The Andrapodizing of War Captives in Greek Historical Memory*

KATHY L. GACA

Vanderbilt University

SUMMARY: The fundamentals of "andrapodizing" in Greek historical memory need reexamining on lexical and moral grounds. Defining the term "sell into slavery" proves fallacious. "Enslave," though at core correct, fails to recognize that adult fighting men were not andrapodized when captured, subjugated, and kept alive. Rather, andrapodizing is a type of premeditated and semi-lethal warfare aimed expressly against inhabitants not trained, or too old or too young, to fight back. Soldiers, when andrapodizing, abduct and dominate mainly the youthful—young women and self-mobile girls and boys—rather than other abused inhabitants who are abandoned as rejects, including old people and infants. The pandemic "andrapodizing of a locale or populace" follows this sorting procedure.

INTRODUCTION

DESPITE THE IMMENSE SCHOLARLY WORK ON WARFARE AND SLAVERY AS presented in Homeric epic and later Greek sources,[1] the significance of andrapodizing[2] as a military practice needs to be reinterpreted by paying

---

* All translations in this article are my own unless otherwise indicated. The transliteration of Greek personal and place names is Latinate with occasional exception. My deep thanks to Jonathan Bremer, Robert Drews, Susan Ford Wiltshire, Kieran Hendrick, David Petrain, Dan Solomon, Barbara Tsakirgis, and the *TAPA* reviewers and editors for their acumen and support. My gratitude also to Donald Mastronarde for his generous technical assistance.

[1] Schlaifer 1936, Lencman 1966, Wickert-Micknat 1983, Woronoff 1983, Garlan 1988, Pritchett 1991, Rihll 1993 and 1996, Hermann-Otto 1994, Finley 1998, Joshel and Murnaghan eds. 1998, Ducrey 1999, Kern 1999, Schumacher 2001, Glancy 2002, Anastasiadis and Doukellis eds. 2005, Hezser 2005.

[2] Though not common in English, "andrapodize" is anglicized and used for the military practice by Glover 1926: 134, 257. This study does not address andrapodizing as the

careful attention to two related factors: the andrapodizing methods deployed by armed forces on the offensive who prevailed in their aggression, and the predominant sex and age of the captives they subjugated or enslaved by these methods. This is my purpose in this article. Through this reinterpretation, I aim to transform our understanding of this recurrent practice of warfare as known from Homeric epic to late antiquity and beyond. Beyond late antiquity, I venture into Byzantine historical sources, as appropriate, where they confirm important points about andrapodizing that are evident from antiquity but are better revealed in Byzantine sources, such as John Caminiates, the first-hand witness and victim of the sack of Thessalonica in 904 C.E., along with his family and fellow city inhabitants, and the war memoirs of the Byzantine general and emperor John VI Cantacuzenus (c. 1295–1383, emperor 1347–1354), who is forthright about andrapodizing.[3]

A few disclaimers and clarifications are in order to frame this study, especially considering its diachronic span. My goal in this article is strictly to reexamine and reshape the fundamentals of what andrapodizing has meant lexically and morally as a practice of warfare in Greek historical memory.[4] It is not to present a discursive history of andrapodizing from antiquity through the Byzantine era, or even a sketch of such a narrative. If this study were such a history, it would need to consider various changes in andrapodizing warfare over this course of time that are not discussed here. These include, for example, how new weaponry altered ways of being injurious or lethal, how developments in shipbuilding affected the number of war-captive slaves that could be forcibly transported per ship, and how the rise of sectarian divisions in the worship of one Lord God or Allah reconfigured the shifting pattern of ethnic

---

opportunistic peacetime crime of kidnapping (e.g., Pl. *Rep.* 344b1–5; John Chrysostom, *Hom.* 16, Migne, *PG* 19.168).

[3] Chronological data about the lives and histories of Byzantine historians are drawn mainly from the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* and partly from the still valuable Krumbacher 1897.

[4] By the "Greek historical memory" of warfare, I mean the multi-ethnic cultural memory of warfare as presented in Greek and Hellenizing material culture and in textual and documentary sources that are from either a Greek ethnic and linguistic perspective, such as Xenophon and Polybius, or from a Greek linguistic but partly other-ethnic perspective, such as Arrian. Within this purview of Greek historical memory are many ethnic practices of warfare over an extensive period, including Greek, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman, to mention only some of the more prominent and earliest. Also included are later religio-ethnic war practices, in which monotheistic religious identities become interconnected with older patterns of ethnic division, such as Byzantine Romans (Ῥωμαῖοι) as opposed to Latins (Λατῖνοι) or Turks and Christians. Insofar as my concerns with andrapodizing here are lexically grounded, my sources in this article are Greek-language based, including the Septuagint.

divisions, and with it the perceptions of which peoples counted as outsiders or enemies to attack as "resources" for war-captive subjugates or slaves. My focus is on the continuities of andrapodizing warfare that persist like bridge cables over this span of time, the most salient of which are elucidated below.

Let me also make clear that andrapodizing does not represent all methods of enslavement through war capture, even though it is a very prevalent method. As shown below, an integral aspect of andrapodizing in its full sweep is the forcible removal or deportation of select sectors of a populace captured by force, not the subjugation of its surviving members on site, where they were already living at the time of their defeat. This aspect differentiates andrapodizing from the Spartan enslavement of Messenians as helots in their homeland in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E., and also from the practice of armed warriors killing adult males among a settled populace and then taking over their place, homes, and communities as the new overlords of the defeated men's surviving dependants, or at least trying to do so, as in the short-lived takeover of Rhegium by Decius and his fellow mercenaries in 280 B.C.E. (Diod. Sic. 22.1.2–3). These methods of on-site enslavement did involve some of the same practices as andrapodizing, such as the aggravated sexual assault of women and girls in the overthrown community, as is expressly attested for Rhegium,[5] and the conspicuous slaughter of some members of the populace in an effort to intimidate the more pliable survivors into submission. Yet these enslavement procedures are not to be identified with andrapodizing as an overall method, for in this pattern of armed aggression, the defeated people are sorted into those to abduct as subjugated captives and those to leave behind.

Further, I am not maintaining that all historical instances of warfare that led to the defeat of a populace necessarily culminated in their being enslaved. The end of enslavement did feature regularly in predatory warfare motivated to hunt down and acquire slaves (e.g., Pl. *Leg.* 823b1–6, 823e2–4; Arist. *Pol.* 1255b37–40; Xen. *An.* 5.5.2), as well as in retaliatory warfare driven by a desire and even oaths to destroy the men among an enemy and then to ravage their dependants (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 3.298–301). Conquerors in principle could elect to exercise a relative clemency toward an overthrown people,[6] but they would not do so if they and their armed forces were set upon gaining captive slaves, oath-bound or greed-driven to destroy their adversaries and enslave the

[5] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 20.4.7: "Divvying up the wives and unmarried girls of their own hosts, the men copulated with them against their will" (τάς τε γὰρ γυναῖκας τῶν ἰδίων ξένων καὶ τὰς παρθένους διελόμενοι συνῆσαν ἀκούσαις).

[6] Xenophon (c. 428–347 B.C.E.) describes, and supports, the legitimization in this way: "It is a law established for all time among all men that when a city is taken in war, the persons and property of the inhabitants thereof belong to the captors" (νόμος γὰρ ἐν

survivors, or interested in enslaving a community by force in order to frighten others in an as-yet unconquered region into surrender and subject status.[7] In order for some degree of clemency to take place, the people on the verge of being attacked had to be offered and accept a bona fide option to surrender and become subordinates with their families and communities still intact. Alternatively, if the fighting men were already conquered by force, the men's city, village, or other kind of community had to be considered more worth sparing than enslaving for various reasons, such as the inhabitants being seen as fellow members of the same ethnicity with ties antedating the conflict. In the Peloponnesian War (431–404 B.C.E.), for example, the decision about whether or not to exercise this discretion turned out in favor of the defeated people of Mytilene and Athens (Thuc. 3.35.1–50.3; Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.19–21), but against those of Torone, Skione, and Melos (Thuc. 5.3.4, 5.32.1, 5.116.4) and likewise against those of the oligarchic faction in the internecine stasis of Corcyra (Thuc. 4.47.1–48.6).

Finally, this study in the procedures of andrapodizing war captives should not be equated with being a study in the making of slaves called ἀνδράποδα. This is an important distinction because not all andrapodized persons among defeated adversaries went on to be abducted, transported, and sold as ἀνδράποδα. As will become clear below, some of them were killed. Further, even though many who were andrapodized were turned into ἀνδράποδα and called by that name, a number of andrapodized girls and women were used as spear-taken concubines and wives. Conversely, in non-military contexts, persons owned as slave chattel could be called ἀνδράποδα as a semi-generic name for slaves,[8] without this name necessarily implying that they in par-

---

πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀΐδιός ἐστιν, ὅταν πολεμούντων πόλις ἁλῷ, τῶν ἑλόντων εἶναι καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τὰ χρήματα, *Cyr.* 7.5.73). For this action to be justified in his view, Xenophon requires that the andrapodized city either be an abhorred personal enemy and in the wrong (ἄδικόν τε καὶ ἐχθρὰν πόλιν, *Mem.* 4.2.15), or that it simply be inhabited by war enemies (τοὺς πολεμίους, *Mem.* 2.2.2). The fourth-century B.C.E. *Dissoi logoi* presents the andrapodizing only of war enemies (τὼς πολεμίως) as legitimate (3.5 = DK 90). See further De Sensi Sestito 1999: 111–14, esp. nn1–8.

[7] Note App. *Ill.* 61–62 on the destruction of the transalpine Iapodian city of Metoulos in 35–34 B.C.E. by Roman forces under Augustus. As Appian maintains, this was the first Roman foray into this region and against people who were ethnic Iapodes. The remaining groups in this region then submitted to Roman rule, apart from one rebel group of Poseni. At Augustus's orders, Marcus Helvetius retaliated against the Poseni, killed those considered responsible for disobeying, and sold the rest (τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀπέδοτο) as slaves.

[8] To cite but a few examples from classical and late antiquity, see the likely fifth-century B.C.E. Old Oligarch 1.11, 18 and the fourth-century C.E. *P. Rain. Cent.* 85.2–11, *P. Oxy.* 33.2673.8–25, and Gregory Nazianzen (329/30–c. 390 C.E.), *Orat.* 16 (*In patrem tacentem*, Migne, *PG* 35), 314A.

ticular were subjugated and deported by military force. Some of them would have been slave offspring in a debased and unrecognized lineage of offspring descending from andrapodized and impregnated women and pubescent girls. It follows that to study ἀνδράποδα in general is a much larger topic than that of this article on the military procedures of andrapodizing.

As one result of this study, my findings about andrapodizing do throw the consensus etymology of ἀνδράποδα into serious doubt. This is the view that ἀνδράποδα etymologically means "man-footed" or "human-biped" plunder and that this compound noun was formed by express analogy with τετράποδα as four-footed plunder and marked the ἀνδράποδα as two-footed equivalents of domesticated animals (Chantraine 1999 s.v. ἀνήρ). However, to transform the etymological theory and moral significance of ἀνδράποδα is a complex topic in need of a separate article. For my purposes here, the current etymology may remain unchallenged at present.

ANDRAPODIZING IN GREEK HISTORICAL SOURCES

When the andrapodizing of war captives is carried out, as narrated in Greek historiography, it is the second step of an enduring military practice of warfare known as "killing and andrapodizing."[9] In such warfare, which is attested widely across militarized societies in the Mediterranean from antiquity through the Byzantine era, the aggressors strive to gain the upper hand through the first step of "men killing and men being killed,"[10] be it through battle, siege, ambush, slaughter, or some combination of these lethal practices. When they kill enough of their adult male opposition to prevail, they then capture and andrapodize survivors from among the defeated populace. The succinct Greek phrase "kill and andrapodize" not only encapsulates this twofold thrust of warfare,[11] it is also part of executive military commands for or against the practice; and it is found in historical narratives that reflect a treaty style of wording, in which one party agrees to a cessation of this kind of collective violence against the other.[12]

---

[9] This two-part practice is first named as such in Herodotus, κτείνειν and ἀνδρα-ποδίζεσθαι or φόνος καὶ ἐξανδραπόδισις, 3.140.5, 3.147.1.

[10] Ἀνδρῶν / ὀλλύντων καὶ ὀλλυμένων, Hom. *Il.* 4.450–51, 8.64–65, 11.83.

[11] E.g., Thuc. 3.28.1–2, 5.9.9, 5.116.4; Arr. *Anab.* 2.27.7; Joseph. *BJ* 3.62–63; Procop. *Pers.* 2.4.21, 7.29.1; George Acropolites (1217–1282 c.e., history concerns 1203–1261), *Annales* 4.l. in Heisenberg 1978; John VI Cantacuzenus (history concerns 1320–1356), *Hist.* 2.156, 2.377, 2.396–97, 2.448, 2.509, 3.32, 3.155, 3.173 in Schopen 1828–32; Michael Critobulus (d. c. 1470, history concerns 1451–1467) 3.22.4, 5.6.8 in Reinsch 1983.

[12] Command: Thuc. 3.36.2; Otanes' command and execution despite Darius's prohibition: Hdt. 3.147.1–149; command against: Hdt. 3.140.5; Thuc. 3.49.4; treaty-style language: Procop. *Goth.* 8.19.4.

Further, andrapodizing is also commonly said to occur in a manner known as andrapodizing a city, village, rural area, or extensive region, in which the component of men killing men is left unstated, be it in battle or by slaughter, or some of both. This phrasing, as I demonstrate below, is a compressed way to signify the same twofold military practice of killing fighting-age males of the attacked city, village, or rural area, and then abducting andrapodized survivors from among the defeated populace. It does not mean to spare the lives of the entire populace captured alive in the locale for the purpose of taking them all away as ἀνδράποδα, regardless of the captured inhabitants' sex, age, or military readiness to fight back or rebel.

Precisely what, then, does it mean to andrapodize captives through warfare? According to authoritative lexical sources, including LSJ, Frisk 1973–79, and Chantraine 1999, "andrapodizing" (ἀνδραποδίζειν, ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι) has two meanings.[13] On the one hand, it signifies the mercantile transaction involved in trading or selling war captives as slaves or subjugates to middlemen or new owners.[14] On the other, it means the enslaving or reducing to slavery of the inhabitants in a conquered community regardless of their sex, age, or standing as fighters or non-combatants.[15] These two senses also apply to ἐξανδραποδίζεσθαι, which is generally synonymous with ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι,[16] and to the corresponding verbal nouns ἐξανδραπόδισις and ἀνδραποδισμός. Modern translations of Greek textual evidence about andrapodizing utilize and reassert the authority of these two meanings, often giving higher priority

---

[13] The middle voice form is used here in my lexical analysis, for it is the more frequent usage; cf. Pritchett 1991: 223.

[14] LSJ s.v. ἀνδραποδίζω: "to sell the free men of a conquered place into slavery"; Frisk 1973–79 s.v. ἀνδράποδον: "als Sklaven verkaufen"; Chantraine 1999 s.v. ἀνήρ: "vendre comme esclave."

[15] LSJ s.v. ἀνδραποδίζω: "enslave, especially of conquerors"; Frisk 1973–79 s.v. ἀνδράποδον: "in Knechtschaft versetzen"; Chantraine 1999 s.v. ἀνήρ: "réduire en esclavage."

[16] Even though the prefix ἐξ- is suggestive of a more intensive or thorough practice of andrapodizing, a "reducing to utter slavery," as LSJ defines it, Ducrey 1999: 25–26 and Pritchett 1991: 223, 427 are correct to regard ἐξανδραποδίζεσθαι and ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι as near-synonyms in actual use, for several authors use one form or the other primarily or exclusively, with no sustained pattern of difference in meaning; thus Polybius and Theodoret prefer the compound, while Thucydides and Arrian use the simple form. Arrian even uses παντελὴς ἀνδραποδισμός, not ἐξανδραπόδισις, to refer to Alexander's utter andrapodizing of Thebes in 335 B.C.E. (*Anab.* 1.9.6). Hesychius (s.v. ἀνδραποδίζει, ἐξανδραποδίζεται) confirms that the two verbs are synonymous by defining them, respectively, as αἰχμαλωτίζει and αἰχμαλωτίζεται.

to the mercantile sense.[17] Modern studies on war captives in Greek historiography have followed suit.[18]

THE MERCANTILE SENSE

If ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι means "sell into slavery," then andrapodized members of an overthrown populace are put up for sale as the next military step after killing the armed male defenders—or at least as the step that is recognized and named as being the next in the sequence once the armed defenders have been eliminated or gotten out of the way. This would indicate that the victorious aggressors turn with quick dispatch from killing or capturing and slaughering the fighting males in a community to selling on a market the remaining live inhabitants captured therein. Pritchett, relying upon this sense of andrapodizing, accordingly interprets Thucydides' statement that Athenian forces under Cleon "andrapodized the women and children of the Toroneians" (καὶ Τορωναίων γυναῖκας μὲν καὶ παῖδας ἠνδραπόδισαν, Thuc. 5.3.4) as but one of "many cases" in which "we find that booty was sold on the spot immediately after capture. ... As typical examples of immediate sale, we may cite for Athens the sale of women and children by the Athenian army at Torone in 422 B.C." (Pritchett 1991: 433). By this mercantile sense of ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι, the dominant soldiers are portrayed mainly as salesmen rather than as assailants in their andrapodizing of war captives.

To categorize andrapodizing as a transaction creates the false impression of a strange and seemingly pervasive silence in Greek narratives about warfare. The collective bodily violence that was the norm for armed forces to employ in order to catch, subdue, and dominate persons struggling against being subjugated oddly seems not to register at all as a military step worth naming, even though warfare is about collective physical violence between adversarial

---

[17] For a few of many examples, see the *Loeb* editions of Diod. Sic. 14.15.2–3 (trans. C. H. Oldfather), 20.105.1 (trans. Russel M. Geer); App. *BCiv.* 2.139.1 (trans. Horace White); Polyb. 8.33.12, 22.8.9, 9.39.3 (trans. W. R. Paton); and *The Landmark Thucydides* 4.48.4, 5.116.4 (trans. Richard Crawley).

[18] Ducrey 1999: 25–26, 132; Pritchett 1991: 223, 238, 427, 433. See as well *CAH* 6: 738, 750 (J. R. Ellis) and *CAH* Plates to Vol. 7.1, 63 (R. A. Tomlinson). Based on *Diod. Sic.* 16.8.5 (Philip of Macedon τὴν πόλιν [Ποτίδαιαν] ἐξηνδραποδίσατο), Ellis states that "the Potidaeans themselves were sold into slavery" by Philip in 358 B.C.E. So too, in light of Diod. Sic. 16.53.3 (Philip τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐξηνδραποδίσατο), Ellis maintains that "the inhabitants [were] sold into slavery" when Olynthus was sacked by Philip in 348 B.C.E. Likewise, based on Polybius 15.24.1 (Philip V καὶ ταύτην [τὴν τῶν Θασίων πόλιν] φιλίαν οὖσαν ἐξηνδραποδίσατο), Tomlinson states that the "population [of Thasos was] sold into slavery."

groups. To compound the oddity, the andrapodizing sale of captives already caught and processed after the killing of defeated male fighters does seem to be classified as warfare, even though the patterns of mercantile transaction that go along with warfare are generally not considered warfare itself. This is true, for example, of black markets in modern wartime or army transactions with merchants in antiquity, like those of the Achaean and allied forces, who traded war captives (ἀνδράποδα) for Lemnian wine with the trader Euneos (Hom. *Il.* 7.467–75). Hence, the collective assault involved in catching, subduing, and dominating people as captives fades out of sight from a modern perspective because this massive violence seems to lack a name. A clear example of this invisibility problem is Pritchett's stress on the women and children of Torone being sold "immediately after capture," which grants but a token nod to the fact that they must first be caught and kept under control before any sale of them can proceed. Thus, if to andrapodize the women and children is to sell them, then the aggressive methods employed to take and dominate them are always already over and done with once they are andrapodized—and gone with little trace from our historical awareness—because the sale of any war captives on a body market necessarily takes place only after they are already captured, subdued, and dominated.

The mercantile sense of andrapodizing, however, is at odds with Greek textual evidence. The trading or selling, when such a transaction occurs, takes place after the andrapodizing, as the following passages make clear. As stated by Thucydides (c. 460–400 B.C.E.), the Athenian navy under Nicias, in alliance with an Egestan cavalry, first andrapodized (ἀνδραποδίσαντες) the non-Greek Sikan community of Hykkara on Sicily in 415 B.C.E.. Only afterwards did they hand over Hykkaran captives for sale (τἀνδράποδα ἀπέδοσαν) at a large profit of 120 talents in order to fund their futile ambition to take over Sicily. This sale of enslaved captives is further distinguished from the andrapodizing in that the transaction took place only after the Athenian ships transported the Hykkarans abducted as ἀνδράποδα to Catana (6.62.3–4).[19] Similarly, as Diodorus (fl. c. 48–21 B.C.E.) notes, when the Syracusan tyrant Dionysius I

[19] Athenian rowers had to proceed on foot with the infantry to Catana, presumably because they had to make room on the ships for the ἀνδράποδα (Thuc. 6.62.4). This would indicate that the ships transporting the ἀνδράποδα were at least in part the triremes with reduced teams of rowers. This would also suggest that the Hykkaran ἀνδράποδα sold by the Athenian forces in Catana were largely women and children. As Xenophon makes clear from his direct experience as an andrapodizing mercenary, it was faster and more profitable to transport a group of subjugated captive children and women by ship, when feasible, than to make them march overland (*An.* 5.3.1–4). This stands to reason, because then more of the children and women would reach the slave market alive and in sellable condition. Note also that the shipload of war captives captured by adult male

andrapodized a city or ethnic group, he later would sell those captives he decided to hand over to the slave market, such as the Catanaean captives (τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους) he put up for sale (ἐλαφυροπώλησε) in Syracuse after he andrapodized their city in 403 B.C.E. (τὴν πόλιν ἐξηνδραποδίσατο, Diod. Sic. 14.15.2–3). Philip of Macedon did the same at Olynthus. Upon "andrapodiz-ing (ἐξανδραποδισάμενος) the inhabitants, he sold them (ἐλαφυροπώλησε)" in 348–347 B.C.E. (Diod. Sic. 16.53.3). As the second-century C.E. historian Arrian likewise points out, Alexander, after conquering Tyre in 332–331 B.C.E., andrapodized (ἠνδραπόδισε) 30,000 or so of the surviving inhabitants, and these were then sold (ἐπράθησαν, *Anab.* 2.24.5). In an individual case, Alcibiades in 416–415 B.C.E. bought (πριάμενος) a Melian woman from the surviving captives taken by the spear (αἰχμαλώτων) in Melos and "produced a son from her" (υἱὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς πεποίηται). This purchase took place once the Athenians killed Melian males from youth upwards and "andrapodized" (ἐξανδραποδίζεσθαι) the Melian women, girls, and boys (Ps.-Andoc. *In Alcib.* 22).

Further, in the early Roman monarchy, when Roman forces destroyed the Latin town of Corniculus, the Latin forces of the town died fighting in its defense, while the base non-fighters along with the women and children were counted as ἀνδράποδα and "sold" (ἐπράθη) (Dion Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3.50.6). Likewise in late antiquity, when the Saracen king Alamoundaros engaged in widespread ravaging from Egypt to Mesopotamia in cooperation with Persian forces, he andrapodized (ἀνδραποδίζων) many tens of thousands, killed the majority, and then sold remaining survivors for a great profit in 531 C.E. (τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἀποδιδόμενος χρημάτων μεγάλων, Procop. *Pers.* 1.17.40–42).

The distinction between andrapodizing and selling continues in Byzantine Greek narratives about warfare. In the mid-eleventh century C.E., the armed forces of the Pecheneg leader Kegen first killed the men among an enemy faction of Pechenegs led by Tyrach and then engaged in "andrapodizing and selling (ἀνδραποδιζόμενος καὶ πωλῶν) their women and children," as noted by John Scylitzes.[20] Similarly, as stated by the fifteenth-century historian

brigands (ἄνδρες ληϊστῆρες) in *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 124–28 is comprised of young adult and pubescent female captives (γυναῖκες), not of captive men and women, and see further Finley 1978: 101 and Patterson 1982: 121–22. Ships served as an imprisoning containment at sea that allowed little chance for the andrapodized and forcibly removed captives to escape alive. A survivable escape proved possible when the ships put into land, as shown by the historical verisimilitude of Demeter's account about doing precisely this in the guise of the fugitive captive woman Dōs (*Hom. Hymn Dem.* 122–32).

    [20] *Vit. Const.* 17 (Constantine Monomachus) in Thurn 1973. The historical narrative of Scylitzes (fl. second half of the eleventh century) concerns 811–1057 and was extensively preserved by the twelfth-century historian Cedrenus.

Ducas,[21] the Byzantine empress Anna of Savoy bribed Turkish armed forces with a great quantity of gold and with "the Byzantine Roman subjects of the rebel John Cantacuzenus whom they would andrapodize (ἐξανδρα-ποδίσουσιν), so that they would then have plenty for selling and buying (πωλεῖν καὶ πιπράσκειν) as they wished," due to her power struggles with him in the mid-fourteenth century. Andrapodizing therefore does not signify the trading or selling of surviving captives, for ample textual evidence throughout the entire tradition of Greek historiography—from Thucydides to Ducas—differentiates this practice from the transaction.

The purported mercantile sense of andrapodizing goes back to an ingenious but fallacious etymology that was first offered in antiquity and surprisingly retains extensive authority today. In this etymology, as documented in the scholia on Aristophanes' *Plutus*, the agent noun ἀνδραποδιστής is divided into two parts, ἀνδρ- meaning "man" in the sense of "adult male," and the meaningless, that is, non-morphemic, letter cluster αποδι (schol. Ar. *Plut.* 521d Chantry). This letter cluster, however, is mistakenly understood to be an abbreviated form of the verb ἀποδίδοσθαι, meaning "give over" or "sell," by virtue of having the same five letters that appear at the beginning of ἀποδίδοσθαι. In ἀποδίδοσθαι, however, these letters comprise the adverbial prefix ἀπο- plus the reduplicating prefix δι- of the verbal root δο, meaning "give," which is not true of αποδι in ἀνδραποδιστής or ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι. The creative etymology in the *Plutus* scholia nonetheless combines "sell" from ἀποδίδοσθαι with "man as adult male" in ἀνδρ and conjures the definition "to sell a man as a slave." As is now well recognized, by contrast, ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι is a compound that breaks down into three morphemes: "ἀνδρα/man and ποδ/foot," which is most clearly seen in the noun ἀνδράποδον, plus the vigorous verbal suffix -ίζειν, which commonly appears in the middle voice -ίζεσθαι.[22] The correct etymology of ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι has nothing whatsoever to do with a sale, a trade, or a handing over of any person taken as a war captive in any sense at all.

The definition "to sell a man as a slave" did not remain an inconsequential conjecture in the scholia on Aristophanes' *Plutus*. It also gained entry into a major resource for ancient Greek lexicography in the modern day, the tenth-century Suda, which defines ἀνδραποδίζω in part by the same etymology, verbatim, that appears in the *Plutus* scholia: "The noun 'andrapodizer' is so named in connection with giving a man over, that is, to sell him" (εἴρηται δὲ

---

[21] *Historia Turco-Byzantina* 8.1 in Grecu 1958. Ducas lived c. 1400–after 1462 and his history concerns 1341–1462, where it abruptly stops.

[22] Chantraine 1999 s.v. ἀνήρ b, p. 87.

ἀνδραποδιστὴς παρὰ τὸ ἀποδίδοσθαι ἄνδρα, τουτέστι πωλεῖν).[23] The entry of this definition into the Suda imparted a seeming authority to it that has carried over into LSJ, Frisk 1973–79, and Chantraine 1999. LSJ adopts the meaning in full by defining ἀνδραποδίζω partly as "to sell the free men of a conquered place into slavery." Frisk and Chantraine refrain from specifying that the free men are the ones sold, but they do endorse the main error of the mercantile transaction by defining ἀνδραποδίζειν in part as "to sell as slaves." From this basis of considerable lexical authority, the defining of ἀνδραποδίζειν as "sell into slavery" or "sell men into slavery" has spread rather prolifically through translations of Greek history and modern studies concerned with this practice of warfare. Even Ducrey and Pritchett remain partly under its spell.[24] The sense is completely fallacious, however, both on semantic and etymological grounds.

SUBJUGATING MALE FIGHTERS AS OPPOSED TO ANDRAPODIZING WAR CAPTIVES

It is beyond dispute that the practice of andrapodizing involves enslaving war captives or reducing them to a subjugated and slavish social position. Nonetheless, the second definition, "enslave or reduce to slavery," is problematic in several important ways. First, "enslave or reduce to slavery" is completely open-ended about who is enslaved or subjugated by the methods of andrapodizing. This lack of specificity makes it seem that persons who are andrapodized in an overthrown community include whoever is caught and subjugated rather than killed, including fighting-age males when they are caught, kept alive, and forced into submission by their adversaries, rather than being eliminated.

In Greek historiography, however, to capture, keep alive, and subjugate male fighters is clearly differentiated as a military practice from the capturing and subjugation of war captives known as andrapodizing. Adult fighting males are generally not andrapodized even when they are subjugated or enslaved

[23] S.v. ἀνδραποδίζω in Adler 1928–38.

[24] "Les Argiens attaquèrent les Mycéniens ... et assiégèrent leur cité. Après une brève résistance, la ville tomba; les Argiens vendirent ses habitants" (Ducrey 1999: 132). The last clause is Ducrey's rendering of Diod. Sic. 11.65.5 on the andrapodizing of Mycene by Argive forces in 468 B.C.E.: οἱ Ἀργεῖοι τοὺς Μυκηναίους ἀνδραποδισάμενοι. Pritchett 1991: 238: "A few painful traces present themselves of the diversities of suffering which befell the unhappy victims who were sold into slavery." Pritchett 1991: 427 does note that andrapodizing "means no more than 'to enslave,' but by extension it is frequently translated as 'to sell into slavery,'" yet he presents the mercantile sense as its meaning, e.g., at pp. 238, 312, 372, 433, and 454.

rather than killed in the fight or killed off afterwards. When armed adversaries take and dominate their fighting opponents, they commonly "take them" (λαβεῖν, ἑλεῖν) or "take them alive" (ζωγρῆσαι) or the like as "prisoners" or "spear-conquered" (δέσμιοι, αἰχμάλωτοι). They do not andrapodize their defeated male opponents even when they put them in chains and subject them to deprivation and forced labor, or sell them to others for such purposes. In Herodotus, for example, Lacedaemonian armed forces attacked Tegea in 575–560 B.C.E. in order to andrapodize (ἐξανδραποδιεύμενοι) unspecified members of the Tegean populace (τοὺς Τεγεήτας), only to be defeated and subjugated themselves by the Tegean male fighters defending their city. As war captives, "they were taken alive" (ἐζωγρήθησαν) and put to hard labor in the fields of Tegea (Hdt. 1.66.3–4). They were not andrapodized.

Similarly, when Athenian armed forces under Cleon took Torone in 422 B.C.E., "they took alive some of the fighting men of Torone and of the Peloponnesus" (τοὺς δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβον), namely, the ones whom they did not kill off (ἀπέκτειναν) right away—and "they andrapodized (ἠνδραπόδισαν) the women and children of the Toronean men" (Thuc. 5.3.2–4). Hence, of the people in Torone who remained alive as war captives, only the women and children were andrapodized by the Athenian soldiers. The seven hundred captured members of the garrison did not receive this treatment (Diod. Sic. 12.73.3, Thuc. 5.3.4). Likewise, when the army of Antigonus took Mantinea by force in 223 B.C.E., his soldiers subjugated the remaining populace of Mantinea after killing only the leading men. "Of this populace, they sold (ἀπέδοντο) some of the fighting-age men and sent the rest of them in chains (τοὺς δ' εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἀπέστειλαν πέδαις δεδεμένους) to Macedonia. The children and women, however, they andrapodized (παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραποδίσαντο)" (Plut. *Arat.* 45.6).[25] Even adult fighters put in some of the worst known conditions as captives are not andrapodized. The Athenian naval troops "were captured" (ἐλήφθησαν, Thuc. 7.87.4) and put into the quarries near Syracuse, where they were exposed to harsh extremes of heat and cold, deprived of food and potable water, and left in filth (Thuc. 7.86.1–87.4). The fighting males are not andrapodized, however, because collective military andrapodizing is not about them and is not carried out on their bodies.

---

[25] Similarly, regarding a distant event of pre-republic Rome as presented in the Augustan era, in the Latin city of the Apiolani, the few fighting adult male Apiolani who surrendered rather than being killed in their failed effort to fend off the Roman sack of their city were sold with the other λάφυρα, whereas "their children and women were andrapodized and driven off by the victorious Roman forces" (παῖδές τε αὐτῶν καὶ γυναῖκες ἀνδραποδισθέντες ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀπήχθησαν, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3.49.3).

As John Cantacuzenus aptly states in his memoirs, based on his intensive involvement in the war mores of andrapodizing as a Byzantine Roman general in the fourteenth century,[26] the aim of andrapodizing is to take and dominate "people who do not know how to wage war" (ἀνθρώπους οὐκ εἰδότας πολεμεῖν) from among those who inhabit an overthrown city, village, or rural area. Josephus makes the same point when he says that Roman forces in the Jewish War of 66–70 c.e. kept andrapodizing "the weak" (οἱ ἀσθενεῖς) upon killing "the battle-ready" (τὸ μάχιμον) (*BJ* 3.62–63). The so-called "weak" people are primarily, and often exclusively, the proverbial women and children war captives (παῖδες καὶ γυναῖκες),[27] as indicated above in the incidents of Melos, Torone, Mantinea, and the Pecheneg factional war. Herodotus is the first to expressly use the verb "andrapodizing" to refer to this method of enslaving women and children as war captives. This practice recurs as a prominent dimension of warfare as narrated in Greek historiography from Herodotus and Thucydides through the end of the Byzantine era. As Herodotus states, Persian forces in 494 b.c.e. turned the women and children of Miletus into ἀνδράποδα (γυναῖκες καὶ τέκνα ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ ἐγίνοντο), after killing off most of the adult male population (Hdt. 6.19.3), and their andrapodizing treatment of boys and adolescent girls in the other Ionian cities was substantively the same.[28] To name but a few of countless such incidents, being andrapodized was also the fate of women and children in Melos and Skione at the hands of Athenian forces; in Delphi by Phocian forces; in Thebes and Gaza by Alexander's Macedonian forces; on Delos by Pontic forces of Mithridates' general Menophanes; in the Latin cities of Orton and of the Apiolani by Roman forces; in Ctesiphon by Roman forces under Severus; among the Celtic Senones by Roman forces; among Illyrians by Hun forces; among Coutrigur Huns by Utigur Hun forces; among Theuderich's

---

[26] Cantacuzenus, *Hist.*, vol. 1, p. 192. The Byzantine civil wars from 1341–1347 made John VI Cantacuzenus especially well practiced in andrapodizing people among his adversaries and in trying to protect his own people from this treatment. As he states, the qualifications for being a good general on his model included the ability to ravage the countryside, to overwhelm a town by force, and to andrapodize it: κακώσας χώραν καὶ πολίσματος ... κρατήσας ἐξ ἐφόδου καὶ ἐξανδραποδισάμενος καὶ τ' ἄλλα ὅσα ἔδει τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιήσας στρατηγόν (*Hist.*, vol. 2, p. 77).

[27] In Greek, the usual order of this proverbial group is "children and women."

[28] "Picking out the most attractive boys, the Persian forces had them castrated, and made them eunuchs (εὐνούχους) instead of ones having testicles (ἐνόρχεας), and they made the most attractive adolescent girls forcibly removed to the Persian king (ἐποίευεν ... παρθένους τὰς καλλιστευούσας ἀνασπάστους παρὰ βασιλέα). They did these things and they burned the cities along with the temples" (6.32).

Goths by Roman forces and in Roman settlements along the Ister (Danube) by Sandilch's Coutrigur forces; among Albanians by Turkish forces; in Constantinople by Turkish forces; and in many strongholds by numerous diverse bands of armed aggressors over this extensive span of time.[29] The practice extends much earlier than Herodotus, however, for the andrapodizing of women and children is also a regular practice of warfare as known in Homeric epic, even though the verb ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι is not used therein: "They kill the men, use fire to level the city, and other men take away (ἄγουσι) the children and the

[29] The evidence is as follows: Women and children are andrapodized in cities and other populated locales, such as by Athenian forces in Torone and Skione (422 B.C.E.), and in Melos (416–415): Thuc. 5.3.4 (καὶ τῶν Τορωναίων γυναῖκας μὲν καὶ παῖδας ἠνδραπόδισαν), 5.32.1 (Σκιωναίους ... παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν), 5.116.4 (Μηλίων παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν); by Phocian forces in Delphi at the start of the Third Sacred War in 356 B.C.E.: Theopomp. Jacoby *FGrH* F 2b 115f, fr. 312 = Paus. 3.10.3–5 (Δελφῶν ... γυναῖκας καὶ τέκνα ἐξανδραποδίσασθαι); on Delos in 88 B.C.E. by armed fighters under Mithridates' general Menophanes: Paus. 3.23.3–4 (προσεξανδραποδισάμενος δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ παῖδας) and McGing 1986: 121n155; in Thebes (335 B.C.E.) and Gaza (332) by Alexander and his Macedonian and other armed forces: Arr. *Anab.* 1.10.1 (regarding τὰ κατὰ τὰς Θήβας ... ἔδοξε ... παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ... ἀνδραποδίσαι), 2.27.7 (παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἐξηνδραπόδισεν αὐτῶν [τῶν Γαζαίων]); in the city of the Apiolani and the Latin city of Orton by Roman armies prior to the Roman republic: Dion Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3.49.3 (παῖδές τε αὐτῶν [τῶν Ἀπιολανῶν] καὶ γυναῖκες ἀνδραποδισθέντες ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀπήχθησαν), 10.26.2–3 (γυναῖκας δὲ καὶ παῖδας αὐτῶν [τῶν Λατίνων] ... ἠνδραποδίσαντο); in Babylonia's main city of Ctesiphon in 197–198 C.E. by the Roman forces under Severus: Herodian 3.9.10–11 (πάντας δὲ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας αἰχμαλώτους ἔλαβον), and in Constantinople by Mehmed's Turkish forces in 1453 C.E.: Critobulus 1.63.2 (παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραποδισμένους). Children and women are andrapodized from ethnic groups foreign to the armed forces on the offensive, such as from Celtic Senones by Cornelius and his Roman forces in 283 B.C.E.: App. *Celt.* 11.3 (τὰς μὲν γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ παιδία ἠνδραποδίζετο); from Illyrians by Huns and from Coutrigur Huns by Utigur Huns in the mid-sixth century C.E.: Procop. *Goth.* 7.11.15 (στρατεύματος δὲ Οὐννικοῦ τοῖς Ἰλλυριοῖς ἐπισκήψαντος παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας ἐξηνδραπόδισθαι τετύχηκεν), 8.18.25 (αὐτῶν [τῶν Κουτριγούρων] οἱ πολέμιοι παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας ἀνδραποδίσαντες ἐπ' οἴκου ἀπεκομίσθησαν); from Theuderich's Goths and in Roman settlements south of the Ister River: Agathias (c. 532–580, history concerns 552–556) 5.6 (γύναια δὲ καὶ παῖδας τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν εὐδαιμόνων ἀνδρῶν ἠνδραποδίσαντο), 25.1–2 (καταπλήξας τε τοὺς αὐτοῦ μεμενηκότας τῷ ἀπροσδοκήτῳ γύναια πολλὰ καὶ παῖδας ἠνδραποδίσατο); from so-called Scythians by the Byzantine Roman forces in the reign of John Tzimisces (969–976 C.E.), Scylitzes, *vit. Joannis* 9 (γυναῖκες δὲ καὶ παιδία ἠχμαλωτίζοντο); and from Albanians by Turkish forces in the thirteenth century, Cantacuzenus, vol. 1, p. 497 (γυναῖκας δὲ καὶ παῖδας ἠνδραπόδισαν οἱ Πέρσαι).

deep-belted women" (*Il.* 9.593–94), with the young female captives primarily being targeted for this treatment.[30]

Thus in principle and practice, the male defenders are eliminated as needed before andrapodizing can begin in earnest,[31] for it is necessary to overthrow them in order to gain unimpeded access to their most desired dependants. When the defeated fighters are instead caught and kept alive in a slavish condition, they accordingly form a distinct category of captive subjugates that belongs no more to the andrapodized than platypus biologically do to ducks. Subjugated women and children thus should no longer be merged together with subjugated male fighters in one undifferentiated list of the enslaved,[32] for there are two distinct categories of subjugated war captives, the andrapodized women and children and adult fighting males who are caught and kept as subjugated prisoners rather than being killed.[33]

A global search of the *TLG* database on andrapodizing further confirms that armed fighters who are taken, kept alive, and subjugated as war captives are not subjected to the procedure known as andrapodizing. For this investigation, I used the search prompt "νδραποδι" by itself, which brings out every attested finite verb, infinitive, or participial form of ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι, ἐξανδραποδίζεσθαι, as well as of the verbal nouns ἀνδραποδισμός and ἐξανδραπόδισις, regardless of the verbal variables of tense, mood, voice, person, and number, and of the substantive variables of gender, number, and case. Even more importantly, "νδραποδι" as the sole search item brings forth every attested object of the verbs, participles, and verbal nouns. This made it possible to review whether adult male fighters by any name (be they

---

[30] *Il.* 6.450–55, 8.164–66, 19.291–99, 20.193–94; *Od.* 9.39–42; and see Gaca 2008: 149. In the conquest of Troy as retold with historiographic wording, "the Achaean forces andrapodized the city and ravaged its nearby strongholds and forts" (Ἀχαιοὶ ἀνδραποδισάμενοι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ συνέγγυς χωρία καὶ φρούρια δηιώσαντες, Hellanicus in Dion Hal. 1.47.3 = *FrGH* F 1a 4, fr. 31).

[31] The thoroughness of the killing in battle or through slaughter varies depending on the incident, from total massacre (e.g., Thuc. 4.47.3–48.6) or being killed in battle to the last defender (e.g., Arr. *Anab.* 2.27.7) to the more prevalent mixed norm of some men adolescent and older being killed or slaughtered while others escape with their lives (e.g., Diod. Sic. 19.8.3–5 on some men of Syracuse escaping the slaughter of the adult males when Agathocles and his forces took over and ravaged this city in 317 B.C.E.).

[32] Pritchett 1991: 226–34 combines the enslaved male prisoners of war and the andrapodized non-combatants in one "Catalogue of Enslavement after Battles and Sieges."

[33] Given this distinction, the enslaved fighters do turn out to be something of a class unto themselves, subjugated prisoners of war (δέσμιοι) on a permanent basis, unless they manage to be ransomed back.

soldiers, hoplites, mercenaries, peltasts, horsemen, slingers, bowmen, or other) are said to be andrapodized through late antiquity when they are taken and kept alive as subjugates or slaves. Striking but true, they are not.[34] Hence, as a sustained but hitherto unrecognized norm in Greek, armed aggressors do not andrapodize defeated fighters when they subjugate them and keep them alive. The sights of the andrapodizing dimension of warfare are instead set in a premeditated and systematic way on those who do not know how to wage war, and especially the women and children.

A REDEFINITION OF ANDRAPODIZING

Even though andrapodizing does mean "enslave or reduce to slavery," it is problematic in two additional respects to regard this definition as adequate. First, this meaning fails to convey the chilling methods of military violence

---

[34] I reviewed 1,261 *TLG* passages by searching "νδραποδι" on the 2002 CD Rom edition, which is preferable to the online version for my interests in concentrating primarily on ancient sources on andrapodizing stopping no later than 1453 C.E., the end of the Byzantine era. Of these passages, in one instance soldiers are andrapodized and then killed: Scythian warriors and armed supporters of Spintamenes andrapodized a few Macedonian soldiers who took refuge on an island, and then killed them (Arr. *Anab.* 4.5.9). An arguably similar instance appears in Procop. *Vand.* 3.22.17–18, in which Gizerich with his Vandal forces "killed many in Zacynthus, andrapodized about five hundred of those in high repute (τῶν δοκίμων ἐς πεντακοσίους ἀνδραποδίσας), ... and then cut their bodies to pieces" prior to 533 C.E. This instance is similar on the reasonable (but by no means certain) inference that τῶν δοκίμων means τῶν δοκίμων ἀνδρῶν. Some of these δόκιμοι may have been women, for when armed forces subject captives to sadistic torture, women are known to have been included, Diod Sic. 20.71.1–5 (Agathocles in Egesta in 307 B.C.E.) and 33.14.1–3 (Diegylis against Thracians perceived to be hostile in c. 145 B.C.E.). Antiochene fighters are said to be andrapodized and left alive in late October 969 C.E., but they first emasculated themselves by throwing away their arms in abject surrender and begging for mercy once Byzantine Roman forces took Antioch by force on October 28 of that year (Ἀντιοχεῖς δὲ πρὸς τοσαύτην στρατιὰν μηδὲ ἀντωπεῖν ἐξισχύοντες, τὰ ὅπλα ῥίψαντες, εἰς ἱκετείαν ἐτράποντο. οὓς ὁ στρατοπεδάρχης ἀνδραποδισάμενος ... τήν πόλιν κατὰ κράτος κατεῖχε), Leo the Deacon (c. 950–after 992, history concerns 959–976), *Historia* in Hase 1828, 5.4, p. 82. In a distinct context that does not pertain to capturing defeated fighters, Appian notes Hannibal's extraordinary punitive measure that pitted one group of Italian troops in his army against another. Hannibal commanded those willing to proceed to Libya with him in 203 B.C.E. to turn their fellow Italian comrades into ἀνδράποδα for being reluctant to go. Only some of the troops complied, because the rest found it unthinkable to andrapodize (ἀνδραποδίσασθαι) fellow soldiers. Hannibal killed off the Italian soldiers in the first group who were willing to go but reluctant to be andrapodizers and the Italian soldiers in the second group who went unclaimed (*Hann.* 247–49).

used to dominate the women and children as well as the remaining popu-lace from whom the children and women are abducted. Second, it focuses strictly on the captives who survive their andrapodizing treatment and live on in a reduced or enslaved social capacity, which is to turn a blind eye to the propensity of andrapodizing to be lethal. Thus, by the definition "enslave or reduce to slavery," we might think that symbols of humiliation that were not themselves life-threatening could have sufficed to reduce captive women and children to slavery, unwarlike and weak as they were compared to the armed aggressors who exerted their control over them. Perhaps the captive women, girls, and boys only had their hair cut slave-style, their bodies clothed with scraps, and their birth names revoked,[35] and other similar practices that were psychologically traumatic but not of the order that would now call for emer-gency room treatment or a funeral service. A clearer grasp of andrapodizing demonstrates the problems with this line of thought.

To begin to comprehend the stunning violence involved in andrapodizing, we should first restore an accurate and forthright definition that dates back to late antiquity. As stated by the fifth-century C.E. lexicographer Hesychius, ἀνδραποδίζειν is "forceful assault" (βιάζειν) and "superiority in power" (ὑπεραίρειν)[36] on the part of soldiers when they carry out "the taking of cap-tives by the spear" (αἰχμαλωτίζειν).[37] As confirmed by Homer and Diodorus, "taking (ἀλ-) by the spear (αἰχμ-)" is no mere figure of speech. Soldiers used their spears as weapons, the blunt end in particular, to immobilize women and children and to cudgel them into submission. In the *Odyssey,* a grieving woman throws herself on her dying husband who is wounded while fighting in defense of their town, only for her armed captors to strike her on the back and shoulders with their spears and to take her away into a dismal life of slavery.[38] Similarly, in 333–332 B.C.E., Alexander's Macedonian warriors and

[35] Slave-style haircut: Pl. *Alc.* 120b2–3 and schol. 120b Greene; clothing scraps: Isocr. *Epist. Archid.* 9.10: renamed: the young Sikan girl renamed Lais ("Booty-girl") and used as a *hetaera* (Plut. *Nic.* 15.4) and the attractive young spear captive from Pydna renamed Antigone (Plut. *Alex.* 48.4). "Antigone" was a fairly popular name for a female slave in antiquity (*GDI* 1722 [τὸ γένος Ἰουδαία], 1788, 1929, 1956).

[36] For this sense of ὑπεραίρειν, see Polyb. 5.85.3; Diod. Sic. 16.83.2; and Procop. *Vand.* 4.2.17, 4.24.2, 5.16.6, 5.27.23, 5.29.12, 6.13.10, 6.23.21, 6.29.33, 7.1.8, 7.4.6, 7.13.25, 7.21.7, 8.11.55.

[37] Hesych. s.v. ἀνδραποδίζει Latte.

[38] *Od.* 8.523–30: ὡς δὲ γυνὴ κλαίῃσι φίλον πόσιν ἀμφιπεσοῦσα,/ ὅς τε ἑῆς πρόσθεν πόλιος λαῶν τε πέσῃσιν,/ ἄστεϊ καὶ τεκέεσσιν ἀμύνων νηλεὲς ἦμαρ·/ ἡ μὲν τὸν θνήσκοντα καὶ ἀσπαίροντα ἰδοῦσα / ἀμφ᾽ αὐτῷ χυμένη λίγα κωκύει· οἱ δέ τ᾽ ὄπισθε / κόπτοντες δούρεσσι μετάφρενον ἠδὲ καὶ ὤμους / εἴρερον εἰσανάγουσι, πόνον τ᾽ ἐχέμεν καὶ ὀϊζύν.

multi-ethnic mercenaries at Issus chased down the young women in Darius's
Persian entourage and immobilized them by striking their bodies with the
blunt ends of their spears (ταῖς στάθμαῖς τῶν δοράτων τύπτοντες, Diod. Sic.
17.35.7). Hence, when soldiers andrapodize captives, they engage in armed
and aggravated assault against their bodily persons.[39] The verb αἰχμαλωτίζειν
indicates the use of weapons in this assault, and βιάζειν signifies related forms
of aggravated physical assault at the time of taking and dominating those who
do not know how to wage war. In addition to βιάζειν and βία, passages con-
cerned with andrapodizing also use their virtual synonyms ὕβρις and ὑβρίζειν,
as well as the intensifying compound forms ἐξυβρίζειν and καθυβρίζειν, to
signify this forceful aggression "against the bodies" (εἰς τὰ σώματα) primar-
ily of women and children when they are andrapodized as war captives.[40] It
is important to elucidate the precise nature of the bodily assault signified
by βιάζειν and ὑβρίζειν, and its dimension of sexual violence in particular.
However, this practice of warfare as en masse sexual violence against their
bodies is a major topic that lies beyond the scope of this article.[41]

The verb αἰχμαλωτίζειν and cognate forms have another important
function in the representation of andrapodizing that goes far beyond He-
sychius's use of it to signify the bludgeoning of women and children being
captured. Greek tragedy does not use ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι or cognate verb
forms and instead uses αἰχμαλωτίζειν, αἰχμαλωτεύειν, and its cognates as
a more restrained and decorous synonym to refer to the andrapodizing of
captive women and girls.[42] With one exception, the Septuagint does the same
to signify the andrapodizing of those who do not know how to wage war.[43]

[39] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 8.18.4 likewise stresses that andrapodizing is an assault on
the bodies of captives.

[40] Ἐξυβρίζειν: Hippoc. *Ep.* 27, line 32; καθυβρίζειν: Theodosius the Deacon, *De Creta
capta* 1022–25 in Criscuolo 1979.

[41] Gaca 2008: 165n59, as well as Kern 1999: 158–62. Pritchett 1991: 239: "Physical vio-
lence to maidens and women was apt to occur on the night of the capture of a besieged
city." Ducrey 1999: 113: "La prise d'une ville était habituellement suivie de la réduction
en esclavage des femmes, ou en tout cas de leur rapt." Harris 1979: 52–53: rape was "com-
monplace" in aggressive Roman warfare. See too Schaps 1983: 203–4 and Volkmann and
Horsmann 1990: 10.

[42] Similarly, in Greek tragedy, andrapodized girls and young women are not called
ἀνδράποδα. They are αἰχμαλωτίς/αἰχμαλωτίδες: Aesch. fr. 47a, line 77 in *TrGF* 3; Eur.
Andr. 962, 1059; *Hec.* 615, 1016, 1096; *Tro.* 28, 296–97; *Phoen.* 185–89, 563–65; Soph. *Aj.*
1228; αἰχμάλωτος/αἰχμάλωτοι: Eur. *Andr.* 871, 908, 932, 1243; *Hec.* 267–68, 822, 881; *Tro.*
35, 677–78; Soph. *Trach.* 417–18; *Locrian Ajax* fr. 10f, line 10 in *TrGF* 4. Αἰχμαλώτιδες is
the title of one of Sophocles' lost tragedies, frr. 33a–59 in *TrGF* 4.

[43] Only once is ἀνδράποδα used in the Septuagint: 3 Macc. 7:5.

Later Greek historical narratives, patristic writings, and other sources that are informed by tragedy, by the Septuagint, or by both the Septuagint and tragedy on occasion do likewise. Hence, these passages too count as evidence for andrapodizing, and are drawn upon below as appropriate. It is sobering to see that the inflicting of blunt force trauma is andrapodizing at its most decorous and restrained. Yet αἰχμαλωτίζειν and cognates are understandable as a less degrading way to refer to ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι, for the weapon-to-body attack indicated by αἰχμαλωτίζειν is at least reminiscent of how the fighting male defenders are killed in action with valor.

ANDRAPODIZING: THE ROUND-UP, SORTING, AND FORCIBLE REMOVAL

Even though several procedural steps are involved in andrapodizing a populace of inhabitants from start to finish, Greek historical memory mainly discloses the forcible removal or driving off (ἄγειν) of women and children from the defeated city, village, rural area, or other locale. To see only this step of andrapodizing, however, is like looking only at cuts of prime tenderloin in the showcase and thinking that this alone is what is meant by "meat packing." To begin to understand the andrapodizing of war captives in full, we need to start with the equivalent of the cattle before they are taken to the slaughterhouse and cut apart into grades of meat, that is, with the populace diverse in sex and age that is first captured, with the most desirable women and children among them, once its line of armed male defense fails.

When the populace in a walled city is conquered as a whole, the first step of andrapodizing is to drive the inhabitants (ἐνοικοῦντες) into submission en masse through aggressive armed assault.[44] Those who are subjected to this treatment are the people living there in all their diversity minus the fighting males who are already killed. This includes females of all ages, from infants to the elderly, males too young or too old to have been fighting in defense, and, where applicable, some fighting male defenders caught and kept alive, at least for the time being. Also included is a group treated as barely visible in antiquity, but one that is a visible presence in Byzantine Greek war narratives: adult men among the non-combatant populace who have neither the training nor the arms nor the inclination to live by the sword.[45] In the Byzantine era,

---

[44] Joseph. *BJ* 1.65–66, 2.68.

[45] The presence of non-fighting adult males among a captured populace is occasionally acknowledged in antiquity, such as the captured and base non-fighters (τὸ ἀγεννές) in the Latin town of Corniculus, who were classified with the women and children as ἀνδράποδα in Dion. Hal. 3.49.3. See too schol. Aesch. *Septem* 330–331 Smith.

this includes devout Christians and farmers kept in submissive dependence on armed overlords for protection.[46]

Because a terrified populace does not submit easily, the conquering soldiers at this point employ an intensely violent mayhem against them that includes killing female and male members of the populace in a seemingly indiscriminate manner in order to stun the remaining survivors into submission.[47] At first glance, this approach to induce collective submission may seem paradoxical, like turning up the flames on people in a burning building that has accidentally caught fire. Flames, however, are all-engulfing and the trapped people are not at war, whereas the populace in a city being sacked are in a fear-stricken last stand that is like a desperate street riot. The assailants confront and overthrow the uproar through crowd-control killing and bludgeoning,[48] which does not engulf everyone in the populace despite its ferocity. Once the surviving populace is subdued through this mayhem, the soldiers then round up the remaining inhabitants into various places inside or outside the city while the captives are in a dazed shock. The dominant

[46] Devout Christian men: Caminiates, *Expug. Thess.* 16.6 in Frendo and Fotiou 2000; farmers: Cantacuzenus, vol. 1, p. 192. Frendo 1997 and Frendo and Fotiou 2000: xxxvii–xxxix have refuted Kazhdan's argument that Caminiates' narrative is a fifteenth-century fiction, which means that Kazhdan's skepticism on this point in his 1991 *ODB* entry on Caminiates (s.v. Kaminiates) is now out of date.

[47] In 409 B.C.E., for example, Carthaginian forces in Selinous "killed off little children, women, and old men alike, differentiating them by neither sex nor age" (οὐ διακρίνοντες οὔτε φύσιν οὔθ' ἡλικίαν, ἀλλ' ὁμοίως παῖδας νηπίους, γυναῖκας, πρεσβύτας ἐφόνευον, Diod. Sic. 13.57.2). See App. *Pun.* 610–20 on the conspicuous slaughter of inhabitants of Carthage by Roman soldiers at the outset of their destruction of the city in 146 B.C.E., followed by them tearing down the remaining buildings and shoveling together rubble and remaining inhabitants dead and alive into pits to create passable ways through the wreckage and carnage. As further noted by Caminiates 39.1–5 about the conquest of Thessalonica in 904 C.E., "When the barbarians on the attack were apportioned [sectors] throughout the whole city, immediately every age group and every class of persons was killed off by them. For they had no pity ... but the old man, the young man, every male who happened to be in their path was a job for the bloody slaughterers ... At the start of the danger, they did not even spare the women or the children themselves ... The cutting down was done equally to all" (ὡς γὰρ κατὰ πᾶσαν εἰσελθόντες διεμερίσθησαν τὴν πόλιν οἱ βάρβαροι, εὐθὺς πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀνήρητο. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν οἶκτος οὐδείς ... ἀλλὰ καὶ γέρων καὶ ἀκμάζων ἔτι καὶ νεανίσκος καὶ πᾶς ὁ προστυχὼν ἔργον τοῖς μιαιφόνοις ἦν ... οὐδὲ γυναικῶν ἐφείσαντο κατ' ἀρχας τοῦ κινδύνου, οὐδὲ παίδων αὐτῶν ... ἀλλ' ἦν ἐπ' ἴσης ἅπασιν ἡ τομή).

[48] See, e.g., the violent but short-lived takeover of Syracuse by the tyrant Dionysius's forces under Nypsios in 356–355 B.C.E. (Diod. Sic. 16.19.2–4) and the sack of Thessalonica in 904 C.E. by Leo of Tripoli and his forces (Caminiates 39.1–42.4, 45.1–7).

armed forces preferably complete this task by nightfall to prevent captives from escaping in the dark.[49]

At this point in the andrapodizing, the captured people herded together here and there still resemble an ordinary town populace in their sex and age, minus the adult male fighters and crowd-control casualties. They are "women, children at their peak, newborn infants, men and old people" (γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδες ἀκμάζοντες καὶ ἀρτιγενῆ βρέφη καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γέροντες), as stated in the scholia on Aeschylus's *Septem* 330–31 Smith. Similarly, as Caminiates puts it, they are "men, women, those in the bloom of youth, and children, everyone altogether" (ἄνδρας, γυναῖκας, ἀκμάζοντας, παῖδας ὁμοῦ πάντας) in lamentation (60.6). Further, when Mehmed and his Turkish forces took Constantinople in 1453, they went house by house, from which they kept "taking as their spear-conquered captives men, women, children, the elderly, the youthful, priests and monks—simply put, every age and every social rank" (ἀπάγοντες αἰχμαλώτους ἄνδρας, γυναῖκας, παῖδας, πρεσβύτας, νέους, ἱερεῖς, μοναχούς, πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν καὶ τάξιν ἁπλῶς), as Critobulus observes (1.61.5). To put it more precisely, the rounded-up groups of inhabitants still include infants and toddlers of both sexes, little boys and girls, more fully grown but still prepubescent girls and boys, adolescent girls, young and somewhat more mature women of childbearing age, women and men beyond their prime, some of whom are elderly, as well as some non-fighting men.

Once the groups are under sufficient control and their takeover is reasonably free of risk from surprise counterattack, the armed aggressors begin their andrapodizing selection and distribution. The precise allocation of tasks here is not uniform and many of its details remain unclear. Nonetheless, the armed fighters along with their leaders start picking through the captives somewhat like fruit scattered at their feet in order to select for forcible removal those considered ripe and ready or still green but close enough to ripening, but in any event free of daily maternal dependency—young, malleable, and female in the majority. In other words, the most desired persons in the gathered populace, the community's cornucopia, are its "group of the spear-conquered inhabitants at their youthful peak" (τὸ ἀκμαῖον τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, Leo the Deacon,

---

[49] By the end of the day, captives including "the mature in age and those still very young (τούς τε ἐντελεῖς τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ τοὺς ἔτι κομιδῇ νέους) were, at the command of the ill omen-named beast [Leo (i.e., λέων) of Tripoli] all separated by the barbarian forces and heaped together into different places, and they posted guards to keep watch on them, so that no one could escape from their midst" (πάντων προστάξει τοῦ δυσωνύμου θηρὸς κατὰ διαφόρους τόπους σωρηδὸν ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἀφορισθέντων, οἷς καὶ φύλακας ἐφήδρευσαν ὑποβλέπεσθαι τούτους διὰ πάσης νυκτός, μή πού τις ἐκ μέσου διαδρᾶναι δυνηθείη, Caminiates 57.2).

Historia 2.8, p. 27 Hase), that is, young women, adolescent girls, semi-grown but prepubescent girls and boys, and girls and boys who are even younger but past the age of needing to be fed, cleaned, or changed.

This principle of selection is further confirmed in the Old Testament. Micah stresses the elders' grief in response to attacks on settlements in Judah: "Shave and cut your hair because of your delicate children ... for they have been taken away from you as spear-conquered captives" (1:16). Most memorably, Deuteronomy issues its didactic warning to Israel to obey or else "your sons and daughters will be given to a different people; you will look at them with mortified eyes, and you will not be able to lift a hand" to protect them (28:32).[50]

Select figs and grapes, however, are handled with care to protect them from bruising, whereas very rough handling is the norm to pull the chosen captives away from the unwanted rejects, their own elderly or newborn relatives, as well as from one another. As Caminiates puts it, based on his eyewitness experience, "a mixed and intense cry of lamentation would arise from the people being forced apart, close relatives crying out to one another, outraged at being separated ... for in this way they were divided with physical force from one another in a confused way."[51] The confusion here reflects the chaotic consternation of the people outraged at being sorted by sex and age into those to take away and those to leave behind. The armed forces knew exactly whom they wanted and were not confused in the slightest.

Among the rejects are the elderly, as well as infants and toddlers still dependant on breastfeeding. They are not wanted because they are too needy and helpless to be likely to survive. Regarding the elderly, as stated by Choricius the rhetor (c. 490–543 c.e.), "the passage of time has made old age useless for servitude" (τὸ δὲ γῆρας ὅσον εἰς διακονίαν ἀνόνητον ὁ χρόνος ἐποίησε,

---

[50] Mic. 1:16 is likely original to the prophet and as such dates to 720–693 b.c.e. (the reign of Hezekiah) and possibly earlier. The code of laws in Deuteronomy likely dates to c. 640–609 b.c.e. (the reign of Josiah) and at least provides a terminus post quem for Deut. 28:32. It is conceivable that Isa. 23:4 might also be relevant here, regarding the city of Sidon's lament "I did not nurture my youthful boys and I did not raise my youthful girls" (23:4). However, this verse on Sidon is perhaps too allusive to permit a definitive interpretation or a clear date. The collection of prophecies in Isaiah existed by 180 b.c.e. Translations here are from the Septuagint, which in all three verses offers a reasonable counterpart to the respective Hebrew Bible versions.

[51] Ὁπότε συμμιγής τις καὶ σφοδρὸς ἀνήγερτο θρῆνος διχοτομουμένης τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλήλους τοὺς ἀγχιστεῖς ἀνακαλουμένους καὶ τὸν χωρισμὸν δυσχεραίνοντας ... ὡς γὰρ βιαίως οὕτως ἐξ ἀλλήλων διαιρεθέντες φύρδην (Caminiates 60.5–6). When the captives became aware of being sorted and separated from one another, they resisted by trying to hold on to one another like an unbreakable chain (σειρὰν ἄλυτον, Caminiates 72.2).

35.2.128), and hence the soldiers tend to leave them aside when determining which captives to abduct.[52]

Xenophon in the *Anabasis* confirms that old people are scarcely worth a glance when seen with a military eye trained in andrapodizing. After Cyrus the Younger was beheaded in 401 B.C.E., Xenophon and Timasion, his fellow leader of a contingent of Greek mercenaries, were seeking to regroup with another contingent of Arcadian fellow mercenaries on a designated hilltop near Calpe Harbor in Thrace, all of whom were involved in abducting captive ἀνδράποδα and stealing sheep from the area (6.3.2–4). Timasion and his cavalry later encountered on the hilltop only a few elderly Thracian rejects whom the Arcadian mercenaries, already having escaped from this designated meeting spot due to Thracian counterattacks, had left behind (καταλελειμμένους) because they were too old to be worth taking, along with several meager head of livestock. Timasion, given his trained eye, underscores their purported worthlessness as old women and men by curtly naming them with the pejorative diminutives γραίδια and γερόντια, "useless little old women and men." As far as he is concerned, they are good only for possibly pointing out to him the direction the Arcadian mercenaries went (*An.* 6.3.22–23)—mercenaries who no doubt took away their daughters, grandchildren, and other youthful relatives along with their prime head of livestock, as was their usual practice both here (*An.* 6.3.3) and elsewhere (*An.* 4.1.12–14, 6.6.38, 7.7.50–57).

Infants and toddlers, conversely, are too young for servitude. They are almost guaranteed to die in transport, for malnourishment and thirst are the norm, and mothers and wet-nurses cease lactating and may even die themselves under these conditions (Caminiates 67.1, 68.7, 71.10). However, to leave infants with their young mothers can be expedient for inducing the mothers to go along without resistance. These young women are eminently desirable to abduct due to their obvious fecundity and success at giving birth; and they are more likely to cooperate in their own abduction if their infants remain with them.[53] Nonetheless, after soldiers or their middlemen buyers

---

[52] The difficulty of the aged struggling to keep up the pace as refugees is described by Diodorus: in the pell-mell evacuation from Camarina in 405 B.C.E., the elderly (οἱ πρεσβύτεροι) "were compelled, contrary to nature, to rush along with those in their prime" (παρὰ φύσιν ἀναγκαζομένους ἅμα τοῖς ἀκμάζουσιν ἐπισπεύδειν, Diod. Sic. 13.111.6). This is not to suggest that all elderly war captives were always rejects, only that very many were most of the time, unlike the legend of Hecuba and the account in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 10.26.2–3: γυναῖκας δὲ καὶ παῖδας αὐτῶν [τῶν Λατίνων] καὶ τὰ γηραιὰ τῶν σωμάτων ἠνδραποδίσαντο.

[53] Caminiates 72.4. For the desirability of abducting young mothers with infants as captives, see too Synesius (370–413 C.E.), *Catastases*, *Orat.* 2.3 in Terzaghi 1944. As a

forcibly remove their chosen war captives, commonly left behind are little children or toddlers (παιδάρια μικρά) because they are too young to walk and feed themselves, and those in old age (οἱ διὰ γῆρας καταλειπόμενοι) because the elderly cannot keep up with the pace of the army, let alone sell for a profit or survive long being exploited themselves.[54]

Demosthenes corroborates this norm of andrapodizing the young and youthful in his unforgettable first-person description of the ravaged Phocian countryside, which he viewed when traveling to Delphi somewhat prior to 343 B.C.E. In the years between 356 and 352, as part of the destructive Third Sacred War, Theban forces had been ravaging the countryside of Phocis in order to retaliate in kind for the brazen opportunism of the Phocian armed forces, who had sacked Delphi in 356 and plundered the temple of Apollo and its rich sacred offerings as their own mercenary war fund.[55] Regarding this assault on Delphi, Theopompus notes (b. c. 378 B.C.E.), "Phocian forces had the audacity to kill the adolescent males of Delphi (Δελφῶν τοὺς ἡβῶντας ἀποκτεῖναι), to andrapodize the women and children (γυναῖκας καὶ

general military norm, young mothers are wanted as andrapodized captives due in part to their reproductive capacity. Regarding captive young mothers, Moses's punitive sexual purity rule in *Num.* 31:15–18 is historically anomalous, for he requires that the Israelite armed forces kill all the already sexually active Midianite women whom they have taken captive, and to keep as live captives only the virgins. To Moses's outrage, however, the Israelite armed forces initially act in accordance with the cross-cultural military norm of abducting young mothers who have already shown their procreative capacity, as well as preadolescent girls and adolescent maidens.

[54] Xen. *Ages.* 1.20–22. Xenophon commends Agesilaus for astutely tending to the abandoned small children and old people so that they survive rather than being attacked by wolves or dogs turned feral. Agesilaus views those who are too young or too old to take as captives somewhat as fishermen view fish that they throw back into the lake. The old people and little children can eventually help restock the land with people and cultivate it anew. In this way, armies in future years can count on them and their descendants to continue providing the armies with the food supply and choice captives that soldiers need to live by force of arms, whereas rural areas that are totally depopulated and devastated are in effect fished out because they do not provide armies with any youthful war captives to andrapodize or domesticated herd animals to kill and eat or seasonal harvests to steal.

[55] This, at any rate, is how the Phocian armed assault on Delphi is now understood (see Buckler 1989). However, if one could hear the Phocians' own version, they would almost certainly maintain that their actions were justified on some grounds, for in the annals of andrapodizing and plundering in Greek historical sources, the aggressors tend not to regard themselves as merely brazen opportunists. Rather, they are for various reasons stirred up and passionate about believing that their en masse violence is in some sense right, even if only as a pretext that those looking from the outside or in retrospect can see through.

τέκνα ἐξανδραποδίσασθαι), and to overthrow the very city to its foundations (καταβαλεῖν δὲ καὶ αὐτὴν ἐς ἔδαφος τὴν πόλιν)," as well as to loot Apollo's temple precinct (Theopomp. *FrGH* fr. 312 = Paus. 3.10.3–5). Demosthenes provides eloquent witness to the retributive payback in kind that Theban forces wreaked on the populace of Phocis, especially the ruined houses, destroyed fortifications, and the ravaged populace in the Phocian countryside bereft of its youthful sector and limited to "pitiable old people" as well as "a few young women and children," who either would have eluded capture or would have been too young at the time for the Theban forces to take away: "It was a fearsome and moving sight. For when we went to Delphi, it was unavoidable for us to see all these things, houses destroyed, defensive walls torn down, the countryside emptied of those in their youth, pitiable old people and but a few young women and children; as a whole, no one could come close in a verbal account to the evils that are still now there."[56]

Given the picking and choosing involved in andrapodizing, the captive women and children who are sure to be selected for forced removal are a clearly defined and specifically targeted subgroup of choice young women, girls, and boys—the counterpart to the prime tenderloin with which we began. They are not women and children of all ages. Among the many spear-conquered captives (αἰχμάλωτα) taken alive at Olynthus in 348 b.c.e. by Philip and his

---

[56] Θέαμα δεινόν ... καὶ ἐλεεινόν· ὅτε γὰρ νῦν ἐπορευόμεθα εἰς Δελφούς, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἦν ὁρᾶν ἡμῖν πάντα ταῦτα, οἰκίας κατεσκαμμένας, τείχη περιῃρημένα, χώραν ἔρημον τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ, γύναια δὲ καὶ παιδάρια ὀλίγα καὶ πρεσβύτας ἀνθρώπους οἰκτρούς· ὅλως δὲ οὐδ' ἂν εἷς δύναιτ' ἐφικέσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τῶν ἐκεῖ κακῶν νῦν ὄντων (Dem. 19.65 in Macdowell 2000). To translate χώραν ἔρημον τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ as "a country deprived of men of military age," as Macdowell 2000: 87 and others do (e.g., "a countryside all emptied of its young men," Vince and Vince 1926: 289), is to ignore and fail to account for why the γύναια δὲ καὶ παιδάρια are eerily few (ὀλίγα) in number in the Phocian countryside, as Demosthenes expressly points out in order to explain what he means by "the countryside emptied of those in their youth." For added confirmation that ἐν ἡλικίᾳ applies to young women too, see, e.g., *Pl. Rep.* 461b4–8; Plut. *Rom.* 21.7. The young women and children are few in Phocis because they are the primary targets for war enemies to andrapodize and abduct in their youth and pre-adolescence, just like the dismal ὄχλος of about thirty γύναια καὶ παιδάρια given by Philip to Atrestidas for him to take away—a tiny fraction of the myriad women and children andrapodized at Olynthus by Philip's Macedonian forces (Dem. 19.305–6). As Synesius further confirms, "youth (νεότης) is driven off spear-conquered"—this in reference to the women, girls, and boys andrapodized in the region of Pentapolis by Ausourian forces (*Catastases, Orat.* 2.3). The young Phocian males of military age would also have been missing from the Phocian countryside through which Demosthenes passed, but this would be due to their having been killed in battle or caught and slaughtered by Theban forces, or being still alive but in hiding.

forces, the young women and children who can survive without intensive daily nurture are the ones put into the line-ups to be taken elsewhere. This includes the roughly thirty γύναια καὶ παιδάρια whom Philip's Mantinean fighter Atrestidas was seen to have, as his gift from Philip, when departing from his commander with his premier andrapodized haul (Dem. 19.305–6). Similarly, Polybius observes, after Aetolian attackers in league with Roman forces andrapodized the city of the Anticyreans in 211 B.C.E., "the Roman forces led off the children and women (τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας), who were clearly about to suffer (πεισόμενα) what it is reasonable to expect for those who fall under the powers of foreign peoples" (9.39.2–3).

Caminiates, however, most forcefully illuminates this routine selection and trafficking in the andrapodized bodies of young women, girls, and boys. Of the captives taken from Thessalonica in 904 C.E. and crammed onto available ships by Leo of Tripoli and his largely Hagarene forces, "the throng was twenty-two thousand, not one male of whom had a beard, except for those of us kept under guard for a prisoner exchange. No woman in all these thousands was mature in age. This city populace was selected and young, each one, as it were, rivaling the other in their bloom of youth and shapely beauty, even though their series of troubles forced them to be estranged from their physiques" (73.2–4).

Andrapodizing is consequently a systematic procedure for liquidating an overthrown populace that involves intense dehumanizing violence every step of the way. It leaves no member of a captive populace unscathed given the crowd-control killings, the round-up, the sorting and separating of family members from one another, and the ensuing forcible removal primarily of the young and the youthful. Some of the girls, women, and boys are kept by various officers and soldiers, and the rest are sold to other buyers or shipped off to other locations. In this ruthless culling of the youth in a city or other locale, everyone else living there is seriously harmed and an untold number are killed, many of them deliberately.[57] It is in this sense that all of the non-fighting inhabitants are subjected to andrapodizing, for the collective assault strikes and devastates each and every one of them in premeditated and variable ways depending on their sex and age, including those who manage to escape.

In light of this selectivity, it stands to reason that the killings during the initial crowd-control andrapodizing would generally not be the indiscriminate rampage it understandably appears to be in the melee. The rampage would

---

[57] See Procop. *Pers.* 2.5.26–33 for an extreme example (the overthrow of Sura by Chosroes and his Persian forces in 540 C.E.), in which everyone is killed except for those who are forcibly removed.

proceed, where possible,[58] with a discriminating focus mainly to cut down those who were not wanted anyway—the too old and too young of both sexes, as well as many of the remaining adult men, fighters and non-fighters alike.[59] As Procopius points out, for example, even when Belisarius's Roman forces were killing inhabitants of Naples in a purportedly indiscriminate manner in 536 C.E., supposedly "sparing no age group" (οὐδεμίας ἡλικίας φειδόμενοι) in this "great slaughter" (φόνος πολύς) to subdue the remaining Neapolitan populace, they at the same time also kept "breaking into houses and andrapodized children and women" (ἔς τε τὰς οἰκίας ἐσβάλλοντες, παῖδας μὲν καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν, *Goth.* 5.10.28–29).[60] These the soldiers indubi-

---

[58] In some circumstances, there would be no capacity to discriminate in the crowd-control slaughter, such as in 540 C.E., when Chosroes' cavalrymen had their horses trample over those Antiochene men, women, and children alike who rushed to flee toward the city gates (Procop. *Pers.* 2.8.18–19), or in the 550s C.E., when the Misimian stronghold and its environs were torched too soon by John Dacnas and his Roman army, such that the casualty count of women and children killed in the fire was very great (Agathias 20.7, cf. 19.4).

[59] It is at this point that the notorious baby-killing (Kern 1999: 85, 340, 354) can be carried out as conspicuous slaughter. As stated in the scholia on Aeschylus's *Septem*, "Here," when the city is being sacked (πόλιν ... περθομέναν, *Sept.* 321–32), "Aeschylus set forth these points, how they maul the women and slaughter their infants" (ταῦτα Αἰσχύλος ἐνταῦθα ἐξέθετο, πῶς τε τὰς γυναῖκας ἕλκουσι καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν βρέφη σφάττουσι, schol. Aesch. *Sept* 326i Smith). So too Agathias 4.19.5: "Many Misimian children were seized crying and shouting for their mothers. Some the Roman soldiers hurled down and mangled brutally on the rocks. Others they tossed in the air, as though they were playing some sort of game, and caught them on the sharp ends of their spears" (παῖδες δὲ πολλοὶ κλαυθμυριζόμενοί τε τὰς τεκούσας ἀναβοῶντες ἡλίσκοντο καὶ τούτων τοὺς μὲν κατὰ τῶν πετρῶν ἀφειδῶς ἀκοντίζοντες διεσπάραττον· ἔνιοι δὲ ὥσπερ ἐν παιδιᾷ ἐς ὕψος ἀνερρίπτοντο καὶ εἶτα τῷ ἄχθει ἀντιφερόμενοι ὀρθίοις τοῖς δόρασιν ὑποδεχθέντες ἐν τῷ μετεώρῳ διεπερονῶντο). Leo the Deacon (9.6, p. 149) notes that armed "Scythian" forces retreating in advance of Byzantine forces slaughtered most of their captives (αἰχμάλωτοι) and strangled and submerged infants and roosters as offerings to the Ister River in 971 C.E. (Leo distinguishes these "Scythians" from the Russian army [ἡ Ῥωσικὴ πανοπλία/στρατιά, 9.7, 9.11, pp. 151, 156], but their ethnicity is now uncertain. Perhaps they were Magyars, Huns, or Turks [Loretto 1961: 166].) Cantacuzenus (vol. 2, p. 596) likewise describes the practice, in this case against inhabitants of Mysia by Turkish forces in the mid-fourteenth century: "What wrong did the people do, farmers and women and small infants, who were slaughtered daily and handed over to slavery and raised by barbarian customs and ways and were led to become apostates from God the creator?" (τί γὰρ ἠδικήκασιν ἄνθρωποι γεωργοὶ καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ βρέφη νήπια, ἃ καθημέραν κατασφάττεται καὶ πρὸς δουλείαν ἀποδίδοται καὶ ἤθεσι καὶ νόμοις ἐντρέφεται βαρβαρικοῖς καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀφίστασθαι ἐνάγεται θεοῦ τοῦ πλάσαντος)?

[60] See too Pachymeres (1242–c. 1310, history concerns 1260–1308) on this home-invasion aspect of andrapodizing violence, in which the Italian forces who asserted

tably kept alive, for in the unusual case of Naples, Belisarius did a volte-face upon finishing the conquest of the city and ordered his soldiers to restore the children and women to any surviving adult male family members, rather than allow the women and children to be abused further and then abducted on a permanent basis. While permitting his soldiers to keep all the material goods they plundered, Belisarius made sure that the women in particular were given back to the men of Naples—the ones not already killed by his forces, at any rate.[61] The seemingly random slaughter in the crowd-control killing is therefore not at all random. Inhabitants with little or no resale value are the main persons killed off. Their slaughter serves as a showpiece of power to stun the remaining populace into submission, especially the young and desirable, who are then ordinarily taken away by the army as andrapodized subjugates. Those in the army with the effective decision-making power (be it the commander or soldiers deciding for themselves) then determine which choice captives to keep by various methods of internal distribution, and which captives to sell, as well as when, how, and where the captives to be sold are to change hands on a market external to the army.

When open and more sparsely populated locales are subjected to andrapodizing, such as rural areas and villages, the killing, selection, and forcible separation and removal work in a less regularly sequential way in response to the opportunities and dangers posed by the odd lots of people who are found "at the feet" (ἐν ποσίν) of the soldiers or whom they encounter as "chanced upon" (τοὺς προστυχόντας) in their andrapodizing.[62] When, say, a group of villagers is attacked or uncovered in hiding, we can imagine that any adult male relatives trying to protect them would be killed or disabled; the young and the youthful abducted; and the unwanted left behind dead, alive, or some-

---

their supremacy "took over the houses of the inhabitants and attacked the women in a crazed rage" (ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐποίκων κατασχόντες οἰκίας ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἐπεμαίνοντο, *Andronicus Palaeologus* 6.3 in Bekker 1835: 335D, vol. 2, p. 482).

[61] Procop. *Goth.* 5.10.29–36. Belisarius adopted this measure because he wanted to win Naples over as a sincere subordinate ally, not to elicit the abiding hatred of any survivors merely for his army's pleasure and gain. To commandeer the women and children of adversaries and then return them was a potent way to make conquered inhabitants willing to cooperate with Belisarius out of dumbstruck relief.

[62] Ἐν ποσίν: Procop. *Pers.* 1.17.41; *Goth.* 6.7.30, 7.29.1; τὸ προστυχόν and τοὺς προστυχόντας: Cantacuzenus, vol. 1, p. 188; vol. 2, pp. 396, 594. Ariston of Pella, fr. 1 (in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 4.6) stresses that Roman forces under the prefect Rufus killed Jewish men, women, and children alike in their andrapodizing of rural areas of Palestine during the second Jewish rebellion (132–135 C.E.) in the reign of Hadrian (117–138 C.E.).

where in between.[63] Then the armed band would continue in search of the next group of inhabitants to attack in a similar manner. The desired captives they abduct, and on they proceed until they reach the maximum abduction capacity for the size of their band, at which point they return to camp with their andrapodized herd mainly of young women, girls, and boys.

Consequently, two distinct aspects of andrapodizing aggression need to be clearly differentiated. First, there is the ruthless and selectively lethal maltreatment of the overall populace in the area taken over by force. Then the armed forces pick out and forcibly remove the desired subset from the midst of this populace—primarily the young women as well as children old enough not to need intensive daily nurture to survive, for they are the most appealing, pliable, productive, and lucrative to take and exploit or to sell to others for this purpose. Hence, when Herodotus states that Persian forces "andrapodized the people" (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠνδραποδίσαντο) of Eretria in 490 B.C.E. during their takeover of the city, this refers to the first aspect of andrapodizing the populace (6.101.3–102). When he then refers, with a partitive genitive, to "those of the Eretrians who were andrapodized" (τοὺς δὲ τῶν Ἐρετριέων ἀνδραποδισμένους) in the sense of being hauled away as ἀνδράποδα by ship (6.119.1), or, in other words, "the slaves from Eretria" (τὰ ἐξ Ἐρετρίης ἀνδράποδα), this would be the chosen subset mainly of young women and children taken from the partly lethal shakedown of the populace as a whole. These captives were first moved and kept on the island of Aegilia, and then reloaded on board by Persian forces in retreat (despite Athenian efforts to intercept them) and shipped to King Darius for him to exploit, in this case all together in the bitumen and petroleum fields in Arderikka (6.119.2), just like the unlucky γυναῖκες and ἄνηβοι παῖδες who were a major part of the workforce in the mines near the Red Sea that Agatharchides (c. 215-after 145) describes in the second century B.C.E. (Photius, *Bibl.* 448a).

Similarly, as Herodotus further notes, in 483 B.C.E., after Persian-sponsored forces under Pheretime exacted revenge against the city of Barca for the assassination of Pheretime's son (by conspicuously slaughtering the men

---

[63] This general approach may be inferred, for example, from Xen. *Ages.* 1.20–22; *An.* 4.1.7–14, 6.3.2–5, 7.3.44–48, 7.4.6; and Procop. *Pers.* 4.3.24, 4.4.3. As Procopius indicates, the especially desired children and women (παῖδες καὶ γυναῖκες) to capture and turn into ἀνδράποδα are "the ripe and exceedingly appealing bodies" (σώματα ὡραῖα καὶ ὑπερφυῶς εὐπρεπῆ) for whom soldiers on andrapodizing forays scoured valleys, rugged areas, and caves, even at great risk of danger to themselves, as Belisarius's Roman forces did when they took over the army camp of Gelimer's Vandal forces in Libya in 533 C.E. (*Vand.* 4.3.24, 4.4.3), and then went in pursuit after the women and children who had fled from the camp and gone into hiding.

deemed most culpable and mutilating their women to death by cutting off their breasts), she handed over "the rest of the Barcaeans" to the armed forces "to take as spoils (ληίη)" (4.202.2). This they did by "andrapodizing" (ἀνδραποδισάμενοι) the remaining populace in the first sense of the word (4.203.1), excluding the families of direct descendants of Battus and those considered free of guilt, to whom Pheretime handed over the city. Thereupon the armed forces departed, taking in their train "those of the Barcaeans whom they andrapodized" (ἠνδραποδίσαντο) in the second sense (4.204), referring to the prime captives selected as spoils to forcibly remove, who again would have been primarily young women and self-mobile children. Those captives who survived the trek from Libya to Egypt then continued to be transported as ἀνασπαστοί, "those forcibly removed," from Egypt and presented before King Darius back in Susa, who resettled them together in a town in Bactria also named Barca (4.204).

Herodotus is more forthcoming about the second aspect of andrapodizing in relation to Persian forces subjugating Greek cities in Ionia and Greek island communities in 494 B.C.E., including Miletus, Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos (6.18, 6.32). Regarding Miletus, once the Persian forces killed most of the Milesian men (ἄνδρες), their women and children (γυναῖκες καὶ τέκνα) were turned into slaves (ἀνδράποδα, 6.19.3). These were ones then driven off (ἤγοντο) to Susa,[64] just as the Persian forces drove back (ἀνήγαγον) to Susa the select ἀνδράποδα abducted from among "the people" (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) inhabiting Eretria (6.115, 119). Darius then relocated the Milesian women and children to the city of Ampe near the Red Sea.

Likewise regarding Miletus, Herodotus makes it clear that the andrapodizing of a locale involves killing most of the fighting-age men adolescent and older (not leaving them alive as subjugates), apart from those who escape and elude the aggressors' grasp. This stands to reason on two counts. First, rare would be the community of men who would step aside and yield when armed aggressors seek to abduct and dominate their women and children en masse. Many would have to be killed for this abduction project to proceed. Second, once the aggressors have their target group of young women and children in hand to be taken away, it would be rash for them not to try to eliminate as many of the trained fighters in the community as possible, in order to fend

---

[64] Hdt. 6.20. The participial phrase οἱ ζωγρηθέντες τῶν Μιλησίων here certainly includes the andrapodized Milesian boys, girls, and women. It is possible, however, that this crowd of captives may also have included a few Milesian men, for Herodotus states that most (not all) of the Milesian men (ἄνδρες) were killed by Persian forces (6.19.3). Hence, he may have named these subjugated and deported captives οἱ ζωγρηθέντες τῶν Μιλησίων in recognition of the few Milesian men in this crowd mainly of women and children.

off the likelihood of a counterstrike, even one that was likely to fail, since but a remnant of outraged fighters would be involved.

Among the forcibly removed women and children, it is clear that Persian armies were sure to include "the especially attractive boys and very beautiful girls on the verge of adolescence" (παῖδας εὐειδεστάτους καὶ παρθένους τὰς καλλιστευούσας, Hdt. 6.32). These captives were a kind of crème de la crème that the Persians "picked out" (ἐκλεγόμενοι) to include among the andrapodized women and children to be sent to their king. The boys were castrated as part of being andrapodized (6.32). Herodotus is especially clear about the premeditated and systematic military procedure of andrapodizing the islands, where the Persian forces deployed the dragnet formation (σαγήνη), with the soldiers linking hands and combing the island. This was designed to leave no hiding place undiscovered in their effort to ferret out the populace of inhabitants (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους) in order to abduct the wanted captives from their midst (6.31.2).

Throughout Herodotus's narratives about andrapodizing, the suffering of the rejects among the andrapodized populace—the old, the infants, and very small children—is largely left unstated. The closest he comes to making them visible is to acknowledge that the first aspect of andrapodizing the populace as a whole applied to "the people" (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) in general of Eretria and to "the rest of the Barcaeans" (οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν Βαρκαίων) apart from the families of Battiads and of those deemed uninvolved in killing Pheretime's son. Nonetheless, we may be sure that they were severely maltreated, with a number of them killed, and the surviving remnant subjected to intense grief and suffering, especially when we consider the trawling maneuver of the dragnet.

THE MILITARY GOAL OF ANDRAPODIZING WOMEN AND CHILDREN

The aggressors' drive to andrapodize women and children among their adversaries is further shown in the regular custom of adult male defenders moving their women and children, and occasionally their elders too, to a place of refuge in advance of an attack on their community or region.[65] The children

---

[65] Hdt. 8.40.1; Thuc. 2.6.4, 2.78.3, 4.123.4; Xen. *Cyr.* 4.1.17–18; Arist. fr. 8.44.398 in Plut. *Them.* 10.4–10; Arr. *Anab.* 1.2.2–3; Cass. Dio 37.52.4–5; Dion Hal. *Isoc.* 9; Paus. 2.36.5, 8.27.15–16; Procop. *Vand.* 4.11.18, 5.25.1–10; Nicephorus Gregoras (c. 1290–1361, history concerns 1204–1359), vol. 1, p. 207 (in an acropolis), vol. 2, p. 741 (those inside taken captive, πολέμου νόμοις) in Schopen and Bekker 1829–55; and Chalcocondyles (c. 1425–1490, history concerns 1298–1463), *De rebus turcicis* 2.41B, 7.185B, 7.187B, 8.218B, 9.260A, 9.269B in Migne, *PG* 159. In an urgent evacuation, the sick and the old without friends and family nearby were liable to be left behind, such as in Camarina in 405 B.C.E. (Diod. Sic. 13.111.3).

among the refugees, however, surely would include, as a general norm, tod-
dlers and infants in the women's care, so long as the women taking care of
them received sufficient advance warning to evacuate.[66] So frequent is this
practice that one of the standard roles assigned to women and children in
Greek war narratives from antiquity through the late Byzantine era is that of
refugees being moved and placed out of the way (ὑπεκθέσθαι) to designated
safe places, which may be allied cities, islands, caves, mountains, or strong-
holds.[67] This practice is not a generic wartime protection, such as to prevent
the dependants from being struck by stray ballistics or from being in some
other unpredictable kind of harm's way. Its main purpose is to prevent them
from being andrapodized by the adversary in case the men's armed defense
fails, that is, attacked, dominated, and sorted, with the young women, girls,
and boys being taken away.

This purpose is readily seen in incidents of partial evacuation and when
the ostensible refuge is itself located, attacked, and overthrown by enemy
assault. For example, prior to the siege of Plataea in the Peloponnesian War
(427 B.C.E.), most of the women and children were evacuated to Athens,
aside from the few women who remained behind as bread-makers to feed the
Plataean male fighters. The Lacedaemonian and Theban forces andrapodized
(ἠνδραπόδισαν) these women when they conquered the city (Thuc. 2.78.3–4,
3.68.2). This treatment would have befallen other women and children of
Plataea if they too had remained behind. Similarly, soldiers regularly sought
out guarded strongholds where the enemy's dependants were put to keep
them out of their hands. When the assailants broke in and took over, they

---

[66] When in flight from an onrushing enemy attack, however, mothers were at strong
risk of being separated from their children (Gaca 2008: 150–51). See also Procop. *Pers.*
2.9.9–10 for a striking instance of a captive woman, who refused to let go of her young
child during her flight.

[67] For example, allied cities: Thuc. 2.78.3; Chalcocondyles 7.187B; islands: Arr. *Anab.*
1.2.2–3; caves: Jer. 4:29; Procop. *Pers.* 2.3.17–18; mountains: Hdt. 8.33; Critobulus (15th
c.) 5.11.9; Chalcocondyles 2.41B, 9.269B; strongholds: Joseph. *AJ* 20.85, *Vit.* 58, *BJ* 1.118,
1.267, 4.505, 6.416; Procop. *Goth.* 6.28.33; Leo the Deacon 8.8, p. 125; Pachymeres, *An-
dron. Palaeolog.* 5.21 (287D, p. 414), 7.3 (400D, pp. 573–74), 7.4 (401E–402A, p. 575),
7.28 (439C, p. 630: dressing women inside as men to act as guards); Critobulus, 2.9.1,
3.21.4, 3.22.4, 5.7.10; Chalcocondyles 9.269B (πολίχνη); allied territories: Chalcocondyles
7.185B. Often the safe place remains unstated, such as Diod. Sic. 12.72.7 (Brasidas, women
and children of Mende and Skione in 422 B.C.E.). Most striking in the Byzantine era is
the stronghold called by the locals "Womancastle" (γυναικόκαστρον), about twenty-five
miles from Thessalonica (Nicephorus Gregoras, vol. 2, p. 634; Cantacuzenus, vol. 1, p.
542; vol. 2, pp. 235, 239–48, 275–95; vol. 3, pp. 136–56).

routinely grabbed the women and children inside and andrapodized them.[68] Hence, in the Greek historical memory of warfare, the recurrent practice of moving women and children to a safe place in advance of an armed attack was a defensive response to the regularity with which armed aggressors andrapodized the dependants of their adversaries when they prevailed, with a view to forcibly separating and abducting the desired women and children from the rest and thereby devastating them all.

The focus on andrapodizing women and children likewise comes to the fore in the unforgettable last resort of collective murder, suicide, or both in a community on the verge of being overthrown or forced to surrender. On several such occasions, including Astapa and Masada, the adult male defenders followed through on a pre-arranged plan to kill their women and children rather than allowing them to stay alive and be andrapodized by the aggressors.[69] The male defenders then killed themselves off as well, by means such

[68] App. *Hann.* 246 (καὶ συνέβαινεν ὅπου μὲν κρατεῖν τὰς πόλεις, ὅπου τοὺς φρουρούς, σφαγή τε ποικίλη καὶ γυναικῶν ὕβρις καὶ παρθένων ἀπαγωγαὶ καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἐν πόλεσιν ἑαλωκυίαις, ἐγίγνοντο, 203 B.C.E.); Joseph. *BJ* 7.190–209 (7.208: γύναια δὲ καὶ παῖδες ἠνδραποδίσθησαν, 73 C.E.); Procop. *Goth.* 6.28.33–34 (καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς Ἄλπεσι φρουρίων τισὶ ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς ἐπισκήψαντες εἷλον, καὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα ᾠκημένους ἠνδραπόδισαν, ἐν οἷς παῖδάς τε συχνοὺς καὶ γυναῖκας τῶν ὑπὸ τῷ Οὐραΐᾳ στρατευομένων ξυνέπεσεν εἶναι). This is seen most vividly in Pachymeres (*Andron. Palaeolog.* 5.21 [287D, p. 414]), when Turkish armed attackers in the vicinity of Bithynian Nicaea grabbed the γύναια καὶ παιδάρια as an "easy hunt" (ἄγρα ἑτοίμη) before the women and children were able to reach the safety of their designated stronghold. When the Misimian stronghold and its environs are torched by John Dacnas and his Roman army in the mid-550s C.E., the casualty count of women and children far outnumbers that of the armed male defenders: "Not less than five thousand of the young men were killed, and many more of their women while the number of children that had lost their lives was even greater, so that the entire nation had come close to extinction" (ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἡβώντων οὐ μεῖον ἢ πεντακισχιλίων ἀπολωλότων, γυναικῶν δὲ πολλῷ πλειόνων καὶ παίδων ἔτι πλειόνων, ὡς ὀλίγου γε δεῖν ἅπαν διαρρυῆναι τὸ φῦλον, Agathias 20.7, cf. 19.4). As noted by the fifteenth-century Critobulus (3.22.4), "Mehmed killed them all (i.e., all the adult males), andrapodized the women and children, and razed the stronghold" (βασιλεὺς δὲ καὶ τούτους πάντας ἀπέκτεινε, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραποδίσατο, τὸ δὲ φρούριον κατέσκαψε), as was the usual practice in the strongholds that he conquered, either to retaliate or because they did not surrender. See further Leo the Deacon 4.1, p. 55 for strongholds andrapodized by Nicephorus Phocas (τὰ πρόσοικα φρούρια ἐξ ἐφόδου ἠνδραποδίσθη); Scylitzes, *vit. Bas.* 34 (Basil the Macedonian), Critobulus 3.21.4, 5.6.8; and Chalcocondyles 8.210C.

[69] The pro-Carthaginian city of Astapa in Spain in 206 B.C.E.: App. *Hisp.* 132–36; the transalpine city of Iapodian Metoulos in 35–34 B.C.E.: App. *Ill.* 60–62; Masada in 73 or 74 C.E.: Joseph. *BJ* 7.252–53, 275–407 and Cotton and Geiger 1989; Yadin 1966; and Cohen 1982. The Iapodian fighting men incinerated the women and children of their city in its

as continuing to fight in order to die, immolating themselves in flames, or some other organized and collective suicide or fighting to the death in a kind of suicide with valor. In these cases, the lethal preemptive strike of the fighting men murdering their dependants to save them grimly confirms that the practice of andrapodizing targets women and children in particular.

The fighting men's preference for murdering their women and children in the above communities should not be trivialized as mere honor-killing laced with machismo, even if this were to have been one motivating factor. Collective murder and collective andrapodizing are both acts of war and should be gauged according to the perceived tolerability of the violence. For example, jumping free-fall from the Twin Towers was surely an unimaginably hideous way to die from this act of war, but it was at least partly volitional and as such better than being engulfed in the fireball—or so it must have seemed to those who jumped. Likewise, it would surely have been horrifying to the children and women to be murdered collectively by their male kin, and for them to do the murdering, but it too was semi-free and thus better than being andrapodized by the enemy. So at any rate the leading decision-makers believed when acting on this premeditated plan. Just as importantly, the leaders who brought their communities to this end when on the brink of overthrow were not regarded as paranoid, insane, or psychotic, like some ancient counterpart to Jim Jones in his Flavor-Aid camp in Guyana. They were admired as heroic in their solidarity. For example, Boges, the Persian ruler of Eion on the Strymon, remained in high repute among the Persians, and "justly so" (δικαίως), Herodotus affirms, for slaughtering his children, wife, and concubines in his stronghold (τείχισμα) and then burning himself alive along with their corpses. In so doing, Boges refused to allow them to fall into the andrapodizing hands of Cimon and his Athenian forces, along with the other women and children whom Cimon's forces did andrapodize when they captured Eion in 476 B.C.E. (Hdt. 7.107.1–2, 113.1; Thuc. 1.98.1).

---

public council building (βουλευτήριον) once it became clear that the men were not going to prevent Augustus and his Roman forces from getting their hands on them (App. *Ill.* 61–62). There is no compelling reason to doubt that collective self-immolation occurred in Masada, even if aspects of Josephus's narrative are embellishments. Note too Chalcocondyles 9.273A–B. See Pritchett 1991: 219–23 for a valuable discussion about other incidents in antiquity of collective murder and suicide with the purpose of preventing the women and children from being abducted and enslaved. Diodorus's account about the conquest of Saguntum by Hannibal and his Carthaginian forces in 219 B.C.E. includes Saguntine women killing their children and themselves en masse (Diod. Sic. 25.15.1), but Polybius states that Hannibal and his men gained many live bodies of captives from Saguntum, which he distributed to his fighting men by rank (Polyb. 3.17.10).

Hence, one of the worst possible outcomes of warfare was to end up as an andrapodized woman, girl, or boy, so much so that it was admired as an un-flinching mercy killing of last resort for the adult male kin to murder their women and children instead (Joseph. *BJ* 7.380–406).

A desperate measure of this sort in Motya, a Carthaginian colony of Sicily, in 397 B.C.E. is especially important here, because it shows that the andrapodizing of a city, village, or countryside cannot be carried out without the live bodies of the women, girls, and boys to perform the andrapodizing on. In the incident of Motya, the Sicilian tyrant Dionysius "was planning to andrapodize the city" (βουλόμενος ἐξανδραποδίσασθαι τὴν πόλιν) in order to raise substantial revenue, only to discover, upon entering the conquered city, that the Motyaean men had dashed his hopes by killing off their youthful dependants just prior to the city's fall. They spared "neither woman nor child nor elder" (Diod. Sic. 14.53.1–2). The corpses that foiled Dionysius's plan to andrapodize are those of the women in early adolescence or still in their prime and the semi-grown girls and boys, insofar as elders are worthless on the body market and nursing infants and toddlers are not likely to survive. Thus, the tyrant could not andrapodize the city without the women and children still alive in the city to andrapodize. Dionysius instead had to settle for the less lucrative choice of having his soldiers engage in "plundering the city's material possessions" (τὴν τῶν κτήσεων [sc. τῆς πόλεως] διαρπαγήν, 14.53.3). He also managed to keep a few of the adult male Motyaean fighters alive in a subordinated capacity. This means that to andrapodize a locale, be it a city, town, village, or rural area, cannot mean simply to plunder it, as Walbank maintains (*HCP* 1.157), for if it did, Dionysius could still have andrapodized Motya by plundering the city's material possessions. The live bodies of children and women in a city or other locale are the sine qua non of andrapodizing the place.[70]

If Dionysius could have andrapodized Motya by subjugating the bodies of any of its inhabitants, even excluding those of its women and children,

---

[70] That andrapodizing requires the bodies (σώματα) of women and children is further indicated in Diod. Sic. 16.19.4: Nypsios and his mercenary forces, during their very brief takeover of Syracuse in 356–355 B.C.E. "right away broke into the houses in triumph" (εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὰς οἰκίας οἱ νενικηκότες ὥρμησαν), whereupon "not a few bodies of women and children, and even of household slaves were andrapodized" (οὐκ ὀλίγα σώματα γυναικῶν καὶ παίδων, ἔτι δ' οἰκετῶν ἐξηνδραποδίζετο) in the city. The most risk-free way to andrapodize a locale is when its adult male inhabitants are rash enough to proceed on a group mission while leaving little or no garrison behind, as happened in the fifteenth-century takeover of Sikyon by the Turkish forces under Amourates (Chalcocondyles 7.184B). The overthrow of Zankle by Samian forces in 493 B.C.E. was similar (Hdt. 6.23.1–6).

then he could still have andrapodized the city when he captured it. Some of the adult male defenders were caught still alive, and Dionysius managed to salvage them as his spear-taken prisoners (αἰχμάλωτοι, 14.53.2–3). But he was no more able to andrapodize the city or its populace by capturing them alive than he was by plundering the city of its material goods, because they were not the wanted women and children. In fact, to keep the few fighters of Motya alive, Dionysius had to intervene to prevent his soldiers from killing them off (14.53.2), outraged as his soldiers were at the fighters for cheating them out of andrapodizing the city by their preventive slaughter of the attractive, young, healthy, and productive women and children of Motya. If Dionysius had allowed his fighters to proceed with the slaughter, they would at least have carried out the first step of andrapodizing Motya by eliminating the adult male fighters, even though this slaughter would have lacked its usual purpose—to step over the corpses of the fallen defenders in order to take and dominate their wanted women and children, who were valuable to exploit or profitable to sell for other buyers to exploit, once the generals and soldiers finished andrapodizing them and then determined which to keep for internal distribution and which to sell off.[71]

Recurrent Greek descriptions about armies andrapodizing a city, village, countryside, or broad region consequently do not mean that there was a pandemic capturing and removal of all the inhabitants in the locale,[72] with

---

[71] As Herodotus would have it, the Persian queen Atossa wanted nothing more from a prospective Persian expedition than Laconian, Argive, Attic, and Corinthian maids (θεράπαιναι, Hdt. 3.134.5). In a late but extraordinary personal insight, Sphrantzes (1404–c. 1478, his *Chronicon minus* concerns 1413–1477) points out the windfall to be gained from selling premier captive women and girls. In the taking of Constantinople in 1453, Mehmed's Master of the Horse (ὁ μεραχούρης = "mirahur") "sold many other beautiful female aristocrats and profited greatly from them" (ὃς καὶ πολλὰς καὶ καλὰς ἄλλας τῶν ἀρχοντισσῶν ἠγόρασε καὶ πολλὰ ἐκέρδισεν ἐπ᾽ αὐταῖς), including Sphrantzes' own wife and twelve-year old daughter, Thamar, whom Mehmed purchased for himself in May of that year (*Chronicon minus* 35.11–12 in Grecu 1966). Two years later Thamar died of a contagious disease in Mehmed's harem at the age of fourteen years and five months, to her father's inconsolable grief (37.9). Mehmed also purchased Sphrantzes' son when he purchased his daughter, and he was attracted to buy both due in part to their beauty (τὸ κάλλος, 35.12). These were the only two children Sphrantzes had (32.3). His wife, the mother of their two children, remained in the possession of the Master of the Horse. It is thus understandable why Sphrantzes opens his memoir by emulating the bleakness of Jeremiah 20:14–18, "It would have been good for me not to have been born or to have died as a little boy" (καλὸν ἦν μοι, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθην, ἢ παιδίον ἀποθανεῖν, 1).

[72] These are but a few examples of the phrase "andrapodizing cities, a city by name, villages, or rural areas." Cities as a general method: Xen. *Symp.* 4.37; Polyb. 11.18a.1;

extended families remaining intact, together, and alive though the disruptive translocation, from the youngest newborn to the elder most advanced in age. Rather, this phrasing transfers to the geographical place the massive violence that the dominant armed forces regularly wreaked in their diverse methodical ways on the bodies and minds of all the inhabitants living there, female and male from infancy to old age. Further, unlike the phrase "killing and andrapodizing," "to andrapodize a locale" treats the killing of the fighting male inhabitants adolescent and older as a practice so obviously a part of andrapodizing the locale that it can go without saying and be understood. Hence, to andrapodize a city, village, or countryside is a highly compressed way to signify the standard military steps by which armed fighters who prevail in their offensive carry out the andrapodizing of a locale in order to remove the desired youthful dependants. They kill or shackle any adult males who fight against them to prevent this abduction and who would pose a risk of future retaliation if left alive and at large. Once this step is finished, the aggressors then round up, select, and forcibly separate the malleable and exploitable young women and children from their unwanted relatives; and then they haul off their choice captives. Thus, for example, when Herodotus states that Persian forces andrapodized Miletus (ἠνδραποδίσαντο, 6.18), this means, he goes on to explain in greater detail, that most of the fighting-age males were killed and the women and children andrapodized (γυναῖκες δὲ καὶ τέκνα ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ ἐγίνοντο, 6.19.3). Similarly, when Thucydides observes that Athenian forces andrapodized the island of Skyros in 476 B.C.E. and the city of Chaeroneia in 447 (ἠνδραπόδισαν, 1.98.2–3; ἀνδραποδίσαντες, 1.113.1), this signifies the same general procedure that he describes more specifically as practiced by Athenian forces in the Peloponnesian War against Skione, Torone, and Melos, and as initially threatened against Mytilene: to

Agathias, Preface 1.10; the twelfth-century C.E. chronicle of Cinnamus 5.8, p. 227 in Migne, *PG* 133 (extant history concerns 1118–1176); the thirteenth-century historian Acropolites, *Annales* 4, 13. Specific cities by name: Hdt. 1.76.2, 1.151.2, 6.18; Thuc. 1.98.1–3, 1.113.1, 6.62.3; Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.15–16; Polyb. 9.38.8–9, 15.17.3, 15.23.9, 15.24.1, 33.10.3; Diod. Sic. 15.67.2, 16.8.6; Anaximenes in *FrGH* F 2a 72f, fr. 41; Strabo 17.1.54; Procop. *Goth.* 7.35.2 (the andrapodizing of Rome in 549–550 C.E.); Nicephorus Gregoras, vol. 3, p. 44; Chalcocondyles 51D; villages: Polyb. 4.34.9; Leo the Deacon 2.9, p. 29; Cinnamus 3.10, p. 114; the twelfth-century historian Nicetas Choniates, *Alex.* 3 pt. 1, p. 494 in van Dieten 1975; Acropolites 13; Chalcocondyles 2.43B. Countryside and rural inhabitants: Diod. Sic. 38–39.8.1; Ariston of Pella, fr. 1 in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 4.6.2–3; Leo the Deacon 2.8, p. 27. Broad region: App. *Mith.* 251; Anna Comnena (1083–1153/4 C.E., history and panegyric of her father Alexios I [c. 1057–1118] concerns 1170–1118), *Alex.* 11.12.5; Nicephorus Gregoras, vol. 3, p. 160; Chalcocondyles 2.41B.

kill or massacre many of the grown male defenders in the community, and to andrapodize primarily their women and children by the usual steps. The same principle applies to the andrapodizing of villages and rural areas.[73]

The seemingly generic phrase about andrapodizing the people or inhabitants in a locale works similarly. As Diodorus notes, when Theban forces "andrapodized the Orchomenians" (τοὺς Ὀρχομενίους ἐξανδραποδίσασθαι) in 364–363 B.C.E., this means "they killed the fighting men of Orchomenus and andrapodized the women and children upon taking control of the city."[74] It does not mean to subjugate and forcibly remove the entire populace of Orchomenus en masse, including adult male fighters taken and kept alive as well as the helpless old people, infants, and toddlers. Likewise, even though Isocrates refers in a prima facie global way to "the andrapodizing of the Melians" (τὸν Μηλίων ἀνδραποδισμόν) in 416–415 B.C.E. (*Paneg.* 4.100), he means the eliminating of the grown male defenders of Melos and the andrapodizing of their women and children through forcible removal, as Thucydides makes clear (παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν, 5.116.4). Similarly, when Procopius states that the Persian Chosroes killed a vast number in Sura and turned the remaining twelve thousand into slaves in 540 C.E. (ἐν ἀνδραπόδων ποιησάμενος λόγῳ, *Pers.* 2.5.26–33), Photius from his reading of this narrative reasonably sums this up as "Chosroes andrapodized the Surenes" (Σουρήνας ἠνδραποδίσατο, *Bibl.* 24b). Hence, when Attila the Hun andrapodized (ἠνδραποδίσατο) Milan in 452 C.E. (Suda s.v. Μεδιόλανον), we should not understand that he subjugated and removed all the members of the populace caught alive, regardless of their sex, age, or military standing. He did to Milan as the Athenian forces did to Melos back in 416–415 B.C.E. The same would be true if Attila were said to have andrapodized the Milanese or the inhabitants of Milan. Thus, when a place or its overall populace of inhabitants is said to be andrapodized,[75] this signifies that the choice women and children are the primary targets among the remaining inhabitants selected for forcible removal, that the fighting men among the populace are killed in battle or eliminated by other means (although some

---

[73] This holds true even if the norm of ἡβηδόν massacre of the grown males is replaced, at the conquerors' discretion, with taking and keeping some of the men alive as subjugates, which was not the case in Skione, Torone, and Melos.

[74] Κατέχοντες δὲ τὴν πόλιν τοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας ἀπέκτειναν, τέκνα δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἐξηνδραπόδισαντο (Diod. Sic. 15.79.5–6).

[75] For further examples about andrapodizing people, a populace, or inhabitants, see Hdt. 6.101.2; Polyb. 16.22a.5, 18.3.12, 22.8.10, 30.15.1; Joseph. *BJ* 1.66, 2.69; the late sixth-century C.E. John Epiphaniensis, fr. 1 in *FHG* 2.272–76; Cinnamus 1.8, p. 19; 2.3, p. 35; 3.11, p. 115; 6.1, p. 251; 6.3, p. 260.

may be captured alive and subjugated as prisoners), and that unwanted old and very young inhabitants are left behind, some killed and others still alive but devastated and at risk of dying.

Pritchett is consequently mistaken to portray instances of express testimony about the andrapodizing of women and children from cities, villages, or rural areas, or from the midst of the inhabitants in these locales, as though andrapodizing women and children were a relatively minor specialty practice compared to a different and more prevalent military norm of andrapodizing whole cities, villages, and rural areas. The latter he interprets to be a kind of pandemic "equal opportunity" enslavement of "all the inhabitants," regardless of the sex, age, or preparedness for military combat of the inhabitants caught in the populace when they are first rounded up.[76] This is to fail to see that the two practices of andrapodizing are integrally related and sequential— the initial attack on the defeated populace as a whole once any male line of defense that may be in place is overthrown, and the ensuing systematic selection and abduction primarily of the desired and exploitable young women and children from their midst. The targeting of this sector of the populace is always central to the practice and program of andrapodizing, even if other sectors of the populace may also be included in the line-up to be forcibly removed, such as some healthy mature women, or adult male inhabitants in the Byzantine era who did not know how to wage war or did not want to learn. Greek historical testimony often cites one or the other aspect of andrapodizing but not both, because the two go together, the all-out and partly lethal assault on the inhabitants in their locale, and the subsequent removal of the choicest women and children foremost. These are the two sides of the coinage of andrapodizing enslavement through warfare, not heads or tails, but the heads and the tails.[77]

In light of the young and appealing profile of the most desirable captives to andrapodize, many of them young women and girls, it becomes even clearer why adult fighting males are not andrapodized even when they are taken and subjugated as captives. Captives designated for andrapodizing are the live young bodies caught by the aggressors and then kept, shipped off together, or sold separately as determined by those in command or as the soldiers

[76] Pritchett 1991: 226–34, under the column header "Number."

[77] To see the integral relation between the two steps, we need only imagine how any populace today would react if armed forces stormed their community determined to permanently abduct the girls and young women living there who range in age from kindergarten to college to graduate and professional school levels, and boys ranging in age from kindergarten to middle-school levels, and to kill or maim anyone who tries to stop them from prevailing.

decided for themselves, depending on the degree of top-down command enforcement in the armed band.[78] Notwithstanding modern-day Abu Ghraib, soldiers on the andrapodizing offensive in Greek historical memory did not yearn to subject adult male fighters among their defeated adversaries to the collective and personal tyranny that distinguishes the subjugated condition of andrapodized war captives. For this purpose, they primarily wanted the young and healthy with sex appeal, especially young women, early adolescent girls, and prepubescent girls and boys preferably closer to adolescence than to infancy in their bodily development.[79]

CONCLUSION

It is of great historical and ethical import to reexamine the significance of ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι and cognate forms as I have done here. Andrapodizing is already recognized as a prominent dimension of warfare in the extensive duration of Greek historical memory. Up to now, however, the severe collective violence of this widespread practice has remained under wraps due to interpretations of andrapodizing that have cloaked its genuine significance, as though the practice were a "bodies for sale" transaction, like slaves "sold down the river" on the Mississippi; or as though its methods of enslavement were undisclosed and its victims for the most part any and all members of a captured populace, regardless of each individual member's sex, age, or standing as fighters or as agents of unwarlike civilized pursuits. By the generic sense "enslave," women and children are only on occasion an unremarkable minority group that gets singled out for subjugation by comparison with the more frequent pandemic norm of andrapodizing entire local populations, where the women and children get lost in the captive crowd that includes armed fighters among the inhabitants who are subjugated rather than killed. As I

[78] As noted by Critobulus 4.12.9, when Mehmed and his Turkish forces rounded up captives in Mytilene, he divided the crowd of captive women, children, and unarmed men among the populace into three main parts (μοῖραι), excluding mercenaries from Italy, whom he killed off. The first part, presumably the relatively wealthy, he allowed to return to the city and keep their possessions so long as they paid him annual tribute. The second part he sent to settle in Constantinople. The third part he distributed to the soldiers as their share. These alone are the ones that Mehmed andrapodized (τὴν δὲ τρίτην ἀνδραποδίσας διέδωκε τοῖς στρατιώταις).

[79] These Mehmed supplied to his soldiers, aside from the real beauties he took for himself, female and male alike (Sphrantzes, *Chronicon minus* 35.11–12; Ducas, *Historia Turco-Byzantina* 40.8 in Grecu 1958); Chalcocondyles 9.255C: Mehmed's forces, "picking out the most attractive war captives from the cities, would take them away" (ἐπιλεγόμενοι τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν πόλεων ἀνδράποδα ἀφῃροῦντο).

have demonstrated, however, the andrapodizing of a local population is the routine step toward the goal of andrapodizing primarily the young women and self-mobile children. Consequently, the definitions "sell into slavery" and "enslave" or "reduce to slavery" are each a kind of "see-no-evil" in their own distinctive way. "Sell" gets the method wrong altogether and thereby conceals the routine but ruthless practices of bodily force and domination that armed aggressors carried out as andrapodizers once they gained unimpeded access to the dependants of the defeated male defenders. "Enslave," though at core correct, is opaque and misleading because it remains blind to the ongoing drive to andrapodize young women, girls, and boys in particular, as well as to the ruthless methods by which the community's life center of youth is wrenched away from the devastated remnants who get left behind.

As I have further demonstrated, grown fighting males are out of the picture when it comes to the dimension of warfare known as andrapodizing. They are not andrapodized even when they are subjugated and kept alive, for andrapodizing is not about them and is not carried out on their bodies. Their exclusion is critical to recognizing this recurrent practice of warfare for what it is, an all-out assault on civilian inhabitants not trained to fight back, as Cantacuzenus has the honesty to admit. In this attack, the old people, infants, and toddlers are killed or left behind and the desired women and children are taken from their midst. The en masse assault leaves no inhabitants unscathed in the locale being andrapodized, with some being killed, some left alive yet abandoned, and others, the surviving choice women and children, abducted on a permanent basis. It is in this sense that "all the inhabitants" are andrapodized in an overthrown locale. The ultimate goal of andrapodizing, however, is to take primarily the choice captive women and children. As the case of Motya well shows, the abducting of their bodies is in fact the sine qua non of the practice, for the andrapodizing of a city, village, or rural area cannot be done without their live bodies to do it to.

With the sole exception of Caminiates, we do not have a single first-person testimony from any of the myriads of andrapodized children, women, or other assaulted inhabitants about the enormity of their suffering. One indirect gauge is attested, however: the view that it was better for women and children to be killed off at the hands of their own menfolk than to be andrapodized by their men's male adversaries. This principle was admired as noble when carried out.

The military norm of "killing and andrapodizing" or "andrapodizing a locale" is prevalent in warfare as narrated in Greek historiography from Herodotus through the Byzantine era. It is also the standard practice of warfare in Homeric epic, even though Homer does not call it "andrapodizing."

It follows that to pick, seize, and then keep or traffic in young women, girls, and boys among an overthrown community was central to emergent Western warfare as practiced in the Mediterranean over the span of premodern Greek historical memory. A concomitant practice, the standard means toward the end of abducting them, was the destruction of the other family and community members from whom armies with the upper hand took the women and children. Prolific as modern scholarship has been on warfare and slavery over this extensive span of time, these accounts are no longer satisfactory to the extent that they gloss over andrapodizing as a mercantile transaction in any sense of the word (let alone of free men exclusively, as LSJ maintains), or treat the practice as though it were a gender-and-age neutral enslavement in which young women and semi-grown children are in no way singled out from the captive crowd except in the cases where they are expressly said to be the ones andrapodized. Here I have started to change this picture by bringing the subjugated bodies of young women, girls, and boys to the fore and by showing the premeditated and partly lethal military violence that armed soldiers used to sever them from their family members and to turn the survivors into σώματα they could call their own or sell to other buyers.

At present we still tend to selectively associate the practice of andrapodizing with barbarian hordes commanded by the likes of Attila the Hun, for when similar practices are carried out in modern warfare, such as in the former Yugoslavia, it is remains common parlance to refer to these military and paramilitary customs as "barbarous" and "barbarism."[80] In so doing, we continue to suffer from a lingering false consciousness. Phrasing of this sort makes it seem as though barbarians at the gates broke in and forced such practices into the great city of western civilization from some alien and savage elsewhere. Greek, Macedonian, and Roman forces, however, were among the most proficient practitioners of andrapodizing in Greek historical memory, even though Persian and Turkish forces were as well. This would indicate that Western warfare on the andrapodizing offensive is barbarous to the core in its domineering assault on young women, girls, and boys among their defeated adversaries, as well as on all of their relatives.

[80] For example, "crimes against humanity" are "in the service of barbarism" (Robertson 2006: 433). Likewise, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 was formulated because "disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind."

WORKS CITED

Adler, A. 1928–38. *Suidae Lexicon.* 5 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.

Anastasiadis, V. I and Doukellis, P. N. eds. 2005. *Esclavage antique et discriminations socio-culturelles. Actes du XXVIIIᵉ colloque GIREA.* Bern: Lang.

Bekker, I. 1835. *Georgii Pachymeris de Michaele et Andronico Palaeologis libri tredecim.* 2 vols. Bonn: Weber.

Buckler, J. 1989. *Philip II and the Sacred War.* Leiden: Brill.

Chantraine, P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots.* 2nd ed. Paris: Klinksieck.

Cohen, S. D. 1982. "Masada: Literary Tradition, Archaeological Remains, and the Credibility of Josephus." *JJS* 33: 385–405.

Cotton, H. M. and Geiger, J. 1989. *Masada: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965: Final Reports. Vol. 2: The Latin and Greek Documents.* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Criscuolo, U. 1979. *Theodosii Diaconi De Creta capta.* Leipzig: Teubner.

De Sensi Sestito, G. 1999. "Schiave di guerra tra δίκαιον ed ὠμότης." In Reduzzi Merola, F. and Storchi Marino, A. eds. *Femmes-esclaves: modèles d'interprétation anthropologique, économique, juridique. Atti del XXI colloquio internazionale GIREA, Lacco Ameno-Ischia, 27–29 ottobre 1994.* Naples: Jovene. 111–28.

Ducrey, P. 1999. *Le Traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique, des origines à la conquête romaine.* 2nd ed. Athens: École Française d'Athènes.

Finley, M. I. 1978. *The World of Odysseus.* Rev. ed. New York: Viking.

——— 1998. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology.* Exp. ed. Ed. by B. D. Shaw. Princeton: Wiener.

Frendo, D. 1997. "*The Miracles of St. Demetrius* and the Capture of Tessaloniki: An Examination of the Purpose, Significance and Authenticity of John Kaminiates' *De Expugnatione Thessalonicae.*" *Byzantinoslavica* 58: 205–24.

——— and Fotiou, A. 2000. *John Kaminiates: The Capture of Thessaloniki.* Perth: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Frisk, H. 1973–79. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* 2nd (repr.) ed. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

Gaca, K. L. 2008. "Reinterpreting the Homeric Simile of *Iliad* 16.7–11: The Girl and her Mother in Ancient Greek Warfare." *AJP* 129: 145–71.

Garlan, Y. 1988. *Slavery in Ancient Greece.* 2nd ed. Trans. by J. Lloyd. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (French 1982).

Glancy, J. 2002. *Slavery in Early Christianity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Glover, T. R. 1926. *From Pericles to Philip.* 4th ed. London: Methuen.

Grecu, V. 1958. *Doukas: Istoria Turco-bizantină.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populaire Romine.

——— 1966. *Georgios Sphrantzes: Memorii 1401–1477.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Greene, W. C. 1938. *Scholia Platonica.* Haverford: American Philological Association.

Harris, W. V. 1979. *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hase, C. B. 1828. *Leonis diaconi Caloënsis Historiae libri decem.* Bonn: Weber.

Heisenberg, A. 1978. *Georgii Acropolitae opera.* Stuttgart: Teubner.

Hermann-Otto, E. 1994. *Ex ancilla natus: Untersuchungen zu den "hausgeborenen" Sklaven und Sklavinnen im Westen des römischen Kaiserreiches.* Stuttgart: Steiner.

Hezser, C. 2005. *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Joshel, S. R. and Murnaghan, S. eds. 1998. *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations.* New York: Routledge.

Kern, P. B. 1999. *Ancient Siege Warfare.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Krumbacher, K. 1897. *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches, 527–1453.* Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9.1. 2nd ed. Vols. 1–2. Munich: Beck (repr. 1958, New York: Burt Franklin).

Lencman, J. A. 1966. *Die Sklaverei im mykenischen und homerischen Griechenland.* Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Loretto, F. 1961. *Nikephoros Phokas "Der bleiche Tod der Sarazenen" und Johannes Tzimiskes: Die Zeit von 959 bis 976 in der Darstellung des Leon Diakonos.* Graz: Styria.

Macdowell, D. M. 2000. *Demosthenes:* On the False Embassy *(Oration 19).* New York: Oxford University Press.

McGing, B. C. 1986. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus.* Leiden: Brill.

Patterson, O. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pritchett, W. K. 1991. *The Greek State at War.* Vol. 5. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reinsch, D. R. 1983. *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Rihll, T. 1993. "War, Slavery, and Settlement in Early Greece." In Rich, J. and Shipley, G. eds. *War and Society in the Greek World.* New York: Routledge. 77–107.

——— 1996. "The Origin and Establishment of Ancient Greek Slavery." In Bush, M. L. ed. *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage.* London: Longman. 89–111.

Robertson, G. 2006. *Crimes Against Humanity: The Struggle for Global Justice.* 3rd ed. New York: New Press.

Schaps, D. 1982. "The Women of Greece in Wartime." *CP* 77: 193–213.

Schlaifer, R. 1936. "Greek Theories of Slavery from Homer to Aristotle." *HSCP* 47: 165–204 (repr. in Finley, M. I. ed. 1960. *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies.* Cambridge: Heffer. 93–132).

Schopen, L. 1828–32. *Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris Historiarum libri IV.* 4 vols. Bonn: Weber.

——— and Bekker, I. 1829–55. *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina historia.* 3 vols. Bonn: Weber.

Schumacher, L. 2001. *Sklaverei in der Antike: Alltag und Schickal der Unfreien.* Munich: Beck.

Terzaghi, N. 1944. *Synesii Cyrenensis opuscula.* Rome: Polygraphica.

Thurn, H. 1973. *Joannis Skylitzae Synopsis historiarum.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

van Dieten, J. L. 1975. *Niketae Choniatae Historiae.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Vince, C. A. and Vince, J. H. 1926. *Demosthenes:* De corona, De falsa legatione. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Volkmann, H. and Horsmann, G. 1990. *Die Massenversklavungen der Einwohner eroberter Städte in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit.* 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Wickert-Micknat, G. 1983. *Unfreiheit im Zeitalter der homerischen Epen.* Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Woronoff, M. 1983. "La Femme dans la société mycénienne d'après les archives en linéaire B." In Lévy, E. ed. *La Femme dans les sociétés antiques: actes des colloques de Strasbourg (mai 1980 et mars 1981).* Strasbourg: AECR. 9–44.

Yadin, Y. 1966. *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.