

Olga PELCER-VUJAČIĆ*

SLAVES AND FREEDMEN IN LYDIA AND PHRYGIA IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

ABSTRACT: *The paper examines the socio-economic position and the everyday reality of the life of slaves in Lydia and Phrygia, two regions of considerable size within the boundaries of the Roman province of Asia, during the first three centuries of our era. The sources available for the study of slavery in Roman Anatolia are mainly epigraphic monuments, though some ancient writers and anepigraphic archaeological finds offer significant insights as well. The impression gained by the study of this material suggests that slavery was widespread and that it permeated both private life and public institutions, though exact numbers of slaves and their economic significance is difficult to determine.*

KEYWORDS: *slavery, family, Lydia, Phrygia, slave trade, manumission*

An understanding of Greek and Roman slavery is important for several cultural and historical reasons. One could refer to the system of slavery as one of the central institutions of Greek and Roman societies. Slaves were the lowest part of the society in the ancient world and the least visible. In the society where inequalities were widely spread and commonly accepted they were the *stratum* with the least amount of freedom (in fact none at all, at least in theory) and with the heaviest burden of physical work and social humiliation. This is probably the reason why the ancient sources were not interested in recording their numbers (if they knew them at all) or offering information on their roles in everyday life and production. Most of the ancient writers and philosophers were at best mildly interested in the question of slavery. Even the ideological defense of slavery is rarely encountered; it is also a conspicuously undeveloped section of ancient philosophy and one of little importance.¹ Inhabitants of the Greco-Roman world felt little need

* The author is the scientific associate in the Historical Institute, University of Montenegro.

¹ G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient World*, Ithaca-New York 1998,

either to explain or to defend this institution, although, as Hunt points out, it permeated Greek and Roman everyday thinking, as evidenced by their frequent use of analogies to slavery.²

In recent decades ancient slavery was vivaciously discussed in various new books and papers.³ Many angles were taken: there was the positivistic approach, as well as modernist, primitivist, Marxist, humanist and many others. The issue was debated by historians, philologists and archaeologists, but also by sociologists, economists, anthropologists, philosophers and others. Recently, the field entered the state of flux, where existing paradigms are being reshaped or abandoned altogether. This change is not due to some dramatic discovery of new sources, though significant individual finds are made every year, but through a reexamination of the established preconceptions and the source material we already possess.⁴

The definition of slavery in terms of the property relationship between the master and the slave is useful because ownership is a familiar concept. However, Orlando Patterson points out that ownership is more complex than it seems.⁵ Patterson defines slavery as “the permanent, violent domination of natively alienated and generally dishonored persons”.⁶ That slavery is permanent and heritable – the children of slaves typically become slaves – distinguishes it from debt bondage and indenture, both of which can be as harsh as slavery and can involve the sale of a person but are not necessarily permanent and often not heritable. For Patterson, slaves were alienated from all ‘rights’ or claims of birth, they ceased to belong in their own right to any legitimate social order.⁷ Lately, his conceptualization of the experience and a metaphor of enslavement as a form of “social death” has been widely adopted by historians of slavery.⁸ On the other hand, Bodel suggested that

416-425. In fact, Aristotle’s theory of “natural slavery” is the only clear candidate for a philosophical explanation and justification of slavery. This is probably the most unsophisticated and logically most problematic part of the entire Aristotle’s system.

² P. Hunt, *Ancient Greek and Roman Slavery*, Malden, 2018, 29.

³ For a very informative overview in Serbian see Н. Вујчић, Античко грчко ропство у новијој перспективи, Зборник Матице српске за класичне студије 21 (2019), (forthcoming).

⁴ For general overview see D. M. Lewis, *Greek Systems of Slavery in their Eastern Mediterranean Context, c. 800-146 BC*, Oxford 2018; K. Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World, AD 275-425*, Cambridge 2011.

⁵ Hunt, op. cit, 50; cf. O. Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death. A Comparative Study*, Cambridge MA – London 1982.

⁶ Patterson, op. cit, 13.

⁷ Ibid, 5.

⁸ For example, see R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*, Leiden – Boston 2005; more recently P. Hunt, *Slaves or Serfs?: Patterson on the Thetes and Helots of ancient Greece* in: J. Bodel, W. Scheidel (eds.), *On Human Bondage: After Slavery and Social Death*, Malden – Oxford 2017, 55-80.

that Roman slaves and slave-owners alike regarded slavery as a temporary rather than a permanent condition.⁹ It would mean that every slave was encouraged to believe that freedom was a realistic possibility, made credible by the not insubstantial minority of those who became free.

What about two regions of the province of Asia, Lydia and Phrygia? Apart from the bare fact that slaves existed in Lydia and Phrygia between the 1st and 3rd century AD, everything else is highly uncertain. How many slaves there were? What were the sources used to maintain and to replenish the slave population? What was their role in agriculture, industry, or domestic life? Was there a slave education? What were the specifics of their everyday relations with their masters? For the most part, a modern historian must be content with only partial or approximate answers.

Scattered evidence, literary, but mostly epigraphic from Lydia and Phrygia, suggests the presence of a considerable diverse group of both (semi-) dependent and free workers, ranging, in agriculture, from slaves to serf-like native peasant populations, people in debt-bondage, slave and freedman agents on elite estates, free agricultural laborers, and free tenant-farmers, and in an urban context, from bought slaves to house-bred servants (*threptoi*), various types of freedmen, free wage workers, the free self-employed, and so on.¹⁰

Phrygians and Lydians are commonly encountered in the works of Greek and Roman writers. References to persons of Anatolian descent as slaves or proper “slave material” are comparatively frequent but they rarely represented the contemporary reality. These references can convey the impression that Asia Minor was one of the main sources of slaves in the Roman Empire but this might just be a common *topos* of Classical literature. Since the 5th century BC (and probably even earlier), Lydians and Phrygians made their way into the Greek literature as archetypical slaves and servants (together with Thracians, Scythians, and the like). Cicero observed that every Greek comedy had a part for a Lydian slave.¹¹ In ancient novels, Phrygians were portrayed as pirates who abduct people and sell them into slavery.¹² In one of his discourses, Dio Chrysostom is reproaching free Rhodians and their servility towards powerful Romans by comparing them unfavorably with the slaves of inner Phrygia, Egypt, and Libya.¹³ For this reason, we cannot

⁹ J. Bodel, Death and Social Death in Ancient Rome in: J. Bodel, W. Scheidel (eds.), *On Human Bondage: After Slavery and Social Death*, Malden – Oxford 2017, 89.

¹⁰ For more, see A. Zuiderhoek, Sorting Out Labour in the Roman Provinces: Some Reflections on Labour and Institutions in Asia Minor, in: K. Verboven, C. Laes (eds.), *Work, Labour, and Professions in the Roman World*, Leiden 2016, 20ff.

¹¹ Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 65: Nam quid ego dicam de Lydia? Quis umquam Graecus comoediam scripsit in qua servus primarum partium non Lydus esset?

¹² Chariton, *Callirhoe* 8,8.

¹³ Dio Chr, 31. 113-114: καὶ ἔγωγε φαίην ἄν, εἰ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἀκούσεσθε, κρεῖττον ὑμῶν

take just any literary reference to Phrygian or Lydian slaves as being strictly true and useful.

Some theoretical stance seems necessary if we are to make sense of dispersed and not so informative sources on ancient slavery and, more particularly, the slavery in Roman Anatolia. The opinion of F. Papazoglou on the debate on the subject of slavery in Hellenistic Egypt can well be applied to Roman Anatolia or indeed any other part of the ancient world. Papazoglou observed that the results of research depend not only on the sources that are being examined but also on the method applied and general assumptions, theoretical standpoints with which a scholar approaches his research. A scholar needs to be able to ask the proper question and separate the important facts from the rest. According to her opinion, the choice of a theoretical approach to any scholarly problem is of the highest importance, and that approach itself is often the result of some very complicated circumstances, not only the objective ones but subjective ones as well.¹⁴ The initial assumptions on the importance of slavery and the role of slaves in society and production will, inevitably, influence any interpretation and conclusion. This is apparent in the works of almost all scholars involved in the question of ancient slavery.

In this paper, the focus will be more on documentary sources, abundant in these two regions in the Roman province of Asia Minor. Slaves are mostly mentioned on epitaphs and usually, they are home, domestic slaves, servants facilitating the lives of the elite. There were also slaves as personal secretaries, physicians, assistants, or agents. It is generally agreed that slaves in the *familia urbana*, and especially those whose occupation brought them close to their owners, stood a better chance of being manumitted or, if they died as slaves, being commemorated; those working in crafts or business had the opportunity to build up their *peculium* to purchase their freedom or a tombstone. One specific way in which a slave-owner could have promoted a sense of community among his or her slave household was to allow certain slaves to start some kind of marital union.

As previously said, a large number of the slaves documented in the Roman Lydia and Phrygia were domestic slaves, owned by the richest citizens, although even people of lower financial status could have kept a slave. It seems that owning a slave was more a feature of social status and respect, than economic necessity. The everyday life of the slaves is hard to reconstruct from epigraphic sources. The slave who worked as an agent for a member of the elite, like the slave who worked as a confidential secretary, a doctor, or a tutor, was both an insider and an outsider in Roman society; a trusted member of the *familia*, with privileged access to its wealth and connections, but regarded in law and ideology as completely dependent,

ἀπαλλάττειν τοὺς ἐν Φρυγίᾳ μέση δουλεῦοντας ἢ τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ.

¹⁴ Φ. Παπαζογλου, *Историја хеленизма*, Београд 2010, 294-295.

inferior and powerless.¹⁵ As Edmondson suggested slaves in the Roman Empire also played a significant role in establishing the social identity of their *familia* within the community and in structuring kin relations within the family. In this way, they could have also been seen as representatives of the family in the public sphere.¹⁶

Except maybe in some aspect of the institution of the sacred slaves, there is no trace of any specifically indigenous type of slavery. Our knowledge of the specifics of slavery in the pre-Hellenistic (and even more so in pre-Persian) Lydia and Phrygia is very slim but whatever the particularities of the Anatolian slavery originally were, they must have been assimilated to the Greek model of slavery long before the rise of the Roman Empire.

Slave terminology

The most reliable way to recognize a slave in an inscription is through specific terminology. Interestingly enough, ancient Greeks had only one term (ἐλεύθερος) to identify free people but a whole array of different expressions to designate slaves.¹⁷ This says something about the social perception of slaves and slavery as marginal and ambivalent and thus hard to define precisely.¹⁸ By far the most common and the most frequent term for a slave in Greek is δοῦλος. It is the only word in ancient Greek used exclusively for slaves or bondmen.¹⁹ It is an expression with a long history in both Greek literature and documentary sources that have been used throughout Antiquity, a variant of it being attested in the Mycenaean tablets.²⁰ As expected, it is one of the most frequent designations for slaves on inscriptions from Roman Anatolia and it is especially regular in Phrygia.

Another frequent expression for a slave is σῶμα, a “body”.²¹ Compared to δοῦλος, it is not very frequently used in Phrygian and Lydian inscriptions to describe slaves but there are several instances.²²

¹⁵ N. Morley, Slavery under the Principate, in: K. Bradley, P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge world history of slaves I: The Ancient Mediterranean World*, Cambridge 2011, 278.

¹⁶ J. Edmondson, Slavery and the Roman Family, in: K. Bradley, P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge world history of slaves I: The Ancient Mediterranean World*, Cambridge 2011, 353-354.

¹⁷ Cf. M. I. Finley, Was Greek Civilization Base on Slave Labour?, *Historia* 8-2 (1959), 146: “The Greek language had an astonishing range of vocabulary for slaves, unparalleled in my knowledge.”

¹⁸ R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free. The Concept Of Manumission And The Status Of Manumitted Slaves In The Ancient Greek World*, Leiden-Boston 2005, 27.

¹⁹ *LSJ* sv. δοῦλος.

²⁰ M. Ventris, J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge 1973², 123-124.

²¹ *LSJ* sv. σῶμα.

²² *TAM* V1 360 (Kollyda, 33/34 AD); *ASAtene* 1963/64, 380 (Hierapolis).

Using abusive and belittling expressions such as “boy” or “child” to refer to adult slave persons is common throughout the history of world slavery. In Greek inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia, these words are παῖς (a “boy”, “child”, but “concerning condition, *slave, servant, man* or *maid* (of all ages)”), παιδίον (a “little or young child”, or “young slave, male or female”), παιδάριον (“little boy”, or “young slave”), παιδισκος (“young boy or son”), παιδίσκη (“young girl, maiden”, but also “young female maid, bondmaid... generally, maidservant”),²³ κοράσιον (“little girls, maiden”).²⁴ Another, different term κοράσιον is attested in Lydia, in an inscription from Hierokaisareia of the slaves donated to a temple.²⁵

Another term occasionally observed in the inscriptions from Phrygia is οὔεργας,²⁶ from the Latin *verna* meaning “a slave born in his master’s house, a homeborn slave”.²⁷ It is perhaps an example of the appropriation of a technical Latin term used to describe the position for which the precise enough Greek word was lacking.

Another expression frequently associated with slaves is θρεπτός (fem. θρεπτή, pl. θρεπτοί). The term designates foster children who were raised by other individuals than their biological parents. The question of their origin and status, similar to Latin alumni was discussed in the literature, most recently by Marijana Ricl.²⁸ Nevertheless, it was often used for slaves, usually for slaves born outside the master’s home. One should not automatically assume that they were treated better or differently than the other slaves in the household.²⁹

A distinct category is public slaves, designated as δημόσιοι, designated public slaves, owned by the community (a *polis*, in all recorded instances).³⁰ There are, however, four inscriptions from Thyateira recording δημόσιοι with

²³ E. g. *SEG* XXXVIII 1237; *CMRDM* I no. 90 (= Ricl, *Svest o grehu* no. 25).

²⁴ *LSJ* sv. παῖς, παιδίον, παιδάριον, παιδισκος, παιδίσκη, κοράσιον.

²⁵ *TAM* V2 1252.

²⁶ *MAMA* V Lists I (i), 182, 123 (Dorylaion); *MAMA* VII 135 (Hadrianapolis).

²⁷ C. T. Levis, C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, sv. *verna* (cf. *vernaculus*).

²⁸ M. Ricl, Legal and social status of ΘΡΕΠΤΟΙ and related categories in the Greek world: the case of Lydia in the Roman period, in: *Sobria ebrietas. У спомен на Мирона Флашара*, Зборник Филозофског факултета серија А: историјске науке, књ. 20 (2006), 293-321; Idem, Legal and social status of *threptoi* and related categories in narrative and documentary sources, in H. M. Cotton, R. G. Hoyland, J. J. Price, D. J. Wasserstein (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge 2009, 93-146.

²⁹ M. Ricl, Legal and social status of *threptoi* and related categories in narrative and documentary sources, in: H. M. Cotton, R. G. Hoyland, J. J. Price, David J. Wasserstein (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge 2010, 99.

³⁰ E. g. *SEG* LI 1783 (Hierapolis, reign of Hadrian).

a patronymic and indicating perhaps freeborn people.³¹ One example from Hierapolis is documenting Theophilus who is δημόσιος, but also agonistic *epimeletes*.³² As Pleket suggested occasionally free men were prepared to fulfill functions that normally were occupied by slaves.³³

Numbers and origin

Two obvious questions must be answered before any attempt to ascertain the social and economic importance of slavery can be attempted: how many slaves were there in Roman Lydia and Phrygia (ideally, in absolute figures or, at least, in proportion to the whole population) and what was the origin of these slaves? Partial or complete failure to provide meaningful answers would necessarily have a serious bearing on the overall conclusion of this paper. Of course, these two issues cannot be separated: the size and composition of the slave population will have been influenced by whatever means of slave supply are available. The availability of new slaves will have a serious impact on the way the owners treat their existing slaves.

There were five primary sources of slaves in the Roman world: 1) persons forcefully enslaved in wars or by pirates or brigands; 2) persons imported from beyond the frontiers of the Empire; 3) the “self-enslaved” persons; 4) infants abandoned by their parents, and 5) children born to slave-mothers within the Empire.³⁴ The magnitude and importance of foreign commerce in slaves are hard to establish. Varro, quite succinctly, claims

³¹ TAM V2 1075; 1084; 1142; 1152; cf. SEG LIV 1907.

³² SEG XXIX 1404 (reign of Augustus): Σεβαστῶι Καίσαρι καὶ τῶι / Δήμωι Θεόφιλος Φιλαδέλφου δημό/σιος ὁ καθεσταμένος ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιμε/λήας τῶν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἀγῶνων τὸ / ἀνάθημα καὶ τὸν βωμὸν παρ’ ἑαυτοῦ.

³³ H. W. Pleket, A free ΔΗΜΟΣΙΟΣ, ZPE 42 (1981), 167-170.

³⁴ W. V. Harris, Geography and the Sources of Roman Slaves, JRS 89 (1999), 62, in slightly different order; C. R. Whittaker, Circe’s Pigs: From Slavery to Serfdom in the Later Roman World, in: M. I. Finley (ed.), *Classical Slavery*, Oxford 1997, 122-123; W. L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1955, 31-33 and 84-85; The claim of Byzantine antiquarian John Lydus, *De Magist.* 2.28 that Trajan returned from the last Dacian war with over half a million slaves is quoted again and again, in spite of it being quite impossible: even with an excessive estimate, this figure approaches the entire population of early 2nd century Dacia. This “fact” is often adduced as the proof of the continual importance of war as the source of slaves during the Early Empire, e.g. C. R. Whittaker, *o cit.*, 122-123. According to W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, JRS 87 (1997), 164-165, if we assume moderate levels of fertility of slave population and moderate supply of abandoned infants, it would still take ca. 25000 imported slave *yearly* to maintain the slave population of 10 million (Scheidel is purposely using the higher estimate than he believes is warranted); if low estimates are taken then the minimal necessary foreign import of slaves would have to be around 40000.

that Roman slave-owners obtained their slaves from one place - Ephesos.³⁵ This probably means that Ephesos (and other large ports of Asia Minor and Eastern Mediterranean) held an intermediate position in the slave trade with inland Asia and perhaps the region around the Black Sea as well. However, this reflects the situation in the 1st century BC that might not remain the same after Augustus.

Considering the prevalence of manumissions in the Roman Empire, even much more extensive conquest and warfare would not suffice to maintain the size of the slave population. Likewise, the assumed scale of the foreign slave import would have to be huge to make any difference. In a paper dedicated to this question, Walter Scheidel concludes that it is impossible to assess the size of trade in foreign slaves in the Roman Empire but that it probably was not very significant for the maintaining of the Empire's slave population.³⁶ Therefore, we are left with the sources of slaves available within the Empire. The "self-enslavement" is the most elusive and probably the least significant of sources. By the process of elimination, the most important source of new slaves in Roman Phrygia and Lydia would have been the offspring of slave mothers and abandoned infants of any origin. For the existing population of slaves to be maintained, we would either have to assume its high reproduction rate or many thousands of infants abandoned by parents each year. Although there is no certain way of proving it, the first assumption is more likely and more in accordance with the epigraphic record. There are indications that some slave owners purposely encouraged reproduction among slaves to obtain young slaves for training and selling.³⁷

Judging from the Roman literature, trading in slaves was widespread activity and was considered important yet, at the same time, somehow less than dignifying and, on the whole, not an acceptable occupation for men of

³⁵ Varro, *De ling. lat.* 8.21.

³⁶ W. Scheidel, op. cit, 159: "As to the third variable, estimates of the size of the pool of 'enslavables' both within and outside the Empire inevitably rest on guesswork. The number of potential suppliers of slaves, mainly via child exposure and sale, within the Empire might be put at forty million or about three-quarters of the non-slave population which should seem a generous estimate. Populations beyond but within reach of the borders were limited in size: one would think in the first instance of the peoples of Ireland, Scotland, Germania, South Russia, the Caucasus, the Arabian Peninsula, and the Sudan (broadly defined). While Mesopotamia and Iran could have been another source, demand for slaves within the Parthian Empire has to be taken into account as well. Needless to say, the inhabitants of most or all the other areas listed above would also make use of slaves themselves which must have limited the scope of export." Cf. W. V. Harris *Demography, Geography and the Sources of Roman Slaves*, *JRS* 89 (1999), 72-73 who agrees with overall conclusion.

³⁷ J. Bodet, *Death and Social Death in Ancient Rome* in: J. Bodet, W. Scheidel (eds.), *On Human Bondage: After Slavery and Social Death*, Malden – Oxford 2017, 100; cf. O. Pelcer, *Dojilje u rimskom Egiptu*, Beograd, 2009.

high social status. This might partly be assigned to the general resentment toward mercantile pursuits, characteristic of the Roman landholding elite, but it does not explain the attitude entirely. That said, the local elite in Roman Anatolia seems to be less concerned about the low social status of the slave trade. There is an honorary inscription for a slave trader Alexandros in Thyateira who was also an *agoranomos* – a fairly high civic office.³⁸ There is a specialized slave trader in Hierapolis (*παιδαριοτρόφος*), apparently engaged in traffic of the young boys.³⁹ The existence of a regular slave market is attested in Akmoneia⁴⁰ and can be inferred in Apamea.⁴¹

Since the slave was considered a piece of property that could be bought, sold, and transferred, the slave-holding and sales were taxed like any other kind of merchandise or property.⁴² The epigraphic evidence on taxes on the slave trade from Asia Minor goes back to the late Archaic age and it is plausible to assume that it is at least as old as the monetary economy itself.⁴³ For the Roman province of Asia, there is the so-called Ephesian Customs Law (or The Customs Law of Asia). The document details more on slavery in lines 12, 74-76, 98, 117-122.⁴⁴ This piece of legislation would be especially significant for inhabitants of Phrygia with its long borders adjoining regions outside of the province. The slaves were certainly imported from other provinces in Asia Minor and client kingdoms but perhaps from further Asia as well. The fact of obligatory registrations of all imported slaves stated in this Law clearly shows the level of organization and the state supervision regarding the slave trade. It also gives some credence to the assumption that each community had a precise index of its slave population; perhaps there was even a province-wide register.

The question about the number of slaves in any province of the Roman Empire is not easily answered. No ancient author makes any explicit statement in this regard. Perhaps parity with the total number of slaves in the province of Asia, the whole of Asia Minor, or even the whole of the Empire could be made? But these numbers, as well as the population totals are equally absent and any demographic figure found in the modern literature

³⁸ TAM V2 932.

³⁹ *Alt. v. Hierapolis* 270.

⁴⁰ *MAMA* VI 260: [Ἀκμονέων τῆι βουλῆι] / καὶ τῶι δήμῳι] / Γάιος Σωρνά[τιος Γαίου(?)] / υἱὸς Οὐελίνα Β[.c.6..τὸ] / στατάριον καὶ τὸν βωμὸν / ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κατεσκεύασεν.

⁴¹ Dio Chr. *Or.* 35.14.

⁴² R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Taxing Freedom in Thessalian Manumission Inscriptions*, Leiden-Boston 2013, 22.

⁴³ *Syll.*³ 4 (Kyzikos, ca. 520 AD).

⁴⁴ M. Cottier, M. H. Crawford, C. V. Crowther, J.-L. Ferrary, B. M. Levick, O. Salomies, M. Wörrle, *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 2008, ll. 12, 74-76, 98, 117; cf. S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Volume I: The Celts and the Impact of Roman Rule*, Oxford 1995, 257.

is an educated guess at best and pure fiction at worst.⁴⁵ Despite our inability to provide exact figures, the question remains important. The impression we get from the ancient authors is that slaves were indispensable and slavery omnipresent. If this impression reflects the reality of the Greco-Roman world, then there must be a comparatively high percent of slave participation in the total population. Egypt is the one province of the Roman Empire where we occasionally have more precise population data, although geographically and chronologically fragmented. But even there the total population is subject to debate with both ancient authors and modern scholars in disagreement.⁴⁶ The Egyptian figures, such as they are, indicate that slaves were approximately one-tenth of the whole population with some regional and social variations (the percentage is higher in urban areas, lower in villages), and that about one fifth to one-sixth of the recorded households own slaves (again, slightly more in cities and towns, slightly less in villages).⁴⁷

Scheidel relies on “simple demographic models” and methodology of statistical approximation to establish the general order of magnitude for the slave population of the Roman Empire. He begins with the widespread assumption that the Roman Empire had roughly 60 million inhabitants in the 2nd century AD and accepts the percentage (ca. 10%) obtained from Egyptian census returns (though some provinces had far less, and in Italy and Sicily slave population was much larger than what was average for the whole Empire, perhaps as much as one fifth or fourth of all inhabitants).⁴⁸ Thus,

⁴⁵ Frequently cited estimation according to which up to 35% of the population of the late Republican Italy were slaves (e.g. N. Morley, *Slavery under the Principate*, in: K. Bradley, P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slaves I: The Ancient Mediterranean World*, Cambridge 2011, 265) belongs to the latter group. These and other “estimates” that assume slave participation in the total population as roughly one third are based on the analogies with the known slave populations in early modern slave societies, especially the antebellum American South, cf. W. Scheidel, *Human Mobility in Roman Italy, II: The Slave Population*, *JRS* 95 (2005), 65-66.

⁴⁶ R. S. Bagnall, B. W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt*, Cambridge 1994, 53-56.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 70-71: “Slaves constitute about 11 percent of census population (118 of 1084). In census returns with complete or nearly complete principal families, slightly under sixth of household register slaves (26 of 167, or 16 percent) ... However, once again villages differ from metropoleis. For complete or nearly complete households, the overall incidence of slaveholding is a good deal higher in metropoleis (15 of 72 households, or 21 percent) than in villages (11 of 95, or 12 percent); there are about four chances in five that this difference is significant. But in villages, 15 percent of complex households register slaves (6 of 41), as against 11 percent of simple households (6 of 54); since complex village households were probably wealthier than simple ones, the difference may be important, although the numbers are far too small for confidence.” Cf. R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton 1993, 208-209.

⁴⁸ For the entire population of the Empire see: B. W. Frier, *Demography*, in: *CAH X²*, 811-816. According to this careful but still somewhat hypothetical estimate, the Empire had approximately 45 million inhabitants in 14 AD and around 60 million in AD 164 (on the

he supposes that slaves were “six million in a population of sixty million”, on the eve of the Antonine plague.⁴⁹ Harris rejected Scheidel’s conclusions as being “without much in the way of justification.” For provinces like Asia, Harris proposes that the actual percentage of slaves in the entire population fell within the range of 16.6 to 20%.⁵⁰ But how big was the entire population of the province of Asia? Most of the historians engaged in demographic studies of antiquity are reluctant even to hazard a guess.⁵¹ Frierr’s estimate (based largely on the methodology advocated by McEvedy and Jones)⁵² is 8,2 million for the entire Anatolia and around 3,5 million for the province of Asia in 14 AD (including client kingdoms annexed after this date).⁵³ Frierr’s figures for 164 AD are 9,2 and 4 million respectively.⁵⁴ The population of Lydia is under half a million and that of Phrygia around 800,000. If correct, these population heights were not attained again before the late 19th century. If we choose to follow Scheidel, there would be 40,000 slaves in 2nd century Lydia and 80,000 in contemporary Phrygia. If, on the other hand, Harris’ assumption is accepted as valid, respective numbers would be 66-80,000 and 132-160,000 slaves, which seems a bit too elevated. It must be underlined that, in the last few decades, the model proposed by Scheidel grew to general acceptance, surpassing rival interpretations.⁵⁵

The only seemingly precise figure on the slave population for any of the cities in Asia is provided by Galenus (second half of the 2nd century AD). He claims that there were 40,000 slaves in Pergamon (together with 120,000 citizens of both sex and any age and an unspecified number of non-citizen free inhabitants).⁵⁶ If we estimate the total of the city’s population at around 180,000, 40,000 slaves would be 22% of the population, or just above one fifth, which is considerably higher than the comparative Egyptian example adopted by Scheidel but, incidentally, very close to Harris’ estimates. There is no easy

eve of the plague) - population apex not reached again until 16th century. The outstanding 19th century work on ancient population, C. J. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Leipzig 1886, 507 estimates the population of the Empire at the time of Augustus at 54 million (28 of which in the East) and this figure has a large following even today, unlike Beloch’s later attempts to revise it upwards.

⁴⁹ W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, *JRS* 87 (1997), 158; see also I. Biezunska-Malowist, *L’Esclavage dans l’Égypte greco-romaine* II (1977), 156-158.

⁵⁰ W. V. Harris, Demography, Geography and the Sources of Roman Slaves, *JRS* 89 (1999), 65.

⁵¹ Beloch, o cit., 514; T. R. S. Broughton, *Asia Minor under the Empire 27 BC - 337 AD*, in: T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV-2*, Baltimore 1938, 812–816.

⁵² C. McEvedy, R. Jones, *Atlas of World Population History*, New York 1978.

⁵³ B. W. Frierr, o cit., 812.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 814.

⁵⁵ Cf. K. Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275-425*, Cambridge 2011, 8-9.

⁵⁶ Gal. *De pro* 5.49.

solution to this riddle. Perhaps Galenus was simply wrong or exaggerating or was merely guessing. Did the residents of the city even know how many slaves there were among them? And, if his figure is at least roughly correct how does it help the discussion on the slave population in neighboring Lydia, for example? Should we assume that at least the larger cities of the region had the same percentage of the slave population? A standard estimation of the population of the Sardis in 2nd century AD fluctuates between 60 and 80,000. Thus, if we take the highest estimation, we are dealing with either 17,600 (if we take Galenus figure as a basis) or 10,000 slaves (if Egyptian parallel is accepted as valid) in the city.

Also, we could only make an educated guess, for statistical reasons, that the average “social life expectancy” of slaves (the amount of time spent in slavery, allowing for periods of freedom before and/or after enslavement) must have been relatively close to twenty years regardless of the sources of slavery.⁵⁷ If slaves were to be released and if the promise of release was commonly used as an incitement to work better, it is reasonable to assume that owners used them at the period of life when they were the most productive.

Judging from the inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia, it seems that there are more male slaves than females, though this may well be an illusion. It is traditionally assumed that any reference to slaves in ancient sources means male slaves unless explicitly stated otherwise. In recent decades historians came to believe that the truth is very different, even directly opposite to this assumption and females were probably predominant in numbers within the slave population.⁵⁸ The main reason for this was that infant exposure and sale into slavery often discriminated against daughters and in favor of sons.⁵⁹ We should also note that slave women were relatively rarely manumitted during the period of prime fertility.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ W. V. Harris, ‘Towards a study of the Roman slave trade’, in J. H. D’Arms and E. C. Kopff (eds), *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome* (1980), 118; cf. Scheidel, *Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire*, p. 156 n.2.

⁵⁸ This demographical observation is also based on data obtained from census records of Roman Egypt; cf. R. S. Bagnall, *Missing Females in Roman Egypt*, *SCI* 16 (1997), 127-133.

⁵⁹ On this see A. Cameron, *The exposure of children and Greek ethics*, *Classical Review* 46 (1932), 105-114; I. Biezunska-Malowist, *Die Expositio von Kindern als Quelle der Sklavenbeschaffung im griechisch-römisch Ägypten*, *JWG Teil 1* (1971), 129-133; D. Engels, *The Problem of Female Infanticide in the Greco-Roman World*, *Classical Philology* 75 (1980), 111-120; W. Harris, *The theoretical possibility of extensive infanticide in the Greco-Roman world*, *CQ* 32 (1982), 114-116; *Idem*, *Child-exposure in the Roman Empire*, *JRS* 84 (1994), 1-22.

⁶⁰ W. Scheidel, *Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire*, *JRS* 87 (1997), 167.

Slaves as family members

In the urban environment of both Lydia and Phrygia (as well as most of the Empire), slaves of various categories constituted a significant part of the core labor force employed by households. We can only speculate on how many slaves were in an average household. If we accept the supposition of the slave population as only about one-tenth of the total, then most of the slaves will have to belong to upper-class families, while only better-off middle-class families will have a slave or two.⁶¹ Presumably, if the higher estimate is accepted, the wider slave ownership among the middle class becomes a real possibility. In such a scenario an average middle-class family could have two or three slaves in the household, and even families of humbler means could afford some. Members of the elite certainly sustained whole households of slaves as seen in at Thermai Theseos, a village of Mokkadene in Lydia, part of an estate belonging to the wealthy C. Iulius Quadratus, where we find an association (κολλήγιον) formed by the (slave) household (φαμίλια). These slaves too were probably largely domestic and not a part of the rural workforce.⁶²

According to Roman law, there was no such thing as a slave family. Most of the Roman jurists are quite clear on this point. Greek attitude was similar, any union among slaves or between slaves and free was legally invalid. Children born from such a union were slaves that belonged to the owner of their parent(s) and could become free only through the act of manumission.⁶³

But, even though from a legal standpoint slaves were not supposed to have a family, the inscriptions show a different picture. Examples of union between citizens and slaves exist even in Rome.⁶⁴ As a component of Anatolian society, the slave families certainly existed in large numbers, even if they were unrecognized by the jurists. Thus, the documents recording the existence of such families are very important for obtaining the complete image of society. It seems slaves were encouraged to form some kind of quasi-marital relationship.⁶⁵ One of the reasons was probably economic,

⁶¹ W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, *JRS* 87 (1997), 156-167; W. Scheidel, The Slave Population of Roman Italy. Speculation and Constraints, *Topoi* 9/1 (1999), 129-144.

⁶² TAM V1 71.

⁶³ J. Bodel, Death and Social Death in Ancient Rome in: J. Bodel, W. Scheidel (eds.), *On Human Bondage: After Slavery and Social Death*, Malden – Oxford 2017, 92.

⁶⁴ B. Rawson, Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire, *CPh* 61-2 (1966), 71-83.

⁶⁵ Riel, Legal and social status, 99; on *contubernales* in Roman society see S. Dixon, *Roman Family*, Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992, 10 ili R. MacLean, *Freed Slaves and Roman Imperial Culture. Social Integration and the Transformation of*

breeding slave children either for domestic work or sale. It was also in the master's interest that the slaves have a stable family life as in that way their content and numbers were increased.⁶⁶

There is an interesting example in a funerary monument for a slave Dadouchos and his family, *doulos pragmateutes* of the senator C. Iulius Philippus⁶⁷ as well as another *doulos pragmateutes*, Eutychnianos, from the estate of Flavia Politta in Apollonis, who erected an inscription for himself and his kind-hearted wife Prepousa, children and grandchildren.⁶⁸ On Pisido-Phrygian border one Auxilia, a slave of Telemachos, made a funerary inscription for her sons, Agathopous and Germanos, out of her own money.⁶⁹ In one inscription from Saittai, a freedman named Antheros was perhaps a biological son of the owner Ti. Claudius Lonkhas and a slave.⁷⁰ A more unusual example is found in the temple of Apollo Lairbenos in Motella. Olympias, daughter of Dionysios, a wealthy free woman had a son with her slave Neikon, also called Neikon. She has publicly declared Neikon as her son and we deduce from the inscription that he was already manumitted.⁷¹ The examples of a free woman being open about her private relationship with her slave are not so frequent.⁷² The possible shame on unions between slaves and free was not nearly as strong for freedmen as it was for the freeborn. Slaves and freedmen associated freely, especially members of the same *familia*.

It is very clear from epigraphic material in these provinces that strong bonds and close, lifelong ties generally continued to exist between the freedmen and their former masters, since many inscriptions mentioning freedmen refer to them as having the right to be buried with their former master, now patron, and his family, as an important part of master's *familia*,

Values, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018, especially 24, 136ff.

⁶⁶ K. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control*, Brussels 1984, 47-51.

⁶⁷ *IK Tralleis* 194 (2nd century AD).

⁶⁸ *TAM* V2 1213: Εὐτυχιανὸς Φλ(αβίας) Πωλλίτιης ὑπατικῆς δ(οῦλος) πραγματευτῆς / Πρεπούση υἱοῦ / γυναῖκι ψυχῇ ἀγαθῇ μνείας χάριν καὶ ἑαυ/τῷ καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις καὶ ἐγγόνοις.

⁶⁹ *I Sultan Dağı* 608: [Α]ὐξιλ[ί]α δούλη Τηλεμάχου / [Αγ]αθόποδι κ[α]ι Γερμανῶ ὑέσ[ι] / ἐ[κ] τοῦ / πεκο[υ]λίο[υ].

⁷⁰ *SEG* XXXI 1018: [- - - - -] / Τι Κλαύδιος [- -ca.8- -] / Λονχᾶς ἐτείμησεν Ἄνθη/ρον Λονχᾶ τὸν πατρικὸν αὐ/τοῦ ἀπελεύθερον καὶ ἴδιον / θρέψαντα Τι Κλαύδιος Ἄν/θηρος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ Κλαυδία Χαρίτιον ἡ σύνβιος αὐ/τοῦ ἐτείμησαν Ἀμμια καὶ Μόσχιον καὶ Ἀππια τὸν ἑα[υ]τῶν πατέρα ἐτείμησαν / Ἄνθηρε ἦρω χαιρε.

⁷¹ *MAMA* IV 275B (177/178 AD): ἔτους σξβ' μηνὸς Ξαν/δικοῦ· Ὀλυμπιάς Διο/νυσίου Βλαουδηνῆ / ἡ καὶ Μο(τελληνῆ) καταγράφω Νεῖ/κωνα β' τὸν υἱόν μου / Ἠλίω Ἀπόλλωνι Λαιρ/μηνῶ, καὶ ἂν τις ἀντεῖ/πη θήσει εἰς τὸν θε/ὸν βφ' καὶ εἰς τὸν / φύσκον ἄλλα (δην.) βφ'.

⁷² See also *MAMA* IV 276A II and B; *MAMA* I 295: Αἰπαφρόδευ/τος Παρδαλᾶ/δος δοῦλος / Φωσπόρφ ὑ/ῶ μνήμη / χάριν καὶ ἑαυ/τοῖς ζῶντες.

in the same tomb.⁷³ In Thyateira, one Stratonikos, son of Eunomos, also allowed members of his immediate family, wife, children, grandchildren as well as foster-children and freedmen to be interred in his tomb.⁷⁴ In Akmoneia a wealthy Roman citizen Titus Flavius Praxios, built a tomb for himself and his family and posterity. His freedmen are also allowed to be buried in the same grave.⁷⁵

The relationship between masters and their slaves and *patronus* and their freedmen was at times quite close and words of affection could occasionally have been seen on the epitaphs. One such example from Philomelion in Phrygia is an epitaph made by Aurelius Leukis for his slave Basilike.⁷⁶ She is praised for her σπουδή and εὔνοια (earnestness and goodwill). A freedman, named Chares used kind words for his relation with his former master.⁷⁷ In a metrical funerary inscription from Philadelphia, a freedman named Skeptikos praised his benevolent master for allowing him to be buried in his tomb.⁷⁸ In the case of some θρεπτοί in Lydia and Phrygia, similar epithets are attested, such as χριστός (worthy, good),⁷⁹ προσφιλής (beloved),⁸⁰ ποθεινός (strongly missed),⁸¹ or πιστός (trustworthy).⁸²

Slaves in economic roles

Inscriptions commemorating slaves and freedmen are known from every province of the empire; they are mostly found in urban contexts, which of course reflects the general pattern of epigraphic habit. Where the occupation is indicated, it is almost always urban; the majority of slaves whose role is recorded were employed as personal servants, to officials, soldiers, or local notables, with a few involved in the imperial administration and a few employed in crafts and trade. It seems there were many slaves in Lydia and Phrygia. Enough so that slaves from Anatolia are frequently mentioned in the literary tradition: Phrygian slaves, in particular, had long become a standard motif, while Lydia, Caria, and Cappadocia also gathered attention.⁸³

⁷³ I. e. *TAM* V2 1050 (Thyateira); *TAM* V3 1911 (Philadelphia); *TAM* V3 1829 (Philadelphia); Hermann, Malay, *New documents* no. 4 (near Thyateira, imperial period); *MAMA* V 89 (Dorylaion); *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 85; *IGR* IV 720 (Blaundos).

⁷⁴ *TAM* V2 1129 ll. 1-12.

⁷⁵ *MAMA* VI 272.

⁷⁶ *MAMA* VII 200a = *I Sultan Dağı* 11.

⁷⁷ *TAM* V1 18 (Lyendos).

⁷⁸ *TAM* V3 1919.

⁷⁹ *TAM* V1 188 (Saittai, 169/170 AD).

⁸⁰ *MAMA* X 194 (Appia, late 2nd or early 3rd century AD).

⁸¹ Waelkens, *Türsteine* 615 (Vetissos).

⁸² *MAMA* IX P191 (Aizanoi).

⁸³ W. Scheidel, *The Roman Slave Supply*, in: K. Bradley, P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge*

In these Roman provinces slaves' main occupation continued to be domestic and personal service, in the broadest sense, from doctors, secretaries, and tutors to cooks, dressers, and masseurs. Generally speaking, females mostly worked around the house, while male slaves were also secretaries, *paedagogi*, or business agents. On Pisido-Phrygian border one female estate manager is attested.⁸⁴ In Hierapolis an epitaph of the *paidagogos* Heliodoros is preserved⁸⁵ Judging by the fact that this inscription was erected by παιδευταί, Heliodoros' professional colleagues, we could perhaps deduce that he was a slave without relatives.

Many slaves participated in nurturing and rearing their masters' children as well as other children in the household. In a recently published inscription from Hypaipa previously unattested expression ἄνθρωποι θρεπτικοί is documented and the editors believe it could be equivalent to θρέψαντες, τροφείς, and *nutritiores*.⁸⁶

In northeast Lydia, several inscriptions are mentioning seven,⁸⁷ eight,⁸⁸ or in one case even 34 people⁸⁹ reared by the same couple or individual.⁹⁰ A couple in Tomara who nurtured eight θρεπτοί were slaves of one Antistius Priscus.⁹¹ As Ricl suggested, there is a possibility that there were couples and individuals specialized in bringing up and training other people's slaves or exposed and rescued children.⁹² This possibility is sustained by the attestation of two Phrygian male educators designated as ἄππας.⁹³

There are just a few epigraphic attestations of agricultural slaves in these regions⁹⁴ and Broughton argued that agricultural slavery was of

world history of slaves I: The Ancient Mediterranean World, Cambridge 2011, 304.

⁸⁴ *MAMA* VIII 399 = *I Sultan Dağı* 567.

⁸⁵ *SEG* LIV 1338 A ll. 1-7.

⁸⁶ M. Ricl, H. Malay, ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙ ΘΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΙ in a new inscription from Hypaipa, *EA* 38 (2005), 50.

⁸⁷ *SEG* XLIX 1620 (Maionia, imperial period).

⁸⁸ *TAM* V1 764 (Iulia Gordos), 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD); *SEG* XL 1093 (Lydia, 175/176 AD); Hermann, Malay, *New documents* no. 37 (west of Daldis, Roman Imperial period).

⁸⁹ *TAM* V1 786 (Tomara): Εὐξενος τὸν πατέρα, Ε[ὐ]ξεν[ος] / τὸν ἀδελφόν, Αθηναίς, Στρατον/εἰκή τὸν / πατρῶόν, Ἡρακλειδης, / ἄφφειν τὸν πάτρωσ, Ἀριστογενη / ..ΝΕ.. ΔΩΣ[Α Φ]οιν[ικί]ς, Ἰουλία τὸν / [.]ΛΙΑΡΙΟΝ, Τρόφιμο[ς] ὁ τε]θραμμέν[ος], / Καλλεινείκη τὸν θρέψαντα, Σ...Ε... / ΡΟΣ, Φοῖβος, Ὀνήσιμος, ΕΛΛΑ... / ΙΣΣ...Σ, Τροφιμίων, Τελεσφο/ρίων, Φιλάργυρος, Πολύειδος, Ἐρμῆς, / Φίλητος, Ἀλέξανδρος, Απολλωνία, / Τελεσφορία, Γλυκωνίς, Τερτία, / Ἀμπελῖς, ΚΑΘΕ..ΑΙΣ, Φοῖβη, Ὀνησίμη, Τροφιμη, Κάρπος, Ξάνθος(?), / Σωτηρίς, Μοῦσα, Ἐλπίς, Πρέπου[σα,], Εἰρήνη, Ναῖς, Εὐτυχίς, / [Β]ασιλία, Τρόφιμος, Εὐρετος, / [.....], Ἐλπίς τὸν θρέψαντα / [] οἱ συγγενεῖς καὶ ὑδεῖς καὶ / [] πάντες ἐτείμη[σαν.]/[—]Ε.ΟΥ[— / χαῖρε]· καὶ σύ.

⁹⁰ Ricl, *Legal and social status*, 108.

⁹¹ *TAM* V1 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD).

⁹² Ricl, *Legal and social status*, 108.

⁹³ *MAMA* VII 170 (Hadrianopolis); *MAMA* VIII 357 (Killanion Plain).

⁹⁴ *TAM* V1 71 (Thermaï Theseos, 140/141 AD); *TAM* V1 317 (area of Kula, early 2nd century

little importance.⁹⁵ This assumption has a large following. In the Phrygian inscription, slaves are used as cattle shepherds, in the area of Kula, there was a five-year-old boy, probably a slave who was also a shepherd.⁹⁶ In Thermai Theseos there is a whole family of slaves on the estate of a possible descendant of the illustrious Pergamene family, one C. Iulius Quadratus.⁹⁷ Still, we must be careful not to make definitive conclusions based on the lack of sources. There is a strong possibility that rural slavery was merely underrepresented in the epigraphical record, and indeed broad patterns of the known epigraphic habit would indicate this.

Slavery in the industry was equally conspicuous by its absence. There are several indications that slaves were working in the textile or wood industries in Saittai. There are two possible attestations of slave textile workers in Saittai, belonging to the same family⁹⁸ and few other examples, also in Saittai, as three persons Ammianus,⁹⁹ Attalios¹⁰⁰ and Iulianus¹⁰¹ do not have their patronymic indicated in the inscriptions, a possible indicator of their servile status. In Saittai a certain Octavius Polykleites is one of the local *lanarioi*.¹⁰² The Octavii Polliones are known as one of the most prominent families in the city. Perhaps the person mentioned in the inscription is either their freedman or his son. Incidentally, the same family had a slave Philetairos as a member of the association of *tektones*.¹⁰³ In an epitaph from Philadelphia, a female linen worker named Trophime is attested.¹⁰⁴ As she has no patronymic we could perhaps suppose her servile status.

A special category of slaves were gladiators. One is attested in Saittai as a member of the first team of gladiators and probably had won some victories in the arena.¹⁰⁵ Another possible, although not explicit example is a recent funerary inscription for a gladiator from Tralleis.¹⁰⁶ Apart from the inscription, this monument contains a relief depicting a gladiator within a rectangular recess. We see a typical representation of a gladiator resting on his right foot. In his hands, he carries a small square shield and a short curved sword. The gladiator's face is completely covered by the helmet and

AD); *MAMA* IV 297 (Dionysopolis, 3rd century AD).

⁹⁵ Broughton, *Asia Minor under the Empire 27BC – 337 AD*, 690-692; see also W. Westermann, *The Slave Systems*, 120.

⁹⁶ *TAM* V1 317.

⁹⁷ *TAM* V1 71.

⁹⁸ *TAM* V1 85; *SEG* XXIX 1186; cf. also Zimermann, *Handwerkervereine*, 93-95.

⁹⁹ *TAM* V1 84: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν λινοθργῶν.

¹⁰⁰ *SEG* XXIX 1195: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν πλοποιῶν.

¹⁰¹ *TAM* V1 83: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν λινουθργῶν.

¹⁰² *TAM* V1 85 (145/146 AD).

¹⁰³ *SEG* XXIX 1186 (165/166 AD).

¹⁰⁴ *TAM* V3 1790.

¹⁰⁵ *TAM* V1 140; cf. L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs*, 161 no. 136 and 286.

¹⁰⁶ A. Saraçoğlu, M. Çekilmez, A Gladiator Stele From Tralleis, *EA* 43 (2010), 57–58.

the shield. His name Σπίκλος probably derived from Latin *spīculus*, “sharp, pointed”. It is another kind of utilitarian slave-name, appropriate for a highly distinct profession.

Imperial slaves

Imperial slaves and freedmen are not so frequently attested in Lydia and Phrygia compared to some other parts of the Roman Empire. They belonged to a distinct category that was not affected by the usual problems of slave labor. Their social position and financial status were noticeably different from the average slave population.¹⁰⁷

One very interesting inscription from Hadrianopolis in Phrygia is documenting one imperial homeborn slave as *eirenarch*.¹⁰⁸ It is unusual to find an imperial *verna* holding the *eirenarchate*.¹⁰⁹ He was perhaps a kind of police officer but connected with an Imperial estate and not a municipal magistrate.¹¹⁰ One imperial freedman, known from the dedications to Zeus Bennisos from the Upper Tembris Valley, was, after manumission, a kind of police officer of the *eparcheia*, equivalent of the municipal *eirenarchai*.¹¹¹ One imperial freedman was honored as *euergetes* in the inscription from Stektorion.¹¹² Another example, found in Tyraion, is an honorary inscription by the *boule* and *demos* honoring a freedman Publius.¹¹³ An imperial freedman Maximus was honored in Attaleia as a benefactor of the *collegium* of *neoteris*.¹¹⁴ Another funerary inscription, from Laodikeia on the Lykos, is documenting an imperial freedman with his family as well as his own slaves and freedmen.¹¹⁵

The position and possible wealth of some imperial slaves and freedmen are documented by one inscription from Dionysopolis, where a slave of Domitia Augusta, wife of the emperor Domitian, donated some roof

¹⁰⁷ Generally see: H. Mouritsen, *The Freedmen in the Roman World*, Cambridge, 2011; P. López Barja de Quiroga, Freedmen Social Mobility in Roman Italy, *Historia* Bd. 44, H. 3 (3rd Qtr., 1995), pp. 326-348; R. MacLean, *Freed Slaves and Roman Imperial Culture: Social Integration and the Transformation of Values*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

¹⁰⁸ *MAMA* VII 135 = I Sultan Dağı 396.

¹⁰⁹ See also ed. pr. J. G. C. Anderson, A summer in Phrygia II, *JHS* 18 (1898), 123.

¹¹⁰ On this particular inscription see also Schultess in *RE Suppl.* III s. v. εἰρηναρχαί, 420: “nicht städtischer E. gewesen sein, sondern bloß über die kaiserliche Domäne”; Magie, *Roman Rule*, 1514 n. 46: “his duties may have been limited to an imperial domain”.

¹¹¹ *SEG* XL 1232 (79 AD); also *SEG* XL 1233.

¹¹² Ramsey, *Cities and Bishoprics*, 704, 641.

¹¹³ *I Sultan Dağı* 365.

¹¹⁴ *TAM* V2 845: [M]αξιμῶ Σεβαστοῦ / ἀπελευθέρῳ κο[ινεῖ(?)]/ον τὸ νεώτερον τ[ῶ] / ἰδίῳ εὐεργέτη.

¹¹⁵ *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 85

tiles and money for the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos.¹¹⁶ Another example would be Eutyches, an imperial slave in north Phrygia who donated oil to the sanctuary of Apollo, celebrating his master's victory.¹¹⁷ In Tralleis, Chresimos, freedman of emperor Nerva, helped the building of *thermae* in the *gymnasion*.¹¹⁸

Manumission of slaves

The institutionalized release from slavery was very common in the Greco-Roman world. The frequency and general simplicity of manumission set ancient slavery apart from its medieval and modern counterparts. The manumission is probably the most neglected aspect of slavery in modern historiography. The reason is probably that most of the students of ancient slavery consider manumitting as the virtual end of slavery which is not true, strictly speaking.¹¹⁹ At least in some variants of Greek manumissions, freed slaves retained some obligations toward their former masters.¹²⁰ Although in strictly juristic terms the rights attained by a freedman were equal to that of a resident foreigner, their social position was not the same. Once again, this is the area where the Roman practice was more flexible and open. Fortunately enough, in Roman society slaves could anticipate freedom if they worked hard and demonstrated skill. Legal manumission was the key. Nevertheless, close bonds between former slaves and masters remain and are sometimes commemorated in the inscriptions.

Following Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz's study, the taxonomy for Greek types of manumission may be schematized as follows, based primarily on the parties or entities involved: the public or private identity of the manumittor (the polis or a private citizen); the presence of a deity (sacral manumission); the involvement of political institutions; and the degree to which the action is publicized. All of these types involved witnesses such as family or friends – similar to Roman *inter amicos* – but whose presence served only for purposes of evidence in court should it be needed. Because of the informal nature of these manumissions, little evidence survives. Two non-Roman manumission processes most common in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire are well-attested: sacral and polis.¹²¹

Slaves were manumitted with great frequency, and freedmen were accepted into Roman society. For centuries Romans had a tax of five percent on

¹¹⁶ *MAMA* IV 293 (ca 90 AD).

¹¹⁷ Haspels, *Highlands of Phrygia*, 318, 51.

¹¹⁸ *IK Tralleis* 148 (96/98 AD).

¹¹⁹ R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free*, 5.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 69-79.

manumissions (*vicesima manumissionum/libertatis*).¹²² In Lydia, Thyateira, we have a reference to an embassy trying to negotiate relief from the burden of a 5% tax on manumission on behalf of the whole province of Asia.¹²³ We can deduce that the tax was a burden, probably due to the frequency of manumissions. We should also bear in mind, as Scheidel observed, that high rates of manumission can make a biologically reproducing slave population socially non-reproductive.¹²⁴

The most prominent ex-slave that ever came from Phrygia was the stoic philosopher Epictetus. He was born in the mid-1st century Phrygia, probably in Hierapolis as a child of slave parents.¹²⁵ The name he was given at birth is unknown as well as the names of his parents. At his young age, he became a slave of Nero's freedman and secretary (*a libellis*) Epaphroditus in Rome.¹²⁶ That allowed him to circulate among the Roman elite and study with eminent Musonius Rufus. When Domitian in the early nineties expelled philosophers from the city, he went to Nicopolis in Epirus and attracted a large audience, historian Arrianus and even perhaps, Hadrian, among others. It should also be noted that there is no evidence as to whether Epictetus had previously been manumitted by Epaphroditus, or as to what his status was later on.¹²⁷ The long journey from Hierapolis to Rome was typical of the compulsory mobility to which Roman slaves from Eastern provinces were normally subjected. One could say that it was because of slavery that Epictetus became a philosopher, as slavery seems to bring him certain opportunities.¹²⁸ A striking feature of Epictetus' teaching is a preoccupation with freedom; a preoccupation perhaps could be explained by the notion that a philosopher who had once been a slave might well have had a far keener appreciation of liberty than one who had not.¹²⁹

¹²² The tax was introduced in 357 BC by the consul Manlius; the tax was filed under the agricultural category, and the duty and sum of the tax collection could be auctioned off to *publicani* who would go out and collect it, for more see K. Bradley, *The vicesima libertatis: Its History and Significance*, *Klio* 66 (1984), 175–182.

¹²³ *TAM* V2 973.

¹²⁴ W. Scheidel, *Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire*, *JRS* 87 (1997), 157.

¹²⁵ In Asia some importance seems to be invested in the fact that he was of the local origin. There is a stoic diatribe preserved in an inscription from Pisidia (dated 150-200 AD), mentioning Epictetus as a slave, *SEG* XLVII 1757 ll. 15-19: ὃ ξ[ένε, Ἐπ]ίκτητος δούλας ἀπὸ ματρὸς ἐτέχθη, / αἰε[ν ὄν] ἀνθρώπων σοφία ἐπι κύδαν' <ἐ>μὰ φρήν, / ὄν <τι> χρή με λέγειν· θ<ε>ῖος γένετ'· αἴθε δὲ καὶ νῦν / τοιοῦτός τις ἀνὴρ ὄφελος μέγα καὶ μέγα χάριμα / πάντων εὐξαμένων δούλας ἀπὸ ματρὸς ἐτέχθη.

¹²⁶ *PIR*² E 74.

¹²⁷ For more see F. G. B. Millar, *Epictetus and the Imperial Court*, *JRS* 55 (1965), 141-148.

¹²⁸ K. Bradley, *Slavery and Society at Rome*, Cambridge 1994, 174-175.

¹²⁹ F. G. B. Millar, *Epictetus and the Imperial Court*, *JRS* 55 (1965), 141-148.

Explicit mentions of manumissions in Lydia and Phrygia are comparatively rare. Two characteristic examples, one from each province, will be discussed. In Lyendos, one freedman, Chares, son of Chares erected a grave monument for his former master.¹³⁰ Their relation is described in very affirmative attributes. A fragmentary inscription from north Phrygia mentions a father paying for the manumission of his slave son (both of them named Diodotes).¹³¹ Father himself does not appear to be a slave.

Another category would be sacred manumissions. In a sacral manumission, a slave owner dedicated or sold a slave to a deity. A common feature of the sacral manumission was a *paramone* clause (from παραμένειν, “to remain, stay, or continue”), which stipulated that despite payment for manumission (presumably the slave’s self-purchase) the now free person must continue in service to the master for a certain period. The slave’s ostensible purchase of freedom presupposed a social and economic dislocation from the slave owner. Thus, the purpose of the *paramone* was to ensure continued service after the slave was manumitted.¹³² A classic example of this type of manumission is attested to in Pisidia.¹³³ Olympias was manumitted on the condition that she would stay, presumably with her owner Aur. Marcia for the duration of the latter’s lifetime, but as a free woman with respect to everything else. The inscription was engraved when Marcia was still alive, and μείνη was erased after her death, probably on Olympias’ initiative, since the latter’s *paramone*-obligation ended at that moment.¹³⁴

Another similar case is a documented manumission in Phrygia that comes from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos. The surface used for the inscribing document is the base of a statue of Apollo that already bore a dedication to the deity. The original inscription is perhaps a century older than the deed of manumission. Marcus, son of Dionysodoros is giving freedom to his slave and θερεπτή Ammia¹³⁵ The same sanctuary also yielded an example

¹³⁰ TAM V1 18 ll. 4-10: Χάρης Χάρητος ἐ[ποίησα(?)] / τὰς ταφ]ὰς τῆς κυρίας μου [— — — / — — —]ας, ἧς / μνήμαις ἰς πέν[θος δά/κρυα] χύνω, καλὰς ἐντολὰς ὑ[πέρ / ἐμ]οῦ καταλιπούσης ἰς ἔλευ[θερί/α]ν, ἃς ὁ / <σ>ύντροφός μου τετήρηκε / καὶ ὁ θρέψας.

¹³¹ Haspels, *Highlands of Phrygia* 331,88 ll. 5-10: Διόδοτος Δ[— — —] / κατὰ ἐντολή[ν Διοδότου] / τοῦ υἱοῦ δην[άρια — — —] / πεντήκ[οντα — — —] / Ἀσκληπίδης [— — —] / ΔΗΝ Ἀσκληπίδ[ου — — —].

¹³² For the *paramone* clause generally see B. Adams, *Paramoné und verwandte Texte; Studien zum Dienstvertrag im Rechte der Papyri*, Berlin 1964; A. Calderini, *La manomissione e la condizione dei liberti in Grecia*. Milan, 1908; L. Darmezín, *Les Affranchissements par consécration en Béotie et dans le monde grec hellénistique*, Nancy, 1999.

¹³³ SEG 47 1777 (after 212 AD) ll. 14-30; edd. pr. G. H. R. Horsley, R. A. Kearsley, A Paramone Text on a Family Funerary Bomos at Burdur Museum, *AS* 47 (1997), 51-55; but cf. also M. Riel, A New *Paramone*-inscription from the Burdur Museum, *EA* 29 (1997), 31-34.

¹³⁴ Riel, A New *Paramone*-inscription, 33.

¹³⁵ MAMA IV 277A II (208/209 AD).

of conditional manumission. The *θρεπτή* Ammia was manumitted by her owner Aurelia Ammia Dioga under the condition that she remains in the service of her former mistress.¹³⁶ This particular example is paralleled by many similar sacred manumissions from the sanctuary at Delphi.¹³⁷

It seems that slave-owners wished to re-capitalise the value of old or dispensable slaves, yet retain their services. The *polis* was probably interested in keeping social distinctions by sanctioning the former masters' rights to their freed slaves' services; and since manumitted slaves were treated as other non-citizens and engaged in those kinds of work that were considered 'slavish', manumission was to the advantage of the economic life in the polis.¹³⁸

Another category of inscriptions concerning manumissions is so-called *katagraphe* inscriptions, especially from the same sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos.¹³⁹ They are called like that because of the repeated verb *καταγράφω* meaning to convey, transfer by deed, register under one's name. As Riel pointed out only the complete phrase *ἐξε[χώρ]ησε καὶ παρεχώρησεν [καὶ κατέ]γραψεν*¹⁴⁰ is showing the whole procedure: "the master had first relinquished all his rights over the slave, then handed him over to the God and finally had him registered under the God's name."¹⁴¹

In the last decade, many new inscriptions of this type were published.¹⁴² In most of them, the persons consecrated to Apollo are *θρεπτοί*, but as Riel proposed we should perhaps consider all *θρεπτοί* from this sanctuary as slaves.¹⁴³ Two interesting examples are documenting not only the consecration of slaves but conveying to them workshops, houses, and tools, as well as incomes and outgoings.¹⁴⁴ Both of these slaves were probably experts in their workshops, had adjoining living space, and were obliged to render services to the temple.

¹³⁶ *MAMA* IV 278 (239/240 AD).

¹³⁷ Cf. commentary of *MAMA* IV 278.

¹³⁸ R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free*, 336.

¹³⁹ Cf. n. 142.

¹⁴⁰ *SEG* L 1269 ll. 3-4 (237 AD).

¹⁴¹ M. Riel, Donations Of Slaves And Freeborn Children to Deities in Roman Macedonia and Phrygia: A Reconsideration, *Tyche* 16 (2001), 156.

¹⁴² M. Riel, Les ΚΑΤΑΓΡΑΦΑΙ du sanctuaire d'Apollon Lairbenos, *Arkeoloji Dergisi* 3 (1995), 167-195; T. Ritti, C. Şimşek, H. Yıldız, Dediche e katagrafai del santuario frigio di Apollon Lairbenos, *EA* 32 (2000), 1-88; more recently E. Akıncı Öztürk, C. Tanrıver, New Katagrafai and Dedications from the Sanctuary of Apollon Lairbenos, *EA* 41 (2008), 91-104, nos. 1-3, 5-11, and 13-18; E. Akıncı Öztürk, C. Tanrıver, Some New Finds From The Sanctuary Of Apollon Lairbenos, *EA* 42 (2009), 89-96 nos. 5-23; E. Akıncı Öztürk, C. Tanrıver, New Inscriptions From The Sanctuary Of Apollon Lairbenos, *EA* 43 (2010), 43-49 nos. 4-7.

¹⁴³ M. Riel, Donations Of Slaves, 158.

¹⁴⁴ *SEG* LVIII 1522 (212/213 AD); *SEG* LVIII 1524 (218/219 AD).

The procedure of official manumission through the public archive and later consecration of the slave to Apollo is attested in another document from the same sanctuary.¹⁴⁵ Achilles freed the slave officially, submitting the papers of manumission to the city archives, and then assigned him to the god. Achilles still refers to Epiktetos as ‘my slave’ inline 3, so editors believe that Epiktetos was perhaps still bound to him by *paramone*. One other clause is attested several times in this type of documents; that consecrated and manumitted slaves cannot be enslaved again.¹⁴⁶ The conveyed slave was almost an equal member of the community.¹⁴⁷

Manumitted slaves were legally free and, according to the Roman perception of this group, they instantly had most of the privileges of the free population, while in the time they could expect full integration into society. There are instances of Roman freedmen achieving high social status, notwithstanding imperial freedmen who were often part of the wealthy elite at the very moment of their manumission. In one text of Greco-Roman literature, an idea is entertained that former slaves may even enter the Senate.¹⁴⁸ Traditional Greek understanding of manumission was at odds with this. In Greek social terms manumitted slaves’ actual position was semi-slavery, or midway between slavery and freedom, at least during the first generation.¹⁴⁹ After AD 212 and the Edict of Caracalla, any manumitted slave automatically became Roman citizens. The conflict was resolved by the triumph of the Roman concept of the freedman.¹⁵⁰

Final Remarks

Slavery was a common feature of life in Roman Anatolia. So far as we can see, it was equally well established in both Lydia and Phrygia. There is also good evidence for slavery in an urban and rural context. Urban slaves are encountered more often in the epigraphic documents but this is to be expected and it need not be in relation to the actual spread of the institution,

¹⁴⁵ *SEG* LVIII 1527 (229/230 AD): Τίτος Φλάβιος Ἀχιλλεύς καταγράφω / τὸν ἑμαντοῦ δοῦλον / ὀνόματι Ἐπίκτη/τον Ἡλίου Λαρμη/νῶ, ὃν κέ ἐπύη/σα ἐλεύθερον / διὰ τῶν ἐν Μο/τελλοῖς ἀρχαίων / ἔτους τιδ´, μη(νός) η´, ς´ ἀ/πιούσα· εἴ τις δὲ ἐ/πενκαλέσει, θή{ο}σι / προστείμου ἰς τὸν / θεὸν ἀργυρίου [✱], βφ´ / κέ ἰς τὸ ταμείον / *vacat* [✱], βφ´ *vacat*.

¹⁴⁶ E.g. *SEG* XLV 1729 (Ricl, *Les ΚΑΤΑΓΡΑΦΑΙ*, 181 no. 32) ll. 6-11; *SEG* LVIII 58 1520 (Öztürk, *Tanniver, New Katagraphai* 2008, 102 no. 14) ll. 7-9: εἴ / τις δὲ ἐπενκαλέσει τοῦ Ζωσί/μου ὡς εἰς δουλίαν ἀνθρώπου.

¹⁴⁷ M. Ricl, *Donation of Slaves*, 156.

¹⁴⁸ *Epic. Diss.* 4.40, with a suitable moral: εἴθ´ ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸν κολοφῶνα ἐπιθῆ καὶ γένηται συγκλητικός, τότε γίνεται δοῦλος εἰς σύλλογον ἐρχόμενος, τότε τὴν καλλίστην καὶ λιπαρωτάτην δουλείαν δουλεύει.

¹⁴⁹ R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free*, 339.

¹⁵⁰ K. Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275 – 425*, Cambridge 2011, 368-369.

although the Egyptian parallel would suggest that slaves were somewhat less common in villages than in towns and cities.

It is sometimes assumed that Roman presence in Asia Minor brought about an increase in the number of slaves both as managers and as workers, but this claim is hard to substantiate. Slaves were involved in all kinds of activity from personal service to crafts and business to education, and in all regions and all levels of society from the depths of the countryside to the houses of the urban elite. Their role was vital for sustaining the lifestyles and ambitions of many elite members, including personal services and a dominant position in the process of education. However, the inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia do not provide as much information on slaves as we would like.

Perhaps the most intensive debate question concerning ancient slavery is the role of slaves in production. The 19th-century scholars took for granted that Graeco-Roman society was slave-holding in a very literal sense: slaves were thought to be the ancient working class that did all or most physically demanding and humiliating tasks. Nowadays this is the view of only a small minority of historians. Any kind of physical or administrative task in antiquity could be entrusted to slaves. But the question is were the slaves of Lydia and Phrygia dominant or at least a very large part of the working population?

The simple fact is that epigraphic sources provide no basis for any such conclusion. There are only a small number of references to slaves as craftsmen and slightly more of those that mention slaves as agricultural workers. Not even all of these examples are beyond doubt. Numerous stone works and mines could well have been worked by slaves but evidence on this is not there. Most of the slaves mentioned in the inscriptions are household slaves, doing domestic and menial work. Of course, it was expected of the members of the higher classes to be attended by a host of personal slaves but even more humble individuals and families could probably afford a slave or two. Does this mean that the importance of slavery in Roman Lydia and Phrygia was not very high? Far from it, the importance of this institution goes well beyond direct economic participation, although one could argue that providing the workforce for numerous households constitutes a serious economic role as well.

Sometimes close bonds and affections between masters and slaves can be observed, displaying perhaps a brighter image in those difficult circumstances. The evidence for closer attachments is surprisingly often, given the general scarcity of documents that mention slaves at all. But, once again, this is surprising only to those who take the large scale slavery of early modern societies as the norm. In a society where slaves were, for the most part, members of a household and where few, apart from the small number of the wealthiest families, owned more than three slaves, it is only natural that

master-slave relations were less formal and rigid, sometimes approaching regular family relations. And sometimes these relations were taken even further. There are several examples of free people of both sexes living openly in a marriage-like community with their slaves. Certain social distinctions and boundaries that are taken for granted to be absolute among the members of the higher classes seem to lose strength in the lower *strata* of society.

If we could prove this phenomenon to be widespread, it would offer some strength to the belief, held by some modern scholars that the position of slaves generally improved during the Early and High Empire and that they were even respected as humans, at least by more enlightened owners. This is usually supported by several common places in the works of contemporary authors and explained in various ways. Two venerable and often repeated explanations for this – the decline in the number of slaves (affecting the general increase in value and thus better treatment for the remaining slaves) and the influence of rising Christianity – can be discarded with confidence as false. But similar views and evidence can be found in other parts of the Ancient world and at other times. In the case of Asia Minor, this warrants the closer examination of sources for slavery from the preceding epochs before coming to a definite conclusion.

As a social group and a legal category, the slaves were present everywhere but we could only guess their proportion in the general population and their full significance in production. Their importance in the real-life of these communities was certainly not negligible, at least that is the impression we get from the epigraphic sources. Several hugely important questions, as well as most of the smaller ones simply cannot be solved with the existing evidence. But such issues are typical of ancient history as a whole, and not specific to western Anatolia.

Olga PELCER-VUJAČIĆ

SLAVES AND FREEDMEN IN LYDIA AND PHRYGIA IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

Summary

An understanding of Greek and Roman slavery is important for several cultural and historical reasons. One could refer to the system of slavery as one of the central institutions of Greek and Roman societies. Slaves were the lowest part of the society in the ancient world and the least visible. Epigraphic evidence suggests the presence of a considerable diverse group of slaves, giving testimony on almost all aspects of their everyday life: relationships, family ties, occupations and possibility

of manumission. By far the most common and the most frequent term for a slave in Greek is δοῦλος. It is the only word in ancient Greek used exclusively for slaves or bondmen. But inscriptions are presenting other examples as well.

The other important question is the origin of slaves. There were five primary sources of slaves in the Roman world: 1) persons forcefully enslaved in wars or by pirates or brigands; 2) persons imported from beyond the frontiers of the Empire; 3) the “self-enslaved” persons; 4) infants abandoned by their parents, and 5) children born to slave-mothers within the Empire. Judging from the inscriptions, it seems that there are more male slaves than females, though this may well be an illusion. In recent decades historians came to believe that the truth is very different, even directly opposite to this assumption and females were probably predominant in numbers within the slave population.

Even though from a legal standpoint slaves were not supposed to have a family, the inscriptions show a different picture. The slave families certainly existed in large numbers, even if they were unrecognized by the jurists. Thus, the documents recording the existence of such families are very important for obtaining the complete image of society. It seems slaves were encouraged to form some kind of marital relationship. The relationship between masters and their slaves and freedmen was at times quite close and words of affection could occasionally have been seen on the epitaphs.

Slaves' main occupation continued to be domestic and personal service, in the broadest sense, from doctors, secretaries, and tutors to cooks, dressers, and masseurs. Generally speaking, females mostly worked around the house, while male slaves were also secretaries, *paedagogi*, or business agents.

Manumitted slaves were legally free and, according to the Roman perception of this group, they instantly had most of the privileges of the free population, while in the time they could expect full integration into society. There are instances of Roman freedmen achieving high social status, notwithstanding imperial freedmen who were often part of the wealthy elite at the very moment of their manumission.

As a social group and a legal category, the slaves were present everywhere but we could only guess their proportion in the general population and their full significance in production. Their importance in the real-life of these communities was certainly not negligible, at least that is the impression we get from the epigraphic sources.