ANABASIS 6 (2015)
STUDIA CLASSICA ET ORIENTALIA

Jason M. Silverman (Helsinki, Finland)

JUDAEANS UNDER PERSIAN FORCED LABOR AND MIGRATION POLICIES*

Keywords: Forced Labor, Persian policy, Judaeans, Temple function, sociology

1. Introduction

Despite frequent acknowledgments in the literature that the Persians indeed continued previous ANE policies of using forced migration and forced labor both as punishments and to further more strategic imperial ends, surprisingly it has received little to no sustained discussion. A rather large amount of relevant material and scholarship is available, but there is no synthetic study of the phenomenon as a whole, nor to the present author's knowledge any which deal with it in a sociological context.[1] A full study of this aspect of the empire is certainly need-

* This paper began under the auspices of the ERC project "By the Rivers of Babylon," at Leiden University, P.I. Caroline Waerzeggers. The BABYLON project's aim is to engage in a comparative study between the Second Temple of Jerusalem and the Babylonian temple cult as evidenced by the recently disclosed cuneiform records. The project in its final stage addresses the question of possible, direct or indirect, influence of Babylonian models on Judean practices. The rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple, however, occurred under the Achaemenid kings, and the author's research, from which this paper derives, attempts to explore how the new Persian context informs and contextualizes the Mesopotamian-Judaean interactions. The first version was presented at the "Money and Cult" conference of Hekhal in Dublin, 2014. The paper was expanded and completed within the project "Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions," Team 1 "Society and Religion in the Ancient Near East," at Helsinki University, P.I. Martti Nissinen. This version was presented at the SBL annual meeting in San Diego, 2014.

[1] There are of course studies which apply sociological perspectives to the Babylonian Exile, e.g., Smith 1989, Smith-Christopher 1997, Smith-Christopher 2002, Ahn 2011, Ahn/Middlemas 2012, but these never focus on the Persian Empire wholesale, and rarely analyze forced labor *per se*. The only major study of the phenomenon in the first millennium remains Oded 1979. Wittfogel

ed, but well beyond current scope. Rather, this paper lays some groundwork and points up a few pertinent issues that could impact one's understanding of how the Judaeans lived in the greater Achaemenid context, and how the Jerusalem temple would have functioned within Yehud, potentially including aspects of why the temple was rebuilt in the first place. The perspective used at present is primarily related to the sociology of forced labor.

This paper will proceed in five sections: first, on the sociology of forced labor generally, focusing on the sorts of impacts one can expect upon a population subjected to it, and the evidence for it one can expect to find in an ancient context. Second, a preliminary parade of evidence will indicate that the Persians did indeed use forced labor, particularly in the contexts of building projects, military colonies, and work groups. The third section will then move on to a consideration of the Judaeans generally and the Jerusalem Temple in particular within this context. The presentation concludes with some preliminary appraisals.

2. The Sociology of Forced Labor and its Use in Ancient History

There are two issues related to forced labor which must be stated at the outset: 1) forced labor is rather often correlated with forced migration, though the two phenomena are distinct.[2] For the present discussion this is highly relevant when one considers that the context for the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple is often discussed in conjunction with a return of exiles from Babylonia, and when one considers the immense size of the empire. This raises the question of which comes first and which causes which in particular cases, something one needs to consider. Further, it may also provide a way to look for evidence of forced labor, in terms of perhaps more easily identifiable evidence for the movement of populations. 2) The difficulty of the term "forced." Though on first glance it might seem easy to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary forms of labor, in practice there is a fuzzy gradation from chattel slavery at one extreme to pure "capitalist" voluntarism at the other. Degrees of coercion operate all along this spectrum, from a basic economic imperative to eat, to forms of moral and legal obligations. This is an aspect that must be dealt with head-on in the analysis.[3]

1973 made forced labor related to waterworks a primary building block of his theory of "hydraulic" (Oriental) despotism–and he included the Achaemenids in his model–but his interest was primarily on the phenomenon of autocratic state power in the face of the USSR rather than on the labor *per se*. His theory has been heavily criticized, e.g., Westcoat 2001, 16385–6.

[2] Kloosterboer 1960, 84, 182–4; Lovell 1983, 135; Wirz 2001, 14158; Klimkova 2007; Cohen 2008, 62; Burke 2011, 44, 50. Especially true for girls and women, e.g., Campbell/Alpers 2004, xv.

[3] E.g., Nieboer 1910; Palmer 1998; Campbell/Alpers 2004, ix–x; Culbertson 2011b, 8. On its persistence in other forms, see Bales 2005.

Definition. What is forced labor, then? In the context of ancient history and the ANE in particular, the attention of most scholarship has focused on the issue of slavery, and whether or not particular groups were indeed slaves or not.[4] Though the definition of slavery itself is more problematic than one might expect, forced labor is a larger phenomenon than slavery, however so defined. For present purposes this paper does not focus on slavery *per se*. Rather, it explores the use of forced labor more broadly within the empire. For the moment, attention is on labor that was imposed by the imperial state for uses beyond personal interests or needs. This is unfortunately rather imprecise but it is a place to start.

Typical Contexts. From the literature the author has surveyed so far, it seems that the use of forced labor is almost inevitable or necessary when governments seek a policy of rapid development, very large scale construction works, or seek to utilize non- or under-utilized territories, particularly if they have sparse populations.[5] In the context of western colonialism this appears to have been essentially a reflex of supply and demand: a shortage of necessary labor in a particular area means the government or its agents must compel the workforce. Though the market systems underlying European colonialism likely do not apply to the Achaemenid Empire, decreased labor mobility and labor shortages certainly did.[6] A key context for seeking forced labor, then, is likely to be governmental policies of monumental building or of utilizing new, previously marginal areas. These are not the sole places forced labor can be found, but they are likely fruitful places to begin looking. For this reason, one of the areas discussed later is the Achaemenid construction of the imperial capitals.

Taxation Link? Within the literature around forced labor after the banning of slavery by the European powers, it frequently appears that laws restricting the mobility of a work force and high taxes were used as mechanisms to force populations into whatever work the policies sought.[7] This is unlikely to be of relevance to the Achaemenid period, however. Slavery was not banned, nor was the government likely to be too squeamish to straightforwardly demand labor. However, it is possible that various taxation policies could have had the practical effect of creating a form of forced labor, particularly as the use of coinage increased throughout the empire. This is something which still requires some

[4] E.g., Dandamaev 1984b; Diakonoff 1987; Culbertson 2011a; Heinen et al. 2012. In biblical studies, e.g., Albertz 2003, 101, where comments are restricted to rejecting slave status; Grabbe 2004, 192–3.

[5] Nieboer 1910; Swianiewicz 1965; van Onselen 1976. In the context of warfare, e.g., Armeson 1964. For ideological reasons, Ebihara/Mortland/Ledgerwood 1994, 12.

[6] Janković 2005; Jursa 2010, 660–727. This is counter the opinions of pre-industrial labor as presented by Lenski/Lenski/Nolan 1991, 185.

[7] Kloosterboer 1960, 20, 23, 82, 111, 120, 126, etc (taxes); 6, 12, 17, 57, 67, 191, etc. (vagrancy laws); van Onselen 1976, 80–2, 94, 117; Lovell 1983; Ash 2006, 403.

thought. More directly, it seems that the primary form of taxation within the Achaemenid Empire took the form of labor obligations rather than money,[8] so a taxation link exists, but not in the same manner.

Mortality. In the context of modern studies of forced labor, its use typically involves high mortality rates for the laborers. This is related to harsh working conditions, dangerous jobs, maltreatment, and malnurishment.[9] However, mortality rates in antiquity were generally higher than today, so this may be a difficult criterion to utilize historically.

Food. Another common correlate to forced labor in the literature is the use of food as an incentive to work.[10] This appears to develop organically from the managers' desire to minimize economic rather than humans costs plus the basic imperative to eat. This element works both in terms of quantity and quality of foodstuffs. Since both in Babylonia and in the Persepolis Tablets ration lists are frequently attested, this is potentially a useful area for exploring the use of forced labor.[11]

Marginality. Unsurprisingly, forced labor in most of its attested forms is something universally avoided when possible. Methods of avoidance include escape and the paying of substitute laborers.[12] In practice this means forced labor typically falls on the weakest and most vulnerable of any given society, since these are the ones unable to avail of such methods of avoidance.[13]

Desire for Education. Lastly, a commonplace in much of the literature is that among populations subjected to forced labor, the experience gives rise to a marked and expressed desire for education.[14] Because education is seen as a social good which enables advancement and yet is immaterial and thus not directly taxable or able to be stolen, it becomes something by which the forced laborers seek to improve their status or the prospects of their children.

Further study of the sociology of forced labor will no doubt throw up more relevant issues, in particular the analysis of everyday praxis,[15] but now the paper turns to some of the evidence for the use of forced labor within the Achaemenid Empire.

---

[8] Jursa 2011, especially 440. For more, see below.

[9] Kloosterboer 1960, 110; Armeson 1964, 40; Swianiewicz 1965, 17; Aperghis 2000, 136; Moyd 2011, 63.

[10] Swianiewicz 1965, 16; van Onselen 1976, 44–47, 160; Gewald 1995, 100; Utas 1997, 14; Moyd 2011, 62; Shesko 2011, 11; *cf.* Bales 2005, 8.

[11] E.g., the Weidner Tablets (Weidner 1939) and the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Tablets (Hallock 1969; Cameron 1948) *Cf.* Snell 2001, 34–5; Jursa 2008; Kleber 2011, 107.

[12] E.g., Snell 2001; MacGinnis 2003.

[13] Kloosterboer 1960, 209; Shesko 2011, 10.

[14] van Onselen 1976, 183; Bales 2005, 56–57. Although the ideological situation seems to have eliminated this in the USSR, e.g., Swianiewicz 1965, 18, 214.

[15] Silliman 2001.

3. Some Evidence Related to the Achaemenid Use of Forced Labor

The discussion here is by no means exhaustive or even representative. Rather, the intention is to indicate some of the sorts of evidence which is available, as well as to indicate some likely contexts in which consideration of the sociology of forced labor may be illuminating for historical research. It is discussed under four headings: taxation, building projects, military colonies, and work groups, though the four have areas of overlap.

Taxation

Jursa has described the Achaemenid taxation system within Babylonia as primarily consisting of labor obligations, though the rich could in theory pay-off their duty and have another serve in their place.[16] Though taxes in kind are known, a significant aspect of the system was based in requiring work: for military service, for building projects, and for agriculture. Without going into the details of the taxation system, this alone argues for the importance of forced labor with the Achaemenid Empire, and justifies a closer look. Moreover, for the purposes of this paper, the labor obligations which accrued to the temples came from both their taxation obligations *and* special demands of the administration, particularly in terms of building projects and the king's table.[17] The details of labor-taxation and temple duties in relation to it are important, and something which could be related more deeply to sociology of forced labor.

Building Projects

The Achaemenids took monumental building very seriously. Besides the well-known palace complexes at Pasargadae, Persepolis, and Susa, there were smaller pavilions and palaces throughout Fars and at least one in Babylon.[18] It seems likely there was one in Ecbatana too, though only some column bases have been found.[19] Imperial projects did not end with palaces, though. The royal road system–with roads, way-stations, granaries, and the like–required construction works throughout the empire.[20] The often-discussed system of paradises would also no doubt require initial planting labor and maintenance.[21] Near Persepolis itself the building of roads and aqueducts required the carving out of

[16] Jursa 2011, 440; *cf.* Jursa/Waerzeggers 2009; Jursa 2010.

[17] MacGinnis 2003; Henkelman/Kleber 2007; Kleber 2008, 64–5, 102–236; Kleber 2011; Jursa 2011, 434; for a collection of relevant sources, see Kuhrt 2009, 708–713.

[18] Haerinck 1997, 29; Stronach 2004; Henkelman/Kleber 2007, 169; Atai/Boucharlat 2009; Nashli 2009; Gasche 2013.

[19] E.g., Knapton/Sarraf/Curtis 2001; Brown 1998.

[20] Mustafavi 1967; Graf 1993; Graf 1994; Aperghis 1999; Briant 2012; for some sources, see Kuhrt 2009, 746–750.

[21] Dandamaev 1984a; Stronach 1990; Tuplin 1996, 80–131; Henkelman 2008, 427–441; Langgut et al. 2013; Knauß/ Gagošidse/Babaev 2013; for some sources, see Kuhrt 2009, 806–11.

rock.[22] Darius supported the building of a canal from the Red Sea to the Nile.[23] All of these projects would have required labor.[24]

Darius's well-known inscriptions from Susa describing the building of his new capital there lists multiple peoples involved in the construction.[25] Some are described as merely providing the materials, others in transporting it, and several in working the materials at the site. This implies the extensive use of corvée labor from a variety of regions. Though the precise details supplied by Darius on ethnicities is not confirmed by the brick makers' marks on the Susa bricks, they do confirm the presence of large numbers of Babylonian workers on site.[26] Other sources indicate the requirements of temples to provide labor for the Susa constructions as well.[27] The building works at Persepolis were no less ambitious than those at Susa, and one can expect they required similar amounts of labor. Presumably most of the labor provided for such projects were done as labor tax obligations.

One of the Akkadian terms for mandatory labor was *pilku*;[28] Demksy and more recently Edelman have proposed that this ought to be seen as the proper etymological background to *pelek* in Nehemiah 3 (which is discussed more below in regards to the temple).[29] For the present purposes it worth noting this is in the context of building walls and a fortress for Jerusalem, clearly in line with the sorts of activity for which one would expect imperial labor requirements to be used.[30]

Military Colonies

Another form of imperial service was military duty, sometimes in the form of military colonies. For the present purposes, of interest is the use of military groups for public works, i.e. construction. This aspect can be a bit tricky to ana-

[22] Described with the works in the surrounding area in Boucharlat 2014, 29–31.

[23] DZa–c (Kent 1961, 146–7). *Cf.* Lloyd 2007.

[24] Wittfogel 1973, 55–56 strongly emphasized the labor (and organization) needed for such systems.

[25] DSf, DSz, and DSaa. The first two are available in Kent 1961, 142–144, and the latter two in Kuhrt 2009, 495–497. DSf and DSz list Assyrians, Babylonians, Carians, Ionians, Medes, Egyptians, Sardians; DSaa mentions Persia, Elam, Media, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, the Sealands, Sardis, Ionia, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Areia, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandhara, Cimmeria, Sattargydia, Arachosia, and Maka.

[26] Maras 2010.

[27] Waerzeggers 2006, 18–19; Waerzeggers 2010; Jursa 2013; *cf.* Briant 2013, 12, 22.

[28] Roth 2005, 374–5 (*pilku* B–C).

[29] Demsky 1983; Edelman 2005, 213, 222; *cf.* Ahn 2011, 100.

[30] Of course, the accuracy and editorial history of Nehemiah are matters of intense debate. For the present purpose, the mere mention of forced labor in what might potentially be a temple context is all that is of relevance, regardless of the event's historicity. The appearance at the very least means the author found the idea plausible.

lyze, since the Old Persian *kāra-* can mean both "people" and "army."[31] The ration lists for *kāra-* in the Persepolis Tablets can therefore be read either as general work groups or specific military work groups. There are ANE and modern examples of ambiguity between military service and labor, both in terminology and in praxis. Ancient Egyptian used the same word for army as for organized work details.[32] Caesar periodically used his troops for building works in the course of his campaigns in Gaul.[33] The use of military forces for manual labor has clear parallels in modern use, too, such as as in WWI Germany or the US Army Corp of Engineers. In fact, there is a subset of sociological literature on this as a particular form of labor which rather ambiguously straddles the voluntary-forced divide.[34] As quick examples within an Achaemenid context one can note that Herodotus narrates Cyrus using troops to separate a river into canals (1.189–99) and describes the use of Phoenicians, Egyptians, and others to dig a canal across Athos and build a bridge over the Strymon River (7.22.1–25.1) in the context of Xerxes's campaign. This is not the work of a colony *per se*, but it is work by soldiers. A Persian period officer in Egypt, Khnemibre, held labor and military titles.[35] For the Judaeans, this immediately brings the Elephantine community to mind.

Work Groups (Primarily Foreign Minorities)

The biggest attention has been given to the use of work groups in Fars, as they are attested in a large number of documents from the Persepolis Fortification Tablets.[36] This system is clearly closely correlated with the building of the imperial capitals, but the work also seems to have included agricultural, artisanal, and administrative tasks. Within the Persepolis Tablets are a large number of ration texts related to the payment (primarily in foodstuffs) of work teams, headed by men and women, and partial rations for basic workers, known as *kurtaš*. Of direct relevance for the present context, Henkelman has counted 27 different ethnicities attested as labels for *kurtaš* working within the heartland.[37] By the period covered in the PFT, these workers had children as well. The administra-

[31] Bartholomae 1904, 465; Kent 1961, 179–180; Lincoln 2012, 407. *Cf*. Hallock 1969, 6, 44, 761.

[32] Wilkinson 2005, 31–2. The author is grateful to the audience in Dublin for this observation.

[33] Julius Caesar, *The Gallic War* 1.8 reports the troops building a trench and a wall and 4.7–8 describes the building of a bridge over the Rhine, though it is unclear if this was by soldiers or engineers (Caesar 1963, 13, 201–3, respectively).

[34] Gewald 1995; Singha 2007; Freeman/Field 2011; Moyd 2011; Shesko 2011; Way 2011.

[35] Yoyette 2013, 252–4.

[36] Dandamaev 1975; Dandamaev /Lukonin 1989, 158–177; Tuplin 1987, 115–116; Briant 2002, 429–439; Aperghis 2000; Henkelman/Kleber 2007; Henkelman/Stolper 2009; Henkelman 2012.

[37] Henkelman/Stolper 2009, 273–275 count 26 ethnonyms, but in Henkelman 2013, 538 he gives 27 ethnicities.

tion even rewarded *kurtaš* women for giving birth (more for boys than girls).[38] The use of *kurtaš* workers was significant, at least during the reign of Darius, and Aperghis has estimated that roughly 10–15,000 individual *kurtaš* were living in Fars in 500 BCE.[39]

There has been some debate over how to classify the *kurtaš*. They have been called slaves, semi-free, and war captives.[40] Dandamaev has emphasized that the term and its cognates (OP **grda* = Elamite *kurtaš* and Akk *garda*) covered a variety of legal statuses, from slaves proper to lower, dependent classes. The basis for these varying characterizations is largely twofold: one, the overwhelming attention slavery has received in ANE scholarship, and two, the size of the allotted rations. For the rations, it is observed that the main commodity, barley, was given to adult male workers at an average of 1 liter a day, just barely or below estimated subsistence levels. Aperghis thinks this means the Achaemenids had a deliberate policy of working the men to death (not the women),[41] and thus, rather like the conditions observable in colonial mines in Africa. Henkelman, however, has insisted that these rations are only partial.[42] Beyond the extras allocated, such as beer or wine, wheat flour, dates, and various kinds of fruit, he has highlighted royal feasts which added to their diet, including meat.[43] He also thinks they had households with additional income.[44] The conditions of the *kurtaš* in Fars deserve closer investigation on this point. Briant has suggested that the workers received payments in credit for use at administrative warehouses;[45] if true, this is very reminiscent of the system of company stores found in Rhodesian mining camps.[46] If Briant is correct in seeing a policy of the breaking up of families,[47] the conditions were perilously similar to modern colonial uses of forced labor.

However, more specialty workers, essentially skilled artisans, appear in the Treasury Tablets, meaning not all of them were hard laborers.[48] We can agree with Briant when he finds dubious Diodorus's report of the amputation of unnecessary limbs from Greek treasury workers (17.69.4).[49] If there is any truth at all

[38] Dandamaev 1975, 77; Aperghis 2000, 133; Briant 2002, 435.

[39] Aperghis 2000, 139.

[40] Dandamaev 1975, 75, 77; Aperghis 2000, 136; Briant 2002, 433; Henkelman 2012; Briant 2013, 18.

[41] Aperghis 2000, 133, 136.

[42] Henkelman 2012, n.p.; Briant 2002, 455–6; *cf*. Jursa 2008, 408–415.

[43] Henkelman 2011.

[44] Henkelman 2012, n.p.

[45] Briant 2002, 456.

[46] van Onselen 1976.

[47] Briant 2002, 437.

[48] E.g., Cameron 1948, PTT 47, 77; *cf*. Aperghis 2000, 136.

[49] Briant 2002, 434.

in the report, it may be an indication of the use of (injured) prisoners of war. The status and conditions of these *kurtaš* workers was likely rather different from unskilled one. Overall, it *is* clear that the work groups came from all over the empire, largely (though not entirely) excluding Persians, and they are a significant aspect of Achaemenid labor policy.[50] As Briant has noted, the nature and number of these suggests the system cannot have been wholly voluntary, though the exact nature still deserves study.

Though the most noted aspect of work groups is in Fars, it is likely that work groups existed throughout the empire, even if not in such large groups or quantities as found in the heartland. A couple of classical citations can be noted as a way of suggesting a more comprehensive system of forced labor, perhaps partially related to forced migrations. Xenophon (*Cyropaedia* 8.1.9) claims Cyrus instituted "ministers of works," and this is in itself not implausible. It also implies a system broader than that attested in the heartland. The nature of the system, though, likely varied regionally, considering the continuation of Neo-Babylonian forms of taxation and corvée in Babylonia.[51]

The Classical sources periodically mention deportations, usually in political contexts, though the end-fates of these are often left unspecified. Herodotus claims that after the Milesians revolted, Darius enslaved the women and settled them all near the mouth of the Tigris on the Persian Gulf (6.19.3–20.1). This area is close enough to the heartland to be involved in the *kurtaš* system–and indeed, Ionians are found there–but there is no way to know whether they were given land for service, or were part of the *kurtaš* system. Curtius reports a settlement of deportees from Miletus in Bactria (7.5.28–29). This report is unclear whether the migration was voluntary or forced, but it gives purely political reasons. Again, like the comment in Herodotus above, there is no indication whether they were subjected to labor requirements or not. Xenophon also describes reasoning for peasant immunity from being moved, and thus, presumably exempt from *kurtaš* (Cyr 4.5–11). This exemption, if even reliable, probably does not apply to tax labor obligations, but it might imply differing legal statuses and levels of forced labor. This too deserves investigation.

The Aramaic reflex of *kurtaš* (גרדא) appears a few times in the Aršama archive. It appeas in a letter order from Aršama (AD 7),[52] in which the satrap orders his officer (פקיד) to take care of his existing wokers (גרדא) on his estates and to acquire new ones.[53] This action appears to make the individuals involved property of his

[50] This does not mean, however, that it was the basis of Achaemenid power, *a la* Wittfogel 1973.

[51] Jursa 2007, 77–89; Jursa 2008; Jursa/Waerzeggers 2009; Jursa 2010; Jursa 2011.

[52] Driver 1965, 23.

[53] Driver translated the term as "staff." The n. on p. 24 is unaware of the Elamite reflex.

satrapal estate. In AD 9 the same status is implied as a form of treatment for a sculptor, and in AD 12 the status seems to come with at least a modicum of protection.[54] Sadly the term is not attested in the new Bactrian archive.

4. The Judaeans (and the Jerusalem Temple) in the context of Persian Labor Policies: Some Thoughts

The above very cursory discussion of the Achaemenid use of labor, however forced or coerced, leads to some preliminary thoughts on how the Judaeans, and in particular the Jerusalem temple–and imperial support for it–may have fitted into this context. This section is still very much only at the stage of initial ideas.

Babylonia

The first consideration is the Judaean community in Babylonia. The long-known Murašû Archive indicates that the majority were in the land-for-service sector, known as the *ḫaṭru* system.[55] The very recently half-published corpus from the rural communities at Āl-Yāhūdu, Ālu-ša-Našar, and Bīt-Abī-ram appear to reflect the same situation.[56] The system involved receiving land in exchange, the labor required was mandatory and of a variety of forms. Even though "slavery" would be an inappropriate category for these Judaeans, they were certainly subject to various forms of involuntary labor–taxation, corvée, and military.[57] A thorough study of forced labor and its sociological implications in the Neo-Babylonian and Persian Empires would do much to illuminate this community.

Elephantine

The Judaeans attested in Elephantine were in imperial Persian service as soldiers, and thus it is likely that the sociology of military forced labor is apropos here. While the archives preserved deal primarily with the issue of the destruction of their temple and private legal matters, the very fact that they were permanent soldiers in the Persian army means this is likely a new and useful perspective to consider their social history.

Jerusalem Temple Labor Obligations

As noted above, there is reason to see in Nehemiah 3 an instance of the involvement of the temple in mandatory labor.[58] Not only does the use of the word

[54] Driver 1965, 28, 33, respectively.

[55] On the *ḫaṭru*, see Stolper 1985, 70–103.

[56] See Pearce/Wunsch 2014; for some earlier, preliminary discussions, see Pearce 2006; Pearce 2011; Pearce 2015. Another volume by Wunsch is still expected.

[57] Magdalene/Wunsch 2011, esp. 116; On renumeration in general, *cf*. Jursa 2008.

[58] Accepted by Demsky 1983; Tuplin 1987, 123; Carter 1999, 80; Hoglund 2002, 16; Edelman 2005, 213, 222. Williamson 1985, 206 rejects the relation to the Akkadian, but only for a different lemma; Blenkinsopp 1988, 232, 235 does not discuss the issue despite including Dem-

pelek potentially indicate this, but the very context of priests and Levites building sections of the Jerusalem wall at the command of the Persian governor (i.e., Nehemiah) also implies this. Mesopotamian temples had corvée labor duties, both in terms of tax obligations and special requirements, and they had their own dependents who also were required to work, albeit for the temple's sake.[59] For two reasons one might suspect that the rebuilt temple might operate along such lines, or at least have aspired to it on a small scale. First, Yehud was still part of the same satrapy as Babylonia, at least for a significant period of time, so the officials ultimately in charge were more likely to be used to the various systems in use in Babylonia proper.[60] Second, since the Yehud elite seem to have largely come from the Babylonian community, it stands to reason their understanding of the functions of a temple were influenced by that context. Blenkinsopp has raised the question of whether or not the Jerusalem temple owned land like the temples of Babylonia or Egypt did, but he came to very uncertain conclusions.[61] Though the scale was surely considerably smaller, the question of the obligations of the temple to the state is still something deserving fuller exploration, in line with the above materials. Even if the temple did not own its own agricultural land, it may have been required to help in other forms of labor, skilled or unskilled, as found among the workers in Fars, or among the Babylonian temples.

The Purpose of the Temple to Persian Eyes: Ramat Raḥel and Mizpah. A major question is of course why the temple (and Jerusalem) were rebuilt at all, and what role they had in the Persian administration of the region, something which has been debated significantly.[62] In administrative terms, Jerusalem seems redundant: the governors' seat or estate was apparently at Ramat Raḥel,[63] while the provincial administration appears to have been at Mizpah.[64] Was Mizpah too

sky in the bibliography. Weinfeld 2000 rejects Demsky's argument on the grounds that the Akkadian *pilku* has multiple meanings, but this is an invalid reason. In the course of arguing for understanding החזיק in Nehemiah 3 as "finance," Lipschits also rejects a meaning from *pilku*, "(forced) labor" (Lipschits 2012, 92–3, n. 43). However, his objections are based on only seven sections being built this way and a rejection of the required administrative system in Yehud, neither of which are persuasive reasons. His description of the parallel system in Khorsabad (pp. 95–97) rather strengthens the understanding as labor rather than challenging it.

[59] E.g., Kleber 2008; Kleber 2011.

[60] E.g., Stolper 1989; Fried 2003; Silverman 2015.

[61] Blenkinsopp 2001.

[62] A much debated topic. For a taste of some voices, see Davies 1991; Hoglund 1992; Berquist 1995a; Berquist 1995b; Zadok 1996; Schaper 1995; Bedford 2001; Janzen 2002; Edelman 2005; Kessler 2006; Finkelstein 2008; Knoppers/Grabbe/ Fulton 2009; Lipschits 2011; Milevski 2011. For the present purposes, the date of Yehud becoming a separate province is irrelevant. Nevertheless, though some argue for a late organization e.g., Kratz 2004, it is more likely that Yehud continued as province from the Neo-Babylon period (for some issues, see e.g., Silverman, 2015).

[63] Lipschits et al. 2009; Lipschits et al. 2011; Lipschits/Gadot/Langgut 2012; Langgut et al. 2013.

[64] Zorn 1997; Zorn 2003; Lipschits/Vanderhooft 2011, 41–44.

far from Ramat Raḥel for convenience? Or did Jerusalem initially have an *administrative* function at all? Could, instead, it have served more of a labor function? Nehemiah likely installed at least a small garrison at Jerusalem, and it was noted above that troops could be used for non-military labor purposes as well. There were royal vineyards in the Jerusalem environs in the Judahite kingdom, vines being the closest natural resource besides olive trees. It is marginally closer to the depression around Jericho than Mizpah as well, though the evidence for the use of Jericho as a plantation prior to the Hasmoneans appears to be limited to stamped jar handles.[65] (The mention of a deportation of Judaeans from Jericho to Hyrcania by late authors is not helpful in this regard).[66]

Yehud's Geography. This line of reasoning makes the present author wonder whether or not the proximity to wine and oil production might actually be the purpose for Jerusalem in imperial eyes. Both wine and oil require laborers, in the field and in processing the products, and the Jerusalem region was centrally located to provide labor for such industries.[67] Moreover, 582 stamped jars have been found dating to the Persian period; their exact use is heavily debated, but surely both wine and oil require jars.[68] Moreover, a large percentage of these were found in Jerusalem and their clay apparently also derived from the Jerusalem region, implying the labor for making them came from there. Nehemiah does actually enforce the population of Jerusalem, and it may be that the imperial reason is a local set of workers to work these two industries.

Proximity to Philistine Littoral. Why would wine and oil matter? Though Jerusalem itself is often noted to be *not quite* strategically placed on the royal road to Egypt,[69] it *is* nearby. The Shephelah has evidenced a number of storehouses, granaries, and forts, which are clearly related to the securing of the passageway to Egypt.[70] As is visible in the PFT, the basic commodity distribution system included grains, wine or beer, and oil. Jerusalem was poorly placed to feed grains into this system, but ideally placed to supply wine and oil.[71] These are commodities required for any laborers being utilized, and likely for military rations as well. This makes Yehud a useful source for such materials, being right

[65] Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2011, 46–48.

[66] A putative deportation of Judaeans from the region of Jericho is doubtful, only reported in a few late writers (Jerome's translation of Eusebius's *Chronicle* Book 2 and Orosius's *History of the Pagans* 3.7). See Briant 2002,685, contra Olson 2013, 197–8.

[67] Barstad 1996, 70–73; Greenberg/Cinamon 2006; in general, Borowski 1987, 102–125.

[68] And according to Lipschits/Vanderhooft 2011, 60, the clay for the pots came from Jerusalem region. Recent analyses of the jars appear to show they contained mead. This was announced by Liora Freud in her paper "An Early Persian Pottery Assemblage of Yehud Jars from Ramat Rahel" at the SBL annual Meeting in San Diego, November 2014.

[69] E.g., Grabbe 2004, 275; Grabbe/Knoppers 2009, 22.

[70] Edelman 2007; Porten/Yardeni 2007; Fantalkin/Tal 2012, 163–168.

[71] On the climate and geography, *cf*. Grabbe 2004, 198–9; Frankel 1999.

nearby. This likely provides a useful perspective on the strategic uses for Jerusalem: not necessarily a locus for administration *per se*, but for coordination of (mandatory) labor.

Relation to the Temple. How does the temple figure into this? At present the author is considering three contexts. The first is the desire of the Judaeans (or some of them) to have the temple rebuilt. This requires little comment. The second is that the temple may have provided an institutional basis for organizing labor in wine and oil production, whether or not this was done on "crown lands," the estates of local elites, or land granted to the temple itself.[72] This is a point which requires further research and consideration. If true, it would rather closely integrate the temple itself into the Persian systems of forced labor. Lastly, there is the biblical literature on tithing and the Levites, something too big to delve into here–though one can note in passing that Neh 10:38 associates the Levites and tithes with corvée duties (עבודה).[73] Tithing in the texts, however, does include tithes in money and in kind, and it is possible that not all of this was purely related to the cult.[74] It may be that some of these tithes were also required via labor obligations rather than materials *per se*, though in terms of agricultural production those two are not in principle so different. Nehemiah mentions the storehouses of the temple, and one might wonder what all was stored there. Indeed, the above noted verse explicitly links these to mandatory work.

5. Conclusions

What can one conclude at this point concerning the Persian labor policies and their relationship to the Judaeans? The first comment is how much evidence there is available, and the incredibly fruitful potential there remains to be had by apply-

[72] The imperial purposes for Jerusalem and/or its temple have been heavily debated, though the aspect of labor is typically not considered in this context. Hoglund 1992, 224 thought that Nehemiah made Jerusalem into a center of fiscal administration, but did not consider the temple; Berquist 1995a, 62–3 saw the construction of the temple as administrative and related to Darius I's campaign against Egypt and the required provisioning of the invasion force; in this he has been followed by Trotter 2001, 289, 291. Briant 2002, 488 implied the temple was built by Darius in return for loyalty, but that Artaxerxes walled Jerusalem to be a fiscal and military center (p. 585). Edelman 2005 sees the temple as part of the package that comes with creating a new *birah*, but she also highlights the temple's role as treasury (ch. 6, on treasury, 347–8). It is worth noting in this context she sees the settlement of Yehud as less than voluntary (342–3). None of these consider a potential use in terms of labor.

[73] E.g., Lev 27; Num 18:8–32; Deut 14:22–29; Neh 10–13.

[74] For an overview albeit with modern theological concerns, e.g., Köstenberger/Croteau 2006, 54–71. For a discussion in the Persian Period, see Knowles 2006, chapter 5 (105–120). The issue is complicated by the dating of Torah texts.

ing the sociology of forced labor to the Persian Empire. The large scale mobilizations of workers across the empire is similar to some more modern colonial efforts, and the incidental comments of scholars on the *kurtaš* system are rather reminiscent of the effects found in that literature–questions of food adequacy and use of it as incentives, the issue of mortality rates, the issues of marginality. More difficult is dealing with the economic differences between the systems, as well as the expectations and experiences of those involved. Moreover, the legal situation still requires clarification–though this is another area where colonial attempts to redefine forced labor to make it legal might be illuminating.

An interesting variable is education and desire for it. In the forced labor literature, there is a marked desire for education, as a way out. In the PFT texts there are classes of boys who are transferred from unskilled to specialized services, including scribal services, and they are remunerated significantly more than their peers. Moreover, the Jerusalem temple is typically seen as a locus for the scribal culture of Yehud. Could there be specific, situational links here? It deserves investigation.

Beyond a general indication that forced labor is a useful perspective for each of the Judaean communities discussed, it likely does have particular import for the Jerusalem temple itself. As Davies has suggested elsewhere,[75] not only is it possible that the returnees to Yehud were not voluntary; in Nehemiah it seems the settlement of Jerusalem itself was not necessarily voluntary (Neh 11). The reasons for this in general may have labor backgrounds, as workers were moved around the empire. Alternately, or additionally, the temple itself may have participated in forced labor regimes, either by owning land or industries or coordinating their manpower. If so, this would be a major aspect of its social role and impact within Yehud, as well as its economic effects. These are all elements which will bear closer inspection. Though it has not received the attention it deserves, the demonstrable use of forced labor by the Persians can thus be seen as a new and potentially fruitful angle to address the many long-standing problems of understanding Yehud and the Judaeans within the Persian Empire.

Bibliography

Ahn, J.J. 2011: *Exile as Forced Migrations: A Sociological, Literary, and Theological Approach on the Displacement and Resettlement of the Southern Kingdom of Judah*, BZAW 417, Berlin.

Ahn, J.J. /J. Middlemas (eds.) 2012: *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon: Approaches to the Study of the Exile*, LHBOTS 526, New York.

Albertz, R. 2003: *Israel in Exile: the History and Literature of the Sixth Century BCE*. Translated by D. Green, SBL Studies in Biblical Literature 3, Atlanta.

[75] Davies 1992, 81–2; also implied by Edelman 2005, 342–3.

Aperghis, G.G. 1999: 'Storehouses and Systems at Persepolis: Evidence from the Persepolis Fortification Tablets' *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* no. 42 (2),152–193.

Aperghis, G.G. 2000: 'War Captives and Economic Exploitation: Evidence form the Persepolis Fortification Tablets' in J. Andreau/ P. Briant/R. Descat (eds.) *Économie Antique: La guerre dans les économies antiques*, Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, 127–144.

Armeson, R.B. 1964: *Total Warfare and Compulsory Labor: A Study of the Military-Industrial Complex in Germany during World War I*, The Hague.

Ash, C.B. 2006: 'Forced Labor in Colonial West Africa' *History Compass* no. 4 (3), 402–406.

Atai, M.T. /R. Boucharlat. 2009: 'An Achaemenid Pavilion and Other Remains in Tang-i Bulaghi' *Achemenet: Arta* no. 7 (5):1–33; Online: http://www.achemenet.com/document/2009.005–Atai&Boucharlat.pdf.

Bales, K. 2005: *Understanding Global Slavery: A Reader*, Berkeley, CA.

Barstad, H.M. 1996: *The Myth of the Empty Land*, Symbolae Osloensis Fas Supplement 28, Oslo.

Bartholomae, C. 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg.

Bedford, P.R. 2001: *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*, SJSJ 65, Leiden.

Berquist, J.L. 1995a: *Judaism in Persia's Shadow*, Minneapolis, MN.

Berquist, J.L. 1995b: 'The Shifting Frontier: The Achaemenid Empire's Treatment of Western Colonies' *Journal of World-Systems Research* 1 (17), 1–39.

Blenkinsopp, J. 1988: *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL, Louisville, KY.

Blenkinsopp, J. 2001: 'Did the Second Jerusalemite Temple Possess Land?' *Transeuphratène* 21, 61–68.

Borowski, O. 1987: *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*, Winona Lake, IN.

Boucharlat, R. 2014: 'Achaemenid Estate(s) Near Pasargadae?' in M. Kozuh/ W.F.M. Henkelman/ C.E. Jones/ C. Woods (eds.) *Extraction and Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew E. Stolper*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 68, Chicago, 27–35

Briant, P. 2002: *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Translated by P.T. Daniels, Winona Lake, IN. Original edition, *Histoire de l'Empire perse* (Paris, 1996).

Briant, P. 2012: 'From the Indus to the Mediterranean Sea: the Administrative Organization and Logistics of the Great Roads of the Achaemenid Empire' in S.E. Alcock/ J. Bodel / R.J.A. Talbert (eds.) *Highways, Byways, and Road Systems in the Pre-Modern World*, New York, 185–201.

Briant, P. 2013: 'Susa and Elam in the Achaemenid Empire' in J. Perrot (ed.) *The Palace of Darius at Susa: The Great Royal Residence of Achaemenid Persia*, London, 3–28.

Brown, S.C. 1998: 'Ecbatana' *Encyclopædia Iranica* 8, 80–84.

Burke, A.A. 2011: 'An Anthropological Model for the Investigation of the Archaeology of Refugees in Iron Age Judah and Its Environs' in B.E. Kelle, F.R. Ames and J.L. Wright (eds.) *Interpreting Exile: Displacement and Deportation in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, Atlanta, GA, 41–56.

Caesar, Julius, 1963: *The Gallic War*. LCL. Translated by H.J. Edwards, London.

Cameron, G.G. 1948: *Persepolis Treasury Tablets*, Oriental Institute Publications 65, Chicago.

Campbell, G. /E.A. Alpers. 2004: 'Introduction: Slavery, Forced Labour and Resistance in Indian Ocean, Africa and Asia' *Slavery & Abolition* 25 (2), ix–xxvii.

Carter, C.E. 1999: *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study*, JSOTSupp 294, Sheffield.

Cohen, R. 2008: *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. London.

Culbertson, L. (ed.) 2011a: *Slaves and Households in the Near East*, Oriental Institute Seminars 7, Chicago.

Culbertson, L. 2011b: 'Slaves and Households in the Near East' in L. Culbertson (ed.) *Slaves and Households in the Near East*, Chicago, 1–20.

Dandamaev, M.A. 1975: 'Forced Labour in the Palace Economy of Achaemenid Iran' *Alt-Orientalische Forschungen* 2, 71–78.

Dandamaev, M.A. 1984a: 'Royal Paradeisoi in Babylonia' in *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin Emerito Oblata*, Leiden, 113–117.

Dandamaev, M.A. 1984b: *Slavery in Babylonia: From Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626–331)*. Translated by Victoria A. Powell. Rev. ed. DeKalb, IL.

Dandamaev, M.A. /V. Lukonin. 1989: *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*. Translated by Philip L. Kohl, Cambridge.

Davies, P.R. (ed.) 1991: *Second Temple Studies I*. JSOTSupp 117, Sheffield.

Davies, P.R. 1992: *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, JSOTSup 148, Sheffield.

Demsky, A. 1983: 'Pelekh in Nehemiah 3' *Israel Exploration Journal* 33, 242–4.

Diakonoff, I.M. 1987: 'Slave-Labour vs. Non-Slave Labour: The Problem of Definition' in M.A. Powell (ed.) *Labor in the Ancient Near East*, New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1–4.

Driver, G.R. 1965: *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* Abridged and Revised ed., Oxford.

Ebihara, M.M. / C.A. Mortland/ J. Ledgerwood (eds.) 1994: *Cambodian Culture Since 1975: Homeland and Exile*, Ithaca, NY.

Edelman, D.V. 2005. *The Origins of the "Second" Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*, *Bible World*, London.

Edelman, D.V. 2007: 'Settlement Patterns in Persian-Era Yehud' in Y. Levin (ed.) *A Time of Change: Judah and Its Neighbors in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods*, London, 52–64.

Fantalkin, A. /O. Tal. 2012: 'Judah and its Neighbors in the Fourth Century BCE: A Time of Major Transformations.' in J.U. Ro (ed.) *From Judah to Judaea: Socio-Economic Structures and Processes in the Persian Period*, Sheffield, 133–196.

Finkelstein, I. 2008: 'Jerusalem in the Persian (and Early Hellenistic) Period and the Wall of Nehemiah' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32 (4), 501–520.

Frankel, R. 1999: *Wine and Oil Production in Antiquity in Israel and Other Mediterranean Countries*, JSOT/ASOR Monograph Series 10, Sheffield.

Freeman, J.B. / G. Field. 2011: 'Labor and Military: Introduction' *International Labor and Working-Class History* 80 (1), 3–5.

Fried, L.S. 2003: 'A Governor of Byblos from Sippar' *Nabu* 2003–2, http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/nabu/Nabu2003–036.pdf.

Gasche, H. 2013: 'The Achaemenid Palaces of Babylon' in J. Perrot (ed.) *The Palace of Darius at Susa: The Great Royal Residence of Achaemenid Persia*, London, 436–450.

Gewald, J.B. 1995: 'The Issue of Forced Labour in the 'Onjembo': German South West Africa 1904–1908' *Itinerario* 19 (1), 97–104.

Grabbe, L.L. 2004: *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period, Vol I: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah*, Library of Second Temple Studies 47, London.

Grabbe, L.L. / G.N. Knoppers. 2009: 'Introduction' in L.L. Grabbe and G.N. Knoppers (eds.) *Exile and Restoration Revisted: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*, London, 1–30.

Graf, D.F. 1993: 'The Persian Royal Road System in Syria-Palestine' *Transeuphratène* 6, 149–168.

Graf, D.F. 1994: 'The Persian Royal Road System' in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg/ A. Kuhrt / M.C. Root (eds.) *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change*, Leiden, 167–189.

Greenberg, R. /G. Cinamon. 2006: 'Stamped and Incised Jar Handles from Rogem Gannim and their Implications for the Political Economy of Jerusalem, Late 8th–early 4th Centuries BCE' *Tel Aviv* 33 (2), 229–43.

Haerinck, E. 1997: 'Babylonia under Achaemenid Rule' in J.E. Curtis (ed.) *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period: Conquest and Imperialism 539–331 BC*, London, 26–34.

Hallock, R.T. 1969: *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Oriental Institute Publications 92, Chicago.

Heinen, H. / U. Eigler/ P. Gröschler/ E. Herrmann-Otto/ H. von Hesberg/ H. Leppin/ H.-A. Rupprecht/ W. Schmitz/ I. Weiler/ B. Zimmermann (eds.) 2012: *Handwörterbuch der Antiken Sklaverei*. CD-ROM ed., Stuttgart.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2008: *The Other Gods Who Are: Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts*, Achaemenid History 14, Leiden.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2011: 'Parnakka's Feast: *šip* in Pārsa and Elam' in J. Álvarez-Mon / M.B. Garrison (eds.) *Elam and Persia*, Winona Lake, IN, 89–166.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2012: 'Elam' in H. Heinen et al. (eds.) *Handwörterbuch der Antiken Sklaverei*, Stuttgart.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2013: 'Administrative Realities: The Persepolis Archives and the Archaeology of the Achaemenid Heartland' in D.T. Potts (ed.) *The Oxford Handbok of Ancient Iran*, Oxford, 528–546.

Henkelman, W.F.M. / K. Kleber. 2007: 'Babylonian Workers in the Persian Heartland: Palace Building at Matannan in the Reign of Cambyses' in C. Tuplin (ed.) *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire*, Swansea, 163–176.

Henkelman, W.F.M. / M.W. Stolper. 2009: 'Ethnic Identity and Ethnic Labelling at Persepolis: The Case of the Skudrians' in P. Briant / M. Chaveau (eds.) *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide*, Paris, 271–330.

Hoglund, K.G. 1992: *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah*, Atlanta, GA.

Hoglund, K.G. 2002: 'The Material Culture of the Persian Period and the Sociology of the Second Temple Period' in P.R. Davies / J.M. Halligan (eds.) *Second Temple Studies III*, London, 14–18.

Janković, B. 2005: 'Between a Rock and a Hard Place: An Aspect of the Manpower Problem in the Agricultural Sector of Eanna' in H.D. Baker / M. Jursa (eds.) *Approaching the Babylonian Economy*, Münster, 167–182.

Janzen, D. 2002: 'Politics, Settlement, and Temple Community in Persian Period Yehud' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (3), 490–510.

Jursa, M. 2007: 'The Transition of Babylonia from the Neo-Babylonian Empire to the Achaemenid Rule' in H. Crawford (ed.) *Regime Change in the Ancient Near East and Egypt: from Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein*, Oxford, 73–94.

Jursa, M. 2008: 'The Renumeration of Institutional Labourers in an Urban Context in Babylonia in the First Millennium BC' in P. Briant/ W.F.M. Henkelman / M.W. Stolper (eds.) *L'archive des Fortifications de Persépolis: État des questions et perspectives de recherches*, Paris, 387–428.

Jursa, M. 2010: *Aspects of the Economic History of Babylonia in the First Millennium B.C.*, AOAT 377, Münster.

Jursa, M. 2011: 'Taxation and Service Obligations in Babylonia from Nebuchadnezzar to Darius and the Evidence for Darius' Tax Reform' in R. Rollinger/ B. Truschnegg / R. Bichler (eds.) *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, CLeO 3, Wiesbaden, 431–448.

Jursa, M. 2013: 'Epistolographic evidence for trips to Susa by Borsippean priests and for the crisis in Borsippa at the beginning of Xerxes' reign' *Arta* 2013.003, http://www.achemenet.com/document/ARTA_2013.003-Jursa.pdf.

Jursa, M. / C. Waerzeggers. 2009: 'On Aspects of Taxation in Achaemenid Babylonia: New Evidence from Borsippa' in P. Briant and M. Chaveau (eds.) *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménidé*, Paris, 237–269.

Kent, R.G. 1961: *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. 2nd ed., New Haven, CT.

Kessler, J. 2006: 'Persia's Loyal Yahwists: Power Identity and Ethnicity in Achaemenid Yehud' in O. Lipschits / M. Oeming (eds.) *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, Winona Lake, IN, 91–122.

Kleber, K. 2008: *Tempel und Palast: die Beziehungen zwischen dem König und dem Eanna-Tempel im spätbabylonischen Uruk*, AOAT 358, Münster.

Kleber, K. 2011: 'Neither Slave nor Truly Free: The Status of the Dependents of the Babylonian Temple Households' in L. Culbertson (ed.) *Slaves and Households in the Near East*, Chicago, 101–112.

Klimkova, O. 2007: 'Special Settlements in Soviet Russia in the 1930s–50s' *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 8 (1), 105–139.

Kloosterboer, W. 1960: *Involuntary Labour since the Abolition of Slavery*, Leiden.

Knapton, P. / M.R. Sarraf / J.E. Curtis. 2001: 'Inscribed Column Bases from Hamadan' *Iran* 39, 99–117.

Knauß, F.S. / I. Gagošidse/ I. Babaev. 2013: 'Karačamirli: Ein persisches Paradies' *ARTA* 2013.004, http://www.achemenet.com/document/ARTA_2013.004-Knauss-Gagosidse-Babaev.pdf.

Knoppers, G.N. / L.L. Grabbe/ D. Fulton (eds.) 2009: *Exile and Restoration Revisted: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*, Library of Second Temple Studies 73, London.

Knowles, M.D. 2006: *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora in the Persian Period*, Archaeology and Biblical Studies 16, Atlanta, GA.

Köstenberger, A.J. / D.A. Croteau. 2006: ' 'Will a Man Rob God?' (Malachi 3:8): a Study of Tithing in the Old and New Testament' *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16 (1), 53–77.

Kratz, R. 2004. 'Der Zweite Tempel zu Jeb und zu Jerusalem' in *Das Judentum in Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels*, Tübingen, 60–78.

Kuhrt, A. 2009: *The Persian Empire: a Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*, London (Orig. Pub. 2007).

Langgut, D. / Y. Gadot/ N. Porat/ O. Lipschits. 2013: 'Fossil Pollen Reveals the Secrets of Royal Persian Garden at Ramat Rahel (Jerusalem)' *Palynology* 37 (1), 1–15.

Lenski, G. / J. Lenski/ P. Nolan. 1991: *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*, 6th ed. New York.

Lincoln, B. 2012: *'Happiness for Mankind': Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*, Acta Iranica 53, Leuven.

Lipschits, O. 2011: 'Shedding New Light on the Dark Years of the "Exilic Period": New Studies, Further Elucidation, and Some Questions Regarding the Archaeology of Judah as an "Empty Land" ' in B.E. Kelle, F.R. Ames and J.L. Wright (eds.) *Interpreting Exile: Displacement and Deportation in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, Atlanta, GA, 57–90.

Lipschits, O. 2012: 'Nehemiah 3: Sources, Composition, and Purpose' in I. Kalimi (ed.) *New Perspectives on Ezra-Nehemiah*, Winona Lake, IN, 73–100.

Lipschits, O. / D. Vanderhooft. 2011: *The Yehud Stamp Impressions: A Corpus of Inscribed Impressions from Persian and Hellenistic Periods in Judah*, Winona Lake, IN.

Lipschits, O. / M. Oeming/ Y. Gadot/ B. Arubas. 2009: 'The 2006 and 2007 Excavation Seasons at Ramat Rahel: Preliminary Report' *Israel Exploration Journal* 59 (1), 1–20.

Lipschits, O., Y. Gadot, and D. Langgut. 2012: 'The Riddle of Ramat Raḥel: The Archaeology of a Royal Persian Period Edifice' *Transeuphratène* 41, 57–80.

Lipschits, O. / Y. Gadot/ B. Arubas/ M. Oeming. 2011: 'Palace and Village, Paradise and Oblivion: Unraveling the Riddles of Ramat Rahel' *Near Eastern Archaeology* 74 (1), 2–49.

Lloyd, A.B. 2007: 'Darius I in Egypt: Suez and Hibis' in C. Tuplin (ed.) *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire*, Swansea, 99–116.

Lovell, W.G. 1983: 'To Submit and To Serve: Forced Native Labour in the Cuchumatán Highlands of Guatemala, 1525–1821' *Journal of Historical Geography* 9 (2), 127–144.

MacGinnis, J. 2003: 'A Corvée Gang from the Time of Cyrus' *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 93 (1), 88–115.

Magdalene, F.R. / C. Wunsch. 2011: 'Slavery between Judah and Babylon: The Exilic Experience' in L. Culbertson (ed.) *Slaves and Households in the Near East*, Chicago, 113–134.

Maras, S. 2010: 'A Reassessment of Brick Motifs and Brick-Building Techniques at Achaemenid Susa' in J.E. Curtis and S. Simpson (eds.) *The World of Achaemenid Persia: History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East*, London, 207–220.

Milevski, I. 2011: 'Palestine's Economic Formation and the Crisis of Judah (Yehud) during the Persian Period' *Transeuphratène* 40, 135–166.

Moyd, M. 2011: 'Making the Household, Making the State: Colonial Military Communities and Labor in German East Africa' *International Labor and Working-Class History* 80 (1), 53–76.

Mustafavi, M.T. 1967: 'The Achaemenid Royal Road: Post-Stations between Susa and Persepolis' in A.U. Pope / P. Ackerman (eds.) *A Survey of Persian Art*, London, 3008–3010.

Nashli, H.F. 2009: 'The Achemenid/Post-Achaemenid Remains in Tang-i Bulaghi near Pasargadae: a Report on the Salvage Excavations conducted by five teams in 2004–2007' *Achemenet: Arta* 7 (1), 1–6; Online: http://www.achemenet.com/document/2009.001–Fazeli.pdf.

Nieboer, H.J. 1910: *Slavery as an Industrial System: Ethnological Researches*, 2nd ed., the Hague.

Oded, B. 1979: *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Wiesbaden.

Olson, D.C. 2013: *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: 'All Nations Shall be Blessed'*, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 24, Leiden.

Palmer, C.A. 1998. *The Worlds of Unfree Labour: From Indentured Servitude to Slavery*, *The Expanding World: The European Impact on World History 1450–1800*, Vol. 16, Aldershot.

Pearce, L.E. 2006. 'New Evidence for Judeans in Babylonia' in O. Lipschits / M. Oeming (eds.) *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, Winona Lake, IN, 399–412.

Pearce, L.E. 2011. ' 'Judean': A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonia?' in O. Lipschits/ G.N. Knoppers / M. Oeming (eds.) *Judah and the Judaeans in the Achaemenid Period*, Winona Lake, IN, 267–277.

Pearce, L.E. / C. Wunsch. 2014: *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 28, Bethesda, MD.

Pearce, L.E. 2015: 'Identifying Judeans and Judean Identity in the Babylonian Evidence.' in C. Waerzeggers and J. Stökl (eds.) *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context*, Berlin, 7–32

Porten, B. / A. Yardeni. 2007: 'Makkedah and the Storehouse in the Idumean Ostraca' in Y. Levin (ed.) *A Time of Change: Judah and Its Neighbors in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods*, London, 125–170.

Roth, M. (ed.) 2005: *The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*, Vol. 12 (P), Chicago.

Schaper, J. 1995. 'The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration' *Vetus Testamentum* 45 (4), 528–539.

Shesko, E. 2011: 'Constructing Roads, Washing Feet, and Cutting Cane for the 'Patria': Building Bolivia with Military Labor, 1900–1975' *International Labor and Working-Class History* 80 (1), 6–28.

Silliman, S.W. 2001: 'Theoretical Perspectives on Labor and Colonialism: Reconsidering the California Missions' *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 20, 379–407.

Silverman, J.M. 2015: 'Sheshbazzar, a Judaean or a Babylonian? A Note on His Identity' in J. Stökl / C. Waerzeggers (eds.) *Exile and Return: New Perspectives on Second Temple Judaism from Cuneiform Texts*, Berlin, 308–321.

Singha, R. 2007: 'Finding Labor from India for the War in Iraq: The Jail Porter and Labor Camps, 1916–1920' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49 (2), 412–445.

Smith, D.L. 1989: *The Religion of the Landless*, Bloomington, IN.

Smith-Christopher, D.L. 1997: 'Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587–539 BCE)' in J.M. Scott (ed.) *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, Leiden, 7–36.

Smith-Christopher, D.L. 2002: *A Biblical Theology of Exile*, Overtures to Biblical Theology, Minneapolis, MN.

Snell, D.C. 2001: *Flight and Freedom in the Ancient Near East*, CHANE 8, Leiden.

Stolper, M.W. 1985: *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*, Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Institute te Istanbul 54, Istanbul.

Stolper, M.W. 1989: 'The Governor of Babylon and Across-the-River in 486 B.C' *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 48 (4), 283–305.

Stronach, D. 1990: 'The Garden as a Political Statement: Some Case Studies from the Near East in the First Millennium B.C' *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* NS 4, 171–182.

Stronach, D. 2004: 'Notes on a Fortified Building and a 'Yurt' in Adjacent Registers of the Arjan Bowl' in A.G. Sagona (ed.) *A View from the Highlands: Archaeological Studies in Honour of Charles Burney*, Leuven, 711–728.

Swianiewicz, S. 1965: *Forced Labour and Economic Development*, London.

Trotter, J.M. 2001: 'Was the Second Jerusalem Temple a Primarily Persian Project?' *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 15 (2), 276–294.

Tuplin, C. 1987. 'The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire' in I. Carradice (ed.) *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires: the ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History*, Oxford, 109–158.

Tuplin, C. 1996: *Achaemenid Studies*, Historia 99, Stuttgart.

Utas, M. 1997: *Assiduous Exile: Liberian Refugees in Danane, Ivory Coast*, Working Papers in Cultural Anthropology 6. Uppsala: Uppsala University Department of Cultural Anthropology.

van Onselen, C. 1976: *Chibaro: African Mine Labour in Southern Rhodesia 1900–1933*, London.

Waerzeggers, C. 2006: 'The Carians of Borsippa' *Iraq* 68, 1–22.

Waerzeggers, C. 2010. 'Babylonians in Susa: The Travels of Babylonian Businessmen to Susa Revisited' In B. Jacobs and R. Rollinger (eds.) *Der Achämenidenhof/The Achaemenid Court*, CLeO 2, Wiesbaden, 777–813.

Way, P. 2011: ' 'Black Service...White Money': The Peculiar Institution of Military Labor in the British Army During the Seven Years' War.' in L. Fink (ed.) *Workers Across the Americas: The Transnational Turn in Labor History*, Oxford, Chapter 7, DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199731633.003.0008.

Weidner, E.F. 1939: 'Jojachin, König von Juda, in Babylonischen Keilschrifttexten' in *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud II*, Paris, 923–935.

Weinfeld, M. 2000: 'Pelekh in Nehemiah 3' in G. Galil / M. Weinfeld (eds.) *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography Presented to Zecharia Kallai*, Leiden, 249–50.

Westcoat, J.L., Jr. 2001: 'Water Resources' in N.J. Smelser / P.B. Baltes (eds.) *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Amsterdam, 16382–16387.

Wilkinson, T. 2005: *The Thames and Hudson Dictionary of Ancient Egypt*, London.

Williamson, H.G.M. 1985: *Ezra, Nehemiah*, Word Biblical Commentary 16, Nashville, TN.

Wirz, A. 2001: 'Slaves/Slavery, History of.' in N.J. Smelser / P.B. Baltes (eds.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Amsterdam, 14157–14162.

Wittfogel, K.A. 1973: *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power*. 8th printing ed., New Haven, CT.

Yoyette, J. 2013: 'The Egyptian Statue of Darius' in J. Perrot (ed.) *The Palace of Darius at Susa: The Great Royal Residence of Achaemenid Persia*, London, 240–271.
Zadok, R. 1996: 'Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (3), 597–598.
Zorn, J.R. 1997: 'Mizpah: Newly discovered Stratum Reveals Judah's Other Capital' *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23 (5), 28–38, 66.
Zorn, J.R. 2003: 'Tell en-Nasbeh and the Problem of the Material Culture of the Sixth Century' in O. Lipschits / J. Blenkinsopp (eds.) *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, Winona Lake, IN, 413–450.

Abstract

The use of forced migration and forced labor by the Achaemenids has received almost no scholarly attention, despite hints that both were widely used strategies. Moreover, the implications of these strategies for the Judaean populations within the empire have also gone mostly unnoticed. To understand the relations of these two neglected issues it is necessary to reconstruct both some of the historical evidence for their use and their likely sociological impacts within the Persian Empire with (ethnic) populations at large. Since this would be a major undertaking, this paper primarily seeks to determine on the basis of sociological models of forced labor and migration what kinds of impact on Judaeans can be expected from a few Persian case studies, and which of these impacts are likely to be directly visible within literary traces (i.e., the Hebrew Bible). This discussion will proceed under three headings: building projects, military colonies, and the organization of minority (work) groups. The implications of these results for further research are then suggested.