

Some Thoughts about the Black Sea and the Slave Trade before the Roman Domination (6th-1st Centuries BC)

Alexandru Avram

Heinz Heinen wrote in a recent paper: “Wer sich mit der Sklaverei im nördlichen Schwarzmeerraum beschäftigt, wird an die Peripherie der alten Welt geführt und bleibt dennoch in enger Verbindung mit den klassischen Zentren der Antike, denn die Sklavenmärkte des nördlichen Pontos bedienten Griechenland und hier vor allem Athen”.¹ I think that the same can be said about the entire area of the Pontos Euxeinos and that this would be a good matter for the “regional and interregional exchanges” proposed as the subject of our conference. I will make an attempt to investigate some aspects of the slave trade, but not the institution of slavery in the Pontic cities.

More than forty years ago, M.I. Finley was the first to identify the problem in his paper “The Black Sea and Danubian Regions and the Slave Trade in Antiquity”.² Still complaining about the poor evidence available in this respect, he indicated some attractive ways for further studies. However, since Finley wrote his paper, new epigraphic evidence has enriched the matter considerably; this is especially true of some private late Archaic lead letters, which refer to slaves in the North Pontic area. First of all, there are two important Olbian letters: that of Achillodoros from the end of the 6th century BC, which in the inventory of Anaxagoras’ property lists “male and female slaves and houses” (δόλος καὶ δόλας κοίκίας);³ and that of Apatourios, dating from the same period, which addresses *inter alia* a question “about the slaves of Thymoleos” (περὶ τῶν οἰκητέων Θυμώλεω).⁴ A third letter is more fragmentary but also of an earlier date (“around the middle of the third quarter of the 6th century”, according to Ju.G. Vinogradov), and it refers to a “slave-girl whom he will bring to you from Melas” (παῖδα τὴν το[ι] ἄγει παρὰ Μέλανο[ς]).⁵ Another letter (dated to “the 30s-10s of the 6th century”) from Phanagoria also concerns a slave: “This slave was exported for sale from Borysthenes, his name is Phaylles” ὁ παῖς: οὗτος ἐ Βορυσθένεος ἐπρήθη : ὄνομα : αὐτῶι : Φαύλλης).⁶ Two letters incised on clay sherds may be added: one found in Olbia (from ca. 400 BC) referring *inter alia* to slaves attempting to escape after a shipwreck (line 9: [--μ]ετὰ τὸ ναύγιον οἱ δοῦλοι καταδρα[μόντες---] (or καταδραμ[εν], Vinogradov, καταδρῆ[ναι], Bravo,⁷ and another from Gorgippia (“first half to middle of the 4th century”), which mentions a πα(ι)δί[ον].⁸

Excluding the *ostraka*, the North Pontic area has furnished 11 lead letters, four of which refer to slaves. This new evidence for slavery in the region enabled Ju.G. Vinogradov to claim: "This is undisputed and clear evidence of the development of slave ownership on the northern shores of the Pontos already in the Archaic period, and also of the use of slaves in a variety of economic spheres. The abundance of relevant sources on slavery and slave-trading once more refutes the opposite view taken by D. M. Pippidi".⁹ In fact, in his pioneering paper "Le problème de la main d'œuvre agricole dans les colonies grecques de la mer Noire",¹⁰ Pippidi made an attempt to demonstrate that the Pontic colonies were not based on slave labour, but on what more recent French historians, more or less appropriately, have called "servitudes communautaires". In the *prolegomena* to his essay, Pippidi made a clear distinction between the slave export from the Pontic regions and the supposed role played by slaves in the economy of the Pontic *poleis*: "Dans cet ordre d'idées, on me permettra d'attirer l'attention sur une erreur toujours possible et qui en fait a souvent été commise, à savoir la confusion entre le fait qu'indubitablement les régions pontiques ont été pendant des siècles l'un des principaux réservoirs d'esclaves du monde grec d'abord, ensuite du monde romain, et la possibilité objective qu'une population servile tant soit peu nombreuse se soit mêlée à la population libre des diverses ἀποικίαι, en tenant dans l'activité économique de celles-ci la place importante qu'aujourd'hui encore [i.e. ca. 1969, when Pippidi first gave this paper] on s'accorde à lui attribuer". Consequently, to "refute" Pippidi's views, one needs first of all to document the place of slaves in the urban and especially the rural economy of these *poleis*. Did the slaves of the epigraphic records work for their owners, or were they only bought in these places in order to be shipped out elsewhere?¹¹

As far as I can see, with the exception of only the lead letter of Phanagoria, which shows the πα(ι)δί[ov] involved in agricultural activities, the new documents do not produce new evidence for slavery in the Pontic cities. The private letters discuss trade affairs and the slaves are listed among other kinds of property in different contexts which are too complex (not to say too obscure) to be discussed here. Nevertheless, the general question addressed by the senders of such letters (who are all traders) to their correspondents can apparently be reduced to: "what to do with the slave(s)?" One of the Olbian letters mentions a slave-girl who must be brought from elsewhere, while another one explicitly mentions that the slave Phaylles was sold at Borysthènes and was shipped out to Phanagoria, where the document was discovered, and possibly from there he was moved on to another slave-market. Therefore, I take it that the owners of those slaves were just going to sell them. Thus the next question is: where? Vinogradov is undoubtedly right in remarking that Phaylles' movement from Borysthènes to Phanagoria is our first piece of evidence for economic links between these two Pontic cities, but I cannot agree with him when he speculates that this παῖς was "a qualified, socially dependent worker, a master of rare crafts, or even the arts, which one could

never hope to find in the barbarian surroundings of Phanagoria, or hope to acquire at the slave-markets of the Bosporan *poleis*".¹²

The fascinating letters on lead-plaques or sherds rather confirm the traditional view, which sees the Pontic area as a remarkable reservoir of slaves for the Aegean world.¹³ This is convincingly supported by Polybios, as regards the Hellenistic period. When he explains the causes of the "Straits War" in 220 BC between Byzantion and Rhodos (cf. Gabrielsen this volume), Polybios (4.38.4) says the following: "For as regards necessities it is an undisputed fact that the most plentiful supplies and best qualities of cattle and slaves reach us from the countries lying round the Pontos". He also explains (4.50.3) that the Byzantians acquired the place called Hieron "owing to its favourable situation, as they did not wish to leave anyone any base from which to attack traders with the Pontos or interfere with the slave-trade or the fishing".¹⁴

I think that one fruitful way in which to address this matter thoroughly is to exploit the "servile" prosopography of regions outside the Pontos. Many records, especially from Athens, concern Thracian slaves,¹⁵ but it is generally impossible to distinguish the slaves shipped out to the Aegean *via* the Pontic cities from those acquired directly by Greek traders from the Aegean or Propontic Thrace.¹⁶ However, the possibility of a "Pontic connection" still remains. I offer a few examples.

The very important regulations from Vetren¹⁷ clearly describe, for the 4th century BC, direct ways used by traders from Maroneia to Pistiros and the *emporía*.¹⁸ On the other hand, the oath given by the same inscription mentions not only the citizens from Maroneia but also those from Thasos and Apollonia. If the Pontic Apollonia is meant, which is far more likely than the less significant Aegean Apollonia, we are invited to define a similar way from Pistiros to this city of the Black Sea. Consequently, all kinds of goods, including slaves acquired in the innermost Thrace, could basically be sold in Apollonia and transited from there by sea to the Aegean.

Strabo (7.3.12) explained the names *Geta* and *Daos* occurring in the Attic "New Comedy" through the ethnics of the Getians and Dacians. This is obviously wrong, and modern scholarship has demonstrated that such names are rather of Phrygian origin. Nevertheless, it is significant to note that Strabon's explanation could convince his readers only if Getians were commonly perceived as slaves in Athens and, more in general, in the Aegean world. This seems to have been an undisputed fact; consequently, for these slaves coming from a North Thracian area a transit *via* the West Pontic cities is more likely to be supposed.

This might also be the case of the Triballians mentioned in two Attic inscriptions. One of the slaves exceptionally enlisted as a soldier in the Athenian army after the disaster at Aigospotamoi is a Τρίβαλλος (IG I³, 1032 VI.115). The second record is less certain. A funerary inscription from the end of the 4th century (IG II², 12822) is without doubt for a slave (χρηστός) but it is less evident if ΤΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΣ was his name (Τριβαλλός) or if he *was* a Τρίβαλλος.

In the 2nd century AD, Pollux (7.14; cf. Suda, A 1384) explains that slaves of low quality were called ἀλώνητοι (“salt-bought”) because the Thracians from the inland changed slaves for salt (τῶν Θρακῶν οἱ μεσόγειοι ἄλων ἀντικατηλλάττοντο τοὺς οἰκέτας). This is not only a beautiful piece of evidence for Thrace as huge reservoir of slaves but also a suggestion that some of the slaves supplied by this region were bought by the (local?) traders in the Thracian hinterland.¹⁹ How they later came to the Aegean is an entirely different matter.

The figures discussed above enable me to suggest that many Thracian slaves were first sold on the markets of the west Pontic cities. We have, as I see, only one direct testimony, a list from Rheneia which includes Thracian slaves.²⁰ This is a very interesting document in many respects and I will comment on it below.

More important to our discussion are the records of slaves bearing such ethnics as Scythians, Sarmatians, Maiotians, Kolchians, Paphlagonians or Καρπαδοκῶνες, because they surely must have come to Athens or to the Aegean after having been sold in one of the cities of the Black Sea. The evidence is rather surprising. First of all, I remark that the poor Attic records of Scythian slaves contrast sharply with the *communis opinio* that the North Pontic area supplied a considerable number of slaves to Athens.²¹ Of course, there is good evidence for potters or painters called *Skythes*, but it is difficult to decide if they were slaves or metics, a rather *vexata quaestio*. There is also the well known police made up of Scythian archers,²² but once again their servile status is not a compulsory inference; indeed, it is rather an improbable one.²³ Finally, I found only five Scythian slaves who are all attested in the 5th century BC: Δ[10] νύσιος, a χαλ[κ]εὺς who was the slave of Axiochos Skambonides,²⁴ Σῆμος,²⁵ both dated to 414/3 BC, and also an *ignotus* belonging to the metic Kephisodoros (*IG I³*, 421.42) from the end of the 5th century, another one who enlisted as a soldier about the same time (*IG I³*, 1032 VI.128) and a Σκύθαινα mentioned by Aristophanes (*Lys.* 184).²⁶ Outside Attica, I have come across only five very late possible records. There are supposed slaves in Rhodian funerary tombstones: Ἀφροδείσιος²⁷, Καλλιόπη Σκύθαινα (*IG XII*, 1, 527 = *SGDI* 4062), both from the 1st century BC, and perhaps also Φίλων (χρηστός)²⁸ and Κιθαιρών (*SEG* 51, 1015) who also seem to be late Hellenistic. Another slave could be Δρίμακος at Chalkis (Euboeia), possibly about the same period (*IG XII*, 9, 1132). So, the direct evidence is surprisingly poor and this needs an explanation.

On the other hand, the evidence concerning Sarmatian slaves is rather satisfactory. The Attic records are not sure: Σωτηρὶς Σαρματὶς χρηστή in the 2nd century BC,²⁹ Ὑγ<ια>ίνων Σαρμάτης who could be late Hellenistic,³⁰ and perhaps [Μ]ελισσις Σαρματὶς (?) χρηστή (?) attested at Rhamnous in the first half of the 3rd century BC (?).³¹ Moreover, the Delphic *manumissiones* from the 2nd century BC produce very explicit evidence:

Φίλα I (*SGDI* 1724: 168 BC).

Αφ[--] (*FD III* 2, 228: ca. 153-144 BC).

- Ἀφροδισία I (SGDI 2274: ca. 153-144 BC).
 Ῥόδα (BCH 66-67, 1942-1943, 73-75, no. 4: ca. 153-144 BC).
 Ἀφροδισία II (FD III 3/1, 24: ca. 153-144 BC).
 Φίλα II (BCH 66-67, 1942-1943, 71-72, no. 2: ca. 153-144 BC).
 Εἰρήνα and Φιλοκράτεια (SGDI 2142: 142 BC).
 Σώπολις (SGDI 2110 [cf. FD III 3, p. 104]: ca. 113-100 BC).
Ignota (SGDI 2108: ca. 150-140 BC).

Two other *manumissiones*, one from Naupaktos (Φρυνέα: IG IX, I², 3, 638.3, shortly after 137/6 BC), and one from the Lokrian Physkeis ([Σ]ωσώ, τὸ γένος Σαρματίας?): IG IX, I², 3, 679, middle of the 2nd century BC) may be added to the list. Finally, we may mention three late Hellenistic Rhodian tombstones, even if neither the date nor the slave status of the persons are sure: Ἀθανὸς Σαρματίας,³² Ἡσούχιον [Σα]ραματίσση (sic)³³ and an *ignota* Σαρματίας.³⁴

We see that all the attested Sarmatians are from the 2nd or 1st century BC, with the not so convincing exception of [Μ]ελισσίς from Rhamnous, whose ethnic was largely restored. This chronology corresponds to the emergence of the Sarmatians in the countries of the north shore of the Black Sea. Fewer Scythian slaves are, consequently, to be expected in this late period, so the two figures revealed (Scythian slaves especially in the 5th century and Sarmatian slaves in the late Hellenistic period) may be complementary.

I suspect that the key issue is addressed by the remarkable evidence concerning Maiotian slaves.³⁵ In Athens, we find in the 4th century BC on a tombstone the name Ἰὰς Μαιώτις χρηστή,³⁶ and in the Hellenistic period, also in funerary inscriptions, six further possible Maiotian slaves: Μόνιμος (3rd/2nd centuries BC),³⁷ Δόλων³⁸ and Κέρδων³⁹ both from the 2nd century BC, Σωτηρ[-] χρηστ[-] (2nd/1st centuries BC),⁴⁰ Πίστος Μαιώτης (Hellenistic),⁴¹ and [-]ικας Μαιώτις χρηστή (late Hellenistic).⁴² In the same area, Ἀρτεμίσιος on a tombstone from Rhamnous (2nd century BC),⁴³ must be added, while at Troizen we find a poorly dated *ignotus* (IG IV, 866). In the 2nd century BC, the Delphic *manumissiones* attest Ἀγάθων (SGDI 1992: 182 BC) and Εὐταξία with her son Παρνάσιος (SGDI 2163: ca. 153-144 BC). As usually, the Rhodian funerary monuments contribute to the same prosopography: Διονυσόδω[ρο]ς χρηστός (Hellenistic),⁴⁴ Λυσίμαχος καὶ Σαπίς Μαιώται (2nd/1st centuries BC),⁴⁵ Τίμων (1st century BC),⁴⁶ perhaps also [Ε]ἰ<ρ>ήνα χρηστά, rather slave than wife of an *ignotus* Ἑρμ[ο]πολίτ[ας] (Hellenistic),⁴⁷ and, at Lindos, Ἀκακία χρηστά, rather slave than wife of [Χ]ρῦς<ι>ππος Βαργυλήτας.⁴⁸

A previously mentioned funerary inscription from Rheneia offers a list of the slaves of one Protarchos (end of the 2nd or beginning of the 1st century BC).⁴⁹ They apparently died in the same time, possibly in an accident. All the names are accompanied by the corresponding ethnics, most of them of Pontic origin. Here we find four Μαιώταις: Δαμάς (line 1), Ἰσίδωρος (line 1), Ἡρακλεῖδ<η>ς (line 11) and Νικίας (line 12). But there are also two Ἰστρία<ν>οί (Βίθυς, l. 2; Δαμάς, l. 19)⁵⁰ and one Καλλιόπη Ὀδησῆτις (l. 3). One of the “Is-

trianoï" has a good Thracian name (Βίθυς), and it is clear that these "false" ethnics indicate, as demonstrated by D. M. Pippidi,⁵¹ not the real origin of the slaves but "the location of the slave market in which the slave in question was sold".⁵² Other leading scholars (especially L. Robert and O. Masson) gave good arguments against the attempt to infer origin from the names of slaves, even from regional ethnics used as personal names. But prudence is required also when we find any city-ethnic like in this case. If we accept this interpretation, we have at least the decisive proof for west Pontic cities like Istros and Odessos as active markets in the slave-trade between the Pontos Euxeinos and the Aegean.⁵³ But we are also invited to ask: if the "Istrianoï" and the "Odessitis" are, in fact, Thracians sold respectively in Istros and Odessos, why must the "Maiotai" be really Maiotians? The records of Maiotians at Athens, Delphi and Rhodos are more remarkable than those of Scythians, although there is no *cliché* in the ancient literature relating to the "Maiotian" slave. On the other hand, we have positive evidence for the existence of flourishing slave-markets in the area of the Maiotis (Sea of Azov) from Herodotos to Strabon, and the archaeological evidence revealed by a settlement like Elizavetovskoe on the Don offers a brilliant confirmation.⁵⁴ If the "Maiotai" of the inscription from Rheneia are to be taken as any kind of Scythians, Sarmatians, Kolchians, etc. who only had in common that they had been sold in the area of the Maiotis, it would be easier to understand why in the later periods we have so few Scythians.

And few Kolchians too, one may add. In a very accurate study devoted to the export of slaves from Kolchis, D.C. Braund and G.R. Tsetschladze⁵⁵ were only able to find a few slaves of Kolchian origin outside the Black Sea: an unnamed slave of the metic Kephisodoros in Athens (*IG I³*, 421.44, end of the 5th century BC), Καλλώ in a Delphic *manumissio* (*SGDI* 2218: 139/8 BC), perhaps also Εὐφροσύνη (*IG II²*, 9049), whom they consider a "wife, daughter, freedwomen or, possibly, slave of Chairemon", Χόλχος, the potter who made at Athens an *oinochoe* discovered at Vulci,⁵⁶ and Κολιανός, a slave from Laurion, whose name possibly indicates a Kolchian origin.⁵⁷ I can add to this collection Εὔνοια Κολχίς, Ἀφροδίσιος Κόλχος and Ἐρωτὶς Κολχίς on Hellenistic tombstones on Rhodos,⁵⁸ but the impression of scanty evidence still remains.

However, Kolchis was well known as a region which supplied the Aegean world with slaves.⁵⁹ Therefore, the contrast between this *communis opinio* and the scarcity of our records can be explained in the same way as for the Scythians. "We know", Braund and Tsetschladze write, "that the Sea of Azov (Maiotis), the mouth of the Don and the neighbouring Crimean Bosphorus were together a centre of trade in slaves: were the four slaves of Protarchos on Delos who are listed as Maeotians not in fact Maeotians at all, but men from other areas – from Kolchis even, for Kolchian pirates traded their captives there?"⁶⁰ For the Roman period (2nd century AD), there is Aelianos' testimony (fr. 71 Hercher) about Dionysios, "a trader by profession, who had spent his life in frequent voyaging, spurred on by gain. Weighing

anchor beyond the Maiotis, he bought a Kolchian girl whom the Machlyes, a local tribe, had carried off".

The area of the Maiotis was doubtless the most important slave market on the north coast of the Black Sea during the Hellenistic period. As for the west coast, we have just seen that at least Istros and Odessos were also active. Using the same arguments, I suspect that people like Ἀ[θ]η[ν]αῖς Ἰστριανή (1st century BC),⁶¹ Ἑρασίνος Καλλατιανός (Hellenistic),⁶² Μήνις Βυζάντιος χρηστός (perhaps late Hellenistic),⁶³ [-]ρυς [Βυ]ζάντιος χρηστός (perhaps late Hellenistic),⁶⁴ all of them mentioned by funerary monuments on Rhodos, or even Ἀφροδισία Ἰστριανά, attested by a tombstone on Kos (possibly late Hellenistic),⁶⁵ came in fact not from Istros, Byzantion or Kallatis (*Athenais* and *Aphrodisia* are, by the way, very common slave names), but from the Getian and Thracian hinterland, and that they were sold in these cities and shipped out to Rhodos or Kos.

For the south coast of the Black Sea,⁶⁶ there is little evidence for Paphlagonian slaves:⁶⁷ Ἀτώτας, a μεταλλεύς at Laurion mentioned in a funerary epigram (Πόντου ἀπ' Εὐξείνου Παφλαγών) of the second half of the 4th century,⁶⁸ an *ignotus* also at Laurion (Παφλα[γών]?) of the 2nd century⁶⁹, Μάνης, manumitted in Delphi (SGDI 1696, ca. 150-140 BC), and Μηνᾶς, γραμ<μ>ατεὺς δαμόσιος on Rhodos, who participated to a subscription in the 1st century BC.⁷⁰ This is by no means satisfactory and does not correspond to the real situation; however, we may add to this rough list a number of further Paphlagonians, whose servile status is less evident.

It is very likely that all the Kappadokians attested by Attic tombstones were slaves: Δαδάτης (2nd century BC),⁷¹ Μόσχος (first half of the 1st century BC),⁷² Φαρνάκης (1st century BC or 1st century AD),⁷³ and the not well dated Κέρδων⁷⁴ and Μᾶ [Κ]απαδό[κ]ισσα.⁷⁵ More other Kappadokian slaves occur in the Delphic *manumissiones*, all of them in the 2nd century BC: Πρόθυμος (SGDI 1796: 174 BC), Μιθραδάτης (SGDI 1799: 173 BC), Μηνόφιλος (SGDI 1851: ca. 170-157/6 BC), Ἀγαθῶ (FD III 3/1, 2: ca. 160 BC), Σώφρον (FD III 3/1, 15: ca. 157 BC), Εὐφροσύνα (FD III 3/1, 21: ca. 146 BC), Μηνόδωρος (FD III 3/2, 265: ca. 150-140 BC), Σῶσος (SGDI 2143: ca. 150-140 BC) and a second Σῶσος (*Fouilles de Delphes* III 3/1, 32: ca. 148 BC). Furthermore, the loosely dated late Hellenistic Rhodian funerary monuments provide good evidence, although servile status is not always sure: Ἀμύντας,⁷⁶ Ἀνδρικός,⁷⁷ Ἑρμαῖος I (c. 150 BC),⁷⁸ Ἑρμαῖος II χρηστός,⁷⁹ Εὐνους,⁸⁰ Κτήσων χρηστός,⁸¹ Σελευκίς χρηστά,⁸² Φιλωνίδας,⁸³ and perhaps also Ζώπυρος and Καπίνδας.⁸⁴

I found only two Bithynian slaves, i.e. Μηνᾶς (SGDI 1906) and Ἑρμαῖ[ος], τεχνεῖτης χαλκεύς (FD III 1, 565) who were freed in the Delphic sanctuary in the middle of the 2nd century BC. We may add some Attic records: Σπόκης (?)⁸⁵ and Χρήστη,⁸⁶ on 4th century tomb stones, perhaps also Φιλάργυρος (1st century BC).⁸⁷ However, even if we accept these entries, the evidence is very poor: many Bithynians might in fact have been assimilated in the epigraphical records to the Thracians.

It is interesting to see that the evidence for Kappadokian slaves contrasts with the poor records concerning Bithynian and Paphlagonian slaves. However, one must remember that Sinope and Amisos (in Paphlagonia) or Herakleia Pontike and T(e)ion (in Bithynia) were important slave markets. Consequently – as for other Pontic cities quoted above – it is possible that the Paphlagonian or Bithynian origin of many slaves was masked by “false” city ethnics. I was surprised to note that Sinope, Amisos, Teion and Herakleia Pontike furnished valuable evidence for slaves. For “Sinopean” slaves the best example could be the 3rd century philosopher Μένιππος, a slave of the Sinopean historian Baton (Strab. 12.3.1), who, according to Diogenes Laërtius (6.99), was freed and later received the Theban citizenship.⁸⁸ Five other possible Sinopean slaves are attested by Hellenistic tombstones on Rhodos: Ἀθηναίς,⁸⁹ Διονύσιος,⁹⁰ Ῥοδίνα,⁹¹ Σοφοκλής⁹² and Χαρμοσύνα.⁹³

The same Rhodian monuments refer to, in the late Hellenistic period, three possible slaves with the ethnic Ἀμισσηνός / -ά: Ἀθηνα<ί>ς,⁹⁴ Ἀυδρικὸς [χρηστικός]⁹⁵ and Κάλλων χρηστικός.⁹⁶ Μᾶ Τιανή, possibly a slave-girl, is attested in Athens.⁹⁷ Concerning the slaves bearing the ethnic Ἡρακλεώτης / -ῶτις, it is, of course, hard to isolate the Pontic Herakleia from the many other cities with the same name in the Greek world. Attention should, however, be drawn to a Delphic *manumissio* dated to 184 BC (SGDI 1959), which uses a precise formula when it records Παρά[μ]ονος τὸ γένος ἐξ Ἡρακλείας τᾶς ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου, i.e. not *Herakleiot*es but, in my view, a Bithynian, or, perhaps more exactly, a Mariandynian sold on the market of Pontic Herakleia.

To sum up. Just like the Scythians, Sarmatians or Kolchians, who were often called “Maiotians”, and just like the “Istrianoi” or the “Odessitai”, who in fact were Thracians (or Getians), so, too, the “Sinopeis”, “Amisenoi”, “T(e)ianoi” or “Herakleiotai” of some records could have been barbarian Paphlagonians or Bithynians. This might be an indirect but remarkable proof of the activity of the slave-markets of the South Pontic cities. It is in my opinion significant that we have by far more evidence for “Kappadokian” slaves. They might have been transferred from this less urbanized area to the Aegean markets *via* overland routes, rather than *via* the harbours of Sinope, Amisos, Teion or Herakleia Pontike, which could explain why their so-called ethnic is better preserved.

Another question is to try to identify the sources of enslaved persons sold abroad. Piracy, for which the evidence (for different reasons) seems to be more generous, has been properly questioned by modern scholarship, but M.I. Finley suggested that the army “was always a more significant factor in the picture than piracy”.⁹⁸ I suspect that he was quite right.

Ancient authors generally approve of those local kings or dynasts who fought efficiently against piracy, from Eumelos of Bosphoros (Diod. 20.25.2) to Cavarus, the dynast of Tylis (Polyb. 8.22 [24].2: πολλήν μὲν ἀσφάλειαν παρεσκεύαζε τοῖς προσπλέουσι τῶν ἐμπόρων εἰς τὸν Πόντον), and to the North Pontic barbarian chiefs (Strab. 11.2.2: ἐν τοῖς δυναστευομένοις τόποις). In the Au-

gustan period, Strabo (11.2.2) criticizes the negligence of the Roman commanders sent to the north coast of the Black Sea (διὰ τὴν ὀλιγορίαν τῶν πεμπομένων). In fact, still being a very productive source of slaves, piracy was first of all an impediment for the Aegean traders sailing in the Black Sea.

The topic of the relation between wars and slave-supply has not yet been fully addressed. However, are the different figures concerning war prisoners or people captured by pirates really useful? Most of captured people might be freed through payment of ransom,⁹⁹ and one needs to question once again the reliability of our evidence. I would suggest that this happened rather often with captured citizen but very rarely with “barbarians” like those taken by Philip II of Macedon during his Scythian campaign from 339 BC (Justin 9.1-2). One should add, especially for the Thracians, the wars between the barbarians themselves. In order to pay the Greek mercenaries, Seuthes II dispatched Herakleides to Perinthos to sell 1,000 people he had just captured from an other Thracian dynast (Xen. *Anab.* 7.4.2), and this might have been a rule rather than an exception. “Peaceful conditions were not conducive to the production of large numbers of potential slaves internally and many of the Thracian slaves documented in the sources were probably acquired from peripheral regions in times of conflict, not from any organized traffic.”¹⁰⁰

Beside piracy, kidnapping and war, another source of slave trade claims more attention: the selling of their own children for export by the Thracians (according to Herodotos 5.6.1) or by the Phrygians (if we believe Philostratos, *Apollonius* 8.7.12).

But this would be a subject for another paper. The general conclusion is that the ancient (Polybios) and modern *cliché* of the Black Sea region as an important source of slaves for the Aegean market can be supported by the evidence.

Notes

- 1 Heinen 2001, 487.
- 2 Finley 1962 (= 1981, 167-175).
- 3 Dubois 1996, no. 23 (with bibliography); cf. Heinen 2001, 490-492; Nielsen 1997-1998, 35-40.
- 4 See now the complete edition by Dana 2004.
- 5 Vinogradov 1998, 154-157, no. 1 (= *SEG* 48, 988); cf. Dana 2007, 70-72.
- 6 Vinogradov 1998, 160-163, no. 3 (= *SEG* 48, 1024); cf. Dana 2007, 87-88.
- 7 Dubois 1996, no. 24; cf. Vinogradov & Rusjaeva 1991 (= *SEG* 42, 710); Vinogradov 1998, 156; Bravo 2001, 254-263, with new readings, restorations and interpretations (= *SEG* 51, 970). For line 9, Bravo gives the translation: “dopo il naufragio gli schiavi abbiano raggiunto la riva e siano scappati (*oppure*: raggiunsero la riva e scapparono)”.
- 8 Vinogradov 1997a (= *SEG* 47, 1175); cf. Vinogradov 1998, 157 and Dana 2007, 89-90.
- 9 Vinogradov 1998, 157. But see the completely opposite view of Gavriljuk 2003, 80: “nothing indicates large-scale slave-holding in the Greek cities on the northern

Black Sea littoral during the Archaic period. This is especially true for the period from the 6th to the first quarter of the 5th century BC, when the use of slaves was limited to house-hold production, while in agriculture and animal husbandry slaves were seldom employed”.

- 10 Pippidi 1973 (= 1975, 65-80).
- 11 This is “quite possible”, according to Gavriljuk 2003, 80-81, but I do not believe that pottery from Chios found in Olbia can be adduced as evidence for a direct link between Olbia and the slave-market on Chios. Chios was itself a transit point. Nor am I convinced that the increasing Greek imports found in Scythian burials of the 5th century “may be interpreted as revenue from the slave trade”.
- 12 Vinogradov 1998, 163. For a research project concerning “slavery in the North Pontic area”, see Heinen 2006, 66-76.
- 13 For a different view see Tsetschladze 2000-2001, 14: “The number of slaves from the Black Sea was small. Thus Pontos was not a major source of slaves in the ancient world”. He cites among others Finley (1962), but, as I understand it, Finley never supported such an extreme opinion; he rather issued a warning to the effect that: “The absence of evidence about the slave trade may prove something about the attitudes and interests of ancient writers, but it proves nothing about the existence of a slave trade or its character or scale. The argument from silence is worthless” (Finley 1962, 52).
- 14 Translation: *Polybius. The Histories*, vol. 2, translated by W.R. Paton, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1922, repr. 1960, 395 and 421.
- 15 Velkov 1964; Zlatkovskaja 1971; Velkov 1986.
- 16 An early piece of evidence might be Hipponax, fr. 15 West, referring to Thracian slaves at Salmydessos. To our evidence of a later date, one should add Xen. *An.* 7.3.48-7.4.2 (“captives to the number of a thousand” (ἀνδράποδα), whom Herakleides sold with all the booty in Perinthos), and Antiph. *Or.* 5.20 (the Athenian Herodes shipped his slaves (ἀνδράποδα) from Mytilene to Ainos in order to get the ransom paid by the Thracians).
- 17 *IGBulg* 5, 5557 ter; cf. *SEG* 48, 486; 47, 1101; 49, 911.
- 18 See especially (with sometimes divergent views) Bouzek, Domaradzki & Archibald 1996 and the papers presented in the conference *Pistiros et Thasos. Structures commerciales dans la Péninsule balkanique aux VII^e-II^e siècles av. J.-C.*, published in *BCH* 123, 1999, and summarized in *SEG* 49, 911, to which add Avram 1997-1998; Tsetschladze 2000; Archibald 2000-2001.
- 19 Cf. Bäbler 1998, 16: “an den nahe gelegenen Handelsplätzen”; but cf. 14: “Die Händler begaben sich für den Einkauf zu den entsprechenden Küstenstädten; ob sie auch selbst Reisen in das Landesinnere unternahmen und direkt mit den Barbaren verhandelten, scheint eher zweifelhaft”.
- 20 Klaffenbach 1964, 16-17, no. 28 (*SEG* 23, 381) = Couilloud 1974, no. 418 = *IG IX*, I, 4, 1778; cf. Robert 1959, 187 (= 1989, 217) with n. 1.
- 21 Gavriljuk 2003, 77, writes: “in the 5th century BC, after the Persian Wars, Scythian slaves were imported into Attica in somewhat greater numbers”; however, she only cites the Scythian slave of Kephisodoros!
- 22 Vos 1963; Welwei 1974, 8-22; Frolov 1998; Bäbler 1998, 165-168; Bäbler 2005; cf. Heinen 2001, 498-499. Scythian archers have been considered as slaves by Vogt (1983). Anyway, the evidence produced by “Scythian” archers in Attic vase painting is useless for our discussion; cf. Ivanchik 2005.

- 23 Nothing can be gained on Scythian slaves from the sculptural evidence. For the representations of Scythians in Athens in the second half of the 4th century BC, see Bäßler 1998, 174-181 and 260-264, cat. 85a-91 (but no. 88, Δᾶος Δάου Ἡρακλεώτης, IG II², 8615, is surely a citizen of Herakleia Pontike: cf. Robert 1973, 440; Ameling 1994, 132).
- 24 IG I³, 422 II.198-199 (Fragiadakis 1988, 345, no. 177; FRA 6909).
- 25 IG I³, 427 I.7-8 (Fragiadakis 1988, 369, no. 693).
- 26 For Scythians in Athens see especially Kljačko 1966; Frolov 1998; cf. Lissarague 1990, chapters 5 and 6. A graffito from the mid 5th century should be added: Σκύθ(ινα) (Lang 1976, 35, F 79 and pl. 13), but nothing can be said about the status of this woman.
- 27 IG XII, 1, 526 = SGDI 4061 (Ἀφροδίσιος) = Maiuri 1925, no. 233 (same inscription, as demonstrated by Morelli 1955, 183) = Berges 1996, 147-148, no. 247.
- 28 Maiuri 1925, no. 421 (Morelli 1955, 183) = Berges 1996, 133, no. 146.
- 29 IG II², 10243 (FRA 6599).
- 30 IG II², 10244 (Ἰγυλίων?), corr. FRA 6600.
- 31 IG II², 12064 (FRA 6598). [M]ελισσίς | ΕΛΩΜΑΤΙΣ | ΠΗΣΤ- (ed.); emended by Wilhelm 1978, 80 (SEG 28,338): Σαρματίς | χρηστή.
- 32 IG XII, 1, 525 = SGDI 4060 (Morelli 1955, 183).
- 33 Jacopi 1932, no. 95 (Morelli 1955, 183).
- 34 Papachristodoulou 1979, 433 (SEG 38.789).
- 35 General survey in Blavatskij 1969.
- 36 IG II², 9253 (FRA 3451).
- 37 Vanderpool 1966, 283, no. 10 (SEG 23, 144; FRA 3454).
- 38 IG II², 9252 (FRA 3450).
- 39 IG II², 9254 (FRA 3452).
- 40 Bradeen 1974, no. 536 (FRA 3457): Σωτήρ[ιος] | Μαιώτη[ς] | χρηστ[ός], but cf. the editor's note: "for reasons of symmetry, restoration of the deceased as masculine is preferable, but, of course, not certain".
- 41 IG II², 9257 (FRA 3456).
- 42 Alexandris 1973-1974, 120 (SEG 29.229; FRA 3458).
- 43 Petrakos 1999, no. 234.
- 44 Maiuri 1925, no. 229 (Morelli 1955, 182).
- 45 Jacopi 1932, 232, no. 122 (Morelli 1955, 182); cf. Fraser 1977, 138, n. 252.
- 46 IG XII, 1, 514 = SGDI 4055 (Morelli 1955, 182).
- 47 Hiller von Gaertringen 1898, 394, no. 64 = SGDI 4351 (Morelli 1955, 182).
- 48 Blinkenberg 1941, no. 683.
- 49 See note 20 above.
- 50 Cf. Pippidi 1966 (= 1988, 32-34).
- 51 Pippidi rightly adduces Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 8.21: *sic tres cum emerunt Ephesi singulos seruos, nonnunquam alius declinat nomen ab eo qui vendit, Artemidorus, atque Artemam appellat, alius a regione quod ibi emit, ab Ionia Iona, alius quod Ephesi, Ephesium: sic alius ab alia aliqua re ut uisum est.*
- 52 Hansen 1996, 184, who collected more evidence for this use of ethnics.
- 53 Hind 1994b suggests that the two young heads *tête-bêche* on the obverse of the earliest Istrian silver drachms could be interpreted as a mark of the slave trade.
- 54 Brašinskij 1980; Martschenko 1986; Hind 1995-1996; 1997.
- 55 Braund & Tsetskhladze 1989; see also Tsetskhladze 1990.
- 56 Beazley 1956, 110, no. 37.

- 57 *IG II²*, 2938; cf. Lauffer 1979, 129.
- 58 Hatzfeld 1910, 243, no. 8 (Eunoia). For Aphrodisios and Erotis see *SEG* 51, 1015.
- 59 Braund & Tsatskhladze 1989, 124, appropriately quote the anecdote in Athenaeus (6.266e-f) about a decision of Mithridates Eupator in 86 BC: “Chians were punished for being the first Greeks to import slaves by the reversal of the positions of master and slaves: the Chians became the slaves and were shipped out to Kolchis”.
- 60 Braund & Tsatskhladze 1989, 120. See now also Heinen 2001, 492, n. 14: “[es] scheint mir nicht sicher, dass die Sklaven wirklich aus den Randgebieten der Maiotis stammten. Möglich ist auch, dass sie über den bekannten Slavenmarkt von Tanais am unteren Don (dazu Strab. 11.2.3), in unmittelbarer Nähe der Küste des Asowschen Meeres, in den Handel gelangten und ihr Ethnikon nicht von ihrem ursprünglichen Herkunftsgebiet, sondern vom Gebiet ihres Verkaufes erhielten, was ja auch sonst bezeugt ist (Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 8.21)”.
- 61 Kontorini 1989, 113, no. 42 (*SEG* 39, 830).
- 62 Konstantinopoulos 1963, 20, no. 33.
- 63 Maiuri 1916, 164, no. 106 (Morelli 1955, 150).
- 64 Maiuri 1925, no. 167 (Morelli 1955, 150).
- 65 Paton & Hicks 1891, 232, no. 364.
- 66 All the evidence is Hellenistic. It is generally admitted that after the Classical period slaves originating from Asia Minor are everywhere more representative than people of servile status in the North and West Pontic regions. See Garlan 1984, 61: “Par la suite, la proportion d’esclaves originaires de toute l’Asie Mineure (Lydiens, Kappadociens, Mysiens, etc.) tendit encore à se renforcer au détriment des peuples septentrionaux. A l’époque hellénistique, sur les stèles funéraires de Rhodes, il n’y a plus que le tiers des esclaves à provenir des pays de la mer Noire, et ce n’est le cas à Delphes que du cinquième des affranchis dont l’origine est mentionnée”. See also Masson 1973 and for a list of slaves in Athens in the 5th century BC (with a comfortable Thracian predominance): Miller 1997, 82-83.
- 67 It is not sure that Kleon (*Ar. Eq.* 919), which would be the first slave of this origin to be attested in Athens, was really a Paphlagonian. His “ethnic” seems rather to suggest a pun (cf. *παφλάζει*): Ehrenberg 1968, 177; Long 1986, 114; Bäßler 1998, 94.
- 68 *IG II²*, 10051 (*GVII*, 836; *CEG II*, 572; Fragiadakis 1988, 341, no. 97; *FRA* 5973); cf. Lauffer 1979, 17, 124, 132, 198 sqq.; Bäßler 1998, 94-97 and cat. 35.
- 69 Peek 1942, 69, no. 120; cf. Lauffer 1979, 127 and 130. “Statt Παφλαγών kommt auch Παφλαγωνίδης in Betracht” (Peek).
- 70 Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, 168 sqq., no. 21.A.III.3 (Morelli 1955, 183).
- 71 *IG II²*, 8954 (*FRA* 2662).
- 72 *IG II²*, 8957 (dated to the 2nd century), but cf. *FRA* 2667.
- 73 *IG II²*, 8958 (*FRA* 2668).
- 74 *IG II²*, 8956 (*FRA* 2665).
- 75 Meritt 1954, 271, no. 108 (*SEG* 14, 204) = Bradeen 1974, no. 511 (*FRA* 2666).
- 76 *IG XII*, 1, 496 (Morelli 1955, 180).
- 77 *IG XII*, 1, 497 (Morelli 1955, 180).
- 78 Maiuri 1925, no. 219; cf. Fraser 1977, 95, n. 55 (Morelli 1955, 180).
- 79 Hatzfeld 1910, 244, no. 16. It does not seem to be the same inscription (here l. 3 gives: *χρηστὸς χαίρει*, while Maiuri 1925, no. 219, ll. 3-4, has *χρηστὸς ἢ χαίρει*).

- 80 Pugliese Carratelli 1955-1956, 162, no. 6 (Morelli 1955, 180).
- 81 *IG XII*, 1, 498 (Morelli 1955, 180).
- 82 Kontorini 1975, 38, no. 9.
- 83 Maiuri 1925, no. 220 (Morelli 1955, 180).
- 84 Just mentioned by *SEG* 51, 1015, without further details.
- 85 *IG II²*, 8410 (Σπόκης) (*FRA* 1332: Σεύκης); cf. Bähler 1998, 214-215, cat. 12 (Σεύθης).
- 86 *IG II²*, 8412 (*FRA* 1335); cf. Bähler 1998, 215-216, cat. 13 (χρηστή [sic] as “Rufname”).
- 87 *IG II²*, 8411 (*FRA* 1333). The restoration of the ethnic in *IG II²*, 8409 (= Bähler 1998, 214, cat. 11) is too adventurous.
- 88 Robinson 1906, 275 sqq.; Debord 1990, 518. Menippos is called Φοίνιξ by Diogenes (6.99) because he really came ἐκ τῶν Γαδάρων (Strab. 16.2.29). But he also bears the ethnic Σινωπεύς (Diog. Laërt. 6.95) because he was sold in Sinope.
- 89 Konstantinopoulos 1969, 470; cf. Debord 1990, 522, n. 32.
- 90 *IG XII*, 1, 465 (Morelli 1955, 170).
- 91 Zervoudaki 1978, 404 (*SEG* 35, 893).
- 92 *IG XII*, 1, 466a (Morelli 1955, 171).
- 93 *IG XII*, 1, 467 = *SGDI* 4038 (Morelli 1955, 171) = Berges 1996, 141, no. 199.
- 94 Maiuri 1916, 178, no. 181 (Morelli 1955, 144); cf. Fraser 1977, 93, n. 46.
- 95 Maiuri 1925, 147 (Morelli 1955, 144).
- 96 *IG XII*, 1, 400 (Morelli 1955, 145).
- 97 *IG II²*, 10448 (*FRA* 7131).
- 98 Finley 1962, 58. See, in general, Ormerod 1924; Ziebarth 1929; Garlan 1978; Garlan 1987; de Souza 1999; Gabrielsen 2001; Wiemer 2002; for the Black Sea, Brašinskij 1973; Tsetschladze 2000-2001.
- 99 See Bielman 1994.
- 100 Archibald 1997, 228. Just when I was reading the proofs of the present paper G.R. Tsetschladze kindly informed me that he prepared an article on “Pontic slaves in Athens: orthodoxy and reality”, to be published in 2008 in the *Festschrift I. Weiler*.