



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Near Eastern slaves in Classical Attica and the slave trade with Persian territories

Citation for published version:

Lewis, D 2011, 'Near Eastern slaves in Classical Attica and the slave trade with Persian territories', *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 91-113. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000480>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1017/S0009838810000480](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000480)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

The Classical Quarterly

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Lewis, D. (2011). Near Eastern slaves in Classical Attica and the slave trade with Persian territories. The Classical Quarterly, 61(1), 91-113doi: 10.1017/S0009838810000480

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



NEAR EASTERN SLAVES IN CLASSICAL ATTICA AND THE SLAVE TRADE WITH PERSIAN TERRITORIES

DAVID LEWIS

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 61 / Issue 01 / May 2011, pp 91 - 113

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838810000480, Published online: 04 May 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838810000480

How to cite this article:

DAVID LEWIS (2011). NEAR EASTERN SLAVES IN CLASSICAL ATTICA AND THE SLAVE TRADE WITH PERSIAN TERRITORIES. The Classical Quarterly, 61, pp 91-113 doi:10.1017/S0009838810000480

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NEAR EASTERN SLAVES IN CLASSICAL ATTICA AND THE SLAVE TRADE WITH PERSIAN TERRITORIES*

During the Classical period, Athens and a number of other *poleis* relied upon trade with ‘barbarian’ territories on the periphery of the Aegean world to maintain large slave populations which played an integral role in economic life and formed the bedrock of elite wealth. Although slaves were imported from a number of regions, modern scholarship has tended to focus overwhelmingly upon the northern branch of this trade, which dealt in slaves from Thrace and the Black Sea regions (although curiously, very little consideration has been given to the Black Sea’s southern littoral). One of the first to study the Black Sea slave trade in detail was M.I. Finley, whose work established the significance of the region as a major source of slaves throughout antiquity.¹ Following Finley’s work, V.I. Velkov soon afterwards began to produce a series of studies documenting the importance of Thrace as a slave source,² and Colchis’ more modest contributions have been discussed in articles by David Braund and G.R. Tsatskheladze some twenty years ago.³ More recently, John Hind has suggested that the antithetically arranged human faces on the silver coins of Istria represent her characteristic export: Getic slaves from the lower Danube region,⁴ and in the last few years, N.A. Gavriljuk and A. Avram have added their own contributions to the study of the Greek slave trade’s northern branch.⁵ The

* I would like to acknowledge several debts I have incurred in the writing of this essay. Fran Curzon very kindly supplied me with a translation of Velkov (1967) from the Russian; Professor E.A. Meyer provided access to her important forthcoming study on the *phiale* inscriptions; and I have benefitted from the resources of the Durham Centre for the Study of the Ancient Mediterranean and the Near East (CAMNE) and discussions with its members. I would like to thank the anonymous referee at *Classical Quarterly* for a number of useful suggestions; my largest debt is to Professor E.M. Harris for reading several drafts of the article, and for his helpful comments and advice on sources and bibliography. Naturally, all responsibility for the views expressed lies with the author.

¹ M.I. Finley, ‘The Black Sea and Danubian regions and the slave trade in antiquity’, *Klio* 40 (1962), 51–9, reprinted as ch. 10 of id. (ed.), *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (London, 1981).

² V.I. Velkov ‘Zur Frage der Sklaverei auf der Balkanhalbinsel während der Antike’, *Etudes Balkaniques* 1 (1964), 125–38; ‘Thracian slaves in ancient Greek cities, 6th–2nd centuries BC’, (in Russian) *VDI* 4 (1967), 70–80; ‘L’esclavage en Thrace antique’ in H. Kalcyk, B. Gullath and A. Graeber (edd.), *Studien zur alten Geschichte: Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag am 4. August 1981 dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1986), 1021–30.

³ D. Braund and G.R. Tsatskheladze, ‘The export of slaves from Colchis’, *CQ* 39 (1989), 114–25; G.R. Tsatskheladze, ‘Zu den Kolchischen Sklaven in der Griechischen Welt’, *Klio* 72.1 (1990), 151–9.

⁴ J. Hind, ‘The trade in Getic slaves and the silver coins of Istria’, *Thracia Pontica* 5 (1994), 153–8. Hind suggests that these coins belong to the same genre of currency as the staters of Cyrene and hemidrachms of Thasos which depict as their characteristic exports antithetically arranged stalks of silphium and amphorae of wine.

⁵ N.A. Gavriljuk, ‘The Graeco-Scythian slave-trade in the 6th and 5th centuries BC’, in P.G. Bilde, J.M. Højte and V.F. Stolba (edd.), *The Cauldron of Ariantas. Studies presented to A.N. Seeglov on the occasion of his 70th birthday* (Aarhus, 2003), 75–86, which cites some of the impressive

exclusive focus upon commerce with northern regions and neglect of other slave sources has been echoed in the comments of several general works which deal with Greek slavery. G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, for instance, wrote that ‘The great majority of Greek slaves in the Classical period were imported “barbarians”, among whom Thracians were particularly prominent’,⁶ whilst Yvon Garlan confidently asserted that ‘at first, most probably came from Scythia, especially Thrace’.⁷ Walter Burkert considered it most unlikely that Carian slaves were to be found in Attica in considerable numbers, claiming that ‘according to all other testimony, Thracian and Getan slaves were far more numerous’.⁸ And Paul Cartledge, in an influential book, has considered the barbarian sources of Athenian slaves and concluded that ‘the major country of their origin was Thrace’ (we should note that Thrace is the only ‘barbarian source’ Cartledge discusses).⁹ Whilst the importance of northern regions (and Thrace in particular) has been well recognized, the supply of slaves from Asia Minor and the Levant has gone largely overlooked.¹⁰

The purpose of this study is to explore the export of slaves from the Near East (principally Asia Minor and the Levant), which fell under the domination of the Persian Empire during the Classical period. I intend to focus upon several areas. Firstly, we shall review our evidence for the ethnicity of slaves in Classical Attica, both general comments in literary sources and actual occurrences of ethnic slave names in the epigraphic record. I preface this discussion with an exploration of the value of ‘ethnic’ slave names as evidence for the ethnic origins of slaves, since an understanding of this issue bears heavily upon the importance we assign much of our epigraphic testimonia (§ I). It is demonstrated that in the majority of cases, these slave names indicate the regions slaves were derived from, and that in Classical Attica slaves from Asia Minor and the Levant accounted for a significant proportion of the slave population (§§ II and III). This should provide us with a good impression of the scale and importance of the Greco-Near Eastern slave trade. In § IV, we shall turn to the Near East itself. Traditionally, classical

bibliography on the Black Sea slave trade in Russian; A. Avram, ‘Some thoughts about the Black Sea and the slave trade before the Roman domination (6th–1st Centuries BC)’, in V. Gabrielsen and J. Lund (edd.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges* (Aarhus, 2007), 239–51. See also T. Taylor ‘Believing the ancients: quantitative and qualitative dimensions of slavery and the slave trade in later prehistoric Eurasia’, *World Archaeology* 33.1 (2001), 27–43, D. Braund, ‘Slaves, ruddle and salt: observations on the internal economy of the Black Sea region’, in P.P. Tolochko et al. (edd.), *Severnoe Prichernomor’e v antichnoe vremya* (Kiev, 2002), 82–6, G.R. Tsetschladze, ‘Pontic slaves in Athens: orthodoxy and reality’, in C. Ulf, P. Mauritsch and R. Rollinger (edd.), *Antike Lebenswelten. Konstanz – Wandel – Wirkungsmacht. Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden, 2008), 309–19.

⁶ G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London, 1981), 227.

⁷ Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY, 1988), 46–7, who does admit that some slaves were from the Near East.

⁸ W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berkeley, 1983), 227.

⁹ P. Cartledge, *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, 1993), 153.

¹⁰ One of the few discussions of Near Eastern slaves of any detail is that of M.C. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity* (Cambridge, 1997), 81–5, who rightly points out that they were ubiquitous in Attica. Following publications such as B. Bäbler, *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen. Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998) and K. DeVries, ‘The nearly Other: the Attic vision of Phrygians and Lydians’, in B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal* (Leiden, 2000), 338–63, we may better appreciate the perception of Near Eastern ethnic groups in Attica, but a study of the trade which brought many of them there remains a desideratum.

historians have treated the Near East as relatively unimportant in the history of slavery. According to this view, slaves existed there in pitifully small numbers, and as such, there was no significant demand for slave labour (and by extension, slaves themselves) outside of the Greek world. This approach has not been followed by Near Eastern specialists, who have demonstrated that slavery played a much more important role than classical historians have imagined, with implications which challenge some of our fundamental views on the 'shape' of the Greek slave trade. Finally, we shall consider some of the reasons why so many Near Eastern people were uprooted from their own communities and sold abroad to Greek masters (§ V). The aim of this study is not to provide a complete picture of the slave trade during the Classical period; instead, I shall highlight several important but neglected areas and show where modifications to our picture of the slave trade are required.

I. SLAVE NAMES AND ETHNIC ORIGINS

Much of the evidence we possess for the ethnicity of slaves in Athens comes in the form of so-called 'ethnic' slave names;¹¹ the value of these names as evidence of *actual* ethnicity has come under attack from some scholars, so it is necessary that we establish the quality of the evidence we shall be examining as a preliminary to our subsequent discussion. The Athenians, like other ancient peoples (such as the Babylonians and Romans), often renamed their slaves after purchase (e.g. Pl. *Cra.* 384d); the classic text on this practice is Strabo 7.3.12:

The Getai are the people living in the area reaching eastwards to the Black Sea, while the Dacians live in the area towards Germany and the sources of the Danube. I think that in ancient times they were called 'Dai'; and it was because of them that the names 'Geta' and 'Daos' were common for slaves among the Athenians – at least, this is a more likely explanation than that they were named after the Scythian tribe called the 'Daai', since they live far away in Hyrcania and it is most unlikely that any slaves were ever brought to Attica from there. In fact, the Athenians would either name their slaves after the area from which they were imported, or give them the same names as their tribes (such as 'Lydos' or 'Syros'), or give them names which were common in those countries, like 'Manes' or 'Midas' for a Phrygian, or 'Tibios' for a Paphlagonian.

[tr. T. Wiedemann, adapted]¹²

This passage has provoked rather sharp reactions in two opposite directions. On the one hand, some scholars read Strabo's comments as a straightforward factual statement, which usually leads to considering ethnic slave names as more or less explicit evidence of a slave's ethnicity.¹³ On the other hand, some scholars are less

¹¹ I use the term 'slave names' as shorthand for 'names of slaves', and do not subscribe to the notion that there ever existed a distinct category of servile names.

¹² Most scholars recognize the Getae as a Danubian people, but there is good reason to question Strabo's explanation of the name Daos. This seems to have been a name given to Phrygians, not Dacians; in fact, the slave Daos in Menander's *Aspis* explicitly states he came from Phrygia (e.g. *Men. Asp.* 206 *Φρύξ' εἶμι*, also lines 240–5). For this view, see O. Masson 'Les noms des esclaves dans la Grèce antique', *Actes du Colloque 1971 sur l'esclavage* (Besançon, 1973), 9–23, at 13 n. 14; D. Wiles, 'Greek theatre and the legitimation of slavery', in L. Archer (ed.), *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour* (London and New York, 1988), 53–67, at 60.

¹³ Of those apparently willing to view ethnic names as straightforward evidence of ethnicity, M. Lambertz, *Die griechischen Sklavennamen* (Vienna, 1907) and Velkov (n. 2 [1967]) are good

willing to trust Strabo, expressing grave doubts over the quality of his sources (if he is indeed relying on anything beyond conjecture) and even questioning whether any solid connection can be established whatsoever between an ethnic name and the genuine ethnicity of any given slave. This second approach is exemplified by Braund and Tssetskhladze's investigation into the trade in Colchian slaves, and the case they have made for a general dissonance between ethnic names and ethnicity must be examined in full. The basis of their arguments lies in Roman slave naming practices, and the scope for confusion which these practices created. For instance, Varro (*Ling.* 8.9) wrote that three men might each purchase a slave in Ephesus, one naming his slave after the city in which he was bought, one after the region the city lay in and one after the dealer the slave was purchased from. This would suggest that the slave's name might indicate he came from Ephesus or Ionia when he in fact came from somewhere entirely different. Another passage (*Dig.* 21.1.31.21; cf. *Dig.* 50.15.4.5) shows that in Roman law, a slave seller was supposed to state the *natio* of each slave; and Varro (*Ling.* 9.93) says that races which were thought to produce better slaves commanded higher prices on the auction block than slaves from less desirable peoples. Braund and Tssetskhladze believed that this would often result in the deliberate falsification of a slave's ethnicity to drive the price of a slave as high as possible.¹⁴ These criticisms are well taken, as some scholars had placed too much trust in ethnic names as positive evidence of a slave's origins; and they may be applicable to the Roman period. However, they are predicated upon the belief that the factors surrounding slave-naming practices during the Roman period were identical to those in Classical Greece, an unlikely assumption, but one which is commonly held. It is worth exploring these factors in the Classical period to see whether the scope for disconnection between an ethnic name and genuine ethnicity was as large in Classical Greece as it may have been in later periods.

Let us first look at the concept of falsifying the ethnicity of a slave to improve his or her market value. The idea that certain races made better slaves than others certainly existed in Classical Athens. The Aristotelian *Oeconomica* (1.5.5) recommended the use of slaves that came from races which were neither too cowardly nor too courageous, which would result in a productive but not disruptive workforce. Quite which races the Peripatetic author of this work means remain unclear, but let us follow the logic of Aristotle, *Politics* 1327b 25–9 (cf. Hippoc. *Aer.* 12.17–24); in this section of the *Politics*, Aristotle describes the qualities of different races as influenced by their geographical location and climate. Northern races, living in colder lands, have an abundance of strength but are short of intelligence, whilst Asians, living in hotter regions, are clever but lack strength and are by nature effeminate and slavish; located between the two are the Greeks, who possess the best balance of characteristics because of their more balanced climate. In the scheme Aristotle proposes, an extremely cowardly race would be located in the extreme south or east, and an extremely courageous race in the extreme north. In terms of the slave supply, it would be surprising to find any great numbers of slaves transported from truly distant regions when closer supplies were plentiful, so the 'problems' implied for our study by [Arist.] *Oec.* 1.5.5 are more apparent

examples. More cautious are Masson (n. 12), Braund and Tssetskhladze (n. 3), Tssetskhladze (n. 5) and P. Fraser 'Ethnics as personal names', in S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (edd.), *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), 149–57.

¹⁴ Braund and Tssetskhladze (n. 3), 119–24.

than real.¹⁵ As for different races commanding different prices, W.K. Pritchett has demonstrated that this was simply not the case in Classical Athens in his study of Attic stelae: 'the average price for slaves from the east (179 ½ drachmas) is almost identical with that (173 drachmas) for northern slaves. It appears that differences in price must be attributed to other factors than nationality.'¹⁶

Although in Rome the *ratio* of a slave had to be stated upon sale, this does not seem to have been important in Classical Greece. A passage in Plato's *Laws* (Pl. *Leg.* 11.916a), closely paralleled by a contemporary inscription from Abdera in Thrace, stipulates that when selling a slave, guarantees should be given against 'latent defects' (sickness, disability), but neither of these examples state that the slave's ethnicity should be indicated or that it even mattered to the buyer.¹⁷ Likewise, in Hyperides' speech *Against Athenogenes* (Hyp. *Ath.* 15) the speaker refers to a law in Athens which demanded the sellers of slaves to state any defects a slave might have; the slave's ethnic origin is not indicated at all, even though mentioning such a clause would be relevant to the speaker's argument about selling property without giving due notice of debts or undesirable qualities. As such, it would seem that in Classical Athens the ethnic origins of a slave were not important in the same way as they were in Rome. In fact, it was seen as desirable to mix slaves of many different nationalities to make communication between them awkward and lessen the chances of revolt.¹⁸ Exceptionally rare slaves such as Ethiopians might have commanded exceptional prices, but this relates to the difficulty in procuring slaves from Africa and the exclusive, exotic nature of such individuals rather than any innate racial qualities (Theophr. *Char.* 21.3). The Athenians wanted to diversify the ethnic composition of their slave holdings to limit cohesion among the slaves, and were not overly concerned about the ethnicity of their slave stock so long as it was free from what they perceived as excessively weak or excessively bellicose peoples. This was aimed at maximizing the profits of slave labour whilst minimizing the risks of resistance; there was little incentive for a slave seller to falsify the ethnicity of his merchandise.

We are left with the possibility that a slave might bear an ethnic reflecting his place of purchase rather than his true origins. This argument faces problems of its own. Firstly, most ethnic names we come across in Attica reflect foreign peoples in a general fashion rather than specific places; Syros, Lydos and Thratta, for example, and names characteristic of foreign peoples.¹⁹ In the passage from Varro cited above, the slave buyers bestow names upon their purchases at the place of

¹⁵ This must be the case, since there is considerable evidence that 'cowardly' peoples such as Phrygians and 'courageous' peoples such as Thracians and Getae were well represented in Attica's slave population. Evidently, the Athenians' conception of extremely cowardly or extremely courageous peoples must lie further afield than these peoples.

¹⁶ W.K. Pritchett, 'The Attic stelai. Part 2', *Hesperia* 25 (1956), 178–317, at 278. The variation of the price of the individual slaves is more likely to be related to their skills.

¹⁷ This inscription is *SEG* 47.1026, dating to sometime before 350 B.C.E. One cannot argue that the lacunose nature of the document rules out such an argument. Lines 5–8 clearly deal with issues of sickness and disability, and a clause on ethnicity makes no sense there; nor is there room for such a clause, as the content of the document switches to animal sales in line 9. It should be noted that the same situation prevailed in the Near East; we possess numerous sale documents from Babylonia and Samaria of this period which contain warranty clauses against undeclared defects in slaves, but ethnicity is never a stipulation.

¹⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1330a25–8; [Arist.] *Oec.* 1.5.6; Pl. *Leg.* 6.777c–d.

¹⁹ See C. Fragiadakis, *Die Attischen Sklavennamen von der spätarachaischen Epoche bis in die römische Kaiserzeit: eine historische und soziologische Untersuchung* (Athens, 1988), 13–25.

sale – in this case, Ephesus. But if we are to believe this to be a complicating factor in the connection between slave ethnics and their true ethnicity, we must believe either (i) that a vast majority of Athenian slave owners bought their slaves from the barbarian periphery at first hand (like Varro's slave buyers), in Thrace, Asia Minor or the Black Sea (an absurd suggestion), or (ii) that having bought a slave from a middleman, an Athenian buyer was content to retain the name bestowed by the middleman rather than name the slave himself (not a particularly strong suggestion either). It makes infinitely more sense to consider these names as bestowed after purchase in Attica and formulated to reflect a slave's (perceived) ethnic origin; Plato (*Cra.* 384d) states quite explicitly that masters would change the names of their slaves. We are left then with a small number of slaves who bear names reflecting cities which lay on the trade routes from barbarian territories.²⁰ Whilst these names may obscure the actual origins of the slave in question, they at least hint at the broader area that slave is likely to have come from, if not the city itself. As we can see, the arguments advanced by Braund and Tsetschladeze for viewing ethnic slave names as poor evidence for ethnicity generally lack force for the period with which we are dealing.²¹

So much for the traditional grounds of objection against ethnic names; there is in fact a case to be made for ethnic slave names reflecting a slave's ethnic origin *in the majority of cases*, which has never before been dwelt upon in detail in discussions of this issue. This argument is based upon comparison with the slave-naming practices of Hellenistic Delphi, known from hundreds of manumission inscriptions, which are far closer spatially, culturally and chronologically to Classical Athens than the Roman practices which normally dominate discussion of this issue. Many of the manumission inscriptions (over 200) contain a 'τὸ γένος' clause following the name of the manumitted slave. For example, in *FD* III 2:237 we find a woman named Ἀντιγόνα, with the qualifying τὸ γένος Θραϊσσα ('Antigona, Thracian by race'). This slave had originated in Thrace, but was evidently brought to Delphi and at some point renamed with the common Greek name Antigona.²² In fact, we find the same name used for a Jew (*SGDI* 1722) and another Thracian woman (*SGDI* 2052). This highlights a central problem in the study of Greek slave names; a foreign ethnic name may indicate genuine foreign ethnicity, but a Greek name as often as not obscures the ethnic origins of that slave and is no evidence whatsoever in itself that the individual in question was Greek.²³ Take the Greek name

²⁰ For example: Πιστύρας in *IG* I³ 1032.136, named after a town in Thrace; Ἐφεσος in *BCH* 59.1 (1935), 453 col.B.I.11.

²¹ Tsetschladeze (n. 5), 309–12 argues that an ethnic name on its own, devoid of the context of slavery, proves little about the bearer's ethnicity; Greeks with foreign guest friends would sometimes bear foreign names. The best example is Olorus, the father of Thucydides the historian (Thuc. 4.104.4), who bore a Thracian name on account of his family's Thracian connections. But this practice obviously has different motivations from slave-naming, and where an individual bearing an ethnic is clearly identified as a slave we must assume that the ethnic was formulated in relation to the ethnicity of the slave in question. For ethnic names among free Greeks, see Fraser (n. 13), 149–57.

²² It is unlikely that this slave was a descendant of Thracian stock born in Greece; such individuals tend to be designated as *oikogenês* in the Delphic manumissions.

²³ As noted by Y. Garlan, 'War, piracy and slavery in the Greek world', in M.I. Finley (ed.), *Classical Slavery* (London, 1987), 7–21, at 12; V.J. Rosivach, 'Enslaving *barbaroi* and the Athenian ideology of slavery', *Historia* 48.2 (1999), 129–57, at 129 n. 3.

Aphrodisia, for example. We have epigraphic evidence for a slave of this name from Boeotia; but it is also borne by slaves from Thrace, Sarmatia and Syria.²⁴

Within this body of inscriptions, however, we also have examples of ethnic names of the type Strabo attests for Attica, paired with their ethnic designation in a 'τὸ γένος' clause. This provides a good testing ground for the problem we have been examining. The legal nature of these documents makes it highly probable that the ethnic designation attached to the slaves' names reflects reality; the slaves in question had in all likelihood served for some time and acquired the Greek tongue, communicating their origins (if known). There is no reason to believe that the stipulated ethnicities are conjured out of thin air. Examples of the first type of ethnic name cited by Strabo (names derived from a people, e.g. Lydos, Syros) show a striking correlation between ethnic names and actual ethnicity. In *SGDI* 2194 we find a *Δαρδάνα τὸ γένος Δαρδάναν*; in *SGDI* 2029 a *Ἰουδαῖον τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖος*; in *SGDI* 1749 and 1750 a *Κύπριος τὸ γένος Κύπριον*; in *SGDI* 2175 a *Λίβυς γένος Λίβυς*; and in *FD III* 2:219 a *Μῆδος Μῆδου τὸ γένος Μῆδον*. A subset of this type of name is one which is based upon a town or area within a larger region; thus we also find (plausibly restored) in *FD III* 3:355 a *Θεσπίας* [τὸ γένος *Βοιωτῶν* (presumably after Thespieae in Boeotia)]. There are representatives also of the second type of ethnic name Strabo cites (typical names from a given region, the ancient equivalent of 'Fritz' or 'Paddy'); so in *SGDI* 2119 we find a slave named *Κότυς* and designated τὸ γένος *Θραίκια*; in *SGDI* 2009 the common Thracian name *Βίθυς* is, unsurprisingly, accompanied by the qualifying τὸ γένος *Θράικια*; and in *SGDI* 1799 we have a *Μιθραδά[τ]ης τὸ γένος Καππάδοκα*. There are also other names which may or may not express such a connection or are generally inconclusive or vague; *SGDI* 1720 (*Ἀλέξανδρος τὸ γένος Μακεδόνα*), *SGDI* 1739 (*Ἄρτεμισία τὸ γένος Ἀσιαγενῆ*), *SGDI* 1718 (*Ἀσία τὸ γένος Σύρον*), *FD III* 3:24 (*Σέλευκος τὸ γένος Σύρον*). In *SGDI* 2184 we find a *Λίβανος τὸ γένος Σύρον* – here we possibly have a connection with the Syrian mountain range of that name, from which the modern region of Lebanon derives its name – but we should perhaps temper our enthusiasm in this case, since in *IG IX*.¹² 624d.4 from Naupactus we find another *Λίβανος*, this slave designated γένος *Ἄραβα*. The same Greek word *libanos* also means 'incense', which was especially associated with Arabia;²⁵ evidently, such vague names, although clearly chosen in relation to the slave's ethnicity, defy a straightforward interpretation.

A degree of elasticity must be expected even with more common names. To give one example, the name Manes, which Strabo claimed was a common Phrygian name, is found in *SGDI* 1696 in relation to a Paphlagonian (*Μάνης τὸ γένος Παφλαγόνα*).²⁶ These regions are neighbouring ones, but this example highlights a pertinent factor; names sometimes transcend political and cultural boundaries, and can be 'indigenous' in several regions at once. The name Manes may be particularly associated with Phrygia, but it can be found in inscriptions from all over Asia Minor.²⁷ As such, when we find a slave named Manes in our sources we must

²⁴ *SGDI* 2226, *IG IX*.¹² 624c.6, *SGDI* 2274 and *FD III* 3:47, *SGDI* 1945 and 1717, *FD III* 3:140.

²⁵ Incense was, however, also a characteristic export of Syria; see Hermippus, fr. 63 KA.

²⁶ This does not mean Strabo thought it to be solely a Phrygian name; according to Str. 12.3.25, it was also common in Paphlagonia. Strabo rather implies that it was considered a stereotypically Phrygian name by the Athenians.

²⁷ See L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague, 1964), §§858.1–3.

admit that, although this name was considered typically Phrygian by the Athenians, a minority of such individuals may have come from neighbouring regions, and in such cases a new master might retain the original name of his slave rather than choose to rename him or her. Slaves bearing names such as *Μηνᾶς*, *Μηνιαῖς*, and derivatives of this sort also further demonstrate this point. Zgusta has shown such names to have been common in Anatolia.²⁸ In cases where we find slaves of this name we may therefore have only the broadest conception of their place of origin. In one example, a slave's name is downright misleading: *SGDI* 1797 gives a slave named *Καρίας* with the designation τὸ γένος Ἐλυμαίαν, which is the Greek term for the region of southern Iran generally known as Elam, although judging from her name one could be forgiven for thinking she came from Caria. However, it is striking that despite this caveat, ethnic names are generally a reliable indication of slaves' origins.

It might be objected that evidence from Hellenistic Delphi cannot be applied directly to Classical Attica. However, the meagre material we possess from Attica is entirely consistent with the close link we have observed between ethnic names and ethnic origins in the Delphic manumission inscriptions. In *IG* I³ 427.8–9 we find a slave named *Καρῖον* and designated τὸ γένος Κάρ. Likewise, several Thracian ethnic names are mirrored by specific ethnic designations: in *IG* II² 8927 we have a *Φιλόνομος Βίθυος Θράκιξ*; and in *IG* II² 9288 and *IG* II² 9289 we find two Thracians described as coming from Maroneia in Thrace. Similarly, the woodcutter *Μάννης* from *IG* I³ 1361 is explicitly described as a Phrygian. There is nothing to suggest that ethnic names were bestowed without a thought to the ethnicity of the individuals concerned. M.I. Finley called into question the widespread scepticism regarding the evidence of ethnic slave names, which he considered to be a mistake. The evidence we have seen suggests that he was right to do so.²⁹

If we draw together the strands of these arguments, we will arrive at a better appreciation of the value of ethnic slave names as evidence. As we have seen, the main grounds for supposing a lack of connection between an ethnic slave name and genuine ethnicity are based upon Roman practices which are not particularly relevant to our period. The evidence of the Delphic manumissions suggests that it was normal for an ethnic slave name to mirror the ethnicity of its bearer, although this was not the case in every circumstance. On the other hand, we have seen how certain names are vague and can only indicate a slave's origins in a very broad sense; much of the terminology used for non-Greek peoples too was broad and unsophisticated, so we cannot expect to recover fine-grained details on the precise geographical origins of slaves. How should we interpret our evidence from Classical Attica in the light of these findings? I would suggest that in individual circumstances, an ethnic slave name does not constitute solid proof of a slave's ethnicity; however, if large numbers of, say, Thracian or Phrygian ethnic names exist (as is the case in Attica), we may be confident that since it was probably normal for an ethnic name to indicate broadly a slave's ethnicity, there will be a close correlation between ethnic trends in large samples of slave names and the ethnicity of the slaves therein.

²⁸ See Zgusta (n. 27), §910. Cf. *SGDI* 1906: *Μηνᾶς τὸ γένος Βειθυνόν*; and from Naupactus *IG* IX.1² 640a: *Μηνιαῖς τὸ γένος Φρυγίαν*.

²⁹ Finley (n. 1 [1981]), 172. I do not understand why Rosivach (n. 23), at 155 n. 102 should consider it likely that Athenian masters might commonly name their slave 'Lydos' or something of this sort with no connection whatsoever to their origins.

II. BARBARIAN SLAVES IN ATTICA

The ethnic character of Attica's slave population is attested by evidence from a number of genres. I have chosen to split this body of evidence into two: firstly, we shall look at the literary evidence, found in comedy, tragedy, forensic oratory, philosophy and the glosses of later scholars and lexicographers. This evidence provides us with very few instances of actual barbarian slaves known to have lived in Attica, but it is a rich mine of general statements and ideological presentations of barbarian slaves which is essential to our understanding of the slave population's ethnic texture. Comedy itself is particularly valuable, as it caricatures everyday Athenian life, slavery included. Secondly, our knowledge of this issue is greatly enriched by epigraphic evidence; this provides us with a number of samples and sub-genres of evidence which, when combined with the literary sources, allow us to refine our understanding of the many ethnic groups that dwelt as slaves in Attica. One note of caution: what I do not propose to produce are 'statistics' for the various ethnic groups, which is far beyond the potential of our evidence.³⁰ What can be demonstrated, however, is that certain groups are repeatedly referred to as common in literary generalizations, groups whose significance is mirrored by substantial representation in the epigraphic record.

It is a commonplace that names such as 'Thratra' (which basically means 'female Thracian') were synonyms for 'slave' in classical Athens.³¹ It is perhaps less well known that a number of ethnic groups from Asia Minor and the Levant could also be called up as typical examples of Athenian slave stock. For instance, the Phrygian ethnic Manes is used by the comic poet Pherecrates as a synonym for slave in the *Agrioi* (fr. 10.1 KA) when he speaks of the distant past, when no one had a Manes to serve them, and women had to rise earlier to begin the housework (cf. *Ar. Av.* 523). In fact, the name Manes was used in precisely the same fashion by Apollodorus in the fourth century and clearly conjured up the same connotations; complaining of ill-treatment by a former slave, he throws the names Manes and Syros to the courtroom as run-of-the-mill slave names in making a rhetorical point (*Dem.* [45.86]). In the drinking game *kottabos*, part of the stand which wine dregs were hurled at incorporated a small figure named Manes, which Antiphanes (fr. 57 KA) tells us represented a typical slave in attendance. Even Euripides could refer to Phrygian and Lydian slaves in a similar, offhand manner (*Eur. Alc.* 675); and in a fascinating list of the characteristic products of various foreign regions, Hermippus (fr. 63 KA) awarded Phrygia pride of place as the exporter of slaves par excellence.³²

³⁰ I therefore do not follow the approach of Miller (n. 10), 82–3, who tabulates the testimony for different ethnic groups of slaves in fifth-century Attica but takes no account of the different genres of evidence employed; the temptation to consider this table as a set of statistics is easy to fall into, e.g. DeVries (n. 10), 340. Her citations of Hermippus, *Moiroi* fr. 48.7 KA (= *Ath.* 15.668a) and Nicochares, *Lakones* fr. 10M KA (= *Ath.* 15.667e) refer to the bronze *Manes* in the drinking game *kottabos*, not to actual slaves named Manes.

³¹ e.g. Finley (n. 1 [1981]), 169, Cartledge (n. 9), 154, B. Robertson, 'The slave names of *IG* I³ 1032 and the ideology of slavery at Athens', in C. Cooper (ed.), *Epigraphy and the Greek Historian* (Toronto, 2008), 79–116, at 86.

³² Hermippus' mention of the Thessalian port of Pagasae is also noteworthy; well situated on the trading routes from the north Aegean and Thrace, it may have contributed to the notion in Aristophanes' *Wealth* that slave traders were characteristically from Thessaly (*Ar. Plut.* 519–21).

The region of Paphlagonia, bordering the southern Black Sea littoral, was another well-known source of slaves. Like Manes, the Paphlagonian ethnic Tibeios was considered a standard slave name; the typical shameless man, Theophrastus tells us, salts the meat from a sacrifice and visits the house of a friend with his slave in tow, inviting the slave to share the food paid for by another, saying 'enjoy your meal, Tibeios' (Theophr. *Char.* 9.3). And it is a Paphlagonian slave that Aristophanes chooses to represent Cleon in the *Knights*, although this was clearly related to the verb *παφλάζω*, to boil or splutter, which recalled Cleon's tendency to rant in the assembly and courts. Caria was another major slave source in Asia Minor; the ethnic name *Καρίων* is found in comedy, and is common as well in inscriptions.³³ In his explanation of the Attic phrase 'away with you, Carians! It is no longer Anthesteria', Photius notes the 'multitude of Carian slaves' (*πλήθος οϊκετῶν Καρικῶν*; Phot. s.v. *Θύραζε Κᾶρες*); in other words, the sheer number of Carian slaves at Athens had become proverbial.³⁴ Whilst Phrygia, Caria and Paphlagonia were the most important suppliers of slaves from Asia Minor, Lydia and Cilicia are also attested as slave sources for the Greeks; Syria seems to have been extremely important in this regard too, as comedy and epigraphy amply demonstrate.³⁵ It is no wonder that Xenophon (*Vect.* 2.3) could describe the metic population (which included many freed slaves) as full of Lydians, Phrygians, Syrians and all other types of barbarians.

General comments aside, the picture of Athenian slavery we find in comedy from the fifth and fourth centuries supports the notion of a multi-ethnic slave population in which Near Eastern slaves were just as common as slaves from Thrace and the north.³⁶ Of course, the most notable barbarian slave in all Greek comedy is the hapless Scythian archer from Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, whose licentiousness and appalling accent are the butt of numerous jokes (Ar. *Thesm.* 1001–1225). There are many other slaves from Scythia and Thrace in Aristophanes' plays; Scythian archers can also be found in *Lysistrata* (e.g. *Lys.* 445–51), and again as the police force of Hades in *Frogs* (*Ran.* 608); Thracian maidservants are alluded to on several occasions: in *Acharnians*, when Diceaeopolis dreams of capturing his neighbour Strymodorus' slave Thratta pilfering wood and raping her, as he was legally entitled to do (*Ach.* 273; cf. [Dem.] 53.16³⁷); in *Thesmophoriazusae*, when an elderly relative of Euripides, tottering along in full drag, calls out to an imaginary maidservant named Thratta for assistance (*Thesm.* 279–94; cf. *Lysistrata*'s handmaiden Scythaena in Ar. *Lys.* 184); in *Peace*, when the chorus sing of making

³³ In Pl. *La.* 187b (cf. *Euthyd.* 285c) the philosopher advises trying out educational experiments upon a Carian slave rather than upon one's own children. A scholion on this passage tells us that the name *Καρίων*, which is a diminutive, was derived etymologically from the reference to short Carian mercenaries (*ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ τοὺς μικροὺς στρατιώτας τινας Καρίωνας προσσηρόρευον*); allegedly, Thracians and Carians were peoples that the early Greeks (*οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων*) made slaves.

³⁴ S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford, 1982), 9.

³⁵ See Fragiadakis (n. 19), 13–25 and, for Near Eastern slaves at Chios, L. Robert, *Études Épigraphiques et Philologiques* (Paris, 1938), 118–26. For a more accessible list of Attic slaves see M.J. Osborne and S.G. Byrne, *The Foreign Residents of Athens. An Annex to the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names: Attica* (Leuven, 1996), 323–62.

³⁶ For barbarian slaves in comedy, see V. Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy* (Oxford, 1951), 165–91; T. Long, *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Carbondale, IL, 1986), 108–25; Wiles (n. 12), 53–67.

³⁷ See E.M. Harris, *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 2006), 275, 329.

sly advances upon a maidservant named Thratta while their wives are in the bath (*Pax* 1138); and in *Wasps*, when Bdelycleon claims that Thratta, a domestic slave, has burnt the soup she was preparing (*Vesp.* 828). Xanthias, a slave from the same household (e.g. *Vesp.* 54–74), may also come from the north if, as Ehrenberg believes, his name was chosen in relation to his red hair.³⁸

However, slaves from the Near East are also commonplace in Aristophanes' plays. We have already noted the Paphlagonian slave from the *Knights* who was a thinly disguised representation of Cleon. In the *Wasps*, two slaves from the household of Philocleon and Bdelycleon bear Phrygian ethnics, Midas and Phryx (*Ar. Vesp.* 433); the Phrygian ethnic Manodorus appears in *Birds* 656–7, and the name Manes appears in *Lysistrata* 1211 (with the female variant Mania in *Frogs* 1345³⁹). In *Peace* 1146 the chorus instructs a female slave named Syra to go into the fields to fetch Manes to help in the preparation of a feast; but the biggest part played by any Near Eastern slave in Aristophanes' works is that of Carion in *Wealth*, who his master calls his most trusted and most thievish slave (*Ar. Plut.* 26–7).⁴⁰ Fragments of other comic poets reinforce this picture; Timocles (fr. 7 KA) compares a politician to newly purchased Syrian slaves, and Antiphanes (fr. 166 KA) relates the tale of a Syrian slave who, with his sister, was brought to Athens as a child by a merchant.

In Menander's plays, many slaves bear foreign ethnics.⁴¹ Slaves from the north often bear the name Getas, which denoted a Thracian tribe living near the mouth of the Danube renowned for its courage. In the *Aspis* (238–45) a Phrygian slave is reprimanded by a Thracian waiter for his cowardice and lack of initiative; Thracians, he tells him, especially Getans, are much less timid.⁴² Slaves named Getas are found in several plays: *Dyskolos* (182), *Misoumenos* (216–21), *Heros* (1–5) and *Perinthia* (1–4). The recipient of the Thracian waiter's diatribe is called Daos, a name which Strabo mistakenly identified with the Dacians but which was instead in the fourth century a stock name for Phrygians.⁴³ This name is extremely common in Menander's comedies; slaves named Daos are found in *Dyskolos* (206–11), *Epitrepontes* (217–23), *Aspis* (206), *Perikeiromene* (261–6), *Heros* (1–5), *Georgos* (35–40), *Kolax* (65–70) and *Perinthia* (13–15). Slaves with names that suggest other Near Eastern origins are also represented in Menander's works; Syrians can be seen in the names Syros (*Dys.* 959;⁴⁴ *Dis Exapaton* 58; *Phasm.* 71; *Georg.* 39), Syriskos (*Epit.* 294–352) and Syra (*Misoumenos* – *P.Oxy.* 4408); Sangarios in *Heros* (in the cast list preserved for the play but not attested in surviving fragments) is a Bithynian ethnic;⁴⁵ and we also may find a Carion

³⁸ Ehrenberg (n. 36), 172–3. Cf. Hdt. 4.108; Hsch. s.v. Σκυθικός: Κρατίνος σκυθικὸν ἔφη τὸν Ἰππόνικον διὰ τὸ πυρρὸν εἶναι.

³⁹ For this name see also Ath. 13.578b–c, quoting Machon. This passage discusses the name Mania and its Phrygian connotations, as well as its similarity to the Greek word for madness.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Ar. Av.* 764, where Aristophanes makes fun of Exceestides, a Carian freedman in the audience.

⁴¹ See Wiles (n. 12), 53–67. In what follows I cite lines in which slaves bearing ethnic names appear, but do not attempt to reference their representation in Menander's works exhaustively; references are to F.H. Sandbach (ed.), *Menandri reliquiae selectae* (Oxford, 1972).

⁴² Cf. Menander fr. 877 KA; *Ar. Av.* 1244.

⁴³ See n. 12 above.

⁴⁴ I refer here to Arnott's Loeb edition, reading the vocative Σύρε as opposed to Sandbach, who reads σύ γε.

⁴⁵ Lambertz (n. 13), at 15 n. 24.

in *Epitrepontes* (fr.1), a Lydos in *Dis Exapaton* (13), a Tibeios in both *Perinthia* (3) and *Heros* (21), and a group of Lycian slaves in the *Aspis* (34–9). As this evidence clearly demonstrates, Near Eastern slaves command a weighty presence in the comedies of the Classical period; since this genre caricatures everyday Athenian life, we may expect the picture of barbarian slaves it presents to correspond to reality. As we shall see, evidence from inscriptions very much confirms the correlation we may conjecture on the basis of classical comedy.

III. NEAR EASTERN SLAVES IN EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES

Epigraphic evidence allows us to refine the picture we have seen from the general comments of literary sources and from comedy by providing us with a number of samples and epigraphic sub-genres (such as grave inscriptions) which contain a large number of ethnic names. I do not propose to ‘calculate’ the ethnic proportions from the aggregate of our epigraphic evidence; rather, we shall look at the proportions of ethnicities within each separate sample. In this way we may be sure that ethnic groups which are repeatedly well represented from sample to sample were well represented in the slave population in general, and avoid the dangers of scaling up a single sample which may, from the haphazard process of preservation, show uncharacteristically large numbers of one ethnic group.⁴⁶ An appendix at the end of this essay gives full references to the slave ethnics in three of our largest samples: the ‘Attic stelae’ (*IG I³ 421–30*); the slaves from fourth-century Laureum; and the naval list *IG I³ 1032*.

The ‘Attic stelae’ (*IG I³ 421–30*) are the records of the sale of property confiscated from a number of individuals following the scandal of the Herms in 415 B.C.E.⁴⁷ These documents are the best known body of epigraphic evidence relating to foreign slaves in Classical Attica, but it is important to point out that the proportion of northern to eastern slaves in the stelae cannot simply be considered a microcosm of the Attic slave population as a whole, to be scaled up at will by the inquisitive social historian; we must compare the proportions in our other samples as well. Of the forty-five slaves in these inscriptions, eleven have names that give no hint of the slaves’ ethnicity or are otherwise unintelligible. Of the remaining thirty-four, who either bear specific ethnic designations or ethnic names, nineteen, or 56% of those bearing ethnics, are northerners, whilst thirteen, or 36%, come from the east. Two seem to be Greek.⁴⁸

The most fruitful document from the Classical period in terms of its yield of ethnic slave names is the naval inscription *IG I³ 1032* (= *IG II² 1951*), and here the northern/eastern ratio tips in the opposite direction. There are a number of interpretations regarding the historical context of this inscription, but most scholars would place it in either the last quarter of the fifth century or the first quarter

⁴⁶ I have deliberately avoided considering the *phiale* inscriptions (*IG II² 1553–78*) as evidence for slave ethnicity; they are not records of manumissions, but rather record *aprostasiou* trials involving metics (with some ex-slaves no doubt among them); see E.A. Meyer, *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-Inscriptions. A Study in Athenian Epigraphy and Law* (forthcoming in *Historia Einzelschriften*).

⁴⁷ See W.K. Pritchett, ‘The Attic stelai. Part 1’, *Hesperia* 22 (1953), 225–99 and ‘The Attic stelai. Part 2’ (for which, see n. 16 above).

⁴⁸ See table 1 in the Appendix, below.

of the fourth century B.C.E.⁴⁹ The inscription itself is a long list of names recording the crews of perhaps eight triremes; metics are named along with their deme of residence, foreign Greeks with their *polis* name, citizens with a demotic, and slaves with their owner's name in the genitive case. The legible names of 146 slaves are preserved in this document, and of these 45 bear ethnic names. Many of those slaves who do not bear ethnic names may well be foreign, but we cannot say anything more definite regarding them. Nevertheless, the proportions within the foreign ethnics make interesting reading: there are only three individuals with names hinting at Greek ethnicity; eleven individuals, or 24% of the slaves bearing ethnics, come from the north and Black Sea regions, but thirty-one of the individuals, or 69% of those bearing ethnics, come from Asia Minor and the Near East. The largest ethnic groups are Thracians, Phrygians, Syrians and Carians.⁵⁰

Epigraphy also sheds light on the labour which slaves in Attica were compelled to perform. For our purposes, the Erechtheum building records (*IG* I³ 474–6) provide scanty information with regard to ethnicity. Of the twenty slaves whose names we possess, only two bear ethnic names. Nevertheless, both names hint at Near Eastern origins; Carion (Carian) and Croesus (Lydian).⁵¹ Whilst a relatively small proportion of Attica's slaves worked on grand building projects, an enormous number – perhaps even 35,000 by 340 B.C.E. – worked in the mining region of southern Attica. They, too, have left an epigraphic footprint. In his study of the Attic slave miners, Siegfried Lauffer has analysed a number of inscriptions, including tombstones, which have been judged because of context to relate to mining slaves from the Laureum region. The stones exhibit a wider range of names than those we have dealt with so far, and many of the names are Greek names; but as we have seen, this is not proof that they were borne by Greeks. Yet a number of the names are foreign names or foreign-style ethnics, and the vast majority of these relate to Asia Minor and the Near East; some seventeen out of twenty-one ethnic-bearing individuals, or 81%.⁵² Lauffer concludes that the majority of the mining slaves 'aus Kleinasien und aus anderen östlichen Gebieten kamen, verhältnismäßig zahlreich aus Ländern mit eigenem Bergbau wie Thrakien und Paphlagonien'.⁵³

We must also take into account the gravestones of non-Greeks collected by Balbina Bäbler. Whilst many of the foreigners whose gravestones are catalogued in her collection will have been slaves or ex-slaves, others were no doubt metics who had no connection to slavery; explicit evidence that a gravestone belongs to either group is not always present, so we must be cautious here.⁵⁴ What her collection shows are the graves of the barbarian population of Attica, which was

⁴⁹ For this document, see Robertson (n. 31), 79–116.

⁵⁰ See table 2 in the Appendix.

⁵¹ See L. Schumacher, *Sklaverei in der Antike: Alltag und Schicksal der Unfreien* (Munich, 2001), 134–5. A similarly low yield can be found in the badly damaged early fifth-century document *IG* I³ 1037. From this list of slaves the ethnicity of two individuals is clear: *Φρυγία* and -----ε *Θράκη*[τα]. Cf. *SEG* 35.134, possibly a list of slaves (or perhaps metics) from after 350 B.C.E. incised on the bottom of a plate. A. Johnston, 'A fourth-century graffito from the Keramaikos', *MDAI(A)* 100 (1985), 293–307 considers the abbreviated names on the list; ethnics seem to indicate a Jew, a Thracian, a possible Celt, a Colchian, a Macedonian, an Anatolian and a Persian.

⁵² See table 3 in the Appendix.

⁵³ S. Lauffer, *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*² (Mainz, 1979), 140.

⁵⁴ As Bäbler (n. 10) herself notes (p. 2): 'Eine Schwierigkeit der Interpretation bildet die Abgrenzung von Sklaven und freien Barbaren. Ein Sklave wurde natürlich fast nie als solcher bezeichnet; Stelen, deren Inschrift aus einem einzigen Namen ohne Patronymikon, Ethnikon oder

not commensurate with the barbarian slave population. Nevertheless, this evidence should be seen in comparison to the epigraphic evidence we have examined so far in order that similarities and differences might be discerned. Her catalogue covers 146 monuments set up for foreigners as well as for nurses and pedagogues, of which eighty-four, or 58%, were set up for individuals surmised to come from Asia Minor and the Near East; whereas only thirty-four monuments, or 23%, were set up for northerners (Thracians, Scythians). Notable also are the eight monuments for Egyptians and ten for Persians, peoples who are difficult to find amongst our literary and epigraphic sources which explicitly mention slaves; these monuments are more likely to have been made for metics. The gravestones of foreigners are a useful check upon the impression built up so far from literary and epigraphic sources of the ethnic groups in the slave population, but the lack of detail regarding the status of the individuals attested limits their use as evidence for the ethnicity of slaves.

Finally, it is worth examining one last epigraphic sample which is relevant to our discussion, this time not from Athens, but from Chios. It consists of two inscriptions judged by Louis Robert to belong to the same historical context and to date from the last quarter of the fifth century B.C.E., and because of the nomenclature 'une seul chose est assurée, c'est qu'ils sont composés d'esclaves.'⁵⁵ Of the twenty-six legible names in the first inscription, ten seem to be ethnics, all reflecting Asian origins: Tibeios, two individuals named Syros, Kilikias, Artymes (Lydian?⁵⁶), Paphlagon[i]des, Ephesos, Tyrgastos (Paphlagonian⁵⁷), Phryx and Midas (Phrygian). The less intact second inscription yields a further three ethnic names if Robert's restorations are correct: two individuals named Tibeios, and a further individual named Artymes.⁵⁸

Let us summarize our study of the literary and epigraphic sources. On the one hand, we must be careful not to place too much weight on this evidence; for a two-century long period, our sources are somewhat limited. There is almost no evidence for the first two-thirds of the fifth century, and what else we possess consists of general comments and occasional random samples. Furthermore, common sense dictates that the flow of slaves from abroad must have fluctuated according to demand, to the influences of warfare, to internal conditions in the regions that supplied slaves, and to other variables which it is impossible to quantify; it would be unsafe to suppose that the proportions of ethnic groups in the slave population remained stable throughout the Classical period. On the other hand, what evidence we do have shows some degree of consistency in the ethnic groups most commonly attested. Thracians may well be the largest single ethnic group. However, other 'northern' groups are less well attested in the epigraphic samples, whereas several Near Eastern peoples are consistently present in large numbers. Phrygians,

sonst einer Angabe zu Herkunft oder sozialem Stand besteht, bilden daher in dieser Hinsicht ein unlösbares Problem.'

⁵⁵ The individual inscriptions are *BCH* 59.1 (1935), 453–9 and *AD* 11 (1927–8), 1930 *παρ.* P. 25, n.3. Texts and restorations of both in Robert (n. 35), 118–22.

⁵⁶ See Zgusta (n. 27), § 108–5.

⁵⁷ Argued by Robert (n. 35), 119–21.

⁵⁸ The predominance of eastern ethnics may betray an obvious logic; with centres of the slave trade such as Ephesus and Sardis nearby, it made little sense to go to the bother of importing slaves all the way from Scythia or Thrace when perfectly good slaves were plentiful on the Chians' doorstep.

followed by Carians and Syrians, are the most common in the inscriptions.⁵⁹ Be this as it may, if we look at the barbarian slave population in terms of 'northerners' and 'easterners', there seem to be no solid grounds for determining which was of greater numerical significance; if anything, Near Easterners more than northerners tend to dominate the epigraphic samples. Let us put this into the context of the slave trade as a whole. In Attica alone during the Classical period there was a slave population of perhaps 100–150,000 at its height.⁶⁰ If a substantial segment of this population came from territories within the Persian Empire, this points to a trade of considerable proportions. That is for one single *polis* (albeit a very large one); if we add Chios, Aegina and Corinth to the equation, not to mention the other Greek cities with an interest in buying slaves from the Near East, we are looking at an operation on an impressive scale, and one that continued beyond the Classical period, as the large numbers of easterners in the Delphic manumission inscriptions amply demonstrate. It would be easy simply to look at the destinations of these slaves and ignore their origins, but that would only show half the picture. As such, it is important to see how this trade fits in to a larger world incorporating the Near East.

IV. SLAVERY IN THE PERSIAN EMPIRE DURING THE CLASSICAL PERIOD⁶¹

Historians of slavery in the classical world have traditionally believed that slavery was relatively unimportant in the Near East; it was in Archaic Greece, the argument goes, that the first steps were taken to incorporate slave labour into social and economic life to the extent that we can begin to speak of a 'slave society'. The most famous advocate of this view was M.I. Finley, who wrote the following:

The pre-Greek world – the world of the Sumerians, Babylonians, Egyptians, and Assyrians; and I cannot refrain from adding the Myceneans – was, in a very profound sense, a world without free men, in the sense which the west has come to understand the concept. It

⁵⁹ Tsatskheladze (n. 3 [1990]), 158 came to much the same conclusion: 'Thrakien, danach Kleinasien und Syrien nahmen eine Schlüsselposition im Sklavenexport in der Antike ein.' Velkov (n. 2 [1967]), 78 gives similar comments regarding the Delphic manumissions: 'Thracians were the most numerous amongst slaves from the northern Balkan area. However, in quantity there were approximately as many slaves from the region of Asia Minor and other parts of the Middle East (Syrians, Carians, Jews and so on).'

⁶⁰ Historians seldom agree upon figures; Finley (n. 1 [1981]), 102 opts for a rather low estimate (60–80,000 at its peak); Cartledge (n. 9), 150 believes the figure to be closer to 100,000, whilst S. Isager and M.H. Hansen, *Aspects of Athenian Society in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Odense, 1975), 17 believe the figure to be closer to 150,000. Good brief accounts of the debate can be found in N. Fisher, *Slavery in Classical Greece* (London, 1993), 34–6 and in Isager and Hansen (this note), 11–19.

⁶¹ In what follows, I give a brief overview of some of the issues which will be tackled in a much larger project examining Greek slavery in comparison with slavery in the Near East. I hope to devote much more attention to some of the problems discussed here in this larger study. In using the term 'Near East' I do not mean to imply that there ever existed a uniform 'Near Eastern' or 'Oriental' form of slavery; rather, the term is used here in a general sense to denote regions within the Persian Empire.

was equally a world in which chattel slavery played no role of any consequence. That, too, was a Greek discovery.⁶²

These arguments have never been supported by a systematic and thorough examination of the Near Eastern sources, and have not convinced specialists in the field of Near Eastern studies; in fact, if the research into slavery carried out by historians of Israel, Babylonia and Persia in the last fifty years has taught us anything, it is that classical historians have repeatedly underestimated the Near East in this respect, and have been too content to see the emergence of a 'slave society' as the darker side of the 'Greek miracle.'⁶³ Yet in the early 1960s Roland de Vaux had already argued that slavery played an important role in ancient Israel; the society among which the early scriptures were composed and circulated could find it credible that Gideon might take ten of his own slaves to demolish a sanctuary of Baal (Judges 6:27), or that a steward of Saul might own twenty slaves (2 Samuel 9:10); in Proverbs 31:10–31 the qualities of an ideal housewife are set out, which centre upon the ability to manage a household, including ordering the slaves to perform their various tasks.⁶⁴ And recently, Catherine Hezser has demonstrated that slave labour was the key ingredient in elite wealth as pictured in the stories of the early patriarchs, which reveals that the Israelites as well as the Greeks perceived a connection between large slaveholdings and wealth.⁶⁵

Most significant for our purposes, however, is the enormous study of Babylonian slavery by Muhammad Dandamaev, which has not only raised numerous objections to viewing 'classical' and 'oriental' slavery as qualitatively different, but has also demonstrated the importance of slavery in Babylonian social and economic life during the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods. Dandamaev estimated that slaves may have constituted between a quarter and a third of the population of Babylonia under the Persian Empire; in terms of its social location, many households owned a few slaves, with wealthier families owning dozens and sometimes hundreds, and the Royal household owning considerably more.⁶⁶ Slavery was important elsewhere in the Persian Empire. In Asia Minor, slave ownership was not merely restricted to the Greek cities of the coast; for instance, Herodotus tells us of Atys, the richest man in Asia (besides the king of Persia), who was apparently willing to give up the vast majority of his riches to finance Xerxes' invasion of Greece and to live out the rest of his days on his estates, from wealth generated by his slaves and

⁶² Finley (n. 1 [1981]), 114–15, also 120–1, 162. Finley's opinions of the lack of freedom and insignificance of slavery in the Near East continue to influence recent work; see K.A. Raaflaub, *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, 2004), 4, 17, 253–4. For a survey of older opinions such as these and a lengthy refutation, see M.A. Dandamaev, *Slavery in Babylonia. From Nabolpolassar to Alexander the Great (626–331 BC)* (Dekalb, 1984), 67–80. For the concept of freedom in the Near East, see D.C. Snell, *Flight and Freedom in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 2001).

⁶³ e.g. T. Rihl, 'The origins and establishment of Greek slavery', in M. Bush (ed.), *Serfdom and Slavery. Studies in Legal Bondage* (London, 1996), 89–111.

⁶⁴ R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel. Its Life and Institutions* (London, 1961), 80–90. The exiles returning from Babylonia following the Persian conquest of Babylon brought thousands of slaves back with them; see Ezra 2:68–70 and Nehemiah 7:66–72 with Dandamaev (n. 62), 218.

⁶⁵ C. Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity* (Oxford, 2005), 285–90. For slaves in fourth-century Palestine, see D. Gropp et al., *Wadi Daliyeh II. The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh*; M. Bernstein et al., *Qumran Cave 4. Miscellanea, Part 2* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 28) (Oxford 2001).

⁶⁶ Dandamaev (n. 62), 215–18; 558–84 for royal slaves.

flocks (Hdt. 7.27–8). Eumenes of Cardia seized a number of similar estates in Phrygia, full of slaves and flocks, in the fourth century (Plu. *Eum.*8.5); but our best evidence for slaveholding of this sort comes from a story told by Xenophon (*An.* 7.8.9–23). Seizing an opportunity for apparently easy plunder, Xenophon and a number of mercenaries raided the estate of a wealthy Persian named Asidates in northern Lydia, but found the venture more difficult than they had originally envisaged; the slaves who worked Asidates' lands mostly got away, but some 200 were captured by the Greek soldiers. An estate of 200 slaves would be enormous by Greek standards, and Xenophon's account makes clear that this was only a portion of Asidates' holdings (Asidates, we may mention, was not even exceptionally wealthy by Persian standards).⁶⁷

We do possess evidence which sheds light on the holdings of just such a noble, Aršam the satrap of Egypt, from a number of letters dating to the fifth century, and it is clear that slavery was the predominant form of labour on his lands. Many of these letters are addressed to subordinates who had been appointed to administer his estates, and the supply of slave labour is an important theme; in one letter, Aršam orders an officer to acquire more workers for his estates and brand them with his own mark, since many of his slaves had fled during the chaos of a revolt. Aršam also owned estates in Syria and Babylonia in addition to his Egyptian holdings.⁶⁸ Moving even further up the social scale, it has been argued that the enormous 'royal economy' of Achaemenid Iran, known from the Persepolis fortification archive, was driven by work gangs which were substantially (if not entirely) composed of slaves, many of them foreigners; Xenophon and the Ten Thousand came across such holdings in Babylonia: several villages owned by the king's mother Parysatis, full of slaves (*Xen. An.* 2.4.27, cf. *An.* 2.3.17).⁶⁹ It was from holdings such as these that the Persian king could make lavish gifts; for example, on an ambassadorial visit to the Persian court, Pelopidas was given

⁶⁷ Plato (*Resp.* 9.578d–e.) thought owning fifty slaves to be the mark of a very wealthy person, and this seems to reflect the normative upper limit of slave holdings described in the Attic orators, e.g. *Dem.* 27.9 (Demosthenes' father owns 32–3 slaves and holds 20 as security for a loan, although technically he did not own the latter), *Dem.* 37.4 (Pantaenetos owns 30 slaves), *Lys.* 12.19 (Lysias and Polemarchus co-own 120 slaves). For Asidates, see N. Sekunda 'Achaemenid colonization in Lydia', *REA* 87 (1985), 7–29.

⁶⁸ G.R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1957), 29–30. See also M.A. Dandamaev, 'Foreign slaves on the estates of the Achaemenid Kings and their nobles', in B.G. Gafurova (ed.), *Proceedings of the 25th Congress of Orientalists, Moscow 1960* (Moscow, 1963), 147–54.

⁶⁹ P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, IL, 2002), 433–9; Dandamaev (n. 68) and id., 'Forced labour in the palace economy in Achaemenid Iran', *Altorientalische Forschungen* 2 (1975), 71–8; see also M.A. Dandamaev and V.G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran* (Cambridge, 1989), 152–77. For foreigners among the work gangs, see A. Uchitel, 'Foreign workers in the Fortification archive', in L. Meyer (ed.), *Mésopotamie et Élam. Actes de la XXXVe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Gent, 1991), 127–35. In relation to the Greeks in these work gangs, the late Professor Lewis comments: 'There are men in our texts who are simply called Yauñā. No one that I know of has spoken against the obvious view that this is not a true proper name, that the persons concerned are Greeks, known by their ethnics instead of their strange and no doubt unpronounceable names, just as the Greeks habitually called slaves Skythes or Kar.' See D.M. Lewis, 'Persians in Herodotus', in A.E. Raubitschek (ed.), *The Greek Historians. Literature and History* (Stanford, 1985), 101–17, at 107. I would like to thank Donald Murray for drawing my attention to this essay.

not only many material goods, but a bed complete with slaves to make it up, as well as 80 cows with their slave herdsmen (Plu. *Pel.* 30.6).

A complete picture of slavery within the Persian Empire is beyond the scope of this essay, but I hope that the evidence cited above is enough to demonstrate that the demand for slaves was not confined to the Greek world, but was spread over a much broader geographical area. This basic fact has substantial implications for our picture of the 'shape' of the Greek slave trade. Yvon Garlan, for instance, saw the Greek world as a 'dynamic centre' of demand, drawing slaves from barbarian regions to Greece as a result of military hegemony.⁷⁰ In such a picture the flow of slaves is monodirectional, beginning at the barbarian periphery and ending in Greece. In the final section of this essay, I wish to demonstrate that such a view oversimplifies the slave trade of the Classical period. Not only was the supply of slaves to Greece and the Near East intertwined, but both areas could draw upon slaves from the same regions. To study the trade of slaves we must be aware of how and where slaves were 'created' (via 'mechanisms of enslavement'), as well as the regions to which slaves were transported by merchants.

V. MECHANISMS OF ENSLAVEMENT AND THE SLAVE TRADE WITH THE NEAR EAST

The initial enslavement of individuals was the result of a number of mechanisms of enslavement: war, piracy, brigandage, enslavement by judicial condemnation, enslavement for debt or self-sale due to poverty, the sale of infants and child abandonment, and the natural reproduction of a slave population; some or all of these processes could be in play in any given region at any given time in the ancient world. By these means individuals could be severed from their indigenous social milieu and become items of trade to be sold to foreign lands such as Greece. In terms of the northern branch of the slave trade, most historians have concluded that the majority of slaves 'generated' in Thrace, Scythia and Colchis were the product of inter-tribal warfare and raiding (both by land and sea); others were sold by parents who could not afford to keep large families (e.g. Hdt. 5.6; Poll. 7.14).⁷¹

Calculating the proportion which each of these processes contributed to the large Near Eastern slave population in Attica is not easy. With regard to the first of these variables, Garlan has rightly argued that the prominence of warfare in our sources creates a false impression of its importance to the slave supply.⁷² Nevertheless, some portion of Greece's Near Eastern slaves was certainly produced

⁷⁰ Garlan (n. 23), 20. It is difficult to envisage how Garlan's theory of distant military hegemony drawing slaves from barbarian regions to Greece could ever work in practice. As a staunch advocate of the 'primitivist' conception of the economy, Garlan refuses to see this process in terms of 'a "market economy" in which the trade in slaves was the result of individual initiatives developing in an atmosphere of free competition'. Yet cf. E.M. Harris, 'Workshop, marketplace and household: the nature of technical specialization in classical Athens and its influence on economy and society', in P. Cartledge, E.E. Cohen and L. Foxhall (edd.), *Money, Labour and Land. Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece* (London and New York, 2002), 67–99 on markets and the market principle.

⁷¹ Finley (n. 1 [1981]), 175; Velkov (n. 2 [1964]), 126; Braund and Tsitskhladze (n. 3), 118; Hind (n. 4), 154.

⁷² Garlan (n. 23).

by the military friction between Persia and Greece during the Classical period.⁷³ The hostile interaction between Greeks and barbarians in Asia Minor ranged from minor *razzie* such as those practised against the Phrygians in the sixth century (Hippon. fr. 27 West) or the kind of raids carried out in Lycia by Cleostratus in Menander's *Aspis* (Men. *Asp.* 23–33) and in Bithynia by Xenophon and the Ten Thousand, to full-scale battles such as that at the mouth of the Eurymedon in c. 466 B.C.E. in which Diodorus (11.62.1) tells us that 20,000 of the enemy were captured. The sporadic nature of warfare, however, can only be a partial explanation for something as regular and high volume as the slave trade; the enslavement of free people by judicial condemnation can also only have supplied a small drop in a veritable ocean of slaves.⁷⁴ What needs to be explained is the steady supply of slaves by regular means rather than by sporadic occurrences. In this respect, the sale or abandonment of infants could provide a better explanation. Philostratus' comment (*VA* 8.7.12) that the Phrygians habitually sold their children dates to the Roman period, but it may well apply to ours.⁷⁵ Enslavement for debt seems to have been a likely factor for some proportion of Near Eastern slaves, although quite what proportion is impossible to determine; Carion in Aristophanes' *Wealth* claims he became a slave 'because of a little bit of money' which could imply that enslavement for debt was prevalent in Caria (Ar. *Pl.* 147–8);⁷⁶ similarly, Nehemiah 5:1–8 describes the enslavement of many Jews for debt in fifth-century Palestine and their sale to foreigners. One wonders how many Jews there were among the mass of slaves the Greeks labelled with the umbrella term 'Syrian'. However, the evident scantiness of our sources on the initial enslavement of Near Eastern peoples makes it impossible to deliver a decisive verdict upon the processes which contributed to these people becoming dislodged from their original ethnic groups and sold abroad.

It remains to be shown that the Greeks were not the only people to import slaves in the eastern Mediterranean, nor were they the sole customers for slaves from Asia Minor and elsewhere. As far back as the time of Solon we have evidence for Near Easterners importing slaves from Asia Minor, since Ezekiel (27:13) tells us that the Phoenicians imported slaves from Javan (Greece), Tubal (Cappadocia) and Meshech (Phrygia).⁷⁷ Herodotus' story of the Chian slave merchant Panionius, who castrated boys and sold them in the slave markets of western Asia Minor to be carried into the depths of the Persian Empire, shows that demand for slaves could entail trade *away* from the Aegean world (Hdt. 8.105); and we find a similar character, Theodorus of Tarentum, peddling his wares (good-looking young boys) in the Levant during Alexander's invasion (Plu. *Alex.* 22). Of course, the Greeks had a reputation in the Levant as the typical exporters of slaves; thus Joel (4:6) complains about the Phoenician cities of the coast for having sold the children of

⁷³ For an outline of Graeco–Persian relations in the Classical period, see P.J. Rhodes, 'The impact of the Persian Wars on Classical Greece', in E. Bridges, E. Hall and P.J. Rhodes (edd.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars* (Oxford, 2007), 31–45.

⁷⁴ See e.g. ML 79A from Halicarnassus, as noted by Hornblower (n. 34), 9.

⁷⁵ See DeVries (n. 10), 340 for similar arguments.

⁷⁶ See Harris (n. 37), 259–60.

⁷⁷ We should not be surprised to see Greeks exporting as well as importing slaves during the Archaic period. References to selling slaves abroad occur in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 24.750–3, *Od.* 17.248–50), and Solon speaks in his poetry of poor Athenians sold into foreign countries (Solon fr. 4 West), many of whom had forgotten the Attic tongue (Solon fr. 36 West). A proportion, albeit probably a small one, of the Greek slaves sold abroad in the Archaic period evidently found their way to the Levant. See Harris (n. 37), 263–8.

Judah to Greek merchants, to be taken far from their original homes. Colchis, which supplied lesser numbers of slaves to the Greek world, was required to send 200 children as tribute to the Persians every five years (Hdt. 3.97), whilst Babylonia was required to send 500 eunuch boys (Hdt. 3.92);⁷⁸ and Asia Minor, which we know from Ezekiel as a slave source drawn upon by the Phoenicians, also supplied slaves to Aršam's estates in Egypt. Three letters from Aršam's correspondence with his inferiors describe varying numbers of Cilician slaves from his holdings; thirteen Cilician runaways are mentioned in letter 5; two Cilician slaves are appointed to assist one of Aršam's subordinates on a visit to Egypt in letter 6; and in letter 12 a man named Warfiš complains that five Cilician slaves which Aršam had promised to send to him in Babylon were not delivered.⁷⁹ Evidently, slaves were in demand far beyond the limits of Greek occupation, and the intricate system of trade which supplied this demand could tap the same geographical sources to satisfy a great diversity of customers.

VI. CONCLUSION

Despite the tendency of modern scholarship to focus upon Thrace and the Black Sea as sources of barbarian slaves, there seems no reason to believe that the slave population of Classical Attica was dominated by individuals from these regions. General comments in the literary sources, the presentation of barbarian slaves in comedy and the proportions of such slaves in the epigraphic sources all point to a polyglot population that was principally drawn from Asia Minor, Syria and the eastern Balkans; Near Eastern slaves may well have been as numerically important as slaves from 'northern' regions. In constructing a model of how the slave supply functioned, it is important to look beyond the Greek world and consider the demand for slaves in other regions; from the evidence discussed above, it is evident that areas outside of the main ambit of Greek occupation, especially in the Near East, employed slave labour and imported foreign slaves to maintain the size of their slave holdings. Although the scale and nature of the slave supply within the Persian Empire is as yet far from transparent (but may be illuminated by further study from historians of the Near East), the principle is nevertheless clear: any model which proposes a simple, monodirectional flow of slaves from 'barbarian' regions to Greece oversimplifies what must have been a much more complex phenomenon, one which facilitated the purchase of individuals uprooted by a number of different processes over a wide geographical area, and their subsequent transportation and sale in markets scattered throughout the eastern Mediterranean.

Durham University

DAVID LEWIS
d.m.lewis@durham.ac.uk

⁷⁸ The ownership of slaves in appreciable numbers was possible in other regions; the Thracian king Seuthes had large enough holdings that he could easily give 120 slaves to a Greek mercenary force as a gift (Xen. *An.* 7.7.53); see Velkov (n. 2 [1986]).

⁷⁹ See Driver (n. 68), 25–37. Similarly, a wide range of ethnic groups made up the work gangs of the Persian royal economy; see Uchitel (n. 69), 127–35.

APPENDIX: SOME EPIGRAPHIC TESTIMONIA FOR
SLAVE ETHNICITY⁸⁰TABLE I: THE ATTIC STELAE (IG I³ 421–30)

No.	Name/Designation	Ethnic Group	Reference
1	[παῖς Π]εισιστρατος Κάρ	Carian	IG I ³ 421.9
2	Κάρ	Carian	IG I ³ 421.38
3	Κάρ παῖς	Carian	IG I ³ 421.45
4	Καρικὸν παιδίον	Carian	IG I ³ 421.46
5	Ποταίνιος Κάρ	Carian	IG I ³ 422.77
6	Στρογγυλίων [τ]ὸ γένος Κάρ	Carian	IG I ³ 427.5–6
7	Καρίον τὸ γένος Κάρ	Carian	IG I ³ 427.8–9
8	Μελιττ[ενός] / Μελιττ[ενέ]?	Cappadocian ^a	IG I ³ 421.48
9	Λυδέ	Lydian	IG I ³ 421.49
10	[Φ]άνες τὸ [γέ]νος Λυδός	Lydian	IG I ³ 427.10–11
11	Φρύχς ἀνέρ	Phrygian	IG I ³ 426.11
12	Σύρος	Syrian	IG I ³ 421.37
13	Σύρος	Syrian	IG I ³ 421.47
14	Θράιττα	Thracian	IG I ³ 421.34
15	Θράιττα	Thracian	IG I ³ 421.35
16	Θράιχς	Thracian	IG I ³ 421.36
17	Θράιττα	Thracian	IG I ³ 421.40
18	Θράιχς	Thracian	IG I ³ 421.41
19	Θ[ρ]άιχ[ς]	Thracian	IG I ³ 422.70
20	[Θ]ρέτε Θράιττα	Thracian	IG I ³ 422.195
21	[Γρ]υλίον Θράιχς	Thracian	IG I ³ 422.196
22	[Θβ]ροσύνε Θράιττα	Thracian	IG I ³ 422.197
23	[Θν]τιγένες [τὸ] γένος Θράιξ	Thracian	IG I ³ 427.3–4
24	Ἀπολλο[νί]δες [τ]ὸ γέν[ος] Θράιξ	Thracian	IG I ³ 427.12–13
25	Ἰλας ἀνέρ	Thracian ^b	IG I ³ 430.7
26	Σκύθες	Scythian	IG I ³ 421.42
27	Δ[ιο]νύσιος χαλ[κ]εὺς Σκύθες	Scythian	IG I ³ 422.198–9
28	Σίμος τὸ γένος Σκύθες	Scythian	IG I ³ 427.7–8
29	Κόλχος	Colchian	IG I ³ 421.44
30	ιλλυριός	Illyrian	IG I ³ 421.39
31	ιλλυριός	Illyrian	IG I ³ 421.43
32	Πολυχσ[έ]νε Μακεδόν	Macedonian	IG I ³ 422.79–80
33	Σοσιμένες Κρέ(ς)	Cretan ^c	IG I ³ 422.206
34	Μεσσηνίος ἀνέρ	Messenian	IG I ³ 430.9

^a Following Pritchett (n. 16), 278, with which Meiggs and Lewis concur.^b See B. Keil, 'ΟΛΑΣ', *Hermes* 31 (1896), 472–6.^c See J. Camp, 'Greek Inscriptions' *Hesperia* 43 (1974): 314–24, (n.30) at 320. The fragment with Sosimenes was not available to Pritchett in his publications of 1953 and 1956.⁸⁰ Only slaves bearing ethnics are presented in the tables below, not all the slaves in the individual inscriptions.

TABLE 2:^a THE NAVAL LIST *IG* I³ 1032

No.	Name	Ethnic group	Line no.
1	Ἀσύριος	Mesopotamian	109
2	Σύρος	Syrian	120
3	Σύρος	Syrian	256
4	Σύρος	Syrian	399
5	Σύρος	Syrian	449
6	Σύρος	Syrian	469
7	Σύρος	Syrian	475
8	Φοῖνιξ	Phoenician	107
9	Φοῖνιξ	Phoenician	274
10	Καρίων	Carian	119
11	Καρίων	Carian	140
12	Καρίων	Carian	366
13	Καρίων	Carian	403
14	Νάδος	Carian	453
15	Τίβειος	Paphlagonian	131
16	Τίβειος	Paphlagonian	255
17	Ἀρτίμας	Lydian	135
18	Ἀρτίμας	Lydian	253
19	Ἀρτίμας	Lydian	372
20	Ἀρτίμας	Lydian	402
21	Ἀρτίμ<α>ς	Lydian	337
22	Δᾶος	Phrygian	234
23	Ἄττας	Phrygian	345
24	Μάνης	Phrygian	323
25	Μάνης	Phrygian	332
26	Μάνη[s]	Phrygian	328
27	Μάνης	Phrygian	405
28	Μάνης	Phrygian	451
29	Μάνης	Phrygian	452
30	Μάνης	Phrygian	472
31	Μάνης	Phrygian	479
32	Γέτας	Danubian/Thracian	108
33	Τρίβαλλος	Triballian – a tribe bordering Thrace	115
34	Σκύθης	Scythian	128
35	Θρακυλίων	Thracian	466
36	Θράιξ	Thracian	248
37	Θράιξ	Thracian	383
38	Θράιξ	Thracian	390
39	Θράιξ	Thracian	391
40	Θράιξ	Thracian	395
41	Θράιξ	Thracian	406
42	Πιστύρας	Thracian	136
43	Ἀρκαδίων	Arcadian	346
44	Λάκων	Laconian	232
45	Χιωνίδης	Chian	461

^a See Robertson (n. 31), 109–16 for an onomastic study of all the slaves in this inscription.

TABLE 3: THE 5TH-4TH C. B.C.E. LAUREUM SLAVES, ADAPTED FROM S. LAUFFER, *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*², 124–8

No.	Name	Ethnic Group	Reference
1	Ἄδα	Carian	<i>IG</i> II ² 10575a.
2	Ἀρτίμας	Lydian ^a	<i>IG</i> II ² 10847
3	Ἀτώτας	Paphlagonian	<i>IG</i> II ² 10051.1
4	Μάης	Paphlagonian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2940.6
5	Θούς	Paphlagonian	<i>IG</i> II ² 11679/80
6	Τίβειος	Paphlagonian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2940.8 and 2937.2 ^b
7	Ἀττάβος	Phrygian?	<i>IG</i> II ² 6218.1
8	Ἄττας	Phrygian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2940.5
9	Ἄττας	Phrygian	<i>IG</i> II ² 10898.1
10	Κάδους	Phrygian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2937.2 and 2940.3
11	Μάνης	Phrygian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2940.4
12	Μάνης	Phrygian	<i>IG</i> II ² 4633.1
13	Μάν[νη]ς	Phrygian	<i>MDAI(A)</i> 67 (1942): 117 #240.4
14	Σαγγάριος	Bithynian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2940.7
15	Ἀζάρατος	Cappadocian or Armenian	<i>IG</i> II ² 4598.2
16	Μανδίων	Anatolian ^c	<i>IG</i> II ² 2937.5
17	Σύρος	Syrian	<i>IG</i> II ² 2937.12
18	Φιλόνικος Βίθυος Θράιξ	Thracian	<i>IG</i> II ² 8927
19	Σωσίας	Thracian	<i>Xen. Mem.</i> 2.5.2
20	- - γυ ... Μακεδῶν	Macedonian	<i>IG</i> II ² 9273
21	Σκιάπος	Ethiopian	<i>IG</i> II ² 12618

^a Lydian, rather than Iranian, as Lauffer suggests; see Zgusta (n. 27), § 108–5.

^b Lauffer (n. 53), 128 is unsure whether the Tibeios in *IG* II² 2940.8 is the same individual as in *IG* II² 2937.2, and again with Kadous in *IG* II² 2937.2 and 2940.3. I have chosen to be conservative and equate the individuals in each case.

^c Anatolian, not Iranian, as Lauffer suggests; see Zgusta (n. 27), § 856–2.