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ABSTRACT

The following paper is based on eight opisthographic fragments as assembled and published by D.M. Lewis in *Hesperia* XXVIII (1959) - *IG II²* 1554-59 and Ag. I 3183 - and *Hesperia* XXXVII (1968) - Ag. I 4763. Although the existing text is fragmentary, much of it remains intact and is legible. Both faces of the stele consist of entries recording the results of fictitious trials for abandonment, in which, in every case, chattel slaves were acquitted from their masters and given metic status. Along with each acquittal, there was a payment of a *phiale* worth one-hundred drachmas.

This stele now stands as the most complete manumission document surviving from ancient Athens and its existence compels us to ask many more questions than can perhaps be answered. Manumissions were exceedingly uncommon at Athens, as attested by the near absence of literary and epigraphical evidence for them, and it is unclear why such a document would appear suddenly, having no predecessors, save for a few fragments found to be from around the same period, never to be followed by further evidence of its kind.

Why would it have been necessary to simultaneously manumit so many slaves in the last quarter of the fourth century? Surely, it wasn’t to honour them, judging from the format of the entries. What, then, was the purpose? With this question in mind, the following topics were explored. Chapter one focused on the legal aspects of the document such as what was meant by the *apophugon* procedure and who paid for the *phiale*. Chapter two involved charting the deme-distribution of the former masters and slaves, with the purpose of finding a general area of domicile for those named on the document. The third chapter discussed the various occupations listed in conjunction with the former slaves, with the ultimate motive of finding what types of slaves were being released and what this might reveal about the document’s purpose.

The following conclusions were formed: the slave probably bore the responsibility for the payment of his release, which here took
the form of a phiale. Based on Plato's reference to paramone agreements in Laws 915a, it is viable that such agreements were practiced at Athens and, furthermore, that they were similar to those found at Delphi. The deme-distribution of both the former masters and slaves provides evidence that the majority probably had domiciles in city-demes. Lastly, the fact that the highest percentage of former slaves were involved in wool-working and domestic-service lends some credence to the slaves' manumissions having been based upon something other than solely the attainment of freedom. These slaves would have been virtually unskilled and, therefore, the cheapest for the masters to release. As for the other more skilled slaves listed, they would almost certainly have been living-apart, already in a quasi-free state.

In essence, these slaves appear to have been token manumissions, although their new legal status is indisputable, assembled from the more politically active city-dwellers, whose purpose was to allow the state to gather revenue for the oncoming and inevitable war with Macedon. This revenue took the initial form of phialai payments and then, subsequently, the perpetual metoikion payments, required of every metic.

The text of the inscription, as published by D.M. Lewis (1959 and 1968), along with his assembly of the fragments, is included. I have also written an English translation. Charts and maps of the former masters' and slaves' deme distribution and slave occupations are also included, as well as an appendix on slave names.
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The following thesis is based upon eight fragments as published by D.M. Lewis in *Hesperia* XXVIII (1959) - *IG II²* 1554-59 and *Ag. I 3183* - and *Hesperia* XXXVII (1968) - *Ag. I 4763*. Koehler had earlier assigned *IG II²* 1556-58 to the same stele, and in fact, as Lewis notes, 1556 joins 1557.\(^1\) Kirchner assigned *IG II²* 1554 to 1555 and lastly, Lewis added 1559, *Ag. I 3183* and later *Ag. I 4763* to the group.\(^2\) These fragments are part of one large opisthographic stele, consisting of five columns on Face A written in stoichedon, with sixteen letters in the first four columns and seventeen in the fifth, and four columns on Face B, written in non-stoichedon.

Although the existing text is fragmentary, much of it remains intact and is legible. Both faces of the stele consist of entries recording the results of fictitious trials for abandonment,\(^3\) in which, in every case, chattel slaves were acquitted from their masters and given metic status. Because these trials all seem to have the same result, this document appears to represent a series of legal fictions, each having the predetermined result of acquittal. The masters are listed as either citizens or metics and the former slaves are listed along with their occupations and given the metic designation - *oikóv ἐν + domicile*. Along with each acquittal, there was a payment of a *phiale* worth one-hundred drachmas. Because all of these fragments record manumissions and

\(^1\) Lewis (1959), 208.
\(^2\) Please refer to pp 10-11 for a diagram of the fragments' placement (taken from Lewis [1959]).
\(^3\) Discussed in Ch 1.
constitute part of the same stele, they will henceforth be referred to together as the Manumission Stele. Following the Introduction, I have included a copy of the layout of the fragments (only the first seven as published by Lewis in 1959) as well as the inscription as published by the same scholar (1959 and 1968). These are followed by an English translation.

As will be seen below, there are three different types of marble found in the descriptions of these fragments - Pentelic, Hymettian and subcaeruleus. One would expect that if all of the fragments came from the same stele, they would all consist of the same type of marble. This discrepancy has not been noted by Lewis and cannot be rectified in this paper. The epigraphical information for the fragments is as follows:

1 IG II² 1554

Height, 0.26m.; width, 0.50m.; thickness, 0.11m.
Height of letters, 0.005m on both sides.

Opisthographic fragment of Pentelic marble, wholly intact on the left side. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line and includes parts of columns one and two. Face B is non-stoichedon and retains parts of columns three and four.

2 IG II² 1555

Height, 0.20m.; width, 0.18m.; thickness, 0.10m.
Height of letters, 0.005m. on Face A (Face B has been damaged and does not retain any inscription)
Fragment of Hymettian(?) marble, broken on all sides. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line and includes parts of columns one and two. Face B has been lost but presumably it would have included part of column four.

3 IG II² 1556
Height, 0.18m.; width, 0.22m.; thickness, 0.115m.
Height of letters, 0.004 on both sides

Opisthographic fragment of Hymettian marble, broken on three sides. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line for column four and 17 for column five. Face B is non-stoichedon and includes parts of columns one and two.

4 IG II² 1557
Height, 0.47m.; width, 0.28m.; thickness, 0.125m.
Height of letters, 0.004 on both sides

Opisthographic fragment of Hymettian marble, intact on the right side. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line for column four and 17 for column five. Face B is non-stoichedon and includes parts of columns one and two.

5 IG II² 1558
Height, 0.41m.; width, 0.26m.; thickness, 0.115m.
Height of letters, 0.004 on both sides
Opisthographic fragment of Hymettian marble, broken on three sides. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line for column four and 17 for column five. Face B is non-stoichedon and includes parts of columns one and two.

6 IG II² 1559

Height, 0.205m.; width, 0.37m.; thickness, 0.115m.
Height of letters, 0.005 on both sides

Opisthographic fragment of blue marble (subcaeruleus), broken on all sides. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line and includes parts of columns one to four. Face B is non-stoichedon and includes parts of columns two to four.

7 Ag. I 3183

Height, 0.214m.; width, 0.262m.; thickness, 0.115m.
Height of letters, 0.005 on both sides

Opisthographic fragment of Pentelic marble, broken on all sides, found in a wall of a house dated to 638/9, located west of the Church of the Holy Apostles on 9 January 1935. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line and includes parts of columns three and four. Face B is non-stoichedon and includes parts of columns two and three.
8 Ag. I 4763

Height, 0.14m.; width, 0.125m.; thickness, 0.055m.

Height of letters, 0.005

Marble fragment, intact on the left side, found in the wall of a late pit southeast of the Agora, east of the Late Roman Fortification, on 20 April 1937. Face A is written in stoichedon with 16 letters per line and includes part of column one. Face B has been lost but presumably would have included part of column four.

NB: All the dates in the following paper are BCE.

The main clue for dating Face A of the Manumission Stele is found at line 189ff where we find three sons of Demon of Phrearrhioi - Demotion, Dem(?) and Demophilos - joining to free a woman who was presumably a family slave.¹ The fact that the father was not present as one of the manumittors implies that he was probably dead by the time of the manumission. There was, however, a Demon of Phrearrhioi alive in 323 or 322, as seen on IG II² 1632.48. Based on this evidence, Face A cannot be earlier than 323. It also cannot be much later than this date, since there are men present on the stele who were born in 389/8 (A.140)⁵, ca. 380 (A.219)⁶ and one before 397 (A.557)⁷. Furthermore, it is probably not after Demetrios of Phaleron's reforms in 317/16 since the name.

¹ Lewis' prosopographical study of the masters' names (1959) has been most helpful in this section.
² LGPN: p 472, Chairippos (16).
³ LGPN: p 229, Thrasymedes (16).
⁴ LGPN: p 80, Autokles (23).
of one of the masters (A.548) has been found on a gravestone (IG II² 6437) which appears to have been made before restrictions were placed on extravagant grave markers. Based on the above evidence, the date for Face A likely lies in the very early twenties.

Face B appears to be later than Face A as it was not as carefully planned and executed, although the date, if indeed later, does not appear to have been much after that of Face A. The main clue is found at line 328ff where there are two brothers joining to free a family slave. One of the brothers, Antisthenes, is found on another inscription, dated 326/5, where he is recorded as having paid for half of a new trireme as the heir of the elder Antisthenes. Since the elder Antisthenes is last known from an inscription dating to 334/3, he could have died after this point and was surely dead by 326/5 when the younger Antisthenes made a contribution in his name; the stele then should not be dated earlier than 334. Furthermore, there is a man called Misgolas at line 335 whose accepted birth date is 390, so the date for Face B is probably not much lower than 320, although it is possible. Thus we have for Face A of the Manumission Stele a date probably between 323 and 320 and not much lower, if at all, for Face B.

As will be discussed in Chapters 1 and 3, manumission seems to have been exceedingly uncommon at Athens. This stele, along with a group of related manumission stelai, which all appear to have been produced within a twenty year time frame, is the only extant epigraphical evidence for manumissions at Athens. That there would be no evidence for such procedures from before or after this

---

6 Cf. Kirchner's stemma, PA 1196.
7 PA 10225. Cf. Lewis (1958), 108 for a discussion of the problems with this date.
8 Lewis (1959), 233-35.
period rouses suspicion that this document is linked to contemporaneous events limited to this particular time in Athenian history.

The mid to early twenties was a period of great turmoil for the Athenians, as they were feeling the heavy weight of Macedon upon them. Drastic measures had been taken by Lycurgus' coalition to systematically prepare for the inevitable battle between the two powers and at the same time to bolster the Athenians' patriotism and political spirit which had eroded after so many failed campaigns over the past thirty years.

The Athenians knew that if they were to compete with Macedon's enormous revenues and manpower, they had to act quickly to gain resources to update their warships and rebuild their fortifications. From 338/7 until his death in 326/5, Lycurgus took the helm as chief Finance Minister and was hugely successful at gaining vast amounts of money, thereby increasing Athens' annual income to 1200 talents, up from 400 in 346. He not only used this money to strengthen Athens' military and naval capacities but also to fund Athenian building projects and festivals. How he managed to gain such revenues is not exactly clear. He did encourage wealthy Athenians to perform liturgies for Athens while prosecuting those he felt were not doing or had not done their civic duty. At the same time, those who had done their civic duties were given honours, thereby encouraging others to do the same; Williams states that over half of the inscriptions from this period appear to be honorary. After

---

11 Williams, 7; Ferguson, 10.
12 Cf. Lyc.52.3; PA 9422, 2746.
14 Williams, 14 no. 37.
Lycurgus' death, his coalition, perhaps with Demades as the new chief financier, who had collaborated with him in finances, no doubt continued to raise money for Athens. When Alexander died in 323, the Athenians, knowing that Macedon was about to enter its own political turmoil as its generals struggled for power, decided to go to war.

How does the Manumission Stele fit into this context? One hundred and twenty-three slaves can be identified as having been freed as a result of these feigned trials. The question arises, why were so many slaves being released at this tumultuous time in Athens? I would like to suggest three reasons. First of all, as mentioned above, with the release of each slave there was a payment of a *phialē* worth one hundred drachmas. Even in the stele's fragmentary condition, a total of 12,300 drachmas can be seen as having come to the state as a result of these acquittals and the total was doubtless even higher. Coupled with the *phialai* payments, each freedman was registered as a metic, obligating him/her to pay the *metoikion* (metic tax). This tax was ongoing so the state was assured of receiving a continuous payment from every metic as long as he or she resided in Attica. Thirdly, every male metic would have been liable to fight on behalf of Athens in the event of warfare, an obligation slaves did not generally have.

The high date for the document, 323, is more likely as this marked the beginning of the Lamian War; by 322/1, the Athenians had surrendered to the Macedonians after being defeated at the Battle of Crannon. These releases could have been simply another effort

---

15 That these *phialai* were payments to the state rather than dedications to a god is discussed below, p.

16 See below, p 76 no.73 for an exception.
Aside from providing some evidence into the political atmosphere of fourth-century Athens, the Manumission Stele gives us valuable evidence for legal issues, such as the little known *apophugon* procedure, as well as deme distribution and slave occupations. It is these topics on which the following paper will seek to provide a commentary. The first chapter will focus on legal issues and questions concerning the document: what the evidence is for *dike apostasiou* trials, what were *paramone* agreements, who paid for the *phialai*, what formula was used and what this document has in common with the oft-compared *IG II² 10*. The second chapter will chart the deme-distribution for the former slaves and masters. In the process, I hope to illuminate any patterns of distribution relating to the former masters and their slaves. Maps for visual reference and cross-reference charts listing former masters and slaves and their demes will be included at the end of this chapter. Chapter three will discuss the social roles chattel slaves played in Athenian society by an analysis of the occupations listed on the stele. I will also try to uncover whether there is any pattern to the kinds of slaves that were being freed, in the hope of further understanding the purpose of this document.
Seven Fragments of the Manumission Stele
as Assembled by D.M. Lewis (1959)

FACE A

-15cm-
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Text of the Stele

(Greek)
(as published by D.M. Lewis
in 1959 & 1968)

FACE A
Column I

23 lines missing

[......]ον

25 .... φιάλ σταθμῆς ή] οίκ
[.....] οίκ.
[....] άτον
[.....] έτοιμον ή

30 [.....] μ] Περα
[oίκων ἀποφυγή] οίκ. έτοιμον ή
[.....] έν έτοιμον ή
[.....] έν έτοιμον ή
[.....] έν έτοιμον ή
[.....] έν έτοιμον ή

about 28 lines missing

[.....] έν

70 [.....] άποφυγή] οίκ.
[.....] πωλ.
[.....] άποφυγή] οίκ.
[.....] έγιοί.

75 [.....] έν
[... φιάλη] σταθμ.: Ἴ
[... βειοὺς Π]
[... ο]κ ἀποφ.
[νγ...οκράτο]

about 12 lines missing

92 [ ... λέ]
[ ... α]σφυγ
[ ... ν Ὄλυμπ]

95 [ιδώρου Α] γρ. φιά στα.: Ἴ
[ ...] ταλα ἐν Κυδ
[ο]ικον] ἀποφυγοῦσα ἐ

Δυσδίκου Δυσσωτρ
ἀτον Ἀχαρνές φιά στα.: Ἴ

100 [Κ] ἵτος ἐμ Πει οἰκών
χαλκοῦ ἀποφυγόν ἐν
Διονύσιον ἴστετή
φιάλη σταθμ.: Ἴ: ὄ
Μητριβέα(ν) ἐμ Πει οἱ

105 κο ταλα ἀποφυγοῦσα
Διονύσιον ἴστετη
φιάλη σταθμ.: Ἴ: ὄ
Σάτυρος Ἀγνοῦν οἰκ
γεωργὸ ἀποφυγόν ἐν

110 Κηφύσιον Κηφισοῦθ
μοι Παλλη φιά σταθ.: Ἴ
[Κ] ἀλλιά<σ> κάψη ἐμ Πε
[ο]ι[κῶν] ἀποφυγόν ἐν

115 [ ...] ἐν Πολυεύκτῳ
[ ... φιάλη] στα.: Ἴ
[ vacat]

Column II
11 lines missing

128 [ ... ο]ν
[ ... φιάλ στ] αμ.: Ἴ

130 [ ... ρ ἐ]ν Κ
[ ... οἰκῶν ἀποφυγόν ἐν]
[Δημοστέρα]
[to Φρεά] [ρρ φαίλ στα: Σ]
[...]
135 [ω χρυ] σοχό ἀποφυγών
[Εν] βόφρωνα Εὐθυκλέ

[—] οὐς Χολλε φιά σταθ: Σ
Βίων ἐμ Μελ ὀἰκῶ δακ
τυλογλύ ἀποφυγών

140 Χαϊρέπποι Χαϊρέτῃ
μου Ἴλαι καί κοι ἐρ
αν τῶν μετὰ Χαιρίτη

[—] Ψηλὼν ἐν Κολλυ ὀι

145 κὼ κλινο ἀποφυγών
Εἰπόλεμον Εἰπολέμο
ο Ἴλαρν φιάλ σταθμῷ: Σ
Μοσχίων ἐμ Παρ ὁ[ικ]
ὡ ἔμπορο ἀποφυγ[ἐν *]

150 Δύκιν Βίωνος [Ἄχαρν]
ϕιάλ σταθμῷ: Σ
Φιλονίκη ταλασί ἐν
Δευκο ὀικ [ποφυγό]
Δημοσθένη [....]

155 λο Φιλά [φιάλ σταθμ.: Σ]
[—] Αδών [ιος ........]

About 28 lines missing

185 πλη[....] ε]
[ν ὁικ φιά στα: Σ]
Μενίππῃ [....]
ταλασί ἀποφ[υγό]
Δημοτίων Δ[ὁμονος]

190 Φρέαρρο, Δημ[....]
Δήμωνοι Φρεά [πρε, Δημ]
[όφιλον Δήμων οις Φρε]
ἀρριῳ φιάλῃ [σταθμ.: Σ]
[ἴθσισμος Α[λατε(?)] ὀικ]
195 ὡ μάγευρο [ἀποφυγόν]

About 11 lines missing
207 [Λ]υκίσκο[ν Διοδότου]
'Επικη φιά[λ σταθμόν] [Η]
Μάνης ἀμφο[τέρων] ἐν Κολό[λ]|]
210 οἶκῳ ἄποφυγῶν
Οἰνάδην Οἰνοκλέα
'Αμαξάν φιάλι σταθμόν [Η]
Φιλίστη ταλαισί ἐμ [Μ]
el οἰκον ἄποφυγοισ
215 'Επιχαρίδην Διούσην
οὐ λαμμὴν φιά σταθμόν [Η]
'Αριστομένης ἐμ [Μελ]
oίκ σκυτοτὸ ἄποφυγν
Θρασύμπηδο Κυδέδο
220 Δεννον φιὰ σταθμὸν [Η]
'Ονυσίμη σφαγα[μοῦ] [Μπωλ]
'Αλπων οἰκοῦ ἄπ[ῳφνεία]
Φιλωνα Φιλο[λα]['.Δλα]
ωπ το οἶκο [ἱ ἄλ σταθμόν [Η]
225 Ποσειδών [ϊος .... εί]
ν Κολλαν ὅ [ἵ ἄποφυγώ]
'Τγαίνων [οντα ....]
χο Παικ[νῆ ἄποφυγόν]
Σωμα [..... 12 .........]
230 τα[λ] ασί ἄποφυγοίσα[ν]
'Αρχ[..... 13 .........]
oυ Φα[ληρ φιὰ σταθμὸν [Η]
vacat

Column III

8 lines missing

241 [Στρό]μβα Θεοῦ[ν ἱστο]
[―] [ΟΛ]ύνθι φιάλ σταθμὸν [Θ:Η]
[―] Πιστωκλῆς ἐμ [Με[λ ωλ]
k ἱποδήματος ἄποφυγο[ν]
245 Καλλιππίδην Καλλ[ί]
oυ ἀφιδ φιάλι σταθμὸν [Η]
Διονύσιας ε[ν Σ]κὰ ο[ι]
k ψευργὸ ἄπο[φ]ν[γ] ἤτον [*.]

250_πάτο Κηφὶ φιά σταθ: ἢ
Πολύτιμος ἐν Κολλυ
οἰκ ἕκτιστο ἀποφυγ
Καλλιάνος Καλλιάδου
Παυεῖς φιάλ σταθ: ἢ

255_Λαμπρὶς ἐν Σκαμν ὕψ.
οὐχ ὑπεθή ἀποφυγοῦν
'Αριστοφάνης 'Αριστή
ἀνὸς 'Αθιδα φιάλ σταθ: ἢ
Εὐπεθή παυεῖ τίτθ

260 ἐν Σκ ὕψοι ἀποφυγοῦν
'Αριστοφάνης 'Αρι[σ]τή
ἀνὸς 'Αθιδα φιάλ σταθ: ἢ
Εὐμ[...]ς ἐν Κο[λ]α(?): ὕψ

53 lines missing

317 [. . .] ἀποφυγοῦσ᾽ 
[. . .] δου
[. . .] φιάλ] σταθ: ἢ

320 [. . . ἐμ Με]λι ὕψοι
[. . . . ἀ] ποφυγοῦσ
[. . . . Ἀ] πολλοῖς
[ροὐ . . . φιάλ στα]θμ: ἢ

3 lines missing

327_.[. . .] Ὠ[. . . . . . . .]
Διδὴ 'Ἀλκητῆ [ὁ]
καλὼς ἀποφυγοῦν

330_Θεόφιλος Ἀν[. . . . . .]
Εὐμηνίμῳ φιά [λ] σταθμ: ἢ
Μένος ἐν Ἡ[. . . . . . . .]
διάκον ἀπ[οφυγόν] ἐκ
Διογέν[. . . . . . . .]

335_πο Ἐρ[. . . φιά σταθμ: ἢ
Κα[. . . . . . . .]
οὐ[. . . . . . . .]
π[. . . . . . . .]

About 10 lines missing
Column IV

5 lines missing

[...]

335 ... φιάλ σταθμ.; ἦ

[---]

360 ... ἔμ Με ὁ

[---]

370 Στρ[...]

380 [..] ἐν Στρ[...] καβω

385 [..] μκ ἀποφ

[... δὴ μου Κυθ

[... ἀποφυγοῦ ἔνο]
390 [.....]δήμου Κυθ
[ήρρων φιά] σταθμόν ;Η
[.....]γεωρ ἐν ὉΗ
[φαι οἰκώ]ν ἀποφυγὼν
[.....] ΑΡρτ. διάνο
395 [.....] φιάλ σταθμὸν ;Η
[.....] μυσθώτο Ἀλω
[πεκ οἰκ] ἀποφυγὼν [.....]
[.....] δὴν 'Α[ρ]ι[σ]τάρ
[χοῦ Μν] πρὸ Γόργαδο Σω
400 [σιστρό] ἁτού Κυδαθην
[φιάλη] σταθμὸν ;Η [.....]
[.....] δειδοσχῆτο
[.....] ν οἰκώ ἀποφυγ
[.....] ν Φίλωνος Πα
405 [.....] φλό Θιστι
[αδ] [.....] δόρο Μειδ
[.....] ΟΙΝΔΙ Ἀπο
[λλ] [.....] εἰνόεν
[.....] φιάλ στ] αθμὸν ;Η
410 [.....] ε] ν Κο
[λλυ? οἰκ — — —] [.....]

15 lines missing

427 [.....] νη ταλ] [ασι εν]
Κολλον οἰκοῦ ἀπο[φυγ]
[Ἀνδρον Ἀλκιμάχου [Π]
430 αανι Καλλιππίδη[ν]
Τιμώνακτος Παια
_\[.....] εα φιάλη σταθμὸν [.....]
Τυρὴν αὐλοποι ἐν Κυ
δαθη οἰκώ ἀποφυγω[ν]
435 Δει[.....]
Μ[.....] φιάλ σταθ Η]

5 lines missing

442 [.....] ος Σφ
[φήτι φιάλ στ] αθμὸν ;Η [.....]
[.....] τα] λασι ἐν Κ
445 [..... οἰκοῦ ἄτρ] φυγου
[.......

[.......

[.......

450

[.......

Ανοικών

[.......

κολλεψ 'Αλω

[πε οικό] ἀποφυγώ ἃν

[.......

455

[.......

Xολα] λέ φιά σταθ: ἡ

[.......

νευρόα ἐν Σ

[κα οικ] ὡ ἀποφυγώ ἃν

[.......

460

[.......

ἐμ] Πει οἱ

[κὼν ἀπο] θ [υ] ἡ

[Xα] ρίαν Χαρωνιδου Εὐ

ωνυμέ φιάλ σταθμ.: ἡ ἃν

---

Φιλων γραμματε ἐν Θ[ο]

465

ρικὸ οἰκῶ ἀποφυγὼν ὁ

Φερεκλείδη Φερεκλέ

ου Περιβοι φιάλ στα: ἡ

---

'Ροδία ταλασ ἐν Θορι

κῶ οικοῦ ἀποφυγοῦσα

470

Φερεκλείδη Φερεκλέ

ου Περιβοι φιάλ σταθ: ἡ

Κορδύπῃ παιδιόν ἐν Θ

ορκ οικοῦ ἀποφυγ[ο] 

Φερει [κλ] εἰδή Φερε[κλέ

475

ου [Περιβ] οί [φιάλ στα: ἡ]

Κ[.......

3 lines missing

480

[.......

[γ ἐμ Μελ]

ε[ι οικοῦ ἀποφυγοῦ] ὁ

Σαυρίαν 'Αθηνίππου Π
εραι Σπουδίαν Θεα [ε]
τή ψολαρ φιά σταθ Ῥ
485 Ἐπικέρδης Ὁησι οἰκῶ
ἀμπελουρ ἀποφυγών 
Δη[μ]όφιλον Δημοφάνο
Παιαν φιά σταθ Ῥ
 postpone
᾿Ηρακλείδης ἐμ Με οἰκ
 postpone
ω κάπη ἀποφυγὼν 
Μενέθμην ἐμ Με οἰκ[ο]
ὑ φιάλ σταθ Ῥ
 postpone
Θραίττα κατηλί ἐμ Με
ὅικον ἀποφυγών 
 postpone
490 Μενέθμην ἐμ Μελ Ῥ[ε]
κοῦ φιάλ σταθ Ῥ
 postpone
᾿Ισαμὴ ταλαστ ἐμ Πε ο
ἥικον ἀποφυγών 
Χαίρεττον Τυμικλεῖ
 postpone
500 δου Ἀχαρνέ φιά σταθ Ῥ
᾿Επίγουνον ἐμπορ ἐμ Πε
οἰκῶ ἀποφυγών 
Κτησίας Κτήσωνος Θο
ῥίκα φιάλ σταθμ Ῥ
 postpone
505 Δημητ[ρί] καθαρωδό
᾿Επικήφι[σί] ὃ οἰκο ἀπο
᾿Αθηνόδωρον [Θ]εόδωρο
Μελίτε Θεόδωρον Θεο
δόρῳ Μελίτ φιά σταθ Ῥ
 postpone
510 Φιλών ταριχοπώ ἐ[ν] Κο
λὺν οἰκῶ ἀποφυγών 
Χαϊρέφιλον Φείδωνο
 postpone
Παῖα φιάλ σταθμ Ῥ
 postpone
Χρυσίων παιδ Ῥακλ
 postpone
515 εὶ ἐν Ξυπ οἰκ ἀποφυγ Ῥ
Φορμίων Εἰμάχο "Ραμν
 Ῥ[ο[ν]] φιάλ σταθ Ῥ
 postpone
᾿Ολυμπιας ταλαστ ἐν Κ
ὑδα οἰκον ἀποφυγών 
 postpone
520 Ἀρχέδ[μ] ἀντ Ἀρχεδήμ
 Ῥ[ο] Ἀλαῖν φιάλ σταθ Ῥ
 postpone
῾Εστιαῖος σκιντό ἐν
Σκαμβω οἰκ ἀποφυγῶν
[Ε]ὐθύμαχον Εὐδίκον [Ξ]
525 [νπε]ταῖ φιάλ σταθμ [.ὅν] [Ο]  
[...] ταλασ[ω ἑν] Κ[...]  
17 lines missing

544 [. . . . . . . .]το[ν] Ἐυ[κρά]  
[...] [π]ους Ἐσικη φιά στ[α ἢ]  
Διομεί οἰκῶν ἀποφυ[γ]  
Ἁντιμένην Πιστοκλ[έ]  
οὐ Κηφισιὲ φιά στα[θ ἢ]  
550 Ἐσωτράτη παιδί ἐν [ν ὁ]  
[εραμ] ἐω οἰκοῦ ἀποφυ[γ] [υγ]  
Ἁντιμένην Πιστοκλ[έ]  
οὐ Κηφισὶ Ἀγνὸν Ἐυ[θυ]  
κρὶ Κιδαθῆνε φιά στ[α ἢ]  
555 Πλαγγῶν ταλασιο ἑν [Κ]  
ἐδα οἰκοῦν ἀποφυγ[ω] [υ]  
Ἁυτοκλέ Ἀνδροκλ[έ] [ον]  
Ἐνωνυμὲ φιάλ στα[θ ὁ]  
560 Ἐπαμφιλος ὅρσικόμ [ἐ Λ]  
αἱ οἰκῶν ἀποφυγ[ω] [υ]  
Σειχάρην Ἐργοσάρ [ον]  
πρασιέα φιάλ στα[θ ὁ]  
565 Νικὰς λιβανω[τ] ἐμ [Π]  
εὶ οἰκ[ω] ἀποφυγ[ῶν] ἄν  
Φιλοκράτῃ Ἐπικράτῳ  
Ἐλευσὶ καὶ κούδ ζαρ  
νιστῶν τῶν μετὰ Θεόφ  
ῥάστων Βασιλέου Χολ  
ἀργεός φιάλ σταθμο: [Η]  
vacat
FACE B

Column I

[------------------------]
[k]αὶ κοινὸν ἐ[ρα]ν[στὸν -- -]
ἀκέστριαν ἐκ Κειρ [οἶκ φιά]
λη:Η

5 Ῥωδείς Δαμάχου Ὀμῆν [---]
ν ἀρτοπώλην Ἀλωπεκή ο[ἰκούν]
τα φιάλ:Η
Εὐάγγελος Θεαγήλου Χολλε
Μώμου σκυλο〈Δέψ〉[ιον ἐν Κιδαθ
10 οἰκώντα φιάλ:Η
Πολύστρατος Πολυστράτ(α) Ἐπ
ικηφάνιος Σωσίαν γεωργόν ἐν
'Ηθωνία οἰκώντα φιάλ:Η
'Αρτεγένης Ἑπιγ〈Ενους ἐν Μελι
15 [ο]ἰκόν Μιᾶσων σκυτο〈τ>όμο ἐν Με
[λ] οἰκόν φιάλη:〈Η〉
[Πά]νκαλος Ἀθηνάνδον πρόξενος
[′Αρ]χών Ταχυδήμου ἐκ Κοῦλης
[.. .] ἵνα παιδ〈ιον ἐν Πειρας φι:]κ
20 [φιάλ]η:Η
[Πάνκαλο]ς Ἀθηνά[δου πρόξενος]

8 lines missing

30 [------------------------] ϕι
[ἀλη:Η] vacat
[------------------------] ΣΕΓΡΟ. ΟΥ
[---] ἐν Π[είραι]ων οἰκῶν[αν ϕιά:Η]
[--- μαχος Κ] αλλιμάχον Μαραβώ
35 [---] ἐν Πειρα〈οίχαριχο [ϕι:Η]
[---] μαχος Καλλιμάχον [Μαραβω]
[---] εφάνη παίδα ἐν Πειρα ὀικ
[ϕιάλη:Η]
[--- μαχος Κα]λλι[μ]άχος Μαραθ
40 [-------------------] ἐν Πειρ οἰκό [ϕιά:Η]
[------------------------]
[------------------------] Μαρα[θ]
45 [---]δημο[---]

3 lines missing

[---] οίκ

50 [---] νο[---]
[---] Ναυτ[---]
[---] ἁμ]πελουργ[δν---]
[---] ν Φύσστρατ[---]
[---] ἐν Κυδαθ[η]ν οίκ [φιάλ.:H]

55 [---] συσπος Ερ[---]ς Π[α]λ[η]ς Ταχυς

5[---] την τ [αλασιο]ν ἐγ Κυ[δαθ οίκ] [φιάλ.:H]

5[---] Ὠμᾶδ[ης ---]ιππ [η]ν

tαλασουργ[--- oίκ φιάλ.:H]

Τιμόθεος Μεν[---] σ 'Αν [τ]ιγων

60 γεωργὸν ἐμ Πα[--- oίκοιντα φιά.:H]

[---] ατρο]κλῆς 'Αν[--- φι]ς Ευπετ[---]

[---] κόλη ταπε[--- oίκ φιά.:H]

[---] ατροκλῆς 'Αν[--- φι]ς Ευπετ[---]

65 [---] o[---] φιά [.H]

[---] ικ οικ[---]

[---] Επικηφών

[---] ο[---] ικούσα [φι].H

[---] θ[---] ου[---] 'Αψ[---]

70 [---] τιμοτ[---] ε]μ Πει οίκ [φι].H]

[---] θους 'Αψ[---]

[---] δων οίκ [φι].H]

17 lines missing

91 [---] ὠνην ποτηριπτ [ε[ν ---]

[---] οίκ [φι].H]

[Θ] ἐρασιππος 'Αντιφάνου[---]

95 [---] πτω[---] δρεω ἐμ Π οίκ [φιά.:H]

Θερσιππος 'Αντιφάνου[---]

Σύμων πατίον ἐμ Π οίκ φιά.[.H]

[---] μάρας 'Αλωπεκῆ οίκ [λεπτ[---]

[---] ν ἐν τοῖσ ἑργ ἐπί Κυν οίκ φιά[.H]

100 ['Αλω] πεκῆσων οίκ φιάλ.:H
...μόστρατος Πολυχαρμίδου
[- -]λ Φειδέστρατων χρυσοχόων
[έγ] K<ν>δαθ οίκ φιάλη:Η
...κράτης Ευξένου Παλλη
105 Νικόζενος Ἡγησίων Ἐρχι
Δημόστρατος Δημοσστάτου
[Π]άλλ "Οκιμον ταλα ἐν Ἡφαι
[oί] k φιάλη:Η
[K] λεόζενος καὶ κύριος Κτησωνί
110 [α]τς Οἰήθ Εὐκλέα ἐγ Κολ ὕκ
χεωρ φιάλ:Η
Μενίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθ "Ἀτταν
ὀστρωταλῆν ἐγ Κ οἰκ φιάλ:Η
Μενίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθ Μαλ
115 θάκην ταλασσουργόν ἐγ K<ελ>ρ
οἰκ φιάλη:Η
Μενίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθ
Πλαγγόνα παιδίον ἐγ Κει οἰκ φι:Η
Μενίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθ
120 Μόσχον παιδίον ἐγ Κει οἰκ φι:Η
Μενίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθ
Ἀριστονίκην παιδί ἐγ Κει φια:Η
vacat

Column II

About 8 lines missing

131 / [------------------------]
_ M[------------------------]
_ Ετ[------------------------]
_ ΟΜ[------------------------]
135 Ετ[------------------------]
_ Αρχ[------------------------]
_ Ετ[------------------------]
_ Ε[------------------------]
[------------------------]
140 [------------------------]ου
[------------------------]φι:]Η
9 lines missing
151 ...οκ[---
Δασιχάρης[ς---
καὶ κοινὸν ἐρ[ανστῶν---
oκ [φιά:H]

About 50 lines missing

205 [---]αυθο[.]
[---]ίκ δῆμος φιά:H
[---]ολέμου Ἑλευ Λαυρίω
[---]ικ γεωρ φιά:H
[---]οφ Χαρεδήμου Αλαι

210 [...]ξ[...Ἀ]λαπεκῆ οῖκ μυλωθ φιά:H
[...]αῖς Ἀριστοκρίτον Ἀφόδην
[...]εἰόραν ἐμ Π οῖκ αὐλή φιά:H
['Ε]πίχαρίνος Ἑπίχαρίνου Λευκ
['Η]χώ ταλασσονυργόν ἐμ Πα [ο]ίκ

215 [φ]ιά:H
[N]εστάλεμος Ἀντικλέους
Μελετὶ Δημέαν τέκτον ἐν [---]
o [ο]ίκ φιά:H
[...]ΙΠΠ[---]e
[---]e
[---]i

7 lines missing

230 Δ[---]
_φιά:H
_ἐντο[κράτης Λγ---]
_Ἀριστῆ[ν---οίκ φιά:H]
_Ἀρτοκράτ[ης Λγ---]
235 Σύμαλον παίδ[ίων---οίκ]
_φιά:H
_Ἀρτοκράτης Λγ[---]
_Νικαρίστην πα[ίδιον---οίκ]
_φιά:H

240 Φυλαζίας Φαν[ίων Ἀναγυράστου]
_Γλυκέραν τα[λασσου---οίκ]
_φιά:H
_Εὐθυλοῦς Κη[---]
εμπο Μουχ[- - - - - - -]

vacat

Column III

About 5 lines missing

250 [- - - - - - -] ου Εδων
[- - - - - - -] vacat
[- - - - - - -] λ οικ κουρε φι:Η
[Nυκήρατος Νι] κηράτου Μελιτ
[Φειδίππος] Σωσιδήμου Ξυπ
255 [- - - - -] εμ Μελίτης οικ δακτυ
[φι:Η]
[Nυκήρατος Νι] κηράτου Μελι
[Φειδίππος] Σωσιδήμου Ξυπ
[...] μωα παιδιον έμ Me οικ φι:Η

260 Νυκήρατος Νυκηράτου Μελιτ
Φειδίππος Σωσιδήμου Ξυπε
Στρατονίκην έμ Me οικ ταλα
φι:Η

265 Νυκήρατος Νυκηράτου Μελιτ
Φειδίππος Σωσιδήμου Ξυπε
Πριάνθην έμ Με οικ ταλα φια:Η
Δυσίδης Χίνων 'Αλωπεκ
Σωστράτην ταλασιουργ έμ M οικ
φι:Η

270 [Κ]αλλίας Καλλικράτους 'Αφιδ
[- - - - - - -] έστον εγ Κολλ οικ ήνη φι:Η
[- - - - - - -] κλής 'Αριστοφάνου 'Αχαρ
[- - - - - - -] έμ M [οικ ταλα] σιουρ φι:Η
[- - - - - - -] ου Δεν
275 [- - - - - - - - -] φι:Η

About 50 lines missing

326 φυ[- - - - - - -]

φι:[Η]

'Αντισθένειν ης 'Αντισθένειν Κυ
θη Αντιφάνη ['ης 'Αντισθένειν]
330 Κυθήρρ Στρατο[- - - - - - -]
_Άγρυλ οίκ φι:Η_

Νικώστρατ[ος ————]

_Άχαρ Κλεο[———–]_

tαλασσηρ[———– φιά:Η]

335 Μισγόλας [Ναυκράτους Κολλυ]

Ναυκλ[ής Ναυκράτους Κολλυ

[———–] οίκ φιά:Η

_Μισγόλας Ναυκράτους Κολ_

340 λυ Ναυκλής Ναυκράτους Κολ

_Ήδιστην παιδίον ε Σκαμ οίκ_

φι:Η

_Τιμόστρατος Σμικρίου Σφητ_

[. . .] μαίνω τειχίστην Σφηττοί

345 [οίκ φιά:] Η

[———– Π] αμψίλου Φυλάσ

[———–] ξ Ζωφίλου Φυλα

[———– οί] κ ταλα ϕι:Η

[———–] vacat

350 [———–] τα

[———– έ] μ M

[οίκ φιά:Η] vacat

10-12 lines missing (?)
-28-

Text of the Stele
(English)

Face A
Column I

23 lines missing

[………..]v
25 [.....phiale weight:100]vv
[………..] resid
ent[.....]escapes from
[………..]atou
[.....phiale weight:100]
30 [………..in] Peira(eus)
[resident]escapes from vv
[………..k]udos T
[.....phiale weight:100]
[………..in] Kolly(tos)
35 [resident]escapes from
[………..]rato
[………..]Synk
[………..]kra
[………..]La]mpt
40 [………..]rat

about 28 lines missing

[………..]resident
70 [………..]escapes from
[………..]pol
[………..phiale] weight:100
[………..in Kol]ly(tos) resid
e(nt)[………..]escapes from
75 [………..o]kratos
[…..phiale] weight:100
[………..]beiou P
[………..]resid(ent) escapes
fr(om)[………..]okratos

about 12 lines missing

92 [………..]le
[………..]escapes (from)
[...........]n son of Olymp
95 [iodoros of A)gryle phia(le) wei(ght):100
[...........]wool(worker) in Kyd(athenaion)
[resident] escapes from ν
Lysidikos son of Lysistratos of
Acharnai phia(le) wei(ght):100
100 [K]ittos in Pei(raeus) resident
smith escapes from νν
Dionysios isoteles
phiale weight:100 ννν
Mnesithea[n]in Pei(raeus) res
105 ide(nt) wool(worker) escapes from
Dionysios isoteles
phiale weight:100 ννν
Satyros in Hagnous resid(ent)
farmer(ies) escapes from νν
110 Kephisios son of Kephisodemos of
Palle(ne) phia(le) wei(ght):100
[K]allias<retail(ier) in Pe
i(raeus) resident escapes from νν
[......]in son of Polyeuktos of
115 [.........]phiale | wei(ght):100

[vacat]

Fragment published by Lewis in 1968
Ag. No. I 4763

two lines illegible

[......]e escapes from
[Arist]an]dros [......]
[.]is of Eu[o](nymon) phi[a]le [weight:100]
[E]lpis in M[e]li(te) [reside(nt)]
5 [fl]utegirl escapes fr
o(m) Leippo[s............]
in Meli(te) resid(ent) and joi
nt contributors [with...]
ontok[.............]
10 phia[l]e [weight:100vvv]

lacuna
11 lines missing

128 [.............]ou
[......phial(e) weight:100
130 [.............]r in K
[..resident] escapes from v
[...........]son of Demostra
[tos of Phrea]rr(hioi) phial(e) weight:100
[......]os in Kyda(thenaion) res
135 iden(t) [goldsm(ith) escapes from
[Eu]thyphron son of Euthykl
es of Cholle(idai) phial(e) weight:100
Bion in Mel(ite) resident sign
etengr(aver) escapes from
140 Chairippos son of Chairede
mos of Halai together with joint contrib
utor(s) with Chairip
pos of Halai phial(e) weight:100
Ophelion in Kolly(tos) res
145 iden(t) bedma(ker) escapes from
Eupolemos son of Eupolem
os of Agry(le) phial(e) weight(t):100
Moschion in Peir(aeus) resi
den(t) merchant escapes from
150 Lukis son of Bion of [Acharnai]
phial(e) weight: 100
Philonike wool(worker) [in]
Leuko(nion) resident escapes from
Demosthenes [......]
155 los of Phyle [phial(e) weight:100]
Adous[ios........]

About 28 lines missing

185 pleph[.............] i
n Kol[lytos resident phia(le) weight:100]
Menipp[e [.............]
woolwor(ker) escapes from
Demotion son of D[emon] of
190 Phrearrhi(oi), Dem[......]
of Demon of Phrea[rrhi(oi),] [Dem]
chilos son of Demo[n of Phre]
arrhio(i) phiale [weight:100]
Onesimos A[lope(?)] resides
195 n(t) cook [escapes from]
207  [L]ukisko[s son of Diodotos] of Epik(phisia) phial(e) weight:[100] Manes amphor(abearer) in Kol(ytos)  
210  resident escapes from vv v Oeniades son of Oenokleos of Hamaxan(teia) phiale weight:100 Philiste woolworker in Mel(ite) resident escapes from  
215  Epicharides son of Lusipp os of Lampt(rai) phiale weight:100 Aristomenes in Mel(ite) resident shoemaker escapes from Thrasymedes son of Kedeidos of  
220  Leukono(ion) phiale weight:100 Onesime sesame seller <in> Alopeke resident escapes from Philon Phile[... Al] ope(ke) resident phiale weight:100  
225  Poseidon[ios...] in Kolly(tos) resident [escapes from] Hygiai[on...] son of chos of Ank(yl(e) phiale weight:100 Sima[..........]  
230  woolworker escapes from Arch[.............] son of os of Phaler(on) phiale weight:100  

vacat
8 lines missing

241  [Stro]mbich(?) son of Theom[east(?)]
    [Ol]ynthi(os) phial(e) weig(ht):100
    Pistokles in Me[1]i(te) resid
e(nt) sandalmak(er) escapes f(rom)
245  Kallippides son of Kall[i]
os of Aphid(na) phial(e) weig(ht): [100]
    Dionysios in [S]ka(mbonidai) resi
de(nt) farmwork(ers) escapes from
    [A]gnonid(es) son of [Pe]lisit
250  ratos of Kephi(sia) phia(le) weig(ht):100
    Polytimos in Kolly(tos)
    reside(nt) shoemak(ers) escapes fr(om)
    Kallias son of Kalliados of
    Paiania phial(e) weig(ht):100.
255  Lampris in Skam(bonidai) resi
de(nt) nurse escapes fr(om)
    Aristophon son of Aristi
    on of Aphid(na) phial(e) weig(ht):100
    Eupeithe serv(ant)/nurs(e)
260  in Sk(ambonidai) reside(nt) escapes fr(om)
    Aristophon Ari[s]ti
    on of Aphidn(a) phial(e) weig(ht):100]
    Eu[m[...]]s in Ko[ll(ytos) resident]

53 lines missing

317  [.........] escapes fr(om)
    [.........]dos
    [.........phial(e)] weig(ht):100
320  [.........in Me]li(te) resident
    [.........] escapes fr(om)
    [.........son of A]pollodo
    [ros...phial(e)] weight:100

3 lines missing

327  [..]0[.........]
    Lyde Alopeke [resident]
    woolwork(ers) escapers fr(om)
330  Theophilos An[......]
    Euonym[e](on) phial[l(e) weig(ht):100]
    Menios in [.........]
    waiting(man) escapes from
Diogen[es........]
335 pos of Er[...phiale] weight:100

About 10 lines missing

Column IV

5 lines missing

[.........]p
335 [.........phiale] weight:100
[.........] resident
[escapes from vv]vv
[.........] LULO
[.........phiale] weight:100
360. [.........] in Me(lite)
resident [...] escapes from(m)
[.........] os of Pal
[lene phiale] weight:100
[- - - - - - - -]
365 [- - - - - - - -]
e[.........]
io[.........phiale] weight:100
Dor[.........]
frankincense[ller] escapes from(m)
370 Str[.........]
in Peir(eus) resident phiale weight:100
Lys[.........]
wooolwork(er) escapes from(m)
D[.........]o
375 [.........phiale] weight:100
[.........] in Me
[lite] resident [...] escapes from(m)vv
[.........] sv
[...phiale] weight:100vv
380 [.........] in Ska<bo
[n(idai) resident] ........ escapes from(m)
[.........] mos of Kyth
[eros phiale] weight:100vv
[.........] in Sk<a<bon(idai) res
385 ide(nt) [.........] ik escapes from(m)
[.........] mos of Kyth
[eros phiale] weight:100vv
[.........] in Pei(raeus) resident ...
[.........] escapes from(m)vv
390 [.........] demos of Kyth
[eros phiale] weight:100
[.........] farm(worker) in He
[phai] resident escapes from
[.........]AR(?). . dano
395 [.....phi]al(e) weig( ht):100
[.....h]iredwork( er) Alo
[pek(e) resi(dent)] escapes fro(m)v
[.....]des A[r]i[s]tar
[chos My]rr(hin?), Gorgatho(s) So
400 [sistr]atos of Kydathe(naion)v
[phiale] weigh(t):100\\n
[.....]s pinesplit(ter)
[.....]n resident(t) escapes fro(m)
[.....]n son of Philon of Pa
405 [.....]olos of Iphisti
[ad(ai).....]doros Meid
[.........]OINDI Apo
[ll.......]einios
[.....phial(e) we(ight):100
410 [.........]n Ko
[ll]? resident(nt)]\\n
15 lines missing
427 [.....]ne wool[work( er) in]
Kolly(tos) reside(nt) escapes fr(om)
Andron son of Alkimachos of [P]
430 aiani(a) Kallippide[s]
son of Timonax Paian
ia phiale weight[:100]
Tyres flutema( ker) in Ky
dathe(naion) resident(t) escapes from
435 Leo[.........]
M[- - phial(e) we(ight):100]

5 lines missing
442 [.........]os of Sph
[ettos phial(e)] weight:100\\
[.....wo]olwork( er) in K
445 [.....reside(nt)] escapes fr(om)
[.........]thykle
[.........] phia(le) weig( ht):100
[.........] ironwor(ker) in
[.....]residen(t) escapes fro(m)
450 [.........] son of Lysanios
[.....ph]ial(e) weig( ht):100
[......] gluebo(iler) Alo
[pe(ke) resid(ent)] escapes fro(m)v
[......]arnes son of Aristo
455 [...(?)] Chol[le] phia(le) weig(ht):100
[......] cobbl(er) in S
[ka(mbonida)] residen(t) escapes fro(m)v
[......] son of Polyretosv
[......] phia(le) weig(ht):100v
vacat

Column V

STOICH. 17

460 [......... in] Pei(raeus) res
tident escapes fro(m)v
[Ch]arias son of Charonidos of Eu
onymo(n) phial(e) weigh(t):100v
Philon secreta(ry) in Th[o]
465 rikos residen(t) escapes fromv
Pherekleides son of Pherekle.
os of Perithoi(idai) phial(e) weigh(t):100
Rhodia woolwork(er) in Thori
kos resid(ent) escapes fro(m)
470 Pherekleides son of Pherekle
os of Perithoi(idai) phial(e) weigh(t):100
Kordype domestic servant in Th
orik(os) resid(ent) escapes fr(om)
Phere[kl]eides son of Phere[kle]
475 os of [Perith]oi(idai) [phial(e) weigh(t):100]
K[......]na[.........]

3 lines missing

480 [.........n]ne[r in Mel]
it(e) reside(nt) escapes fr(om)v
Saurias son of Athenippos of P
eira(eus) <and> Spoudias son of Thea[i]
tetos of Cholar(gos) phia(le) weigh(ht):100
485 Epikerdes Oe resid(ent)
vinedres(ser) escapes fromv
De[m]ophilos son of Demophanos
of Paiani(a) phia(le) weigh(ht):100v
Herakleides in Me(lite) resid
490 d(ent) retail(er) escapes fromv
Menedemos in Me(lite) resid
en(t) phial(e) weigh(ht):100v

Joss
Thraittta retail(er) in Melite
resident escapes from

Menedemos in Melite resident phial(e) weight: 100
Itame woolspinner in Pireaus resident escapes from
Chairippos son of Timokleides

dos of Acharnai phial(e) weight: 100
Epigonos merchant in Pireaus resident escapes from
Ktesias son of Kteson of Thoricos phial(e) weight: 100

Demetria cythara-player in Peiraeus resident escapes from
Epikephisia resident escapes from
Athenodoros son of Theodoros of Melite <and> Theodoros son of Theodoros of Melite phial(e) weight: 100

Philon saltfish-dealer in Kolos resident escapes from
Chairphilos son of Pheidonos of Paiania phial(e) weight: 100
Chrysion domestic servant of Herakles

es in Xypete resident escapes from
Phormion son of Eumachos of Rhamnous phial(e) weight: 100
Olympias woolworker in Kyda thenaion resident escapes from

Archedamas son of Archedemos of Halai phial(e) weight: 100
Hestialos sandal-maker in Skamnidian resident escapes from
[Eu]uthymachos son of Eudikos of Xype

[ype]te phial(e) weight: 100
[.....] woolworker [in] K[...]

17 lines missing

[.........]tost son of Eukrates of Epikephisia phial(e) weight: 100
[S]oteides donkey-driver [in]
Diomei resident escapes from
Antimenes son of Pistokles phial(e) weight: [100]
Sostrate domestic servant in K[...]
[eram]eis resident escapes from
Antimenes son of Pistokles phial(e) weight: [100]
Sostrate domestic servant in K[...]
[.....] woolworker [in] K[...]

Hagnon son of Eu[thy]
-37-

kros of Kydathei(aion) phial(e) weight:[100]

555 Plaggon woolworing(ler) in [K]
yda(thenaion) resid(ent) escapes f(rom)
Autokles son of Androkleos of
Euonymon phial(e) weight:[100]
Pamphilos muleter [in L]

560 aki(adai) resident escapes from
Theochares son of Ergochar(os)
of Prasiai phial(e) weight:[100]
Nikias frankincense(seller) in [P]
ei(raeus) resident escapes from

565 Philokrates son of Epikratos of
Eleusis and joint contrib
utors with Theoph
rastos son of Bathyllos of Chol
argos phial(e) weig(ht):[100]

vacat
[- - - - - - - - - -]

and joint contributors[---]
clothes-mender in Keiri(adai) [resi(dent) phia]nle:100

5 Tydeus son of Lamachos of Oe [- - -]n baker <in> Alopeke reside
nt phial(e):100
Euangelos son of Theangelos of Cholle(idai)
Momos tanner in Kydath(enaion)

10 resident phial(e):100
Polystratos son of Polystrat(at) of Ep
ikephisia Sosias farm-worker in
Hephaistia resident phial(e):100
Antigenes son of Epig<e>nes in Meli(te)
residen(t) Mnason sanda<w>mak(er) in Me
[li(te)] resid(ent) phiale:<100>
[Pa]nkalos son of Athenados proxenos
[Ar]chon son of Tachydemos from Koile
[...l]ian domestic-ser<va>nt in Peira(eus) resid(ent)

20 phiale:100
[Pankalo]s son of Athena[dos proxenos]

8 lines missing

30 [- - - - - - - - - -]phi
[ale:100] vacat
[- - - - - - - - - -]IEGRO.OU
[- - - in P]eir(aeus) residen(t) [phia(le):100]
[- - -]machos son of K[allimachos of Marathon

35 [- - - - -]a(t) Peir(aeus) <res(ident) saltfish deal(er)
[phi(ale):100

36 [- - - - -machos son of K[allimachos of [Maratho(n)]
[- - -]ephane domestic servant in Peire(aeus) res(ident)
[phiale:]100
[- - -machos Kallli[m]achos of Marath(om

40 [- - - - - -]in Peir(aeus) resi(dent) [phia(le):100]
[- - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - -] Mara[th](on)

2 lines missing

45 [- - - - - - - -]demo[- - -]
3 lines missing

Joss

17 lines missing

[- - ]one horse-tend(er) in [- - ]
[ - - ]resi(dent) phi[a(le):100
[Th]ersippos son of Antiphanos [- - - - -
[...rtion mulet(ear) in P(eiraeus) resi(dent) [phi(a(le):100]

95 Thersippos son of Antiphanos[- - - - -
Simon domestic-servant in P(eiraeus) resi(dent) phi[a(le]:[100]

97 [...]mares Alopeke resi(dent) Lept[...]
[...]n in the work at Kyn(osarges) resi(dent) phi[a(le):[100]
[......]s isoteles Meson wool-(worker)

100 [Alo]peke resi(dent) phi[a(le):100
[...mostratos son of Polycharmidos
[- - ]1 Pheidestratos gold-smith
[in] Ky[dath(enaion) resi(dent) phi[a(le):100
[...krates son of Euxenos of Palle(ne]
Jos

105 Nikoxenos son of Hegesios of Erchi(a)
   Demostratos son of Demostratos of
   [P]all(ene) Okimon wool-(worker) in Hephai(stia)
   resi(dent) phiale:100
   [K]leoxenos and kurios Ktesoni

110 des of Oe Eukles in Kol(lytos) resi(dent)
   farm-(worker) phial(e):100
   Menites son of Menon of Kydath(enaion) Attas
   pulse-dealer in K(?) resi(dent) phial(e):100
   Menites son of Menon of Kydath(enaion) Mal

115 thake wool-worker in K<ei>r(iadiai)
   resi(dent) phiale:100
   Menites son of Menon of Kydath(enaion)
   Plaggon domestic-servant in Kei(riadi) resi(dent) phi(ale): 100

119 Menites son of Menon of Kydath(enaion)

120 Moschon domestic-servant in Kei(riadi) resi(dent) phi(ale): 100

121 Menites son of Menon of Kydath(enaion)
   Aristonike domestic-servan(t) in Ke(?) resi(dent) phiali(ke): 100
   vacat

Column II

About 8 lines missing

131 /[-----]  
M[-----]
Ep[-----]
OM[-----]

135 Ep[-----]
Arch[-----]
Ep[-----]
[Z[-----]
[-----]

140 [-----] ou
[----- phi(ale):100

9 lines missing

151 ..oi[-----]
Lusichare[s -----]
and joint contr(ibutors ----]
resi(dent) [phial(e):100]
Antho(?) resid(ent) dem(?): 100
Jolemos of Eleusis Achryio
farm-(worker): 100
os son of Chairedemos of Halai

lopeke resid(ent) mill(er): 100
ias son of Aristokritos of Aphidna(
[]tyra in Peireaus resid(ent) flute-(girl): 100
picharinos son of Epicharinos of Leuk(onoion)
[Ep]hon wool-worker in Pallenon resid(ent)

eoptolemos son of Antikles of
Melite) Demeas carpenter in [- -]
resid(ent): 100
[OIG [- - - - - - - - - ]

e[- - - - - - - - - ]
v[- - - - - - - - - ]
i

Simalon domestic-[servant resid(ent)]
Autokrates son of Ag[- - - - - - - - - ]
Nikariste domest(sic-servant resid(ent)]

Phylaxias son of Pan[ios of Anagyrous]
Glykera wool-(ork(er): - - - resid(ent)]
Euboulos son of Ke[- - - - - - - - - ]
merch(ant) Mosch[- - - - - - - - - ]
About 5 lines missing

250 [- - - - - - - -] os of Euon(ymon)
    [- - - - - - - -] vacat
    [- - - - - - - -] l resid(ent) barber phi(ale):100
    [Nikeratos son of Nikeratos of Melite]
    [Pheidippos] son of Sosidemos of Xyp(ete)
255 [- - - - -] in Melite resid(ent) signet-en(graver)
    [phi(ale):100]
    [Nikeratos son of Nikeratos of Melite]
    [Pheidippos] son of Sosidemos of Xyp(ete)
    [...] non domestic-servant in Melite resid(ent) phi(ale):100
260 Nikeratos son of Nikeratos of Melite
    Pheidippos son of Sosidemos of Xyp(ete)
    Stratonike in Melite resid(ent) wool-(worker)
    phi(ale):100
    Nikeratos son of Nikeratos of Melite
265 Pheidippos son of Sosidemos of Xyp(ete)
    Prianthe in Melite resid(ent) wool-(worker) phi(ale):100
    Lysides son of Chion of Alopek(e)
    Sostrate wool-work(er) in Melite resid(ent)
    phi(ale):100
270 [K]allias son of Kallikrates of Aphida(na)
    [...] stos in Kollytos resid(ent) donkey-(driver) phi(ale):100
272 [.....] kles son of Aristophanes of Achar(nai)
    [- - -] in M(elite) [resid(ent) wool-work(er) phi(ale):100
    [...] - - - os of Leukonoion)
275 [- - - - - - - - - - - -] phi(ale):100

About 50 lines missing

326 on[- - - - - - - - -]
    phi(ale):[100]
    Antis<ten>[es son of Antisthenes of Ky]
    ther(os) Antiphan[es son of Antisthenes]
330 of Kyther(os) Strato[- - - - - - -]
    Agyrl(e) resid(ent) phi(ale):[100]
    Nikostrat(os - - - - - - -]
    of Achar(nai) Kleo[- - - - - - -]
    wool-wo(rker)[- - - - - - phia(ie):100]
335 Misgulas [son of Naukrates of Kollytos]
    Naukl[es son of Naukrates of Kollytos]
    [- - - - - - - - -]
    resid(ent) phia(ie):100
Misgolas son of Naukrates of Kol
ly(tos) Naukles son of Naukrates of Kol(lytos)
Hediste domestic-servant i<n> Skam(bonidai) resid(ent)
phi(ale):100
Timostratos son of Smikrios of Sphet(tos)
[...]maios wa[ll]-builder Sphettos
345 [resid(ent) phia(le)]:100
[- - - - - - - son of P]amphilos of Phyle
[- - - - - - -]s son of Zophilos of Phyle
[- - - - - - - resid(ent) wool-(worker) phi(ale):100
[- - - - - - -] vacat
350 [- - - - - - - - - - -]ta
[- - - - - - - - - - -] in M(elite)
[resid(ent) phia(le):100] vacat

10-12 lines missing (?)
As stated in the Introduction, the entries on the Manumission Stele are the results of fictitious trials for abandonment, called dikai apostasiou. They are considered legal fictions because every entry records an acquittal, resulting in the complete release of every slave on the document. These Attic manumissions all date within a small time frame of not more than twenty years and appear to be an isolated event, since there are no such inscriptions extant from before or after this period.\textsuperscript{17} This system of manumission registration appears to have been introduced suddenly at Athens and then just as suddenly abandoned. For a detailed explanation of the real action, we must rely on the ancient lexographer Harpokration, whose definition survives as the most complete of its kind:

It is an action against freedmen which is given to those who have freed them if they (the freedmen) should ever abandon them or register another as prostates and not do the things which the laws bid. For those convicted, they must (again) be slaves, but those who are successful, already being free, must become so completely.\textsuperscript{18}

Although the trials on the Manumission Stele were feigned, they

\textsuperscript{17} Tod, 191-92 and no. 41 and Lewis (1959) 238.

\textsuperscript{18} Harpocrationis Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos, s.v."apostasiou": δίκη τίς ἔστι κατὰ τῶν ἀπελευθερωθέντων δεδομένη τοῖς ἀπελευθερωμένοις εἰπών ἀφιστώμεναι τε ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἢ ἄλλων ἐπιγραφώντα προστάτην καὶ ἀ κέλευσιν οἱ νόμοι μὴ ποιῶσιν. τοὺς μὲν ἀλλότρους δεὶ δούλους εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ νικήσαντας τελέως ἢ ἔλευθεροὺς. Although it is probable that Harpokration was referring to Athens when describing such procedures, it is impossible to say whether he was referring to Classical or Hellenistic times.
give evidence of a process that was necessary to protect former masters when their former slaves abandoned them, or failed to fulfill their paramonai agreements once they had been freed. As Harpokration stated, among the conditions imposed upon the freedman, was the legal requirement that he have his former master as his prostates. He further states that if the freedman was found guilty of failing any of the conditions of his agreement, he would immediately revert to his former status as a slave. If found innocent, he would obtain apolusis and be freed “completely” from his paramonai obligations. Because of Harpokration’s wording where he deals with the result of acquittal,¹⁹ we know that the defendants in these cases had already been released and were therefore living-apart (khoris oikountes) in a quasi-free state.²⁰

There is very little evidence for paramonai agreements at Athens. Literary evidence is scarce and is only found in two authors. In Xenophon’s Oeconomicus there is one dubious reference to paramone:

> Then what, he said, if I show you besides that in households in which all the servants are fettered, so to speak, these frequently run away but in households in which they are unfettered, these are willing to work and remain? (3.4)

Although Xenophon uses the verb παραμένειν in the last line of this passage, it is almost certain that here he is referring to

¹⁹ He writes: ἡδε ἐλευθέρους.
²⁰ There has been much debate as to whether these freedmen were actually free. Although they had been manumitted and were therefore in a freer state than they had been previously (i.e. they were not full-fledged slaves), they were still under paramonai agreements and thus remained obligated to their former masters. Because of the intermediary nature of the freedman’s status, it is not difficult to understand why there would have been confusion among writers. See Harrison, 167 and no. 5.
slaves who were not khoris oikountes, and certainly not freedmen. This reference should not, therefore, be used as evidence for paramone agreements.

Better evidence is found in Plato’s *Laws*:

The former master may indict the freedman, if he does not attend those who freed him, or does not do so sufficiently. And such tendance shall consist in the coming of the freedman three times per month to the home of the man who freed him; and he must undertake to do whatever is necessary which is just and within his ability. (11.915a)

Interestingly, this same idea of attendance after liberation, and punishment for failure to do so, is found in inscriptions from Delphi, many of which contain clauses such as the following: ‘(The said freedman) must abide by (the said master) for the duration of his (the master’s) life, carrying out every duty as far as he is able. If he does not do this, (his master) has the power to penalize him for doing as he wishes.’ These acts cover the years between 201-100 BCE and total nine-hundred and seventy-four.

In the absence of epigraphical evidence for paramone agreements at Athens, we cannot be sure that such agreements as the ones illustrated in the Delphic inscriptions were practiced there but when compared to the passage from Plato, which is comparable to

---

21 Fouilles de Delphes: Les Inscriptions du Theatre. Cf. for example, nos. 35, 50 and 51 for such paramonai (παραμονή) clauses.
22 Cf. Garlan, 81. Conditional manumissions become more numerous as unconditional manumissions began showing a gradual increase in cost throughout the years. Garlan (80) explains the apparent growing reluctance for masters to unconditionally free their slaves as a consequence of Roman occupation, which was making it increasingly difficult for Greek masters to acquire foreign slaves.
the agreements from Delphi, the possibility for there being similar Athenian agreements is certainly viable.\textsuperscript{23}

In light of this, it cannot be said that the defendants on the Manumission Stele were being released from paramonai agreements, as would be the case in the real trials as illustrated by Harpokration, but only that this document (and related stelai\textsuperscript{24}) was a government posting, resulting from some sort of legal process, which acted as public evidence of the freedman’s release. Manumission agreements were often made in private, as there was no required legal procedure for a master to free his slave.\textsuperscript{25} By publishing the slave’s release, any challenge to his liberation would be difficult. Garlan states that the situation of freedmen was “precarious” because they ‘ran the risk of having their liberation challenged.’\textsuperscript{26} Perhaps it was for this reason that the state saw it necessary to publish such manumission documents in an effort to avoid any confusion over the freedman’s status.

1.1 Payment of the Phialai

For each entry, there was a payment of 100 drachmas in the form of a phiale (a silver bowl). The phialai acted as registration fees, perhaps, as Lewis suggests, imposed by a Lycurgan Law documented by the fragment IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1560.\textsuperscript{27} This fragment, dated ca.

\textsuperscript{23} It must be noted that Plato does not use the verb παραφεύειν in Laws but rather θεραπεύειν.
\textsuperscript{24} Lewis (1959), 235 states that there are 17 in total. He later adds one new fragment (1968), making a total of 18.
\textsuperscript{25} It was not uncommon, however, for a master to desire publicity for his action. Often manumissions occurred in courtrooms or at the theatre. Announcements at the theatre, however, were banned in the mid fourth-century because of the frenzy they caused.
\textsuperscript{26} Garlan, 82.
\textsuperscript{27} Lewis (1959), 237.
330, gives a law in column A related to the payment of something by weight (τὸ σταθμὸν is clearly legible at line 7), and column B is a list of manumissions along with payments of phialai, identical in formula to the entries on Face A of the Manumission Stele. These phialai do not appear to be commemorative offerings to Athena, as has been suggested. In fact, they do not appear to be dedications at all, as were the payments from the Delphic manumission stelai. Rather, these bowls are often referred to as the phialai exeleutherikai, the likes of which were accounted for in the Athenian treasurers' financial reports for 321/0 and 320/319 BCE. These record the phialai exeleutherikai as having been melted down and made into large silver hydria of varying weight. Since the list dates from approximately the same time period as the Manumission Stele, it is very tempting to think that the phialai named in the treasury report might actually have been the same ones listed on the Manumission Stele. This would then date the stele just prior to the Athenian financial reports.

That the phialai were actually payments to the state rather than dedications to a god gains further support from fragments studied by Lewis in his later publication. On one of the fragments, IG II² 1575, phialai payments resulting from manumission procedures were listed on one side of the opisthographic fragment while liturgies were listed on the other. Presumably, these two types of transactions were listed back to back because both were

---

28 Garlan, 82.
29 Payments dedicated to Apollo are listed in Fouilles de Delphes: Les Inscriptions du Theatre. See for example no. 35.19-20: τὰν δὲ ἐτέραν (ὦναν) (ἐῖς τὸ ιερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐνεχειράζομεν. no. 52.9: Τίθεμαι τὰν ὦναν κατὰ τοῦ νόμου, τὰν μὲν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἔχων ἀράξας.
30 IG II² 1469, Face A column I.
31 (1968), 376.
coming to the state as payments.

It is difficult to tell who paid for the phiale, the master or the freedman. There are two stelai on which erasures concerning the case of the phiale occur and these have been used by Lewis to argue for who made the payment: IG II² 1569, which lists the former slaves as the active agents, like Face A of the Manumission Stele, and Ag.I 5656, which lists the former masters as the active agents, like Face B. On the basis of the cases in which the phialai were reentered - not all the endings had been reentered but all had their endings erased - Lewis regards it as certain that the case of the phiale was changed in order to clarify who made the payment.

In the case of IG II² 1569, it appears that the case of the phialai was being changed from the accusative into the nominative. Lewis argues that this change indicates that the former slaves were not to be mistaken as having paid for the phialai, since both shared the same case. Conversely, for Ag.I 5656 Lewis argues that the former masters paid for the phialai, since here we see opposite cases, the former masters as the active agents and the phialai as the objects. According to this logic, on the stelai on which the former slaves and the phialai share the same case and those on which the masters are the active agents and the phialai the objects, the masters paid for the phialai.

Since no erasures occurred on the Manumission Stele, nor on the majority of the extant manumission stelai, we cannot deduce on the basis of the two anomalous cases in which they do occur that the payment was made by the master on Face A, where both the slaves

---

32 Lewis (1968), 369-71.
and the phialai are in the nominative. Furthermore, on Face B both the masters' names and the phialai are in the nominative, a combination which Lewis' model does not explain.

I am not convinced that the case of the former slaves' and masters' names had anything to do with that of the phialai. On Face A, the former slaves, who are in the nominative with the accompanying participle ἀποφυγόν/οὖσα, seem to correspond to their former masters who are in the accusative (e.g. Elpis escapes from Leippos). On Face B, where the masters are in the nominative and the slaves in the accusative, the meaning appears to be the same but with the masters as the active agents (e.g. Leippos [is defeated by] Elpis). The nominative case of the phialai is constant throughout the entire stele and appears to be a separate clause (Payment: 100 drachmas). Even if we are to accept Lewis' theory concerning the fragments in question and the assumption that the case of the slaves and masters had something to do with the payment of the phiale, it still remains very unclear who made the payment in the majority of the remaining evidence.33

It is definitely plausible that since slaves were presumably required to buy their own freedom - and they could indeed make money, as seen in the Erechtheion building accounts34 - those who were living apart and likely able to accumulate more funds than they would in their masters' oikoi, would have been required, and no doubt willing, to pay for the phialai as registration fees for the publication of their complete release.

Further, and more convincing, evidence can be found in the

33 Westermann (94) presupposes that for the formula on Face A the verb "has deposited" was assumed for the slave but oddly not on Face B when it would have related to the master.
34 Randall, 199-210.
presence of the eranoi on the Manumission Stele. Such contributors are found five times, thrice on Face A, at lines 141 and 566 and on Ag.I 4763 line 7, and twice on Face B, at lines 2 and 153. On Face A, they are listed in conjunction (καὶ) with the master, with someone named each time as the head of the contributors (μετά + name). At A.141, the master is named as the head of the eranoi but at A.566 and Ag.I 4763.7, men other than the masters are named. At B.2 and 153, the eranoi appear to be listed without a head contributor, perhaps because he was also the master and the particular writer of Face B, who was much more prone to abbreviations compared to the writer of Face A, did not deem it necessary to repeat his name.35

Who were the eranoi and how do they relate to the Manumission Stele? The LSJ describes eranoi as ‘a society of subscribers to a common fund, a club.’ Therefore, an eranos was someone who contributed money to a certain cause; the term does not specifically apply to one who helped pay for someone’s manumission. Some historians have thought that slaves named with eranoi were in the possession of an eranos-society, which would then be the manumittor.36 There are serious problems with this theory: first of all, why would some slaves who had the help of eranoi also be listed with a separate master if they were supposedly owned by the eranoi, such as the one at A.567-70? Furthermore, the Manumission Stele is too early to have anything to do with so-called eranos-clubs, for which the earliest epigraphical evidence comes from the mid third-century.37

35 See below, no.40.
36 This is discussed by Finley, 104-105. This evidence is assembled by Poland, 28-33.
37 Ibid.
There is only sparse literary evidence for eranoi as related to manumission. This is found in Demosthenes 59 Neair. 29ff. According to Demosthenes, Neaira was given permission to purchase her freedom from her masters, who were marrying other women. She then went about collecting money from various eranoi, asking one of them to take all the money she had collected and purchase her freedom from her masters; she could not do this herself because she was a slave, inherently having no legal rights. This man would then have been named as the legal collector, although she had actually done the collecting herself. If we are to assume that this procedure was the same at Athens, then it was this man who was the legal collector who would be named as the head of the eranoi. In the absence of proof for the procedure at Athens, Demosthenes’ account at least gives evidence that Neaira’s manumission was recognized there and perhaps gives us a clue as to the role of the eranoi, and of the head contributor in particular, in the case of the Attic manumissions.

The answer to who was responsible for the payment, former master or slave, may well be found at A.141. Here the former master is named as also the head of the eranoi - although the second time he is listed, only his name and deme are repeated - and possibly also in the two entries on Face B where a head of the contributors is lacking. If the former master had always paid for the phiale, there would have been no distinction made by adding other named contributors, nor would he specifically have been named as such if he was assumed to be a contributor. Thus, the slave likely collected his own eranoi - as illustrated by Demosthenes - of whom 38 These points are discussed by Finley, 105.
his master could doubtless be one, and the head contributor was named on the document as having helped secure for him the payment.

1.2 The Formula

Each entry records the freedman, his technitikon (to be discussed in Ch 3), domicile, the former master, and the payment of a phiale. The arrangement of the details varies, however, between Face A and Face B. On Face A we have in every instance the defendant's name in the nominative, followed by the oikon en formula (metric designation for domicile), a technitikon and the participle apophugon ('acquitted from'), followed by the plaintiff in the accusative. The oikon en formula and occupation are often inverted but the order stated here is the most common. On the other hand, the author of Face B has reversed the order of the defendant and plaintiff, naming first the plaintiff in the nominative, then the defendant in the accusative, his/her technitikon and the oikon en formula.

The reversal of formula from Face A to Face B is difficult to explain. Lewis reasons that the two sides were inscribed at different times and by different people. There is evidence that Face B was inscribed later based on prosopographical information (see the Introduction) and the hasty manner in which it was inscribed suggests that it was not planned as carefully, making it appear to be a later addition. The evidence that it was inscribed by a different hand, however, is convincing: Face A was carefully planned and executed in stoichedon, there are no major

\[\text{Lewis (1959), 233.}\]
abbreviations, no spelling mistakes and the script was drawn by a careful hand. Alternatively, Face B is not written in stoichedon and is rife with spelling mistakes and extreme abbreviations.

A difference in hand, however, does not explain the departure from the more common formula with the defendant’s name in the nominative. Lewis does discuss two other stelai which have the reversed formula, IG II² 1566 and IG II² 1578. IG II² 1566 is opisthographic like the Manumission Stele, but oddly it suddenly changes formula on the same side from the common apophugon type to the more uncommon formula with the master’s name in the nominative. The other fragment, IG II² 1578, is even more anomalous as it lacks all reference to phialai, appearing to be an earlier inscription written before the institution of such payments.

Lewis does not venture a new theory as to the reason for these reversals. Rather, he combines the theories of Tod and Kahrstedt, inferring that since Face B and the comparable IG II² 1566 both seem to have been inscribed at a later period, the legal responsibility for the payment of the phiale may have changed at some time from freedman to former master. Perhaps, more simply, the reversal was due to a formulaic modification which occurred at the request of the former masters wanting to be named first, although this is a hypothetical suggestion. Realistically, although we know that manumissions were occurring on both sides of the document as evidenced by the continuous payments for every

---

11 See above, p 14 for a fragment with the possible institution of this law.
12 (1959), 238.
entry, there is so little evidence for this procedure as a whole that these reversals cannot be explained adequately.

On the Manumission Stele there can be identified three categories of metics: those with the honorary title *isoteles* (A.103 and B.99), privileged foreigners with the title *proxenos* (B.17) and the most common kind identified simply by the oikon en formula and the lack of patronymic (one metic does have a patronymic at B.14, but this is uncommon). The metics' oikon en designation is generally thought to be an indication of domicile, doubtless because they were usually registered in city demes where they likely worked, such as Melite or the Peiraeus. This differs from the citizen's demotic, which, because hereditary, was not always an indication of domicile. Like the metic, however, the citizen's demotic had been the residence of the original citizen under Kleisthenes' reforms.

The honorific character of both *isoteleia* and *proxenia* is emphasized by the lack of the oikon en formula and the common inclusion of a patronymic - although on the Manumission Stele, the recipient of *isoteleia*, Dionysios (A.103), is listed without one. What is most telling of the level of honour it was to be an isoteles or a proxenos is the fact that the metic gave the title pride of place before citizenship in another city.

Unlike an isoteles, a proxenos did not have to be a metic. He could simply be a xenos who was given the title as an honour by the Athenians. He could also be an Athenian citizen who was given the title by another city-state. There is one proxenos, Pankalos, on the Manumission Stele (B.17-21), who is listed in conjunction

---

See below, p 65ff, for a discussion of this designation.

Whitehead, 34.
with Archon, an Athenian citizen. It is impossible to say for sure whether this man was an Athenian citizen who was given the title by another city-state or whether he was a metic who was honored by the Athenians. The fact that he was freeing his slaves in Athens, however, would indicate that he probably lived there and was therefore a metic.

1.3 Comparison with IG II² 10

Since IG II² 10 and the Manumission Stele are often spoken of in conjunction with each other, I feel it prudent at this point to give a brief discussion outlining their similarities and differences. At first glance, there is good reason to compare the two inscriptions: both are long lists naming slaves (although this designation is in dispute for IG II² 10, see below), accompanied by various humble occupations, who appear to have undergone some sort of emancipation. Furthermore, both types of inscription are very uncommon, the only other comparable one being the Erechtheion Building accounts, on which slaves are also present and listed with their occupations. This latter inscription is of a very different type than the first two, however, since, like slaves, metics and citizens were also listed with their occupations for the self-evident purpose of accounting for the work performed on the building. This latter list, therefore, does not figure in the present discussion and will not be spoken of further here.

For the following section, I referred to Osborne's text (1981).
Discussed in Ch 3.
Randall, 199-210.
I referred above to the recipients on IG II^2^ 10 as slaves. This designation is up for debate, since the word in question only retains the last two letters -oi. Since the recipients were obviously not citizens, as indicated by their lack of patronymic and demotic, as well as their being listed with occupations, which is exceedingly uncommon for citizens, we are left with three choices for their status: xenoi, metoikoi, or douloi.

Their being xenoi is quickly rejected, since it is difficult to believe that there would have been such a great number of foreigners employed in Attica at one time performing various menial occupations and, furthermore, that these men would have risked their lives fighting to overthrow the Oligarchy for a state in which they did not wish to become permanent residents. Nor were they metoikoi, for why too would these men wish to risk their lives in such a pursuit? Their status would presumably remain the same under either rule. We are left, therefore, with douloi, who would stand to gain the most precious of all things; their freedom. Furthermore, both their lowly occupations and the Thracian origin of some of their names attests to this designation.

Even though the men on IG II^2^ 10 appear to have been slaves, this inscription was apparently not a manumission document in the truest sense, although emancipation surely must have come part and parcel with the grant of isoteleia. Assuming that the procedure of manumission was the same in the fifth century as in the fourth,

---


\(^{50}\) None of these men were listed as mercenaries. See Harding (1987), 177.
the slaves' masters would probably have been listed and there would likely be some proof of dike apostasiou (the apophugon formula) which resulted in an acquittal for the defendants, all of which are seen on the Manumission Stele. The purpose of IG II² 10 is different from the Manumission Stele; it is to honour the recipients for performing an important role in the overthrowing of the Oligarchy and the subsequent reinstitution of the democracy. Judging from the structure of the inscription, which lists the recipients under tribal headings only, it is clear that they were either naturalized or given isoteleia, both of which required membership in tribes. The former is easily rejected, since there was no assignation to demes, which was essential after Kleisthenes' reforms. We are left, then, with the grant of isoteleia, the likes of which is attested by literary evidence (Xen.Hell. 2.4.25).

Although these recipients would have had to become metics in order for their new title to make sense, they presumably were not designated as such, namely with the oikon en formula, not only because this would have been assumed but also because the purpose of the decree was to honour the recipients with isoteleia, not to formalize their new status as metics, as was the case on the Manumission Stele. Furthermore, the title of isoteles displaced the common metic designation.

51 These are not public slaves, as seen by their occupations, which are very similar to those on the Manumission Stele.
52 Although the Manumission Stele is about eighty years later than this document, we have no other Attic manumission documents to compare it to.
53 The heading for the first category is missing but the space available suggests that these recipients were listed under tribal headings like the rest. See Harding (1987), 176 no. 7.
54 Osborne, 33. He further argues for citizenship for the first group of recipients, but this is conjecture and not based upon epigraphical evidence.
55 See above, p 55.
There is much more to be said about IG II² 10, but this is not the place for such a discussion. It is similar to the Manumission Stele only its most general appearance regarding slaves listed by their occupations, which are similar, and in the fact that emancipations had taken place, although the purposes of the documents are doubtless very different. The occupations listed on IG II² 10, however, are much the same as those on the Manumission Stele, meriting its revisitation in Chapter Three.
Both Tables 1, representing Face A, and 2, representing Face B, are written in alphabetical order according to the former masters' demes (the Tables are given at the end of this chapter, pp 70-73). The word 'New' written beside a line number indicates that the entry is from the fragment published later by Lewis in Hesperia XXXVII, Ag.I 4763. The 'C' under 'Status' stands for 'citizen' and the 'M' for 'metic' and each letter stands for a different man. Groups of '(B)'s signify brothers. The freedmen are listed with their demes, genders and occupations. In the case that a slave was joint-owned, each of his/her masters are named. I have also included maps to illustrate the demes of both the masters and freedmen (also located at the end of this chapter, pp 74-75): Map A refers to Face A and Map B to Face B. For these, the map from J.Traill's publication (1975) was used.

Below, section one is concerned with the former masters in relation to their statuses and demes, while section two focuses on the freedmen's demes. The last section will correlate the demes of the former masters and their slaves. The freedmen's occupations will be discussed in the next chapter.

Before beginning a study of the former masters' demes, however, some clarifications should be made. First of all, at B.69 Lewis has filled in 'Απο-' for the deme, based on B.71 which probably refers to the same man. That he considers the 'Α' as being the first letter of a name is apparent by his capitalization of it,
and, judging from the placement of the word, it is the name of a deme. He would not have capitalized the first letter if he thought it simply composed the preposition 'ἀπό', in which case he would have also added the accent. The problem with a deme beginning with 'Ἀπό', however, is that there is only one, Apolloneis, and this deme was not created until ca. 200. If Apolloneis was indeed present on this document, Face B would have to be dated no earlier than 200, at the inception of this new deme, about 120 years later than the presently accepted date for the document. Based on prosopographical information (discussed in the Introduction), this late date is impossible. Since Lewis makes no comment regarding his assessment of these letters, I must conclude that his capitalization of the 'Ἀ' at both B.69 and 71 is in error. Considering that the letters are clearly legible at B.71, they must have composed the preposition 'ἀπό', followed by a deme name which is now missing.

The spelling of two other demes may cause some confusion. At B.110 there is written Οἰηθεν. Since the only demes beginning with 'Οι' both have nus, Οίνος and Οἶνος, they cannot be possibilities in the inscription because of the inclusion there of a theta for the ablative.56 This must be a mistake for the deme 'Οη, seen previously at B.5 and written there correctly as 'Οηθεν and also at A.485 as 'Οησι.

At B.13 is inscribed Ἡφαιστία and the abbreviated form Ἡφαι is seen at B.107 and also at A.392-3. Ἡφαιστία is simply a corruption of the name Ἡφιστιάδαι - which does, in fact, appear at A.405 -

56 The vowel, or rather diphthong, is seen at B.110 but must be assumed at B.5 because of local damage to the stone. For this use of the ablative, see Smyth, no. 342.
resulting from the regular process of "iotacism". As Lewis states, 'Ἠφαίστια is the version used commonly in the manumission stelai.\(^{57}\)

Furthermore, at B.98, the deme for the freedman is not apparent. Lewis judges that there is only room for one letter before 'υυ' and edits the locale as 'ἐκ τῶν ἐργ ἐπὶ Κυν οἰκ', amending Tod's earlier text 'ἐκ τῶν ἐργ ἐπὶ [Σ]ουν οἰκ'.\(^{58}\) Lewis further expands the phrase to 'ἐκ τῶν ἐργ[αζομένων] ἐπὶ Κυν[οσάργει] οἰκ[οῦντα]'.\(^{59}\) According to his suggestion, the freedman was apparently employed at Kynosarges, but this is not a deme so it cannot be his demotic. As suggested by Lewis, since Kynosarges was close to the former master's deme of residence, Alopeke,\(^{60}\) and, because he was a metic, the freedman could have been registered in his former master's deme.

Regarding the name of the locale, Lewis sees a kappa as the first letter and argues for it having been an abbreviated form of Kynosarges, based on his assertion that there is only space for one letter before 'υυ'. Conversely, Tod sees a sigma and suggests that the deme was Sounium, abbreviated to 'Σουν'. I would like to suggest a combination of these two theories: since every other freedman is listed with a deme, it seems unlikely that here the deme would have been omitted. If Lewis' assertion that there is only room for one letter before 'υυ' is true, the writer of Face B, clearly more hasty and careless in comparison to the writer of Face A, could have erroneously misspelled the deme-name, writing

---

\(^{57}\) Lewis (1959), 228. Cf. IG II\(^{2}\) 1570.82.

\(^{58}\) Lewis (1959), 231. In his restoration of the inscription, he wrote 'ἐν' but in his commentary he wrote 'ἐκ'. The former must be a mistake, since it does not make grammatical sense.

\(^{59}\) Cf. M.N. Tod, 12-13 for other possibilities.

\(^{60}\) Lewis (1959), 231. For location, see Herod. 5.63: καὶ Ἀγγιμολίου ἐσι ταφαὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀλοπεκῆς, ἀγχοῦ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ ἐν Κυνοσάργει.
Lastly, I have not included Peiraeus in my assessment of city demes, although it is recorded as such by Garland and Traill. Garland, however, refers to the Peiraeus as its own city, distinguishing it from the city of Athens, a reference that is in line with classical authors. Peiraeus was by the fourth century an entity unto its own, consisting of an enormously diverse metropolitan population rivaled nowhere else in Attica, including the Asty. Because of the port’s incomparable commercial advantages, it attracted a great number of foreigners, who were needed to fill the many jobs the busy port required. Considering the ample opportunities for employment in the Peiraeus, it is not surprising that many metics were registered in this deme. Therefore, in adherence to the classical tradition, I will henceforth keep Peiraeus separate from my calculations of city demes.

2.1 Former Master’s Demes

The total demes represented for the former masters are thirty-three for Face A and twenty-two for Face B; these totals refer to all the legible demes. For two entries on Face A, only the first letters are legible, ten are missing altogether and one is an isoteles, written without a deme. On Face B, nine demes are

---

61 Traill (1975), 52; Garland, 2.
62 Cf. Arist.Pol.5.1303b.12 and Thuc.2.13.7, 2.94.1 and 8.92.7.
63 For example, Garland (59-61) states that the bustling Peiraeus offered unrivaled opportunities for employment that simply did not exist in the countryside. He states further that sixty-nine of the metics whose demes are known are in Peiraeus, a number rivaled only by Melite at seventy-five. On the Manumission Stele, Melite has the most freedmen at twelve followed by Kollytos at ten and then Peiraeus at eight. Face B has eight in Peiraeus and seven in Melite.
missing, seven because of damage to the stone and two because the honorary titles proxenos and isoteles displaced the deme-names."

Out of the thirty-three demes on Face A, eight are coastal (24%), nine are inland (27%), and sixteen are city demes (48%). There are four metics represented, three of whom are in city demes (1-Alopeke and 2-Melite). Out of the twenty-two demes on Face B, six are coastal (27%), seven inland (32%) and nine city (41%). There are four metics in total on Face B, two in city demes (1-Alopeke, 1-Melite) and two are named without a deme, one being an isoteles and one a proxenos, as mentioned above.

On Face A, the most former masters are from city demes (47%), then a number from inland (31%) and coastal demes (22%). Comparable to Face A, Face B has the most from city demes (42%), then there are a number from inland (33%) and a few from coastal demes (25%). As mentioned earlier, some deme-members would not necessarily live in their deme, as membership was hereditary for citizens, but the pattern on the Manumission Stele lends some credence to the notion that many deme-members did indeed dwell in their deme’s locale. It makes more sense that most of the masters on this stele would have lived in or close to the city where such a document would have been published. Conversely, it does not seem likely that someone who lived further away would have had such an opportunity, nor be interested, in publishing his slave’s release on a document in the city, far from where he lived, unless, of course, he had a second home in or near the city where he employed his slave.

On Face A, six masters released more than one slave (1% of the

"For visual references, refer to Maps A and B and Charts 1 and 2 at the end of this chapter."
total). Four out of the six were citizens but two out of the four metics also released more than one slave. On Face B, however, there are no extant metics who released more than one slave, but there are six citizens (1.4%) who released multiple slaves, two pairs releasing jointly-owned slaves. Some of these masters appear to be more affluent than the ones on Face A, with one pair releasing four slaves and one man releasing five, whereas the most slaves released by one master on Face A was three.

2.2 Freedmen’s Demes

The official metic designation oikon en, combined in every entry with the freedman, is seen in its embryonic form on IG I2 329.14 (with metoikos and possibly oikon en), dated to 414/3; thereafter, the word metoikos appears to have been dropped. By the late fifth century, we see only the oikon en formula and this designation endures until the last quarter of the fourth century. The Manumission Table records the most instances of oikountes en.

Does the designation of domicile indicate that metics were members of demes? Logically, one could not belong to a deme without belonging to a tribe. Whereas a citizen, when he wished to pursue a matter in court, would go to the four judges of his tribe, metics were required to go to the Polemarch who would then distribute their cases among the tribes. This judicial process is

---

65 With the exception of B.98. See below, p 33.
66 See Whitehead, 28 and no.4.
67 Whitehead, 63 no. 30 notes an exception, IG II2 1951, which has not only the oikon en formula but also the abbreviation metoi. He suggests that this may be evidence of deme changing.
68 Enrollment into a deme, phratry and tribe was essential for citizenship after Kleisthenes’ reforms. Cf. Osborne (1972) for the procedure.
described by Aristotle:

Only private cases are handled by him (the Polemarch), which concern the ordinarymetics, as well as isoteleis and proxenoi. He must, upon taking and dividing them into ten parts by lot, place a share with each tribe, and then the tribe must render jury men to the Arbitrators. He himself prosecutes actions for both apostasios and aprostasios (an action for not having a prostates), both appointing and assigning by lot cases concerning metics. Namely, other kinds of matters\(^6^9\) which the Archon handles for citizens, the Polemarch handles for metics. (Ath.Pol.58)

The fact that metics were required to go elsewhere for legal help would indicate that they did not belong to tribes. In this light, the deme was merely a functional umbrella which gave them legal status. There is no evidence that metics' residence in their demes was immutable, as was the citizens', but rather to the contrary. Presumably, unless the phrase oikon en is nonsense, if a metic changed domicile, his deme would change. He was therefore not 'of' a deme, like a citizen, but rather 'residing in' a deme. Furthermore, the formula itself is non-honorific, appearing only on formal documentation and its usual lack of patronymic\(^7^0\) further emphasizes its non-honorific quality. It never appears in literary sources, nor in private inscriptions, such as tombstones.

The freedmen's deme-distribution represent a much less varied picture than that of the former masters'. This is not surprising since metics were usually registered in city demes or the

\(^6^9\) Except ones involving homicide, which would be tried in the Palladium. Cf. Rhodes, 655.

\(^7^0\) A.223 is unusual. Cf. Whitehead, 64 no. 39.
Peiraeus, where they were more likely to be employed, rather than inland or coastal demes. On Face A, there is a total of sixteen different demes represented, twelve of which are city demes. Thus, 75% of the freedmen’s demes on Face A are city demes, as opposed to 48% for the former masters. Furthermore, if we look at the actual distribution of people, forty-nine out of sixty-two freedmen (79%) were registered in city demes, and eight in Peiraeus (13%), whereas out of fifty-five former masters, only twenty-six were in city demes (47%). Not surprisingly, there is a wider deme-distribution for former masters than freedmen.

On Face B, there are ten demes for the freedmen, eight of which are city demes. Here, 80% of the demes represented are city demes, with twenty-six out of thirty-four freedmen registered (76%) and eight in Peiraeus (24%). This contrasts with the twenty-two demes for the former masters, nine of which are city demes (41%). Furthermore, fifteen out of thirty-six former masters are in city demes (42%). Again we see a higher percentage of metics in city demes as opposed to former masters, although there is still a large number of former masters in city demes.

2.3 Deme Correlation Between Former Masters and Slaves

On both Faces, it is uncommon for the freedman to be registered in the same deme as his former master. There are only three occurrences of this on Face A and all three times the former master is a metic. There are five metics in total and the

---

71 I assume that the single letters 'M' and 'P' inscribed by the writer stand for the common demes 'Melite' and 'Peiraeus'. Cf. For 'M' B.268, 273 and 'P' B.212 and perhaps 214.
remaining two could very well have had their former slave in their deme - in one case, the deme cannot be read because of damage to the stone and in the other instance, the deme-name is displaced by the title isoteles.

There are six cases of common demes between former masters and freedmen on Face B, four of which form a group of slaves released from the same master - two of the masters are metics and two are citizens. The case of the citizen who shares his deme Melite with his four freedmen does not appear to be such an anomaly because Melite registered several freedmen on the Manumission Stele and it is known to be a common deme for metics.\(^7\) Sphettos, on the other hand, is a little more difficult to explain. It is an inland deme, appearing only twice, here (B.343) and once at A.443. Unfortunately, at A.443 the stone is damaged and the freedman’s deme is illegible.

Thus, out of a total of eighty-nine entries for both Faces for which the demes of former masters and their freedmen can be correlated, there are only nine cases of deme-sharing, including the four slaves released by the same master. In light of this, deme-sharing appears to be exceedingly uncommon. When it does occur, four times out of six the former master is a metic (here I have counted the master who released four slaves only once). It is difficult to say why it is the case that freedmen were not usually registered in their former citizen-masters’ demes whereas metic-masters appear to share their demes with their former slaves. In most cases, citizens are not in common ‘metic’ demes, so it would appear that this is the reason why freedmen were not registered in

\(^7\) Although there are two citizen brothers at A.508-9 who did not have their freedmen registered in their deme Melite.
in the same deme as their former master. Usually when a citizen was a member of a deme such as Melite at A.508-9, or Peiraeus at A.483, however, the freedman was registered in another deme, although many of his counterparts on the document were registered in Melite and Peiraeus. In these cases, the masters probably resided in their former slaves' demes but, because demes were hereditary, they were registered elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MASTER DEME</th>
<th>FREEDMAN DEME</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Acharnai</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wool-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Agryle</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Agryle</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bed-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sesame-dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ankyle</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aphiadna</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sandal-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aphiadna</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Servant/Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cholargos</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cholleidai</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cholleidai</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Glue-boiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>Peiraius</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Frankincense-dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Epkephisia</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Epkephisia</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(New)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Euonymon</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Euonymon</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wool-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Euonymon</td>
<td>Peiraius</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Euonymon</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wool-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Halai</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Signet-engraver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Halai</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wool-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hamaxanteia</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Amphora-bearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kehisidai</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Pine-splitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kehisidai</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kehisidai</td>
<td>Diomeia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Donkey-driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kerameis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>House-servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hired-labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>(as line 553)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kyteros</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Peiraius</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lamptrai</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wool-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Leukanion</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shoe-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Flute-girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Retailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Retailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>C (B)</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>Epkephisia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>C (B)</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Myrrhinous/outta? (as line 400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paiania</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shoe-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paiania</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wool-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paiania</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paiania</td>
<td>Oe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vine-dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paiania</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Salt-fish dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pallene</td>
<td>Hagnous</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farm-worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 1: FACE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pallene</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Perithoidai</td>
<td>Thorikos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorikos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorikos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phaleron</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phrearrhioi</td>
<td>K___?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phrearrhioi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phrearrhioi</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phrearrhioi</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phyle</td>
<td>Leukonoion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Prasiai</td>
<td>Lakiadaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rhamnous</td>
<td>Xypete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sphettos</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Thorikos</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Xypete</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Iphistiadaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M___?</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T___?</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(isoteles)</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINE</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>MASTER DEME</td>
<td>FREEDMAN DEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Acharnai</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Acharnai</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anagyrous</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aphidna</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aphidna</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Apo_?</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cholleidai</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Epikephisia</td>
<td>Iphistiadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Epikephisia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Erchia</td>
<td>Iphistiadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Euonymon</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Halai</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Koile</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>C(B)</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skambonidai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>C(B)</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
<td>(as line 335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(as line 339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
<td>Keiriadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keiriadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keiriadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keiriadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keiriadai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>C(B)</td>
<td>Kytheros</td>
<td>Agryle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>C(B)</td>
<td>Kytheros</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Leukonoion</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marathon</td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peiraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Melite</td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oe</td>
<td>Alopeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oe</td>
<td>Kollytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oe</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pallene</td>
<td>Kydathenaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pallene</td>
<td>(as line 105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pallene</td>
<td>(as line 105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: FACE B

| 347 | C | Phyle | (as above) |
| 343 | C | Sphettos | Sphettos |
| 61  | C | Xypete | M | Wall-builder |
| 254 | C | Xpete | (as line 253) |
| 258 | " | " | (as line 257) |
| 261 | " | " | (as line 260) |
| 265 | " | " | (as line 264) |
| 100 | M | (isoteles) | Alopeke | F | Wool-worker |
| 54  | C | - | Kydathenaion | - |
| 103 | C | - | Kydathenaion | M | Gold-smith |
| 19  | M(?) | (proxenos) | (as line 18) | F | - |
| 33  | - | - | Peiraeus | F | Clothes-mender |
| 52  | - | - | Keiriadai | M | Vine-dresser |
| 91  | - | - | - | - | Horse-tender |
| 93  | - | - | Peiraeus | M | Muleteer |
| 96  | - | - | - | F | House-servant |
| 235 | - | - | - | F | House-servant |
| 236 | " | " | " | F | House-servant |
NB: The question-marks indicate either a split or divided deme, for which only the first half of the name has been recorded on the Manumission Stele.

Former Slaves: GREEN | Former Masters: RED | Both: BLUE
NB: The question-marks indicate either a split or divided deme, for which only the first half of the name has been recorded on the Manumission Stele.
Chapter 3

Slave Occupations

In the words of the Cambridge scholar M.I. Finley, 'with little exception, there was no activity, productive or unproductive, public or private, pleasant or unpleasant, which was not performed by slaves at some times and in some places in the Greek world.' The exceptions for Athens, of course, were politics and warfare. Finley’s statement is borne out in the Manumission Stele, which includes a high degree of diverse occupations involving agriculture and industry, among others.

Since slaves doubtless took part in almost every aspect of the Athenian work force, to what degree were slaves differentiated from the citizen body? Cohen states, perhaps a little too broadly but nonetheless effectively, that 'the residents of Attika were remarkably homogeneous in appearance and worked in commerce, agriculture, and craft without differentiation of status or compensation. In daily life, individuals would have little or no knowledge of the “status” of the persons with whom they had contact, and virtually no way of determining to which of the three groups a person belonged.'

Although there would likely have been apparent differences in slaves newly acquired from other nations (i.e. in language and

"A rare case in which Athenian slaves were employed for military service is found in Xen. Hell. 1.6.24, who says that along with freemen, slaves and knights, who were also not usually liable for military service, were put aboard ships to fight in the battle of Arginusae in 406. For their bravery, the slaves were granted citizenship, which was also a very rare occurrence. This grant, no doubt, was to encourage the slaves to perform in a patriotic manner. There is also a reference to this battle in Arist. Progs 33, where Xanthias the slave asks his master Dionysos mournfully: Τί γαρ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐναμώχουσ; - in which case he would have been free.

"Cohen, 105.
manner of dress), for second-generation slaves such differences would have been minimal, if at all apparent, as these individuals would have been assimilated into Athenian culture from birth. In fact, it has been commented on in Classical literature how alike Athenian slaves looked in comparison to citizens, so much so that it became necessary to enact a law against anyone hitting a slave because he might have actually been a citizen mistaken for a slave, although this is probably an exaggeration.75

Although Cohen's statement of individuals having no knowledge of the status of those with whom they dealt is generally questionable, since presumably foreigners would have stood out to native Athenians and there is also evidence that slave-women wore a discernible style of clothing,76 the stress here must be placed upon whether they would have particularly cared; since slaves were so deeply woven into the fabric of almost every aspect of Athenian life, surely their constant presence was unexceptional to citizens, who were accustomed to dealing with them on a daily basis. For instance, when a citizen wished to have his shoes mended, it is doubtful whether he would have specifically asked for the services of someone of a particular status to perform the task - he simply would have approached a cobbler, not a citizen, metic, or slave, to perform the task for which he had been trained.77 There is no reason to think that the handiwork of slaves was inferior to that of citizens.

Athens was not self-sufficient, requiring rather large imports

76 As apparent from stelai depictions of slave-women wearing 'gandys', a type of slave garment (Cf. Babler).
77 In fact, an Eleusinian inscription, IG II² 1672.190, records a citizen-cobbler as having made shoes for the slaves working on the project.
of grain to feed her inhabitants. Her enormous size, 2,500 km$^2$, as well as her hefty population, estimated to be around 300,000, made her the antithesis of a 'face-to-face' society, a term which has often been attributed. Moreover, a census taken at Athens reportedly between 317 and 307 numbers the foreigners at approximately half that of the politai and the Athenians believed their servile population to exceed that of the free. In light of this, a great mingling between Athenians and resident foreigners would have taken place.

Furthermore, there appears to be no differentiation of pay between the three groups; the state indiscriminately employed people of all statuses, working side-by-side to perform similar tasks for similar compensation. Rather than pay having been based on status, it appears to have been based upon the work done. Even in the smaller setting of the oikos, members seem to have worked alongside each other, carrying out similar tasks. It must be noted, however, that there is no evidence for the daily wages of everyday workers of most occupations, regardless of status. The only evidence we have is from monumental structures and various occupations serving the state, such as jurors, bouleutai, archons and ekklesiastai. It cannot be assumed that the wages of workers

---

78 In the fourth century, Athens required an extra 720,000 medimni of grain to feed her population. This number is almost twice the 402,000 medimni of grain that Attika produced annually, meaning that Athens needed to import grain to feed approximately half of her population. Cf. Harding (1988), 68 and (1995), 108 no. 20.
79 Cohen, 12-13 and 104.
80 Hansen, 93.
81 Isager and Hansen, 16-17.
83 For example, Iskhomakhos’ wife is found in Xen.Oec.7.6 performing the same task of wool-spinning as the servants. This must not be mistaken for social equality, however, since it was the wife’s primary function to oversee and delegate work to the slaves. Cf. Xen.Oec.6.35-36; Cohen, 37-38.
84 Randall, 199-210; Eleusis, IG II$^2$ 1672-3.
on state-governed monumental structures would have been a reflection of the average daily wage for such work performed elsewhere. These figures do, however, give evidence for there being equality among the statuses regarding payment for the work performed.

Because there were strict laws governing the rights of citizens and metics, contrasting with the near absence of rights for slaves, it is often supposed that this distinction of status was a constant presence in the life of the individual. In fact, there was likely a much more fluid relationship between the statuses than is often assumed; in an entity such as Athens, which was highly cosmopolitan and accustomed to the constant influx of foreigners resulting from her ever-bustling port, daily interactions between residents of all statuses would have taken place, with no real differentiation of tasks between them; very unlike North American slavery which is often inaccurately compared to ancient slavery.

Slaves appear to have been allowed a rather liberal role in their business affairs; we find in the pseudo-Xenophontic Constitution of the Athenians a good explanation for this equality between free persons and slaves:

If your slave fears me, there will be a danger that he will give you the money in his possession so as not to be at risk himself. (1.11)

There was protection for the slave against murder and sexual abuse. Cf. Antiph.5.48; Schol.Aiskhin.2.87; Harrison, 171; Cohen, 158ff; Dem.21.47. Furthermore, outside the oikos, slaves were under no obligation of subservience. Cf. MacDowell, 81. There is also no evidence for a slave having been abandoned by his master in old age, but rather to the contrary. Cf. Cohen, 146 and no.79.
Since slaves were often in the position of having to deal with large sums of money as bankers, they necessarily would have had to have some autonomy; it would be a problem if slave employees felt the need to defer to free customers, in which case the bank itself would have been in danger. Such egalitarian dealings are depicted further in Demosthenes (52.5), when a slave banker derisively asks a prominent client who's pressing a claim, 'And what business is it of yours?' Like bankers, merchant-slaves would have also required some degree of responsibility as the 'legal representatives' of their master's property.

This ' uppityness ' is often griped about by ancient writers, but was nonetheless tolerated and for good reason; banausic occupations were required if the Athenian residents were to enjoy the luxuries they so desired, although such 'slavish' work was generally intolerable to the citizen. This was due, in part, to the political and social pressure to play an active role in city-affairs. Xenophon, for instance, gives several reasons why banausic work is held in disdain among the politai:

The ignoble arts, as they are called, are spoken against, and are, naturally enough, held in utter disdain in our states. For they spoil the bodies of the workmen and foremen, forcing them to sit still and live indoors, and in some cases to spend the day at the fire. The softening of the body involves a serious weakening of the mind. Moreover, these so-called liberal arts leave no spare time for attention to one's friends and city, so that those who follow them are reputed bad at dealing with friends and bad defenders of their country. (Oec.4.2-3)

---

87 Slaves were preferred over the free in such occupations because of the need for confidentiality and continuous service.
88 Westermann, 16.
89 See especially pseudo-Xenophon 1.10-11.
The Athenians' had an innate loathing for repetitive work and the reliance upon an employer for a living. This stemmed from the importance the Greeks placed upon personal freedom and self-sufficiency. Although ideally every citizen would have been completely self-sufficient, not having to rely on anything but husbandry to keep himself and his family, in reality, many had to supplement their living by producing an excess of goods to sell to the public. Some even took employment, but only for short durations, as this was considered by some writers an abhorrent expedient. It must be remembered, however, that this disdainful attitude towards such work was promulgated by political theorists who thought that the politai should spend more time in the pursuit of the ideal state. A great number of freedpersons did in fact take part in these so-called banausic professions (see below), as has aptly been pointed out by Ehrenberg, for example:

The distinction between 'banausic' professions and those carried on by 'liberally educated people', which was inherited from the period of aristocracy, had more importance in literature than in real life.

Still, a large part of industry was worked by slaves in various ergasteria. Ergasterion is often translated as 'workshop', but this term can be misleading as it, at least in the modern sense, suggests an actual building set up and used specifically for industrial pursuits. In fact, there is no conclusive archaeological or literary evidence for separate buildings as

90 Xen.Mem.2.7.
91 Dem.57.45; Isoc.14.48
92 Ehrenberg, 144.
workshops. It appears, rather, that industry usually took place in the owner's domestic dwelling and that the term \textit{ergasterion} more specifically applies to a work-force rather than a shop.\textsuperscript{93} Demosthenes, for example, in a deposition of his father's property, records two \textit{ergasteria} left by his father but mentions only the slaves employed and the raw materials; he does not mention a separate building for the workshops but he does record the worth of his father's house (Aphob.1.27.9; cf. also 27.32). He later describes the slaves as having been left in the house by his father (27.24). In another speech, Demosthenes clearly states that industry worked by slaves took place at the owner's residence (48.12-13). Based on this evidence, and the lack of archaeological evidence for buildings used specifically as workshops, it can thus be presumed that most industry took place in the \textit{oikos}.

Businesses required employees to perform regular, repetitive service. As Cohen states, 'in Attika, free persons were not available for "employment"'.\textsuperscript{94} An explanation of this comes from Aristotle who states that 'it is the nature of the free man not to live under the control of another.'\textsuperscript{95} Because of this work-ethic, which stressed self-sufficiency and self-employment, there was a great demand for labour. This demand provided ample work for slaves, who did not have the luxury to be so discriminating. Sometimes business-owners would purchase their own slaves to work as their employees but it was also possible for slave-owners to 'rent out' their slaves for such service; these slaves were called

\textsuperscript{93} Fischer-Hansen, 91-120, in agreement with the perception that classical workshops were not physically separate from dwellings, gives a study of archaeological evidence for \textit{ergasteria} in Western Greece.

\textsuperscript{94} Cohen, 142.

\textsuperscript{95} Arist.\textit{Rhetoric} 1367a32: ἀλλοιον ζην.
andrapoda misthophorounta or douloi misthophorountes, who would, no doubt, also be khoris oikountes.

Certain businesses would have required the slave to live-apart from his master: a slave who was managing a bank would have to be living-apart in order to keep his customers' assets separate from his master's, which would also release the master from any personal liability. Certain other businesses, like smithing or tanning, or multiple businesses such as the perfumeries of Hyperides, would also likely be operated out of separate residences. Furthermore, if a slave became of great economic benefit to his master's oikos, as could happen in ancient Athens as a result of the employment opportunities and training which could be provided for slaves, there would no doubt have been tension between his master and him if he was to remain in a servile position within the household. For a slave-owner who was able to 'rent out' his slave, the enterprise would have been a good investment, both profitable and easy. He could have his slave out making money for him - his slave would be required to hand over part of his earnings - and not have to worry about taking care of any of his needs, as such slaves would likely be providing for themselves and, perhaps, their family.

On the contrary, manumission was not profitable for slave-owners - there is little proof for paramonai agreements at Athens, nor was there a continuing patronus-cliens relationship as Rome later had - so a khoris oikon arrangement was a good way
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96 Cohen, 151.
97 Speeches 3.6, 9-10.
99 Cf. Cohen, Ch 5.
98 See p 46ff.
100 Cohen, 145.
for an owner to make money and it provided the slave with the means to perhaps one day pay for his own manumission.\(^{101}\) Even without the insurance of complete liberation, being permitted to operate one's own oikos would have provided enough incentive for promising slaves to work hard to release themselves from the demeaning position they held as resident in their owner's oikos. Such an arrangement gave the slave many of the benefits of manumission but did not cause the owner to lose income on account of manumitting his slave.

Although manumission does not appear to have been exceedingly common at Athens, it did indeed take place, as attested by the manumission stelai.\(^{102}\) The Manumission Stele provides us with invaluable evidence for slave occupations. It must be kept in mind, however, that such documentation cannot be viewed as a cross-section of the total slave population; all of the slaves on the stele were chattel, none were state-owned. The occupations are not those which public slaves, or demioi, would be involved in, such as mining, coin minting, policing and other services which aided the public collectively. Rather, the slaves' main purpose was to serve their individual masters.

Moreover, their occupations can be used as evidence for their masters' own livelihoods and income; slaves would often be trained in their master's profession. On the Erechtheion building

\(^{101}\) Interestingly, Xenophon gives many incentives that should be provided for slaves to improve their work but does not mention manumission as one of them. See Oec.5.16, 9.12, 12.6 (a share in the profits of the oikos), 13.10 (decent clothing) and 13.9 (decent food). Furthermore, although manumission is not a legal responsibility for a master, there may have been social pressure to free a slave once he or she had earned enough money for his/her manumission. Cf. Westermann, 18-19.

\(^{102}\) It could have taken place more frequently than we know but the process may have been more informal, thus leaving us with no other epigraphical evidence. If this was the case, however, then one would expect that there would be more literary evidence for manumission.
accounts, for example, almost every slave followed the profession of his master, with three possible exceptions.\textsuperscript{103} It was a profitable venture for a skilled citizen or metic artisan to purchase an unskilled, and therefore cheaper, slave, train him as an apprentice and then have him working in his own shop or hire him out. The most logical trade to train a slave in would be a skill which was in continual demand, such as the ones seen on the Manumission Stele. It is interesting to note, however, that no sculptors or pot-painters are seen on either the Manumission Stele, nor on IG II\textsuperscript{2} 10.

The term \textit{banausoi} is often applied to much of the work done by slaves. It originally referred to furnace-workers (ie. potters and smiths) but it was eventually used for all manual workers.\textsuperscript{104} The word had a strong pejorative connotation, likely because of the Athenians' negative views of technai but also presumably because there was a great number of slaves performing such occupations, so that this type of work eventually became perceived of as 'slavish'. In Euthydemus' conversation with Socrates, for example, he clearly states that most of the people involved in the \textit{banausic} arts are slavish.\textsuperscript{105} Some crafts were disdained because the job was unsavory by nature; these would include smithing and tanning, both of which will be discussed below.

The occupations on the Manumission Stele can be roughly divided into seven categories: Industry, Retail, Entertainment, Transport, Domestic, Agriculture and General Work. It must be noted, however, that slaves were not necessarily confined to such

\textsuperscript{103} Randall, 204.
\textsuperscript{104} Flaceliere, 119.
\textsuperscript{105} Xen.\textit{Mem.} IV. 2.22: Οι γὰρ πλείστοι τῶν γε τὰ τοιαύτα ἐπισταμένων ἀνδραποδώδεις εἰσίν.
categories and occupations; they have here been categorized simply for the purpose of loose organization. As Jameson suggests, only the rich would have had their slaves working at one occupation, whereas the average slave-owner likely would have put his slave to a variety of tasks. The occupations listed on the Manumission Stele therefore likely indicated only the major function of the slaves, who presumably continued their occupations upon liberation. The following section will be a discussion of the seven categories as they relate to the stele.

3.1 Industry

3.1a Smithing

On the Manumission Stele there are four smiths: two gold-smiths (A.135, B.102), one smith (A.101), and one iron-smith (A.448), all male. Because of their craft, smiths were exposed to dangers such as inhaling poisonous gases produced during the smelting process. They were also in danger of serious accidents, such as burns from pouring molten metals and working with hot irons. In depictions on red-figure vases, smiths are often shown half-nude, no doubt because of the heat associated with the furnaces, and there is usually a jar standing close by, which could indicate that smiths always had water on hand to quench their thirst. A good example of a crippled smith is seen in Homer’s depiction of...
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106 Jameson, 137 and no. 78.
107 χαλκεύς originally applied only to bronze-workers but later was used for all metal-workers. Cf. ABSA VIII 203 and Tod, 12.
108 The stone has only σιδηρο, so the word could have been σιδηροτομής, σιδηρομαχός or σιδηροκότος, among other possibilities. Cf. M.N. Tod, 9.
109 Burford, 72.
110 Placeliere, 133.
the smith-god Hephaistos as a limping buffoon.\textsuperscript{111} Although his
deformity was caused by an event unrelated to smithing, the fact
that this god, whose occupation was arguably the most dangerous of
all the banausic arts, was just as widely known to be crippled,
might perhaps suggest a connection between deformity and smithing.

3.1b Tanning

Tanning, also an unsavory occupation, was disdained because of
the terrible smell associated with working with dead animals.
This occupation is mocked by Aristophanes who twice comments on
the stench of leather.\textsuperscript{112} A later writer describes the tanner as
annoying everyone because he smells so bad, forcing him to have
his shop far from town.\textsuperscript{113} In classical Athens, however, the
evidence shows tanners who were registered in city demes;\textsuperscript{114} this is
the case with the one tanner on the Manumission Stele, who was
registered in the city deme Kydathenaion (B.9). The evidence would
then indicate that some tanners, at least, practiced their trade
in the heart of the city.

3.1c Wool-working

Wool-working is the most common of all the industrial
occupations listed for both sides of the stele. I agree with Tod’s

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Iliad} VIII.410ff.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Knights} 892: οὐκ ἐς κόρακας ἀποφημεῖ, βύρας κάκιστον ἄξων; (Go to the crows, you Brute, stinking most horribly of leather!); \textit{Wasps} 38: άξει κάκιστον τοῦ ὁδόντων βύρας σαμψ (Your dream smells most horribly of putrid leather).
\textsuperscript{113} Artemidoros \textit{Oneirokritos} I.51.
\textsuperscript{114} Burford, 80.
translation of ταλασιουργὸς as 'wool-working' rather than 'wool-spinning' because the task need not be confined to just spinning, but probably referred to spinning, carding and weaving.115 Out of a total of forty-six industrial workers, twenty-four are wool-workers (52%): eleven out of twenty-seven (41%) of those on Face A (and a probable one more, which would make a total of 44%)116 and twelve out of nineteen (63%) on Face B are wool-workers. All of these are women. Wool-working is the main feminine activity for both sides: the women average 46% wool-workers on Face A and 46% on Face B. Thus, out of fifty women recorded for both sides of the stele, 46% were employed at wool-working.

In most of the cases, the name or gender of the participle makes it certain that the wool-workers were female. There is no reason to think that men took part in this employment; when wool-working is mentioned in literature it either clearly applies to women117 or else the gender is uncertain.118 It is never clearly stated that the workers were male so there is no reason to believe that this was the case. Until evidence should be found to firmly support men having been wool-workers as well as women, it can be considered a feminine occupation.

Furthermore, if I may draw a parallel between Classical and Mycenaean Greece, Mycenaean women most commonly were involved in textile production. This is seen, in part, by the textile inscriptions from Knossos, which state that women in Phaistos were allotted a fixed quota of wool to work, after which they would

115 M.N. Tod, 10.
116 At A.480, ὄφη has been restored, but the worker is obviously a female, as confirmed by the gender of the participle.
117 Plato Ion.540c; Xen. Mem.2.7.
118 Cf. M.N. Tod, 10-11.
send on the finished product to Knossos. Since there was indeed a sizable work-force of wool-workers at the palace's disposal, it appears that there would have been a rather large excess of finished Mycenaean cloth intended for export. Further evidence for this trade is gleaned from depictions on Egyptian documents of Mycenaean holding out lengths of cloth as offerings. Of course exported textiles were probably more elaborate than ordinary cloth, which was produced in all ancient societies, in order to make it a desirable commodity. Combining the tablets from Knossos and Pylos, also documented by Chadwick, the workers were very likely slaves. This is evidenced by some indication of provenance and the fact that they always lived near the palaces and were continually employed, with about two-thirds located near Pylos.

Further evidence for a Bronze Age textile industry, presumably for trade, is carefully and convincingly laid out by Killen. In the Linear B tablets from Knossos dealing with sheep (Series D), some list only sheep while others list both sheep and wool. Killen concentrates mainly on the former in which only sheep are listed. On these tablets, there is an inordinately high number of rams. He suggests that these flocks were not used for breeding but rather for wool-production, in which case the rams would have been wethers; normal flocks used for breeding would not have had such a large number of uncastrated rams. He parallels such flocks with records from Medieval England, where it was principally wether flocks, prized for their wool-production, which provided a good
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119 Chadwick, 151.
120 Kantor, 58f; Chadwick, 150-1.
121 Chadwick, 79.
122 Ibid., 152.
123 Killen, 1-15.
part of the economy of the time. He further enhances his conclusion by comparing the ratios of ewes to rams for the Pickering Manor in Yorkshire to the records of Pylos and Knossos; the ancient records' ratios bear a striking similarity to the those of the Medieval manor, whose flocks were primarily involved in wool-production.

Concerning the Manumission Stele, a quarter of all the workers were employed in wool-working. This number is not seen for any other occupation listed, which leads me to think that these workers were not just producing wool for local use but were perhaps producing for export. According to the palace accounts from Mycenae, textile production was a centralized industry, worked by slave women who lived near the palace. Although we know that the slaves on the Manumission Stele were chattel, there is no reason to think that these women were working solely for the usage of their masters or the local residents. Rather, they could have been producing cloth, at least in part, for export, much like their earlier Bronze Age counterparts. Furthermore, as with the Mycenaean workers, the workers from the Manumission Stele resided near the city, or rather, the area of centralized control which had supplanted the more archaic palace structure of Mycenaean Greece, if I may make such a comparison.

Although Athenian trade in wine and olives is widely recognized, textile trade has not been sufficiently studied; taking into account the Bronze Age evidence for industrial wool-production and trade, there is no reason to believe that such an industry did not exist in Athens, but rather to the contrary. This

\[12^{\text{N}}\] Killen, 6.
document provides some indication that there was an industry in wool-production which was not confined to just local consumption and furthermore, that it was worked, in part at least, by slaves.

3.1d Shoe-working

There are a number of other industrial activities from the Manumission Stele. Three different occupations involving shoe-working are seen: namely shoe-making (A.218, A.252, A.522, B.15), cobbling (A.456) and sandal-making (A.244). The first two involve different aspects of shoe-working: a σκυτοτόμος was, literally, a leather-cutter and a νευροράφος was a shoe-mender or stitcher (from the word for sinew, τὸ νεῦρον and ῥᾶπτω for stitching). Although each could be separate stages of shoe-development, it is more likely that the σκυτοτόμος was a general shoe-maker while the νευροράφος was involved in mending worn shoes. Since there is also a mender of clothes, an ἀκέστρια, on the Manumission Stele (B.3), this type of task-delineation is not impossible. There is also one sandal-maker, which, as Tod states, can also refer to a general shoe-maker. The word is abbreviated to ἱποδηματος, which could conceivably end with either -ποιὸς (or other such variants) or -πώλης. These three words together, shoe-making, cobbling and sandal-making, demonstrate the great care that was taken to show that the slave’s occupations, although similar, were not the same.
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123 For other spellings, see M.N. Tod, 8 and 10.
124 Both words could also, of course, simply be the final stage of production, namely the finishing of shoes and cloth. Mending, however, is the more common meaning for these words.
125 M.N. Tod, 11.
126 Ibid.
127 Ibid.
3.1e Wood-working

There are also various wood-workers on the stele: a bed-maker (A.145), a pine-splitter (A.402) a carpenter (B.217) and a flute-maker (A.433; first epigraphical appearance in Attica).\textsuperscript{130} Possible endings for the bed-maker, since the word is abbreviated to κλινωπ, are -ποιός, -πήγως, and -πρίστης.\textsuperscript{131} The word for pine-splitter, δαίδοσχίστης, has not been found elsewhere; because it very likely refers to someone who makes torches, I have placed it in the banausic category. Τέκτων, usually refers to a worker in wood, especially a carpenter or joiner, although it can also be a general term for any craftsman. Because of the specification seen for other craftsmen on this document and the many variants of the word which have the meaning 'carpenter', however, it is more likely that the term was intended specifically to denote a worker in wood.\textsuperscript{132}

3.1f Other

There is also a glue-boiler (A.452; a rare word)\textsuperscript{133} and two signet-engravers (A.138-9, B.255). The occupation 'glue-boiling' (χολλεψως) is only found on this document, but the word 'χόλλα', used in the context of building operations, has been found twice on other epigraphical documents.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{130} Lewis (1959), 229.
\textsuperscript{131} M.N. Tod, 7.
\textsuperscript{132} Cf. LSJ.
\textsuperscript{133} M.N. Tod, 8.
\textsuperscript{134} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1672.68, 1682.28. Cf. M.N. Tod, 8.
3.2 Retail

There is a total of eleven vendors on the stele. On Face A there are eight: a male sesame-seller (221), two male frankincense-sellers (369,563), a male saltfish-seller (510), a merchant (501) and three kapeloi (113-male,490-male,493-female). On Face B, there are three: a male pulse-seller (113), a male saltfish-seller (35) and a male bread-seller (6).

Two of the kapeloi were male (κάπηλος) and one female (καπηλίς). One female and one male (A.490,493) belonged to the same metic-master and presumably worked in his business. Unlike an αὐτοπώλης, who sold his own wares, a κάπηλος sold others' products. This is stated as such by Plato who writes: ἡ τῶν καπήλων τέχνη τῆς τῶν αὐτοπώλων διαώρισται τέχνης (Pol.260c); meaning that the κάπηλοι sell the goods which others produce. This is likewise stated by the scholiast on Aristophanes, in his explanation of the five different categories of vendors: κάπηλος δὲ ὁ ἀγοραζόν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοπώλου καὶ πωλῶν ἐν τῇ χώρα ἐν ἡ ἡγοράσει (Plut. 1155).135

The word 'κάπηλος/καπηλίς' was derived from the action of pouring wine into cups and only later came to encompass all local retailers.136 A kapelos could be either a wine-seller, an inn-keeper or a general retailer and a kapeleion could be either the shop of a kapelos or, more especially, a tavern.137 On the whole, all such hucksters were looked down upon as being dishonest people who

135 Cf. M.N. Tod, 5-6.
136 Ehrenberg, 114.
137 Cf. LSJ: τὸ καπηλεῖον.
would do anything to make a buck from some unsuspecting customer.\textsuperscript{138} Retailers were also the frequent recipients of abuse, as seen, for example, in the treatment of a bread-seller:

\textit{Come, stand by me, by the gods I entreat you. There he is, the one who ruined me, who struck with his torch and threw down from there bread worth ten obols and four to boot. (Arist. Wasps 1388-91)}

The poor attitude towards retailers is in direct contrast to that towards another type of retailer, the merchant (A.501). The main difference between the two is that a \textit{kapelos} sold his products locally, whereas a merchant was not confined to his own locality - the term \textit{\'Εμπορος} originally meant 'one who was a passenger on another man's ship'. Being a merchant was profitable and they were often wealthy and highly regarded. Although merchants and other retailers in essence had the same occupation, \textit{kapeloi} are likely criticized more harshly not because their practices were inferior but more likely because they were everywhere and their trading touched more people personally.

As mentioned above, there are two salt-fish sellers on the Manumission Stele. Fish was a staple of the Athenian diet and salted-fish was a common, albeit 'little esteemed' food, presumably because it was not fresh.\textsuperscript{139} Salted fish, apparently cheaper than fresh fish, needed time for its preparation and often

\textsuperscript{138} Ehrenberg quotes (114 no. 9) from adesp.567: \textit{κάπηλον φρόνομα}. He suggests that the sense of the phrase is not favourable but rather indicates the retailer's dishonesty.

\textsuperscript{139} Ehrenberg, 131.
came from distant seas.

With the possible exception of the bread-seller, who likely made as well as sold his bread, all of the retailers listed were professionals who bought from producers and resold to the public; in short, they were middlemen. The only difference between the general retailers and those who sold specific goods was probably that the former were shopkeepers while the latter sat in the agora and sold their wares. Furthermore, men and women are both seen as working in this type of employment; on the Manumission Stele there are nine men working as vendors and two women. Women as retailers are also mentioned by Aristophanes, in which case the occupation appears to have a rather pejorative nature, since vending is mentioned in conjunction with mud-wrestling, waitressing and other such occupations.  

3.3 Entertainment

There are three entertainers on the stele, all female. Two are flute-girls (A.5[New], B.212) and one a harper (A.506). These women were likely hired out by their masters to perform at various symposia. The harper would have sung as well as played the cythara. Such female entertainers are commonly found in classical literature and appear to have been largely hetairai.
3.4 Transport

Four freedmen on the document can be described as transporters: two donkey-drivers (A.546, B.271) and two muleteers (A.559, B.94). In Classical literature, slaves appear as muleteers and copper transporters. Since men employed in such occupations were acting as legal representatives of their master’s property (or someone else’s, if they were hired out), they would have had to be trustworthy. Since their occupations would have required a fair bit of freedom and mobility, it is not hard to imagine that these men were khoris oikountes and were likely available for hire to anyone who required their services.

3.5 Domestic Servants

There has been a fair bit of discussion concerning the descriptions παιδίου (A.259, 472, 514, 550; B.19, 96, 118, 120, 122, 235, 238, 259, 341) and παις (B.37), the most common occupation after wool-working, and again, dominated by women; over a quarter of them (28%) were employed as servants. Jameson takes the name to mean “no profession yet,” meaning that we should understand the designations παιδίου and παις as literally denoting “children.” His argument is, in part, that since one slave, who is designated τίτθη (A.256), is released along with one who is designated παιδί τίτθ (A.259), the latter should thus be the “child of the nurse.” He
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111 Arist. Thea 491; Plato Lysis 208b.
114 See above, p 79ff.
116 Jameson, 135 no. 63.
also notes that, since in two entries παιδία are freed together (A.118,120,122 and B.235,238), and in three other entries are released along with other slaves (B.35,37; 94-96; 255-66) these could have been family units.

Although these arguments are impressive, in the context of the document they do not make sense. Tod's assertion that παιδίον and παῖς should be taken to mean "servant" and that παιδί τίτθ is simply a double designation, servant and nurse, is more compelling because it is difficult to imagine that children could have bought their own freedom (none are mentioned with eranoi). Even if the masters did pay for their freedom, it is even more difficult to imagine that these children would have been registered as metics. Moreover, master's were under no obligation to free entire families.

3.6 Agriculture

We do not see the occupational variety amongst agricultural workers that we see for the other categories discussed thus far. We have only farm-workers (A. 109, A.248, B.12, B.208, B.111) and vine-dressers (A.486, B.52).

Considering that Classical Greece was mainly an agricultural society, since most Athenians appear to have owned at least a small plot of land, and most Athenian households probably owned at least one slave, slavery must have played a significant role in

146 M. N. Tod, 9.
147 The designation 'τίτθ' probably meant more specifically 'wet-nurse'. Cf. LSJ for variations of this word.
148 Jameson, 124.
149 In 403 BCE, only 5000 out of some 20 000 citizens did not own land. Cf. Gomme, 26; Jameson, 125 and no. 13.
agriculture. There have been two major arguments posited for the small number of agricultural workers on the Manumission Stele: the first is that agricultural slaves were less likely to be *khoris oikountes*, and thus were less likely to have the funds to purchase their freedom.\(^{150}\) For this reason, their numbers are quite small for such documents. The second reason is more compelling and lies in the translation of *γεωργός* in the context of the other occupations on the document.\(^{151}\) The translation *farm-hand*,\(^{152}\) although perfectly permissible in a general context - especially one referring to slaves - may be misleading. As with most of the other slaves on the document, who were very likely undertaking work on their owner's behalf, these workers were probably employed as farm-managers on either their owner's or rented land, in which case they would presumably have earned more money than a general farm-hand and would thus have been more able to purchase their freedom.\(^{153}\)

Moreover, as mentioned above, most Athenians probably owned land, so farm-work would have come part and parcel for all members of the *oikos*. It is unlikely that someone would have been named specifically as having the occupation *farm-hand*, since all but the richest citizens would have taken part in agriculture.\(^{154}\) As Jameson states, *"if we have trouble identifying "agricultural slaves" in Athens it may be in part because they were everywhere."*\(^{155}\) Therefore, farm-work would have been an assumed
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\(^{150}\) Jameson, 134.

\(^{151}\) Jameson, 135.

\(^{152}\) M.N. Tod, 6.

\(^{153}\) In Lysias 7.10, there is a metic who rented land, presumably continuing his earlier profession when he was a slave.

\(^{154}\) Jameson, 124.

\(^{155}\) Jameson, 137.
occupation for all household members, making it less likely to be listed as a specific occupation. In light of this, the farm-workers on the Manumission Stele likely held managerial-type positions on behalf of their owners, were probably khoris oikountes like most of the other workers on the document, and were therefore able to accumulate the funds to purchase their freedom.

The other listed agricultural occupation, vine-dressing, required skill. Viticulture was also the most laborious of farming activities in Classical Greece.\(^{156}\) Because of the skill demanded for such work, it is possible that such agricultural experts would have been rented out to work on other people's farms as need demanded. Moreover, vine-dressers perhaps acted as retailers as well as producers, selling wine to consumers or inn-keepers.\(^{157}\) Skilled agriculturists would presumably have been less numerous than general farm-hands. By reason of their skill and paucity, they surely were paid more and were therefore able to accumulate more funds than the average unskilled slave, making it possible for them to purchase their freedom.

3.7 General Work

There are nine men who, with the possible exception of one, fall under this last category: a hired-labourer (A.396), an amphora-bearer (A.209), a secretary (A.464), a wall-builder (B.344), a female/male? horse-tender (B.91), a building-worker (B.98), a miller (B.210), a cook (A.195) and a barber (B.252).

\(^{156}\) Cf. Jameson, 130 and no. 45.
\(^{157}\) Ehrenberg, 130.
At B.344 (wall-builder), Lewis has edited the occupation as τ[ει]χιστήν. Tod had earlier read it as σ[τι]χιστήν and Lolling as τ[ο]χιστήν.\(^{158}\) As Lewis states, his interpretation of the word would be its earliest appearance, but none of the suggestions are impossible.

At B.91 (horse-tender), Lewis interprets παμπιαστρί (dotting the "η" and second "ς") as 'an hapax legomenon with extraordinary spelling', positing that the freedwoman was a Horse-tender (from the verb ψήκω, meaning to rub down a horse).\(^{159}\) This would be the only instance of 'πς' found in Attica.\(^{160}\)

The type of occupation at B.98 is not clear; Lewis takes the man to be a building worker, comparing the occupation to those contracted in IG II\(^2\) 1665. Tod, along with others, suggests that 'ἐφυ' should be expanded to 'ἐφυστρίων', so that the meaning of the phrase is 'resident at Sounium from the workshops.'\(^{161}\) Granted, this is a rather general depiction for a freedman's occupation in comparison with the others on the document, but it is not impossible. He could have been working on the location of a large building project.

3.8 Comparison with IG II\(^2\) 10

The Manumission Stele's list of occupations bears a striking resemblance to the late fifth-century inscription IG II\(^2\) 10.\(^{162}\) Both have slaves working mainly in retail and industry and there

---

\(^{158}\) Lewis (1959), 233.

\(^{159}\) Lewis (1959), 231; Cf. LSJ.

\(^{160}\) Cf. Lewis (1959) 231.

\(^{161}\) M.N. Tod, 13. For the locale, refer to p 62.

\(^{162}\) Cf. p 56ff.
are a number of the same occupations: tanners, retailers, smiths, merchants, hired-help and farm-workers. There are, however, some notable differences; on IG II² 10 there are more slaves working as retailers - 40% as opposed to 11% on the Manumission Stele. Furthermore, IG II² 10 has neither wool-workers nor domestic-servants, the likes of which are so dominant on the Manumission Stele. Since IG II² 10 is a list of male slaves only, these differences are not surprising, as wool-working and domestic service appear to be feminine occupations. As far as masculine occupations are concerned, however, it appears that chattel slave occupations remained fairly constant during the eighty or so years between the two documents.
D.M. Lewis has done a great service for classical scholars by piecing together fragments of this large Manumission Stele. It now stands as the most complete manumission document surviving from ancient Athens and its existence compels us to ask many more questions than can perhaps be answered. We have seen that manumissions were exceedingly uncommon at Athens as attested by the near absence of literary and epigraphical evidence for such procedures. Without contemporary literary evidence for these trials, we must rely on Harpokration for a definition of the procedure, even though it is not clear what time period he was referring to when he described it, nor even if he was referring to Athens. Furthermore, his definition relies upon there being paramonai agreements between master and freedman, for which we too have very little evidence from Athens and of that only literary. We have seen, however, that Plato’s reference (Laws 11.915a) bears close resemblance to the Delphic manumission agreements, lending some credibility for there being similar Athenian agreements between masters and freedmen.

The answer to who paid for the phiale is equally elusive, as the document appears to list the payment as a separate clause. We have seen, however, that the presence of the eranoi may help resolve the issue, since at A.141 the former master is also listed as the head contributor. If it was the case that the former masters always paid for the phialai, it would not make sense to list this man as also the head contributor, as his role would have been assumed. It seems much more likely that the slaves were
expected to make the payment and, if they were unable, they could collect a group of contributors to loan them the funds, as illustrated in the case of Neaira (Dem.59).

The Manumission Stele can also bear evidence to the domiciles of the former masters and slaves. We have seen that the greatest percentage of both were from city demes, with an average of 45% of the former masters and 76% of the freedmen. Furthermore, it is not surprising that more freedmen were registered in city demes, since we have seen that metics' demes were not hereditary but rather, were indications of domicile, unlike those of citizens'. Even though there are few cases of deme-sharing between former masters and their slaves, this could simply be due to the former master's domicile being different from his deme. His former slave was probably registered right where he worked, which could well have been the same domicile as his master; it is unlikely that these slaves had worked far from their masters' residence.

Another intriguing element of the stele are the many diverse occupations listed, which as a group can tell us a great deal about the socio-economic role of slave activity in fourth-century Athens. Slaves were employed in almost every aspect of daily life, from industry to retail to agriculture. As stated in Ch 3, however, these occupations as a whole must not be taken as a cross-section of slave-activity in fourth-century Athens, since all the slaves are chattel and most would likely have been khoris oikountes. These numbers do not take into account the demioi, the likes of whom probably made up a fair amount of the slave population.

There must have been a constant mingling of people from all
statuses, at times working side-by-side at the same tasks, perhaps receiving the same pay. The strong presence of slaves allowed citizens more time to take part in city-affairs, releasing them from many of the repetitive but necessary tasks of daily life. In turn, slave-work enabled both Athenians and resident-foreigners alike to have easy access to goods and services, the fruits of city-living.

There are eight instances in which groups of slaves have been released under one master (with the exception of one, B.253-66, where there are two masters). What can these groups tell us about the masters? In four of these instances, there is more than one slave in the same occupation. In the case of A.489-96, the master, who was a metic, released two retailers, one male and one female. It seems probable here that this metic owned a store and had two slaves running it together, since both were resident in Melite. Furthermore, these slaves were almost surely khoris oikountes and were very likely also a married couple.

The other three instances have multiple females being released, all combinations of wool-workers, domestic servants and nurses: at A.255-262, the two entries record nurses, one with an apparent double-designation (see Ch 3). At B.112-122, one master released five slaves in total: one pulse-dealer, one wool-worker and three domestic servants. Lastly, at B.253-266, two masters jointly released four of their slaves: one signet-engraver, one domestic servant and two wool-workers. With the exception of the group of retailers, all include at least one wool-worker, nurse or domestic servant.

Why do these women, working at such occupations, figure so
highly in the numbers released? Domestic servants (including nurses) and wool-workers make up 41% of the total workers on the document. In the case of domestic servants and nurses, having no apparent trade with which they might have supported themselves, two questions arise: first of all, since presumably they were not khoris oikountes, as most of the others freed evidently were, how would they have accumulated enough capital to purchase their freedom? Secondly, what sort of employment would they have undertaken upon their release? I would like to make some suggestions in answer to these questions.

Since, as suggested in the Introduction, masters might have felt compelled to release slaves in order to contribute capital to the state during this time of emergency, as a sort of liturgy, perhaps some masters did not wish to release slaves who were generating good income working as skilled artisans, shopkeepers or the like. Instead, they released female slaves who performed general domestic services. Such slaves could even have been those described by Hopkins as ‘not producers at all, but consumers, tokens of their master’s wealth.’ Even though the new metics would owe the state metoikia payments, these sums probably paled in comparison to what some masters were making from their khoris oikountes slaves. Perhaps the masters even took on these payments on behalf of their domestic servants; if the khoris oikountes slaves were bringing in more money, as presumably they were, it would be a worthy venture. Thus, these domestic servants could have continued in the service of their former masters or else were married off after their liberation.

163 Hopkins, 166.
Wool-workers, of course, were producers, but how worthy was their art? Every woman appears to have been taught this skill. Even if wool was being produced for export, such slaves probably did not bring in the amount of money that a slave at another trade, such as smithing or wood-working, would have. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine that these women would have been khoris oikountes. They were more likely working out of their master's oikos. Thus these slaves, along with domestic servants, probably generated very little income, if any at all, for their masters and were therefore the cheapest to release. After their release, these too most likely continued working in the same manner they had previously, albeit with modified legal status.

Perhaps the answer to the purpose of this document lies in its anomalous nature. As we have seen, there is no evidence for such procedures from much before or after this period, making it appear that this document is tied to a contemporaneous event. The greatest worry for Athens at this time was Macedon and we know that measures were being taken by Lycurgus' coalition to gather revenue for the inevitable war between the two powers. In light of this, I would like to suggest that the purpose of these manumissions was not so much to manumit slaves but was invoked by the state as another way to gather revenue, perhaps after the wealthy had been exhausted of liturgies. Furthermore, there is evidence that the majority of the masters were city-dwellers, the likes of whom would be more apt to be politically active and perhaps felt more intensely the need to provide financial assistance to the state. In order to make the manumissions legally binding, the state used, or perhaps enacted, these trials, all of
which were legal fictions serving to acquit the slaves. The ultimate purpose was to gather phialai as revenue, which were soon after melted together into various hydria, as evidenced by the contemporary Athenian financial reports. The new metics would then continue to contribute capital in the form of metoikion payments and the male metics would also be liable to fight in the oncoming war; all in all, an excellent resource for Athens during this time of emergency.
Appendix:

References for Slave Names
Found on the Manumission Stele

Note - I have included only whole names, extant or restored. The digit following the slave’s name records the total number of instances in which the name has been attached to a slave. Occasionally I have indicated an alternate spelling of the same gender below the appropriate line. As seen below, the names are listed in order of occurrence on the Manumission Stele and I have given the numbers for the names as listed in Osborne’s and Byrne’s The Foreign Residents of Attica (FRA) and Reilly’s Slaves in Ancient Greece (SAG).

A.100 [Κ]ίττος 1 : FRA 7774; SAG 1630
A.104 Μησιθέα[ν] 1 : FRA 7866; SAG 1908
A.108 Σάτυρος 6 : FRA 7984-89; SAG 2463-68
A.112 [Κ]αλλία<ς> 6 : FRA 7743-48; SAG 1547
A.138 Βίων 1 : FRA 7516; SAG 533
A.144 Ωφελίων 12 : FRA 8147-49; SAG 3237-48
A.148 Μοσχίων 4 : FRA 7871-72; SAG 1914-16
A.152 Φιλονίκη 1 : FRA 8111; SAG 3128
A.156 Ἀδοῦσ[ιος] 1 : FRA 7409
A.187 Μενίππη 1 : FRA 7849; SAG 1864
A.194 'Ονήσιμος 10 : FRA 7925; SAG 2161-70
A.209 Μάνης 14 : FRA 7822-34; SAG 1809-11
A.213 Φιλίστη 1 : FRA 8106; SAG 3109
A.217 Αριστομένης 2 : FRA 7467; SAG 321-22
A.221 'Ονησίμη 2 : FRA 7923; SAG 2159-60
A.225 Ποσειδών[ιος] 5 : FRA 7965-66; SAG 2350-53
A.243 Πιστοκλῆς 1 : FRA 7951; SAG 2320
A.247 Διονύσιος 1(?) 22 : FRA 7568-70; SAG 732-54
A.251 Πολύτιμος 1 : FRA 7961; SAG 2345
A.255 Λαμπρίς 1 : FRA 7801; SAG 1724
A.259 Εὐπείθη 1 : FRA 7648; SAG 1082
A.328 Λύδη 1 : FRA 7808; SAG 1760
A.332 Μένιος 1 : FRA 7848; SAG 1863
A.433 Τύρην 1 : FRA 8086; SAG 3031
A.464 Φίλων 14 : FRA 8120-24; SAG 3157-67
A.468 Ῥοδία 3 : FRA 7977; SAG 2417-19
A.473 Κορδύπη 1 : FRA 7784; SAG 1674
A.485 Ἐπικέρδης 1 : FRA 7589; SAG 922
A.489 Ἡρακλείδης 16 : FRA 7679-88; SAG 1394-1401
A.493 Θραίττα 4 : FRA 7715-18; SAG 1480
Θραίσσα 3 : SAG 1477-79
A.497 Ἰταμή 1 : FRA 7735; SAG 1536
A.501 Ὑπίγουνος 3 : FRA 7587; SAG 917-19
A.505 Δημητρία 13 : FRA 7551-55; SAG 647-57
A.510 Φίλων see above, A.464
A.514 Χρυσίον 1 : FRA 8144; SAG 3222
A.518 Ὑλυμπιάς 3 : FRA 7919; SAG 2108-2110
A.522 Ἑστιαῖος 1 : FRA 7619; SAG 996
A.550 Σωστράτη 4 : FRA 8048-49; SAG 2802-05
A.555 Πλαγγῶν 2 : FRA 7955-56; SAG 2325-26
A.559 Πάμφιλος 6 : FRA 7929; SAG 2187-92
A.563 Νικίας 8 : FRA 7893-94; SAG 2020-26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.004</td>
<td>[Ε]λπίς</td>
<td>15: FRA 7583; SAG 866-880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.009</td>
<td>Μωσόμος</td>
<td>1: FRA 7881; SAG 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.012</td>
<td>Σωσίας</td>
<td>19: FRA 8043-46; SAG 2656-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.015</td>
<td>Μνάσων</td>
<td>4 : FRA 7865; SAG 1902-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.055</td>
<td>Ταχίστη</td>
<td>1 : FRA 8066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.059</td>
<td>Ἀν[τ]ιγων</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.062</td>
<td>Εὐ]κόλη</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7640; SAG 1058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.096</td>
<td>Σίμος</td>
<td>9 : FRA 8000-04; SAG 2494-96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Σίμων</td>
<td>4 : SAG 2490-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.102</td>
<td>Φειδέστρατος</td>
<td>1 : FRA 8100; SAG 3053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.107</td>
<td>Οκιμον</td>
<td>1 : FRA 8146; SAG 3228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.110</td>
<td>Ἔυκλῆς</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7638; SAG 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.112</td>
<td>Ἀττας</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7503-05; SAG 426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.114</td>
<td>Μαλθάκη</td>
<td>2 : FRA 7819-20; SAG 1808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.118</td>
<td>Πλαγγών</td>
<td>see above, A.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.120</td>
<td>Μόσχος</td>
<td>2 : FRA 7873; SAG 1918-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.122</td>
<td>Ἀριστονίκη</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7468; SAG 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ἀριστονίκα</td>
<td>4 : SAG 324-327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.214</td>
<td>Η]χῶ</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7695; SAG 1418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.217</td>
<td>Δημέας</td>
<td>2 : FRA 7549-7550; SAG 644-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.233</td>
<td>Ἀρίστη</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7456; SAG 297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.235</td>
<td>Σύμαλον</td>
<td>1 : FRA 7995; SAG 2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.238</td>
<td>Νικαρίστη</td>
<td>2 : FRA 7890; SAG 1985-86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.241</td>
<td>Γλυκέρα</td>
<td>3 : FRA 7534; SAG 572-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.262</td>
<td>Ἱστατονίκη</td>
<td>5 : FRA 8018; SAG 2561-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ἱστατονίκα</td>
<td>7 : SAG 2554-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the names on Face B are of questionable spelling. I have not made any attempt at conjecture but have left them as they appear on the stele. I have, however, made assumptions concerning the gender of some of the names, tending towards the feminine for persons involved in occupations such as wool-working and domestic-service, the most common occupations for female slaves.\footnote{164}

Although the vast majority of the names are Greek, some do give an indication of other ethnicities: at A.209, the name 'Manes' is thought to be of Phrygian origin and occurs fourteen times on epigraphical documents,\footnote{165} at A.328 we have a woman simply called 'the Lydian', at A.433 there is an Etruscan man by the name of 'the Tyrian'\footnote{166} and at A.493, a woman called 'the Thracian'. The name 'Chrusios' (A.514), meaning 'fair-haired', is also a likely indicator of a foreign slave.

There are several names which denote characteristics that the slaves either had or the masters hoped they would come to have: these include names such as 'Assistance' (A.144), 'Useful' (A.194 & 221), 'Trustworthy' (A.243), 'Much-honoring' (A.251), 'Obeys Well' (A.259), 'Profitable' (A.485), 'Strong as a Horse' (A.187), 'Strength' (A.332), 'Quickest' (B.055), 'Speedy' (B.107), 'Sweet' (B.241) and also 'Sweetest' (B.341).

\footnote{164} Cf. Ehrenberg, 173. See also Ch 3.\footnote{165} Ehrenberg, 172.\footnote{166} Lewis (1959), 229.
Furthermore, the name 'Sosias' (B.012), although originally a name for freepersons as well, came to be used in comedy exclusively and commonly for slaves.\textsuperscript{167} This was also apparently the case in reality, since 'Sosias' ranks as the most common slave name on the Manumission Stele, occurring a total of nineteen times on epigraphical documents.

\textsuperscript{167} Ehrenberg, 172.
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