

Chiara Matarese, *Deportationen im Perserreich in teispidisch-achaemenidischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden (Harrassowitz) 2021 (Classica et Orientalia 27), XII, 318 S., ISBN 978-3-447-11594-0 (geb.), € 78,-

Besprochen von **Jan Tavernier**, E-Mail jan.tavernier@uclouvain.be

<https://doi.org/10.1515/klio-2025-2003>

With the publication of Chiara M(atarese)'s volume on deportations in the Teispid-Achaemenid Empire, a long-standing lacuna within the field of Teispid-Achaemenid studies has been dealt with. Indeed, the volume reviewed here is the first published global and thorough research on this topic and therefore merits a large attention by the scholarly community.

Quite logically the book starts with an introduction (1–25), which consists of three sections (“Migrationsforschung und Deportationsdefinition”, “Das Perserreich” and “Quellen zum Perserreich”). The main corpus of the volume is made up of three larger sections, following four appendices (229–318) which close the monograph. They are: “Anmerkungen zu Namen und Begriffen” (231), “Abkürzungen” (233–240), an extensive bibliography (241–298) and three excellent indices (299–318) on persons, divinities and groups (299–308), geographical names (304–308) and cited sources (308–318).

In the first chapter of the introduction, the author distinguishes deportation from related phenomena such as migration and exile. She clearly defines the criteria, with which a deportation must comply (3): deported people are “Menschen, die durch eine politische Institution gezwungen werden, die eigene Heimat zu verlassen, und die in Gebiete umgesiedelt werden, die von dieser Institution kontrolliert werden”. This definition will be the criterion to which movements of people have to comply to be called a deportation and accordingly be discussed in the monography reviewed here.

The first part of the book, the longest one, is called “Deportationsfälle im Perserreich” (27–162) and studies twelve examples of deportations that are attested in the ancient sources. Each discussion of a deportation case follows the same structure and methodology. First, the historical sources are presented in translation (with the original text in accompanying footnotes) and briefly resumed. Secondly, this source is situated within its historical context. Thirdly, the author tackles the question of historicity of the source, in other words, is the source historically reliable or not? Thereby the author includes other sources that might help in defining this historicity. For example, the first case study concerns the deportations of Egyptians by Cambyses when he conquered Egypt in 525 BCE. Here “Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions” and administrative texts from the “Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Archives” mentioning Egyptians working in the Persian homeland are included in the discussion.

As demonstrated by the following table (which would have been welcome in the volume itself) most of the deportations concern Greeks (four cases) or people living close to Greece (four). Another four cases concern non-Greek people. Except for the Paeonians that were deported to Phrygia, all deportees were settled in distant areas of which the closest is Babylonia.

Deported people	Area/city of deportation	Pages (in book)
Barceans	Bactria	45–55
Boeotians	Media	139–143
Eretrians	Cissia (Susiana) or Media	75–91
Greeks (and Lycians)	Persepolis (Fars)	107–125
Paeonians	Phrygia	57–64
Branchides from Didyma	Marakanda region (Sogdiana)	127–137
Carians	Borsippa (Babylonia)	39–44
Milesians	Ampa (SE Susiana)	65–73
Sidonians	Babylonia and Susa	145–151
Jews	Hyrkania and Egypt	153–162
Egyptians	Susa (Susiana)	31–38
Various Eastern Iranians	Persian Gulf Islands (Susiana)	93–106

Due to the meagre number of sources available to the author, her study of the cases was not that evident. Yet the result is a nice overview of the various deportations. The best documented case is that of the Eretrians (with nine text passages, of which that of Philostratos is an extensive one), but most deportations are only mentioned or described by just one or two authors. Moreover, even with relatively many sources for the Eretrian case at her disposal, the author must admit that the historical interpretation remains difficult (81).

The various deportation examples clearly corroborate that the classical sources are by far the most important category of sources that inform us on Teispid-Achaemenid deportations: only one of the twelve examples discussed in the volume is based on a non-classical source, more precisely the Babylonian chronicles, informing us on the deportation of Sidonians to Babylon and Susa (145–151).

Here the question arises if indigenous sources can be of any use whatsoever and immediately the “Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Archives” come to mind. Both archives demonstrate that the Persian capital was a multi-ethnic metropole: next to Iranians (Persians and Medes) the texts mention thousands of Bactrians, Lycians, Lydians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Ionians, Skudrians, etc. These non-Iranian people constitute a large labour force active not only in the huge royal construction projects of the Teispid and Achaemenid kings, such as Persepolis and the Borazjan complex, but also in the agriculture. Of course one may wonder how these people arrived in Persepolis, a question discussed partly

in chapter 16 (179–183; see also 227–228), where the author comes to the conclusion that at least part of them must have been deportees, but that an important part had already migrated (voluntarily) to the region before the Teispid-Achaemenid period. In this light it is fortunate that the author does not limit herself to Persepolis; she also discusses Babylonian sources from the reigns of Cyrus II (labour force in Laḥiru) and Cambyses II (Babylonian workers in Matannan, a village northwest of Persepolis). One could add here the Babylonian workers sent to the coastal Borazjan area (ancient Taḥmaka/Tamukkan) and engaged there in the construction and maintenance of various palaces (Charkhab, Bardak-e Siah and Sang-e Siah) during the reigns of Cyrus II and his successors (Tolini 2008, 2–6; Zehbari 2020; Potts 2022).

Although the author mixes up indigenous sources from Mesopotamia and Fars, a distinction between both regions should be made. Whereas it is indeed possible and probable that non-Iranian and non-Babylonian persons were already present in Babylonia before the rise of the Teispid dynasty, this is a lot less acceptable for non-Iranian persons in the Achaemenid heartland. Concerning Babylonia, such people could have been deported by earlier authorities, such as the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian ones, both known for their deportation programmes.

In the Fars region, no centralized state existed in the centuries before the rise of the Teispid state. Accordingly, it is more plausible to believe that the Teispids and Achaemenids initiated the deportations to the Iranian heartland and that the labourers mentioned in the “Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Archives” were in reality deportees, even if the Mesopotamian, Persian and classical sources remain silent on this issue. They just mention the presence of the labourers.

In this context, it is noteworthy that the example cited by the author to confirm that foreigners were already settled in a new region before its incorporation in the Empire, is that of the Carians in Babylonia (183 n. 49). No example from Fars is discussed; logically, as there is none.

One should note here that the Teispid and Achaemenid authorities conducted much more deportations than attested in the sources, but due to the nearly exclusive Greek-Roman character of the sources available to us these deportations, e.g. in the Eastern Iranian regions, are not mentioned. Quite unsurprisingly, the sources illustrate mainly deportations from ‘Western’ people to more central and eastern parts of the Teispid and Achaemenid Empires.

This larger first part is the basis for the two following parts, which seek to draw more general conclusions on the Achaemenid deportations on the one hand and to compare these deportations with the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian ones.

The second section of the book, “Charakterzüge der teispidisch-achaimenidischen Deportationen” (163–198), consists of an introduction and four chapters (chapters 15–18). The first one aims at describing the goals and ways of Teispid-Achae-

menid deportations, while the second one focalises on the so-called *kurtaš*, groups of workers active in various parts of the Empire but especially documented at Persepolis (cf. *supra*).

As to the status of deportees, discussed in chapter 17, the author draws the conclusion that in the three empires the deportees were not degraded to slavery, though they obviously did not possess the same rights as the indigenous free civilians. The concluding chapter of the second section, chapter 18 on the identity of the deportees, confirms that deportees had the right to retain their own identity and customs. They could also stay with their families (198).

The third part of the volume, entitled “Persische, Neuassyrische und Neubabylonische Deportationen” (199–222), tries, as admitted by the author herself, to compare the Achaemenid deportation policy with the deportation policies of the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Empires. This comparison includes sources and goals of the deportations as well as identity and status of the deportees. As to the historical sources, the completely different landscapes become immediately clear: where the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian deportations are studied on the basis of indigenous sources (royal inscriptions, letters, documentary texts and reliefs for the Neo-Assyrian period; royal inscriptions, Babylonian chronicles, documentary texts for the Neo-Babylonian period¹), the Achaemenid ones are to be investigated nearly exclusively on foreign sources, i.e. the Greek and Roman authors. This is indeed by far the largest difference between the Teispid-Achaemenid deportations on the one hand and the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian ones on the other hand.

The comparison also makes clear that the goals of the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods are similar: protection against potentially dangerous persons (in combination with demotivating provinces to start a rebellion) and promotion of the Empire’s economy, both by developing agriculture and by starting large building projects (e.g. royal palaces).

The conclusion of the work (223–228) is a nice summary of the research results that emanate from the study of Teispid-Achaemenid deportations. One of the major results is that deportations should not be considered primarily as a punitive measure but as a practice having in the first place economic reasons, i.e. the obtaining of workers for agricultural labour or for work at larger royal building projects. Aptly the author also provides prospects for future research, among which a comparative study between the deportation policy of the Teispid-Achaemenid on the one hand and the Arsacid and (especially) the Sasanid Empires on the other hand.

1 An important foreign source on the Neo-Babylonian deportation practices is the Old Testament, which gives us much information on the Babylonian captivity.

The high academic quality of the volume is of course to be applauded. We are looking here at a volume that nicely integrates both classical and Oriental sources in a global study on deportations in the Teispid-Achaemenid period, a book that furthermore discusses in depth the twelve cases of deportations and that thereby makes use of a solid methodology. These aspects are without doubt the strengths of the book, which is doubtlessly a highly significant and welcome contribution to the field of Teispid-Achaemenid studies.

Some detailed remarks

Nevertheless, despite the high quality of the volume, some more detailed and critical remarks can be made:

P. 46–47: here a correction should be made. According to Herodotus, the descendants of Battos were given the city of Barka by Pheretima. As a result, they were not deported by the Persians, as the author claims.

P. 89 and 279: Potts 2012 has been published (Potts 2016).

P. 99: with regard to the Old Iranian word for “punishment, chastisement”, that is found two times in an Aramaic letter from Arsames to Artavante (TAD A6.3:6,7), it should be noted that the correct reading is *srwšyt* and that the reading adopted by the author, *šršy* (with initial *š*) is a ghost-reading; the initial *samēkh* is clearly visible on the papyrus. As a result, *srwšyt* can be realized as **sraušyatā*, easily to be linked to Av. *sraošiia* “punishment” (Tavernier 2007, 448 no. 4.4.13.5).

P. 107–125: here Tavernier’s article on the Lycians in Achaemenid Babylonia and Fars (Tavernier 2015) could have been integrated in the discussion.

P. 114 n. 81: see also Jacobs 2017 on corporal punishment in the Teispid-Achaemenid period.

P. 181: Elamite *battiš* actually is a rendering of Old Ir. **pati*- “master, chief” and is frequently used as second element in compositions (for examples, see Tavernier 2007, 414–437). For its use in anthroponyms, see Tavernier 2007, 600.

P. 187: it would have been interesting to mention the etymology of Old Persian *bandaka*-, which is a derivation from the verb *band-* “to bind” and not from a postulated **banda-* “belt”, as Schmitt believes (Schmitt 2014, 151). The latter is allegedly related to Av. *banda-*, which, however, means “strap, shackle”. Literally *bandaka-* means “the one belonging to the union between king and vassal” (Widengren 1969, 27; Brust 2018, 266).

P. 191: Balzer’s claim that the Iranian-Elamite acculturation process already started around 1500 BCE (Balzer 2012, 3) depends on the arrival date of these Iranians, a date which is subject to debate. Modern scholarship generally accepts that “By at least the late second millennium, Iranian people had infiltrated this territory [i.e. Persis or Fars] and mingled with the local population [i.e. Elamites], a process leading to the emergence, or better ‘ethnogenesis’, of the people we call Persians” (Kuhrt 2007, 47; see also Atayi – Roaf 2019, 175). A critical note to Balzer’s citation would have been welcome.

P. 195: one should be cautious in naming Old Persian a “Kunstsprache”. By now, it is generally accepted that Old Persian was also an administrative language, as illustrated by the Old Persian tablet of the “Persepolis Fortification Archive” (Stolper – Tavernier 2007) and by the various Old

Persian calques and loanword in Aramaic texts from Egypt (Tavernier 2017, 343–347; Tavernier 2020, 77–82 and 83–87).

P. 195: the author correctly states that the main deity in the inscriptions is Auramazdā, who appears in inscriptions of Darius I to Artaxerxes III. Nevertheless, Auramazdā is not the only god appearing as such and not as part of a group, as suggested by the author. In A⁷Hb, an inscription in which Artaxerxes II claims to have built an audience hall (*apadāna*), the last phrase goes as follows: *Mi-i-[t-r : m-a-m : p-a-tu-u-v]* “May Mithra protect me” (cf. Schmitt 1999, 87; Knapton, Sarraf – Curtis 2001, 101–102; Schmitt 2023, 188).

P. 195: it is true that the “Persepolis Fortification” texts mention offerings to various gods, but it is wrong to assume, like Koch does, that there were two well-defined religious spheres in Persepolis: an Iranian/Zoroastrian one and an Elamite one. In various publications, Henkelman has convincingly demonstrated that ‘Achaemenid religion’ was one system in a landscape where Elamite and Iranian elements were involved in a process of acculturation (Henkelman 2008; Henkelman 2021b, 1245–1246, with literature). To name but some of his arguments: although he is the deity ‘par excellence’ in the “Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions”, Auramazdā was not the exclusive divinity in the “Persepolis Fortification Archive”, where he receives less offerings and is less frequently attested than the Elamite deity Humban; divinities with Iranian and Elamite names were served by priests with both Iranian and Elamite names and titles; the well-attested *lan*-ceremony was not the official sacrifice for Auramazdā, as Koch and others have assumed (Koch 1977, 125–178; Koch 1987; Ahn 1992, 106–107; Kellens 1994, 123–126; Herrenschildt 1995–1996, 229; Koch 2004, 244–245; Kreyenbroek 2010; more literature in Henkelman 2017, 284 n. 20).

P. 195: there are more attestations of some of the divinities in the documentary texts from Persepolis, including other divinities too, such as *Miždušī-, *Spantarmatiš, *Šēθrapatiš and *Vrkažana- (cf. Tavernier 2007, 43 no. 2.1.2 and 97–98 nos. 4.1.1–8). Divinities with Elamite names include Humban, Napiriša, Simut, etc. (Henkelman 2021a, 1223–1234)².

P. 212 n. 76: the mentioning of deportations by the Cilician ruler Azatiwada (8th century BCE) is remarkably interesting, as it confirms the widespreadness of deportations in the Ancient Near East. This example nicely demonstrates that deportations were not an exclusive privilege of the larger Empires, such as the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Teispid-Achaemenid ones.

Bibliography

- Ahn 1992: G. Ahn, Religiöse Herrschaftslegitimation im achämenidischen Iran. Die Voraussetzungen und die Struktur ihrer Argumentation (Acta Iranica 31, Série 3/17), Leiden 1992.
- Atayi – Roaf 2019: M. T. Atayi – M. Roaf, The Arrival of the Persians into Far, in: Y. Hassanzadeh – A. A. Vahdati – Z. Karimi (eds.), Proceeding of the International Conference on the Iron Age in Western Iran and Neighbouring Regions II, 2–3 Nov. 2019, Tehran 2019, 175–190.

2 Mention may also be made of the attestation of *Xšaθrapati*- “Lord of power” in the trilingual stela from the Letoon at Xanthos in Lycia. This deity must be identified with Mithra and appears in a place where one expects Apollo, pointing to a possible syncretism between Mithra and Apollo (Dupont-Sommer 1974, 145–148; Dupont-Sommer 1976; Dupont-Sommer 1979, 155; Mayrhofer 1979, 184–185; Vernet 2021, 530–537).

- Balzer 2012: W. Balzer, Ethnische, tribale und kulturelle Identitäten. Von Persern, Elamern und frühen Achämeniden. Ein Rückblick auf die jüngere Achämenidenforschung (2). Non-published article, (https://www.academia.edu/3875479/Ethnische_tribale_und_kulturelle_Identit%C3%A4ten_von_Persern_Elamern_und_fr%C3%BChen_Ach%C3%A4meniden_Ein_R%C3%BCckblick_auf_die_j%C3%BCngere_Ach%C3%A4menidenforschung_2_2012, last accessed 25.01.2025).
- Brust 2018: M. Brust, Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Altpersischen. Mit einem etymologischen Glossar (IBS 161), Innsbruck 2018.
- Dupont-Sommer 1974: A. Dupont-Sommer, La stèle trilingue récemment découverte au Létôn de Xanthos. Le texte araméen, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 118, 1974, 132–149.
- Dupont-Sommer 1976: A. Dupont-Sommer, L'énigme du dieu "Satrape" et le dieu Mithra, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 120, 1976, 648–660.
- Dupont-Sommer 1979: A. Dupont-Sommer, L'inscription araméenne, in: H. Metzger (ed.), *La stèle trilingue du Létôn (Fouilles de Xanthos 6)*, Paris, 129–178.
- Henkelman 2008: W.F.M. Henkelman, *The Other Gods Who Are. Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts* (Ach. Hist. 14), Leiden 2008.
- Henkelman 2017: W.F.M. Henkelman, Humban & Auramazdā. Royal Gods in a Persian Landscape, in: W.F.M. Henkelman – C. Redard (eds.), *Persian Religion in the Achaemenid Period / La religion perse à l'époque achéménide* (Classica et Orientalia 16), Wiesbaden 2017, 273–346.
- Henkelman 2021a: W.F.M. Henkelman, The Heartland Pantheon, in: B. Jacobs – R. Rollinger (eds.), *A Companion to the Achaemenid Persian Empire* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Hoboken 2021, 1221–1242.
- Henkelman 2021b: W.F.M. Henkelman, Practice of Worship in the Achaemenid Heartland, in: B. Jacobs – R. Rollinger (eds.), *A Companion to the Achaemenid Persian Empire* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Hoboken 2021, 1243–1270.
- Herrenschmidt 1995–1996: C. Herrenschmidt, Le rayonnement du mazdéisme sur les mondes juif et grec, *Annuaire EPHE, Section des sciences religieuses* 104, 1995–1996, 227–232.
- Jacobs 2017: B. Jacobs, Torture in the Achaemenid Period, *Enclr*, 2017, online edition, (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/torture-achaemenid-period>, last accessed 27.01.2025).
- Kellens 1994: J. Kellens, *Le pantheon de l'Avesta ancien*, Wiesbaden 1994.
- Knapton – Sarraf – Curtis 2001: P. Knapton – M. R. Sarraf – J. Curtis, *Inscribed Column Bases from Hamadan, Iran* 39, 2001, 99–117.
- Koch 1977: H. Koch, Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit. Untersuchungen an Hand der elamischen Persepolistäfelchen (GOF 3/4), Wiesbaden 1977.
- Koch 1987: H. Koch, Götter und ihre Verherung im achämenidischen Persien, *ZA* 77, 239–278.
- Koch 2004: H. Koch, Texte aus Iran, in: B. Janowski – G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben* (TUAT N.S. 1), Gütersloh 2004, 221–248.
- Kreyenbroek 2010: J. Kreyenbroek, Zoroastrianism under the Achaemenians. A Non-Essentialist Approach, in: J. Curtis – St J. Simpson (eds.), *The World of Achaemenid Persia. History, Art, and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, London 2010, 103–109.
- Kuhrt 2007: A. Kuhrt, *The Persian Empire. A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*, London – New York 2007.
- Mayrhofer 1979: M. Mayrhofer, Die iranischen Elemente im aramäischen Text, in: H. Metzger (ed.), *La stèle trilingue du Létôn (Fouilles de Xanthos 6)*, Paris 1979, 178–185.
- Potts 2016: D. T. Potts, Cultural, Economic and Political Relations between Mesopotamia, the Gulf Region and India before Alexander, in: J. Wiesehöfer – H. Brinkhaus – R. Bichler (eds.), *Megas-*

- thenes und seine Zeit. Megasthenes and His Time (*Classica et Orientalia* 13), Wiesbaden 2016, 109–118.
- Potts 2022: D. T. Potts, 'They went to Tamukkan'. Some Observations on Bushehr, Borazjan and Overland Travel between the Persian Gulf and the Achaemenid Capitals, Parseh. *Journal of Archaeological Studies* 6, 2022, 14–38.
- Schmitt 1999: R. Schmitt, Beiträge zu altpersischen Inschriften, Wiesbaden 1999.
- Schmitt 2014: R. Schmitt, Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften, Wiesbaden 2014.
- Schmitt 2023: R. Schmitt, Die altpersischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden. Editio minor mit deutscher Übersetzung, Wiesbaden 2023².
- Stolper – Tavernier 2007: M. W. Stolper – J. Tavernier, From the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project, I: An Old Persian Administrative Tablet from the Persepolis Fortification, Arta: Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology, 2007/001, (<http://www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/table.htm>, last accessed 27.01.2025).
- Tavernier 2007: J. Tavernier, Iranica in the Achaemenid period (ca. 550–330 B.C.). *Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, attested in non-Iranian texts* (OLA 158), Leuven 2007.
- Tavernier 2015: J. Tavernier, Des Lyciens à Persépolis et en Mésopotamie durant la période achéménide (c. 521–331 av. J.-Chr.), in: R. Lebrun – E. Raimond – J. De Vos (eds.), *Studia de Lycia Antiqua* (Hethitica 17), Leuven 2015, 147–174.
- Tavernier 2017: J. Tavernier, The Use of Languages on the Various Levels of Administration in the Achaemenid Empire, in: B. Jacobs – W.F.M. Henkelman – M. W. Stolper (eds.), *Die Verwaltung im Achämenidenreich. Imperiale Muster und Strukturen / Administration in the Achaemenid Empire. Tracing the Imperial Signature. Akten des 6. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema „Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen“ aus Anlass der 80-Jahr-Feier der Entdeckung des Festungsarchivs von Persepolis, Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 14.–17. Mai 2013* (*Classica et Orientalia* 17), Wiesbaden 2017, 337–412.
- Tavernier 2020: J. Tavernier, Persian in Official Documents and the Processes of Multilingual Administration, in: C. J. Tuplin – J. Ma (eds.), *Aršāma and his World. The Bodleian Letters in Context, III: Aršāma's World* (*Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents*), Oxford 2020, 75–96.
- Tolini 2008: G. Tolini, Les travailleurs babyloniens et le palais de Taokè, ARTA 2008.002, (<http://www.achemenet.com/en/tree/?/on-line-publications/arta>, last accessed 27.01.2025).
- Vernet 2021: M. Vernet, The Theonyms 'Leto, Artemis and Hšatrapati' in the Letoon Trilingual. A Parallelism with a Passage from the Xanthos Stele, Barcino (*Monographica Orientalia* 16), 527–540.
- Widengren 1969: G. Widengren, Der Feudalismus im alten Iran. Männerbund – Gefolgswesen – Feudalismus in der iranischen Gesellschaft im Hinblick auf die indogermanischen Verhältnisse (*Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen* 40), Köln 1969.
- Zehbari 2020: Z. Zehbari, The Borazjan Monuments. A Synthesis of Past and Recent Works, ARTA 2020.002, (http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/arta/ARTA_2020_002_Zehbari.pdf, last accessed 27.01.2025).