at all. The spectre of these unmarried women must have discouraged soldiers from raising daughters.

Mark Golden (1981) has recently postulated a female infanticide rate of 10 per cent or more for Athens, arguing that otherwise there would have been an oversupply of marriageable women. A general rate of female infanticide for Hellenistic Greece has not been established, but even a rate as high as the one suggested by the Delphinion inscriptions need not have been suicidal for the people concerned.¹² Such a rate among isolated endogamous people like the Inuit or Bushpeople, it is true, would cause a population to die out eventually. But limited populations of Greeks living in attractive locations could be replenished in a variety of ways. On a small scale there was seepage from the lower strata of a population into the citizen group. Neaera and her children furnish an example of such seepage (see above, p. 212). If the woman had not been so notorious and if her male friend did not have political enemies, she could well have gotten away with it in a period when there was laxity regarding the roster of citizens. States dealt with their changing population needs by legislation either accepting or rejecting as a citizen a child born of the union of a citizen and a non-citizen. All the known cases involve a citizen father and an alien mother. Thus another solution to the shortage of women was simply to marry a foreigner. Mass enfranchisements, whether of slaves (as following the battle of Arginusae, after Athens had sustained heavy casualties at the end of the Peloponnesian War), or of freeborn people (as in Miletus) were not uncommon. Immigration was another means of replenishing citizen rosters. Doubtless Greek immigrants flocked to Miletus because they wanted to live the kind of life in which they would be able to raise all

the children born to them, for painful as it is to study infanticide, it must have been far more painful to be forced to practise it. Thus although a population decline is well attested for the Greek world in the Hellenistic period, a prosperous state like Miletus need not have suffered from it.

The Hellenistic period may be characterised as the age of the deracinated Greek and of the mercenary soldier. Thus the people who were enfranchised by Miletus were not atypical. Mercenaries did not live on the fringes of society, but exerted great influence, not only in military and political spheres, but in cultural and social life as well (Launey, 1949). Because mercenaries travelled extensively and then often settled down in military colonies, or (as in Miletus) in one of the older cities, their way of life was revealed to sedentary people. The people whose names appear on the Delphinion gave preference to males, and exposed or neglected their female offspring, and such practices were not anomalous in Hellenistic Greece.

Notes

1. A shorter version of this paper was presented at the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians, Vassar College, 17 June 1981. I am grateful to Ernst Badian, Stanley Burstein, Valerie French, William Harris and Cynthia Patterson for their comments, and to the Research Foundation of the City University of New York for a grant which supported research for this paper.
2. For surveys of such evidence see Glotz, 'Infanticidium' and 'Expositio' in Daremberg and Saglio (1877), Golden (1981), and Eyben (1982).
3. For criticism of Mulder and Zimmern see Gomme (1933), p. 80.
4. For the effect of the mutilation of papyri on demographic statistics see Hombert and Préaux (1952), p. 157.
5. See Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v. *nothos*.
6. Plut., *Mor.* 871. I am grateful to R. Merkelbach for this suggestion.
7. I am grateful to R. Merkelbach for this suggestion.
8. See Amundsen and Diers (1969).
9. On longevity in antiquity see, e.g., Samuel, Hastings, Bowman and Bagnall (1971) and Duncan-Jones (1982).
10. At least 283 Cretans are listed in *Milet* 3, 38 alone (*Milet* 3, p. 74 [198]).
11. No children: (72), (86). Sons: 2(41), 6(45), 2(46), 2(50), 2(57), 6(64), 1(65), 3(66), 3(67), 2(70), 1(74), 2(75), 2(77), 1(79), 2(82). Daughters 1 each: (41), (46), (70), (75), (77).
12. See Harris (1982) and Golden (1981) for well-argued criticism of the model conceived by Engels (1980).

Further Reading

- Brunt, P.A. (1971), *Italian Manpower, 225 B.C.-A.D. 14*, Oxford
 Eyben, Emiel (1982), 'Family Planning in Greco-Roman Antiquity', *Ancient Society* (forthcoming)
 Menander, *Perikeiromene* (The Girl who Gets Her Hair Cut Short), *Aspis* ('The Shield')
 Préaux, Cl. (1978), *Le monde hellénistique*, 2 vols., Paris

Appendix

In the following tables the numerals in the left-hand margin refer to the paragraphs following the tables. These paragraphs give the citations on which the tabulations are based. The following abbreviations have been employed:

- A = *anēbos*
 D = daughter
 E = *hēbon* (mature youth)
 F = single adult woman
 H = husband
 K = *korē* (maiden)
 M = single adult man
 N = *nothē* or *nothos* (non-citizen)
 S = son
 W = wife