SLAVERY IN THE CLASSICAL WORLD [Hist7104]  

**Autumn Term 2009 and Spring Term 2010**

Teacher: Simon Corcoran       Room G.09, Mondays 11am-1pm  
Office Hour: Tuesdays 1-2pm, Room B18, 23 Gordon Sq.  
Tel.: (020) 7679 3614.  
e-mail: s.corcoran@ucl.ac.uk [this is the best way to contact me]

Course information on the web:  
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/history/currentstudents/coursematerials/undergraduatecourses/HIST7104  
also on my home-page: http://www.roman-empire.co.uk (follow slavery link)

Course Aims:  
Slavery is a feature common to most ancient societies, being in general a normal,  
unexceptional and unchallenged institution. In the modern world, however, it is regarded as  
contravening the most basic concepts of human rights, and attempts continue to be made to  
eliminate it, where it survives, and to address its legacy, even where it has been abolished  
(e.g. reparations debates).

This course seeks to study slavery in the context of the societies of Greece and Rome, while  
remaining aware also of the influence of developing modern debates and concerns on the  
subject. The topic is approached principally through the study of the ancient sources, in order  
to find out both how slavery functioned in practice, but also how the people of antiquity  
thought about it. It tackles the difficulties of uneven and incomplete ancient evidence, both  
textual (much from slave-owners, little from slaves) and physical, and considers the merits of  
other approaches less dependent on ancient material (e.g. demography, and comparative  
history). Slavery is considered from economic, social and ideological perspectives.

Course plan:  
Week 1: Introduction, definitions, historiography and ancient sources  
Week 2: Ancient ideas about slavery: Aristotle, Seneca  
Week 3: Becoming a slave, sources of slaves, and demography  
Week 4: Slaves at work, agricultural, industrial, domestic  
Week 5: Treatment of slaves; torture; family life  
Week 6: Slave revolts and other responses to slavery  
Week 7: Manumission and freedmen at Athens: manumission at Rome  
Week 8: Freedmen at Rome, social mobility, imperial civil service  
Week 9: ‘Unfree’ labour: debt bondage; Helots; eunuchs  
Week 10: Christianity and slavery; Paul, Augustine, late imperial legislation

Course-book: **T.E.J. Wiedemann, Greek and Roman Slavery (1981)**. You should buy a  
copy of this book, as it will be needed for both classes and essays.

**PRESENTATIONS**

Everyone is required to give one presentation during the course, which will be allocated  
during the first class. The presentation should be about 10-15 minutes long. You should talk  
from notes or to a hand-out, but may be read from a prepared script if necessary. I am  
prepared to photocopy hand-outs, if given sufficient notice. The other students will be given  
an opportunity to ask you questions following the presentation. Please note that these  
presentations are in effect the ‘lecture’ part of the course and your fellow-students will be  
relying upon you to provide accurate information as well as coherent argument via clear and  
audible delivery.

**DO NOT LET THEM DOWN!**
**Coursework Essays**

Questions for your assessed coursework essays are listed below.

1. How have contemporary ideas and circumstances affected the study of ancient slavery in the last 200 years?

2A. Why did ancient thought about slavery not create a significant abolitionist movement?  
OR  
2B. "Use it rather" (1 Corinthians 7.21). What do you understand Paul to mean and how do you account for the differing interpretations of this passage by later Christian commentators?

3. What part has demography to play in understanding slave supply and sources in antiquity?

4. In which sector of the economy was slave labour most vital for the prosperity of classical Athens?

5. "Most Spartan institutions have always been designed with a view to security as regards the Helots" (Thucydides IV.80.2). What do you understand Thucydides to mean and is his judgement justified?

6A. Is it true to say that slavery was a rural rather than an urban phenomenon in Roman Italy of the late Republic and early Empire?  
OR  
6B. What rôles were played by slaves and their peculia in the commerce of ancient Rome?

7A. When and why were slaves or the free liable to torture in antiquity?  
OR  
7B. How and why did Roman law seek to regulate the treatment of slaves?

8. How useful is the concept of “resistance” in understanding the behaviour of slaves in antiquity?

9A. To what extent did the stigma of slavery constrain freed slaves in classical antiquity?  
OR  
9B. Contrast the intended purpose with the actual result of the Augustan manumission legislation.  
OR  
9C. How do you account for the high status but low reputation of the emperor’s slaves and freedmen?

10. What functions are served by slaves and slave status in ancient literature? Discuss with particular reference to:  
EITHER A] Aristophanes OR B] New Comedy OR C] Petronius

You must choose TWO titles from the above list.

You should submit two hard copies of each essay. Please put your name on both copies. One copy will be returned to you with corrections, along with a cover sheet of comments; the other will be retained for the use of the second and external examiners.

Essays should be handed in at the departmental Reception, with a 3-part cover sheet attached. Please ensure you fill in all the required details, including the word count of your essay. Cover sheets can be found in the corridor outside room G.06 and in the Undergraduate Common Room. Complete the cover sheet with a ball-point pen (press hard) and attach it to your essay with a paper clip. Please do not staple it.

All parts of the cover sheet and both copies of the essay will be date-stamped on receipt. The third copy of the cover sheet will be returned to you as proof that the essay was submitted. This should be retained in a safe place.

Please note that assessed coursework must be date-stamped in order to receive a mark. Without this, it will receive a mark of zero.

In addition, all coursework essays MUST be submitted electronically, via Moodle, by the relevant deadline.
Deadlines – Term 1 courses
For students who attend the whole year:

The first essay should be handed in by 17th November 2009. This is an unofficial deadline that I have set to help you to space out your essay writing assignments. You will not be penalized if you fail to meet it. However, I strongly recommend that you submit your first essay by this unofficial deadline so that I will have an opportunity to give you some tutorial feedback before you write your second essay. I may not be able to provide one-to-one tutorial feedback for essays that are submitted after this deadline.

The official deadline for both essays is 5 p.m. on Monday 11th January 2010. You will be penalised if you fail to meet this deadline unless you have been granted an extension by the Chair of the Board of Examiners (see below).

Each of these essays should be c.2,500 words (including footnotes but excluding bibliography).

If my unofficial deadline clashes with an unofficial deadline set by another of your teachers, please bring this to my attention, and we will try to negotiate different dates.

For Affiliate students leaving in December only:

You should submit both your essays to the History Department Reception by the official deadline, which is 5 p.m. on 18th December 2009. Each of these essays should be c.2,500 words (including footnotes but excluding bibliography). I strongly recommend that you submit your first essay by my unofficial deadline of 17th November 2009 so that I have an opportunity to give you some tutorial feedback before you write your second essay. However, you will not be penalised if you do not meet this unofficial deadline.

Deadlines – Term 2 courses

The first essay should be handed in by 23rd February 2010. This is an unofficial deadline that I have set to help you to space out your essay writing assignments. You will not be penalized if you fail to meet it. However, I strongly recommend that you submit your first essay by this unofficial deadline so that I will have an opportunity to give you some tutorial feedback before you write your second essay. I may not be able to provide one-to-one tutorial feedback for essays that are submitted after this deadline.

The official deadline for both essays is 5 p.m. on Monday 26th April 2010. You will be penalised if you fail to meet this deadline unless you have been granted an extension by the Chair of the Board of Examiners (see below).

Each of these essays should be c.2,500 words (including footnotes but excluding bibliography).

If my unofficial deadline clashes with an unofficial deadline set by another of your teachers, please bring this to my attention, and we will try to negotiate different dates.
Penalties

Any essay submitted after the relevant deadline listed above will be penalised by 5 MARKS PER DAY LATE, up to a maximum of FOUR days, after which it will receive a mark of 0. Penalties are not applied by the teacher marking the essay, but by the Chair of the Board of Examiners, and are included in the calculation of the final overall coursework mark.

Students are advised to submit essays even if they will receive a penalty mark. Failure to submit all the required assessed coursework will result in a final result for the course of ‘incomplete’.

Extensions to the above deadlines can only be granted by the Chair of the Board of Examiners on the recommendation of the Departmental Tutor. He is only likely to do so in cases of serious illness, for which you must provide medical certification, or bereavement. In particular, it is normal to expect up to two weeks’ illness in the course of the two teaching semesters and applications for extensions on medical grounds received in the last two weeks of the second term, where the illness was clearly of less than two weeks' duration, will not normally be granted. Students wishing to apply for an extension should complete a form (available from the Academic Office) and make an appointment to see the Departmental Tutor, no later than the Friday before the deadline. After this date, only bereavements and serious illnesses that occurred on the day of the deadline, or in the weekend before it, will be considered valid grounds for an extension.

You should aim to get your essays in well before the deadlines listed above, not least because of delays caused by faults with computers, printers, photocopiers etc. Do not expect everything to work smoothly. You are expected to plan accordingly. If printing at home, make sure you have a spare ink/toner cartridge for your printer. Last-minute equipment or transport problems are not considered valid grounds for an extension.

Legibility

All essays must be well presented and clear. Please leave wide margins and use double-spacing to allow teachers to write comments. Proof-read word-processed work carefully, and do not rely entirely on spell-checkers – they can introduce mistakes, particularly with proper names.

Plagiarism

Essays, while based upon what you have read, heard and discussed, must be entirely your own work. It is very important that you avoid plagiarism, i.e. the presentation of another person’s thoughts or words as though they were your own. Plagiarism is a form of cheating, and is regarded by the College as a serious offence, which can lead to a student failing a course or courses, or even deregistration.

Any quotation from the published or unpublished works of other persons must be clearly identified as such by being placed inside quotation marks and students should identify their sources as accurately and fully as possible.

Please see the History Department Study Skills booklet for further guidance on avoiding plagiarism and referencing. (Students not registered in the History Department may obtain a copy from the Departmental Reception or download one from the History Department webpages.)

Recourse to the services of “ghost-writing” agencies or of outside word-processing agencies which offer correction/improvement of English is strictly forbidden and students who make use of the services of such agencies render themselves liable for an academic penalty.

You should note that UCL has now signed up to use a sophisticated detection system (Turn-It-In) to scan work for evidence of plagiarism, and the Department uses this software to check assessed coursework. This system gives access to billions of sources worldwide, including websites and journals, as well as work previously submitted to the Department, UCL and other universities.
History Department Marking Criteria

Note: These guidelines are derived mainly from the History Benchmarking Statement, approved by the Quality Assurance Agency. They show the expected standard required for each mark band in terms of the following aspects of performance: structure and focus; quality of argument and expression; range of knowledge.

The actual mark awarded will reflect the degree to which the qualities required for the award of a particular class are present.

First Class (70+)

Structure and focus

- Engages closely with the question throughout, showing a mature appreciation of its wider implications.
- The structure of the argument is lucid and allows for the development of a coherent and cogent argument.
- Factual evidence and descriptive material is used to support the writer's argument, and is both concise and relevant.

Quality of Argument and expression

- The writing will be fluent, coherent and accurate.
- The writing will go well beyond the effective paraphrasing of the ideas of other historians. It will show that the writer has a good conceptual command of the historical and, where relevant, historiographical issues under discussion.
- The work will display originality and imagination, as well as analytical skills of a high order.
- The work will demonstrate that the writer can move between generalizations and detailed discussion confidently.

Range of knowledge

- The answer demonstrates in-depth reading and critical analysis of the texts, secondary literature and (where relevant) contemporary sources.
- The answer demonstrates that the writer has a comprehensive knowledge of the subject and a good understanding of the historical period under discussion.
- The writer will demonstrate an ability to evaluate the nature and status of the information at their disposal and identify contradictions and attempt a resolution.

Upper Second Class (60-69)

Structure and focus

- Work which displays an understanding of the question, an appreciation of some of its wider implications and tries seriously to engage with the question.
- The structure of the answer will facilitate the clear development of the writer's argument. But towards the lower end of this mark band the candidate will not be able to sustain a consistently analytical approach.
- The writer will deploy relevant evidence to support the argument. But towards the lower end of this mark band, the writer may not explain the full implications of the evidence cited.

Quality of Argument and expression

- The answer will be clear and generally accurate, and will demonstrate an appreciation of the technical vocabulary used by historians.
- The answer will deploy the ideas of other historians and try to move beyond them. It will also show some appreciation of the extent to which historical explanations are contested.
- The answer may not demonstrate real originality or imagination, but the writer will present ideas with some degree of intellectual independence, and show an ability to reflect on the past and its interpretations.

Range of knowledge

- The answer will display an extensive, but sometimes uneven, range of knowledge. It will demonstrate evidence of considerable reading.
The answer will demonstrate a sense of the nature of historical development.

The writer will demonstrate an ability to move between generalizations and detailed discussions, although there may be a tendency towards either over-generalised or an over-particularised response to the question.

The writer will reflect on the nature of the evidence and sources available to them, and attempt to use it critically.

The answer will demonstrate a secure understanding of the historical period under discussion.

Lower Second Class (50-59)

Structure and focus

- The work will display some understanding of the question, but it may lack a sustained focus and only a limited understanding of the question's wider implications.
- The structure of the work may be determined largely by the material available to the writer, rather than by the demands of the question. Ideas may be stated, rather than fully developed.
- The writing may include descriptive and factual material, but without the kind of critical reflection characteristic of answers in higher mark bands.

Quality of Argument and expression

- The writing will be sufficiently accurate to convey the writer's meaning, but it may lack fluency and command of the scholarly idioms used by historians. It may be clumsy in places.
- The writing will show some understanding of historians' ideas. But it may not reflect critically upon them. The problematic nature of historical explanations may not be fully understood.
- The answer is unlikely to show any intentional originality, and may tend towards the assertion of essentially derivative ideas.

Range of knowledge

- The answer will show significant knowledge, but it may be limited or patchy. It will be sound, but may contain some inaccuracies. The range of reading will be limited.
- The answer will show only limited awareness of historical development.
- The writer may show a proneness to present too much narrative or descriptive material, and may present information without reference to the precise requirements of the question.
- Information may be presented uncritically and there will be little attempt to evaluate its status or significance.
- The answer will demonstrate some appreciation of the nature of the historical period under discussion.

Third Class (40-49)

Structure and focus

- Work that displays little understanding of the question and the writer may tend to write indiscriminately around it.
- The answer will have a structure, but it may be underdeveloped, and the argument may be incomplete and developed in a haphazard and undisciplined manner.
- Some descriptive material will be deployed, but without any critical reflection on its significance or relevance.

Quality of Argument and expression

- The writing may not always be grammatical, and it may lack the sophisticated vocabulary or construction needed to sustain a complex historical argument. In places it may lack clarity and felicity of expression.
- There will be little appreciation of the contested and problematic nature of historical explanations.
- The answer will show no intentional originality of approach.

Range of knowledge

- There will be sufficient knowledge to frame a basic answer, but it will be patchy and limited. There are likely to be some inaccuracies.
There will be some understanding of historical development, but it will be underdeveloped, and the ideas of historians and others may be muddled or misunderstood.

There will be an argument, but the writer may be prone to excessive narrative, and the argument may be signposted by bald assertions rather than informed generalizations.

Information will be employed uncritically as if it was always self-explanatory.

The answer will demonstrate only a rudimentary appreciation of the historical period under discussion.

**Referral (35-39)**

*Structure and focus*

- Work that displays very limited understanding of the question and in many places displays a tendency to write indiscriminately around it.
- The answer will have a weak structure, that is poorly developed. There is only a limited and somewhat incoherent argument.
- Only a limited amount of descriptive material will be deployed, usually without any critical reflection on its significance or relevance.

*Quality of Argument and expression*

- The writing will frequently be ungrammatical, and will not be such as is required to sustain a complex historical argument. It will often lack clarity and felicity of expression.
- There will be almost no appreciation of the contested and problematic nature of historical explanations.
- The answer will show no intentional originality of approach.

*Range of knowledge*

- There will only be sufficient knowledge to frame a very basic answer. It will contain many inaccuracies.
- There will be only a limited understanding of historical development.
- There will be only very limited evidence of an argument.
- Information will be employed uncritically and as if it was always self-explanatory.
- The answer will demonstrate only a very rudimentary and extremely limited appreciation of the historical period under discussion.

**Fail (0-34)**

*Structure and focus*

- Work that displays little or no real understanding of the question.
- The answer will have a weak structure, which is poorly developed. There is no coherent argument.
- Only a very limited amount of descriptive material will be deployed, without any critical reflection on its significance or relevance. Some of it will be irrelevant.

*Quality of Argument and expression*

- The writing will be ungrammatical. Ideas will sometimes be presented in note form.
- There will be no appreciation of the contested and problematic nature of historical explanations.
- The answer will show no intentional originality of approach.

*Range of knowledge*

- There will not be sufficient knowledge to frame even a basic answer.
- There will be no real understanding of historical development.
- There will be little if any evidence of an argument.
- It will contain little relevant information.
- The answer will demonstrate no real appreciation of the historical period under discussion.
**SOME WORDS FOR SLAVES:**

**Greek:** *doulos* (most common), *dmos* (of the house), *andrapodon* (man-footed creature, often of war captives), *oiketes* (of the household), *therapon* (attendant), *pais/paidion* (boy), *amphipolos* (handmaid), *akolouthos* (follower), *hyperetes* (assistant), *threptos* (reared foundling)

Note also: *apeleutheroi*, *exeleutheroi* (freedman)

**Latin:** *servus, famulus/famula* (of the *familia/household*), *mancipium*, *ancilla* (maid-servant), *domesticus*, *puer, verna* (home-born slave), *vicipes, vicarius* (slave belonging to or substituting for another slave), *alumnus* (often used of reared foundling)

Note also: *libertus/liberta*, *libertinus/libertina* (freedman/freedwoman), *ingenuus* (freeborn)

**SOME ‘GUESSTIMATES’ OF SLAVE NUMBERS:**

**ATHENS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date (BC)</th>
<th>no. of slaves</th>
<th>no. of citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus, <em>Deipnosophistae</em> 6.272c (Wiedemann no. 80 p. 90)</td>
<td>312/308</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>21,000 citizens, 10,000 metics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He also suggests for Corinth and for Aegina</td>
<td></td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypereides, <em>Frag. 33</em></td>
<td>mid-4th C.</td>
<td>150,000 (adult male)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent, <em>The Size of the Slave Population at Athens</em> (1925)</td>
<td>c.430</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomme, <em>The Population of Athens during the 5th and 4th C. BC</em> (1933)</td>
<td>c.430</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones (AHM), <em>Athenian Democracy</em> (1957) 75-96</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauffer, <em>De Bergwerksklaven von Laureion</em> (2nd ed. 1979)</td>
<td>4th C.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallares, <em>The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World</em> (1991) 60</td>
<td>4th C.</td>
<td>30-50,000 slaves and metics</td>
<td>100-120,000 total citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, <em>The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes</em> (1991) 53-4, 90-4</td>
<td>c.450</td>
<td>over 150,000</td>
<td>60,000 (adult male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habicht, <em>Athens from Alexander to Anthony</em> (1997) 58</td>
<td>312/308</td>
<td>150,000 or 250,000</td>
<td>21,000 or 31,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Citizen figures are sometimes taken as referring to all of citizen status, sometimes to adult males only

**ROMAN EMPIRE:**

Harris, *MAMR* 1980: 10 million slaves, 50 million citizens

Scheidel, *JRS* 1997: before mid-2nd C. AD plague, 6 million slaves out of total population of 60 million; with 2-3 million slaves in Italy alone; cf. Brunt 1971: 3 million slaves in total population of 7 million for Augustan Italy

See now Scheidel, *JRS* 2005: between 850K and 1.86 million slaves for Augustan Italy
COURSE-NOTES

The course-notes that follow here serve a dual function. They provide both preparation and guide for each week’s class, as well as bibliographical help on the topics to which the essays relate.

Each week you should prepare by AT LEAST reading the source material indicated at the top of that week’s course-notes (often a chapter of the Wiedemann source-book), AND considering the various questions suggested below the sources. These are a starting point to give you ideas of what to ask yourself while reading the sources or how you might think about the issues involved. They do not limit the questions or issues that may be asked or raised. This applies especially to those giving the week’s presentations: they are not specific questions that need to be answered point by point.

For some weeks, there will be class discussion of specific texts, and for these weeks ACTIVE preparation is essential. You will need to have READ AND MADE NOTES on the material, so as to aid both fruitful group discussion, and clear oral presentation to the rest of the class.

The weeks and works involved are:
Week 2: Aristotle, Politics Bk 1 (1253b-1255b)
Week 3: Jerome, Life of Malchus
Week 6: Sources for the Sicilian and Spartacus slave revolts
Week 7: [Demosthenes], Oration 59 Against Neaira
Week 8: Petronius, Cena Trimalchionis from the Satyricon
(for full details see the bibliography and the individual weeks’ course-notes)

The bibliography given at the end of the course-notes for each week provides further reading on the topics of the week, and help with navigating the large and detailed main bibliography. This will be most necessary for those preparing the class presentation for that week, as well as for those whose chosen essays relate to the topics covered. However, note that not every item on the main bibliography necessarily appears on the course-notes or other class handouts, and before starting the reading for your essays, it is wise to browse the bibliography to see if further items appear useful.
SLAVERY IN THE CLASSICAL WORLD (Hist7104)
WEEK ONE
INTRODUCTION

How might you define a slave? Is such a definition helpful?

How might you define a slave society? Does it matter?

What effect do modern debates and concerns have on the study of ancient slavery?

What type of sources and methods are there for studying ancient slavery, and what problems are associated with interpreting or using them?

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

General works:
Patterson 1982; Turley 2000

Antiquity:
Wiedemann 1987 (revised 1992, 1997)
Greece: Garlan 1988; Fisher 1993
Rome: Bradley 1987 and 1994

Collections of essays:
Archer 1988; Bush 1996; Cartledge, Cohen and Foxhall 2002;
Dal Lago and Katsari 2008; Katsari and Dal Lago 2008 (these are different collections!)
Finley 1960 and 1987 (repr. 1999); Joshel and Murnaghan 1998
Papers from the conferences of the Institute for the Study of Slavery (Nottingham):
2000: Wiedemann/Gardner 2002
2001 Kleijwegt 2006
2006: Geary/Vlassopoulos 2009

Historiography:
Cartledge 2002 (both); Finley 1980 (repr. 1998); McKeown 2007;
Wiedemann 2000; Callahan, Horsley and Smith 1998 [various essays];
Paton/Webster (2009)
Comparative history: Dal Lago/Katsari 2008; Katsari/Dal Lago 2008;
Wickramasinghe 2005; Webster 2005
Modern representations on film: Davis 2000; Winkler 2007

Sources:
Hopkins 1993 (Aesop)
Bradley 2000 (Apuleius)
Courtney 2001; Prag/Repath 2009 (Petronius)
Champlin 2005; Henderson 2001 (Phaedrus)
McCarthy 2000 (Plautus)
Fitzgerald 2000 (Latin lit.)
Morris 1998, Thompson 2002 (archaeology)
Petersen 2006 and D’Ambra and Métraux 2006 (art)
S. Lewis 1998/9 and 2002 (pottery)
Parkin 1992, Scheidel 2001 (demography)
WEEK TWO

ANCIENT IDEAS OF SLAVERY

Sources: Wiedemann Sourcebook chs. 1, 4, 12
Aristotle: Wiedemann no. 2 (Politics 1.2 = 1253b-1255b = Saunders 1995 I.iii-vii pp. 4-10, with commentary), Garnsey 1996 esp. ch. 8; Brunt 1993; Cambiano 1987 in Finley 1987; Deslauriers 2003; Scofield 2005; Millett 2007
Seneca: Wiedemann nos. 190, 196-7, 237, 238 (Letter 47), 239 (De Beneficiis 3); Griffin 1976 ch. 8; Garnsey 1996 esp. ch. 9; with Manning 1989.
Dio Chrysostom, Oration 15 (Wiedemann no. 235); with Brunt 1973
Marcus Aurelius: Brunt 1998
Epictetus: Hershbell 1995

NOTE: There will be discussion of the passage from ARISTOTLE, POLITICS BK ONE

REMEMBER, FOR ALL ANCIENT SOURCES, CHECK THAT YOU KNOW WHEN AND WHERE AUTHORS WERE WRITING, AND THEIR STATUS/CONTEXT; AS ALSO OF THEIR SOURCES IF APPROPRIATE.

Questions to think about:
What sort of categories/dichotomies between people do you regard as significant for yourself? Are these simply dichotomies or gradations?
Which seem to have been important to ancient writers, including slave/free?
How does Aristotle attempt to define natural slavery and what difficulties does this make for him?
Is Seneca really concerned about slaves, individually or as an institution? If not, what is he concerned about?
Do any ancient writers see slaves as capable of virtue or honour? Are any particular virtues or vices seen as typical of slaves?
How are slaves identified or distinguished from other sections of the population? What issues does this raise regarding attitudes to slaves?

Other bibliography to read:
Bradley 1994 ch. 2; Du Bois 2003
Harris 2001, esp. chs. 12-13 (ideology of anger)
Hunt 1998 and 2006 (use of slaves in warfare)
Raaflaub 2004; Rosivach 1999
Robertson 2008
de Ste Croix 1981 ch. VII/ii and iii ; Golden 1985
Demand 1998 in Joshel and Murnaghan 1998, and McKeown 2002 (on medicine)
For slavery in ‘novels’, see Bradley 2000 and Kenney 2003 (Apuleius) and Hopkins 1993 (Aesop)
WEEK THREE

BECOMING A SLAVE


NOTE: There will be discussion in class on Jerome’s Life of Malchus to which all are expected to be able to contribute

Questions to think about:
What are the different ways in which someone can become a slave? In what ways do these vary in importance over antiquity? What are the different ways in which someone can acquire a slave? Why might someone acquire a slave? What do we know of slave prices? From where do slaves originate? What do we know of the mechanics of the slave trade itself?

What problems are caused for historians by ancient statistics or lack of them relating to population size in general and slave numbers in particular? Does it matter? How far can modern demographic ideas be utilized to investigate ancient slavery? What are the crucial issues at stake?

Bibliography: Bradley 1994 ch. 3; Garlan in Finley 1987 and Gabrielson 2003 (on piracy); Braund 1989; Finley 1981 ch. 11; Bradley in Finley 1987; Pritchett 1991, III.2 and VI.3; Thompson 2002 ch. 1;
For the Roman law of slave status and buying/selling slaves, see Buckland 1908 chs. 2-3, 17-18; more briefly in Watson 1987; Rodger 2007; on slave sale rules, see Hughes 2006 and Cloud 2007
Slaves trade/traders: Bodel 2005 and Fentress 2005; Bosworth 2002
For demography in general, see introduction by Parkin 1992, but now especially Scheidel 2001 ch. 1.
For current discussion of slave demography, see contrasting pair of articles by Scheidel 1997 and Harris 1999 (also Harris 1980; 1994) and see now Scheidel 2005a and 2007; also the view of Jongman 2003
On Italian population, see Brunt 1971 (note list of census figures pp. 13-14 and App. 7), Lo Cascio (1994) 23-40; Morley 2001; Scheidel 2004 and 2005
On the Aegina slave figures, see suggestion by Sekunda (2002)
On slave prices, see Scheidel 1996 [in teaching collection] and 2005b; Duncan-Jones 1982 App. 10; for ransom prices, see Pritchett 1991, III.3
WEEK FOUR

SLAVES AT WORK

Sources: Wiedemann Sourcebooks chs. 5, 7, 8; Gardner/Wiedemann ch. 4; Austin and Vidal-Naquet ch. 5 espec. nos. 73-8; Dillon/Garland ch. 11; Lomas 1996 ch 6; Sherk TDGR 6 nos. 171-3, 178; Xenophon, *Oeconomicus*
For attitudes to work etc.: Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse 7: Euboicus* (Loeb vol. 1) with Brunt 1973; Lucian, ‘On Salaried Jobs in Great Houses’ and ‘Apology for “On Salaried Jobs in Great Houses”’ (Loeb vols. III and VI)

Questions to think about in relation to Athens and/or Rome:
What sort of jobs/functions do slaves fulfil? Are any exclusive to or typical of slaves? Do slaves do low status jobs, or do jobs done by slaves acquire low status? What value is placed upon such work by either masters or slaves? Do attitudes to work differ between slaves and the free poor? What is the status of an ‘employee’? How do slave-owners seek to manage their slaves? To what extent are masters motivated by economic, social or other aims in their use or treatment of slaves? Is it possible to assess the overall economic importance of slaves in agriculture or any other area?

For Athens: Garlan 1988 ch. 1; Jones in Finely 1960 ch. 1; Finley 1981; Tod 1901/2; MacDowell 1978, 155-9; Hopper (1979); Cohen 1992, esp. ch. 4 (with Silver 2006); Trevett 1992 ch. 1; Cartledge et al. (2002) esp. chs. 10-12
On agriculture: Jameson 1977/8, Wood 1988; Nussbaum 1960; de Ste Croix 1981 App. 5; Sallares 1991; Burford 1993 ch. 5; Thompson 2002 ch. 2; Silver 2006
Those “living apart”: Fisher in Katsari/Dal Lago 2008 ch. 8; Kazakévich 2008
Public slaves: Lewis 1990 pp. 254-8; Martin 1991 (in teaching collection); Hall 1989
For wages and prices, see Loomis 1998

For Rome: Bradley 1994 ch.4 and 1987 ch. 1
Urban/Domestic: Joshel 1992; Treggiari 1975 (both); George 1997 (both) and in D’Ambra and Métraux 2006; Flory 1978; Garland 1992; Jongman 2003; Hasegawa 2005
Agriculture: Rathbone 1981, 1983; Foxhall 1990; Thompson 2002 chs. 3-4; Jongman 2003; Roth 2007 (plus her short articles2004, 2005a and b); Marzano 2007, esp. ch. 5
Industry: Thompson 2002 chs. 5-6 (Greece as well as Rome)
Child slaves: Laes 2008
Public slaves: Coulton 1988; Weaver 1972; Houston 2002; Lenski 2006
On commercial activity and peculium: Kirschenbaum 1987; Aubert 1994; Gamauf 2009; for Roman law, see Buckland 1908, Watson 1987 (and 1993); also Roth 2005b
On gladiators, see Wiedemann 1992; Hope 2000
On slave prices (Greece and Rome): Scheidel 2005b

On non-slave labour:
See Garnsey 1980, esp. ch. 3 (Athens), and chs. 6-9 (Rome/Empire)
Brunt 1973 (attitudes) and in *JRS* 1980; Giardina 1993, ch. on ‘The Peasant’
For Egypt, see Cuvigny 1996; Bagnall/Frier 1994; Rathbone 1991
WEEK FIVE

TREATMENT OF SLAVES

Sources: Wiedemann, esp. ch. 9; Gardner/Wiedemann ch. 2; Cicero, Pro Cluentio 175-187. I suggest also reading at least one play by Aristophanes or Plautus.

Questions to think about:
How were slaves treated? What motivated this treatment: e.g. fear, affection, economic or ideological reasons &c? How did the treatment of slaves differ from that of the free, and if so, how did these differences alter over time? How far were slaves excluded or included within the household? To what extent were slaves able to enjoy ‘family’ life, or sexual or religious rôles or freedoms?

What protection or rights, if any, were afforded to slaves under either Athenian or Roman law? How and when did these change, if at all, and for what reasons? How effective were they?

What part did slaves play in the legal process and how was this affected by their slave status; e.g. as litigants, accusers/accused, witnesses? What role did torture play under Athenian and Roman law? How was it justified?

Bibliography:
General Ideology: Harris 2001, esp. chs. 12-13
Roman law and Roman empire
Bradley 1987, and 1994, esp. chs 5, 7, 8
Watson 1987 pp. 84-9, ch. 8; Buckland 1908 pp. 36-8, 86-97;
Burdon in Archer 1988; Robinson 1981; Brunt 1980 (torture) and 1998 (legislation)
MacMullen 1986; Millar 1984 (hard labour)
Thompson 2002 ch. 7; Evans-Grubbs 2000
Saller 1991 and 1996; Clark in Joshel and Murnaghan 1998 ch. 8; Parker 1989

On sexual exploitation/attitudes: Williams 1999 ch. 1; Evans-Grubbs 1993; Pollini 2003;
James 1997; Salmeri in Katsari/Dal Lago 2008 ch. 4

B. Rawson 1966 ; Treggiari 1981; Hasegawa 2005
Slaves at theatre and baths: see E. Rawson 1987 and Fagan 1999
On domestic violence: Pomeroy 2007; Dossey 2008

Athens
Articles in Hunter and Edmondson 2000, esp. Hunter, Todd and Osborne.
Harrison vol. 1 (1968) ch. 6

The torture debate:
Mirkady 1996 and 2000; Gagarin 1996
Hunter 1994 chs. 3 and 6
Garlan 1988 ch. 3, also pp. 40-5
Harrison vol. 2 (1971) 147-150; MacDowell (1978) 245-7
Finley (1980) 93-5; Todd 1990, espec. 33-6; check also Todd 1993
Du Bois (1991) 1-68 (more broadly theoretical), and 2003
WEEK SIX

SLAVE RESPONSES TO SLAVERY

Sources: The main sources for the Roman revolts are: Diodorus Siculus Books 34 and 36 (for Sicily 1 and 2); Plutarch, Life of Crassus and Appian, Civil Wars (for Spartacus). These can be read in editions of the authors (e.g. Loeb; Penguin Classics) or from the source books: thus Wiedemann chs. 10 and 11, plus no. 80 pp. 84-6; or Yavetz 1988; or Shaw 2001 [Shaw is especially good and comprehensive]

What sort of problems are there in trying to use these sources?

NOTE: you will ALL be expected to have read the accounts of the revolts and be able to talk about them in class

Questions to think about:
How frequent were slave revolts in antiquity? What governed their frequency? Were they typical of certain times and/or places? What factors were the principal causes of revolts?
Were there any common features in the character and progress of revolts? What aim or aims did such revolts have?

How many other slaves responses to, or strategies for coping with, slavery can you identify?
What is the importance of the concept of “resistance”? Can slave responses/revolts be matched to those of any other groups in the ancient world?

To what extent can comparative evidence from other slave societies be used to throw light on revolts and other slave responses in antiquity?

Bibliography:


Greece: Fuks 1968; Cartledge 1985 (also available on library “digital readings” list); Brown 1992

Rome: Bradley 1989, and 1994 ch. 6; Callahan and Horsley 1998; Thompson 2002 ch. 8; Grünewald 2004


New World: Genovese 1979; da Costa 1994; Franklin and Schweninger 1999; Orser and Funari in Mitchell 2001 (=World Archaeology 33.1)
WEEK SEVEN

MANUMISSION AND FREEDMEN AT ATHENS
MANUMISSION AT ROME

Sources: Wiedemann Sourcebook ch. 3 and Gardner/Wiedemann, Roman Household ch. 7. [Demosthenes], Oration 59 Against Neaira (translation by C. Carey in Aris and Phillips edition (1992), or in Trials from Classical Athens (1997) [electronic copy available via library “digital readings” list]; also available in the Loeb, and Oratory of Classical Greece series); good extended treatment/discussion in Hamel 2003; see now also Henry 2006

Athens: EVERYONE to read and MAKE NOTES on Against Neaira, and be prepared to talk about it in class, for the light it throws on Athenian attitudes to male/female, slave/free, citizen/metic and anything else relating to law and society that you can think of! What problems are there in interpreting the speech, given its genre and context? Who wrote it and who delivered it? What does it set out to prove, and is it successful in its aim?

Rome: What were the methods and procedures for granting freedom to a slave? How did the different methods affect the freed slave’s status? How frequently was freedom granted? Who was most/least likely to be freed? What reasons/motives might a slave owner have had for granting freedom? What are the chief contrasts in the attitude to manumission between Roman law and the Athenian or other legal systems?

Bibliography:
On Freedmen in general with comparative focus, see essays in Kleijwegt 2006.

Rome:
Bradley 1987 ch. 3 and 1994 ch. 8
For law, check Watson 1987 (cf. Watson 1967 chs. 16-19) or Buckland 1908; Hopkins 1978 chs. 2-3; Wiedemann 1985; Kleijwegt 2009
Gardner 1993 ch. 2; also 1991
Duff 1928 (early empire, now rather dated); Treggiari 1969 (late republic)
Lopez de Quiroga 1998

Greece:
Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005 and 2009; Todd 1993; McLean 2002 ch. 12; Tod 1901/2
Paramone agreements: Wiedemann nos. 23-7; Horsley/Kearsley 1997 (Roman imperial example); see Hopkins 1978 ch. 3 on Delphi
Trevett 1992 ch. 1 (Pasion), Cohen 1992
Harrison vol. 1 1968, chs. 7 and 8
MacDowell 1978 pp. 82-3
Whitehead 1977, esp. 114-16 (and manumission in index)
Hunter and Edmondson 2000, especially Hunter ch. 1 and Osborne ch. 4

Jewish manumission material:
Gibson 1999; Levinskaya 1996 Appendix 3; Hezser 2005
WEEK EIGHT

FREEDMEN AT ROME

Sources: Gardner/Wiedemann, Roman Household ch. 7
Petronius, Cena Trimalchionis from the Satyricon (translations: Loeb; Penguin Classics; Oxford World’s Classics; U. of California/ Methuen entitled Satyricon; also available in cheap Wordsworth edition); use also Courtney’s Companion (2001) and now especially Prag/Repath’s Handbook (2009)
On imperial freedmen: Tacitus, Annals esp. bks 11-13; Pliny, Letters 8.6; Suetonius, Life of Claudius; Statius, Silvae 3.3

EVERYONE to read and MAKE NOTES on the Cena, and be prepared to talk about it in class. Think about the following: Who was Petronius? When did he live? What sort of work is he writing and for whom? Does he have an ‘agenda’? How many points of view or perspectives are present in the work?
What light, if any, is thrown by the Cena upon freedmen and slaves in Roman society?
Consider the portrayal of Trimalchio, his attitude to himself and his status; the account of his career and wealth; the nature of his social milieu.

Wider questions:
What in general was the status of freedmen at Rome? What restrictions/burdens did they carry compared to the freeborn? What social stigma did they suffer, why and from whom? What sort of occupations were open or closed to them? What degree of social mobility was possible for them and their descendants? Did this change over time? What does this tell us about the nature and importance of social integration in Roman society?

Why were imperial freedmen so important? What functions did they perform for the emperor? Why did this cause problems and who objected? To what extent did their position change during the course of the Principate? Think of the same in relation to eunuchs in the later empire (for week 9).

Bibliography: Gardner 1993 ch. 2
Duff 1928 (empire)
Treggiari 1969 (late republic); Watson 1967 ch. 19 (law)
Kirschenbaum 1987; Andreau 1999 ch. 6 and in Giardina 1993
D’Arms 1981 chs 5-6 and D’Arms 2000; Mouritsen 2005
Garnsey 1981 = 1998 ch. 2; Petersen 2006
Millar 1995; D’Ambra and Métraux 2006 (papers by Leach, George and Koortbojian)
Wiedemann 1988 review of W. Waldstein, Operae Libertorum
Rauh 1989 (auctioneers); Purcell 1983 (apparitores); E. Rawson 1975 (sculptors)
Gordon 1931; Williams 1995 (on Horace)

On the Satyricon:
Courtney 2001; Walsh 1970; Sullivan 1963
D’Arms 1981 ch. 5; Donahue 1999

On imperial freedmen: Duff 1928 ch. 8 and App. 3; Millar 1977, III.5
Gregory 1995; Houston 2002
WEEK NINE

UNFREE LABOUR and EUNUCHS

Sources: Wiedemann ch. 2; Cartledge 1979 (also rev. ed. 2001) Appendix 4; Dillon and Garland Sourcebook 11.27-39; Hauken 1998 esp. nos. 1 and 3

On imperial eunuchs, see Claudian, Against Eutropius (In Eutropium) (Loeb), with Long 1996

Questions to consider:
Look again at the definition of slavery &c from week 1. What are the main differences between chattel slavery and other forms of unfree labour? Are they terminological or substantive? In what ways did the Greek/Roman attitude differentiate between various forms of ‘unfree’ labour, if at all?

What are the main features of the status, treatment and use of the Helots at Sparta? What are the main similarities and differences between the legal status, economic function, social role, and actual treatment of Helots and chattel slaves (as at Athens)?

What are the main problems in dealing with the ancient sources for Helots?

Why are eunuchs so often despised and disliked? What accounts for their rôle in the late antique imperial court? What light does their nature and status throw upon ancient attitudes to gender, freedom, honour &c? How do they compare with imperial freedmen of the early empire (as in Week 8)?

Bibliography:
on archaic serfdom in general: van Wees 2003 in Luraghi and Alcock 2003
van Wees 1999 (Solonian debt reform); with Morris in Cartledge et al. 2002
Helots at Sparta: Hodkinson 2000, esp. ch. 4; also in Dal Lago/Katsari (2008) ch. 11
Luraghi and Alcock 2003 (varied selection of essays)
Engerman in Bush 1996 ch. 1; Garlan 1988 ch. 2
De Ste Croix 1981 ch. III.iv, and in Archer 1988 ch. 1
Cartledge 1979 (rev. 2001) ch. 10, and in Archer 1988 ch. 2
Finley, Ancient Economy ch. 4 (and ‘further thoughts’); Finley 1981 ch. 7-9
Hunt 1998 chs. 2 & 4; Alcock in Cartledge et al. (2002) ch. 13

Vermaseren 1977; Gleason 1995
WEEK TEN

CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY

Sources: Wiedemann ch. 12; Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery* (1996) espec. chs. 10-14
Note: for Paul’s *Epistle to Philemon* (trans.: Wiedemann no. 213), see Wansink 2001
and for *I Corinthians* 7.21, see Thiselton 2000 pp. 553-9 or Barclay in *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (2001) 1118-20; also Kovacs (2005) 104-130

Questions to consider: What attitude or attitudes do early Christian writers take towards slavery? To what extent do these derive from earlier thinkers? What uses are made of slavery as part of Christian thought; e.g. allegorical or metaphorical? Do you detect anything new in Christian thought in this area? Can any changes in Christian thought be detected across the first centuries of the era? Do Christian ideas have any impact on 1) actual treatment of slaves or patterns of slaveholding? 2) imperial legislation on slavery?

Bibliography:
Garnsey 1997 in Rawson/Weaver 1997 ch. 5
Combes 1998; Harrill 1998 and 2006; Horsley 1998b ; Byron 2003
Glancy 2002; Bartchy 1973
de Ste Croix 1981 ch. VII.iv, VIII
Klingshirn 1985
Evans-Grubbs 1993 and 1995 ch. 6; Arjava 1995 ch. 6
Clark 1998; Whittaker 1987 in Finley 1987
Serfass 2006
Morris in Bush 1996 (glance at Byzantium)
SOURCE BOOKS:

**T.E.J. WIEDEMANN, GREEK AND ROMAN SLAVERY (1981)**


**TDGR** = Translated Documents of Greece and Rome: vol. 1 (Fornara), vol. 2 (Harding), vol. 3 (Burstein), vols. 4 and 6 (Sherk)

OTHER ANCIENT WORKS

Cicero, *Pro Cluentio* (Loeb; Penguin Classics [*Murder Trials]*)
Claudian, *In Eutropium (Against Eutropius)* (Loeb)
Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse 7: Euboicus* (Loeb)
[Demosthenes], *Oration 59 Against Neaira* (Loeb; also C. Carey in Aris and Phillips edition (Greek Orators VI; 1992) or in *Trials from Classical Athens* (1997) [available on Library “digital readings” list]; V. Bers in *Demosthenes Speeches 50-59* (The Oratory of Classical Greece 6; 2002))
Petronius, *Satyricon* (Loeb (Heseltine); Penguin Classics [with Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*] (Sullivan); Oxford World’s Classics (Walsh); U. of California/ Methuen/Everyman entitled *Satyricon* (Branham/Kinney); Hackett (Ruden); also cheap Wordsworth edition (Dinnage))
Plautus, *Pseudolus* and *Captivi* (Loeb; Johns Hopkins Complete Roman Drama in Translation series vol. 1 and IV; Penguin Classics, both being in *The Pot of Gold and Other Plays*)
Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* (‘The Estate/ Household- Manager’) [Loeb Xenophon vol. IV; Penguin Classics as ‘The Estate- Manager’ in *Conversations of Socrates* pp. 269-359 (trans. Waterfield); also translation and commentary by S. Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus* (Oxford University Press, 1994)]
EXAMPLES OF SLAVE NARRATIVES

These include the most famous individual texts:
**Frederick Douglass,** *The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* (1845: many editions, including Penguin Classics, Oxford World’s Classics)
**Olaudah Equiano** (Gustavus Vasa), *The Interesting Narrative* (1789: many editions, including Penguin Classics, Dover Thrift editions &c.)
**Mary Prince,** *The History of Mary Prince: A West Indian Slave* (1831: Penguin Classics)

SELECTION OF WORKS DEALING WITH POST-CLASSICAL SLAVERY OR SLAVERY IN GENERAL

Archer, L. (ed.), *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labour* (1988)
Mitchell, P. (ed.), *The Archaeology of Slavery* = *World Archaeology* 33/1 (2001)
Paton; D. and Webster, J. (eds.), *Remembering Slave Trade Abolitions: Reflections on 2007 in International Perspective* [= *Slavery and Abolition* 30/2] (2009)
Patterson, O., *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (1982)
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