

HIST600: CITIZENS AND SLAVES IN THE ANCIENT GREEK WORLD

Instructor: Prof. Claire Taylor (claire.taylor@wisc.edu)
Office: 5122 Mosse Humanities Building
Office hours: Monday 3.30-4.30pm, Wednesday 11.30-12.30pm
Telephone: 608 263 2339

Citizenship was a key feature of ancient Greek political life, but even in the most democratic cities (that is, those with the least restrictive definition of citizenship) only about a third to a half of the population were actually citizens. The rest of the population was made up of slaves, foreigners, and Greeks from other cities. This course explores the social history of the fifth and fourth-century BCE Greek world through the prism of citizenship and non-citizenship. Who were the other groups in Greek cities, what did they do, and how do we know about them? How did citizens define themselves in relation to non-citizens (and vice versa) and what duties and responsibilities did they have? How did these groups interact with one another and what measures were used to define, or blur, status? Was the interaction between citizens and non-citizens antagonistic or hospitable? In exploring questions like these students will develop their knowledge of the ancient world in addition to refining their historical and analytical skills.

Credit hours

The credit standard for this 3-credit course is met by an expectation of a total of 135 hours of student engagement with the course's learning activities (at least 45 hours per credit or 9 hours per week), which include regularly scheduled meeting times (group seminar meetings of 115 minutes per week), guided individual research, dedicated online time, reading, writing, field trips, individual consultations with the instructor, and other student work as described in the syllabus.

Learning outcomes

At the end of this course, students will be able to:

- understand historical problems relating to the Greek city and its inhabitants
- interpret historical evidence and modern theories about status in the ancient world
- assess and evaluate ancient evidence and scholarly literature
- demonstrate knowledge through written and oral means

Assessment

Library treasure hunt	Pass/fail
Class participation & discussion	10%
Source analysis exercise	20%
Research paper	70%

Research paper breakdown	
Proposal	10%
Draft	20%
Final paper	40%

Source analysis

Each week a student will lead the discussion on a specified source (either ancient evidence or an article review). This will help develop both analytical and presentational skills as well as providing familiarity with evidence and scholarship. These presentations will form the basis of discussion for the remainder of the seminar so please ensure that you have done the readings even if you are not presenting that week.

Presentations should be approx. 10 minutes long.

Research paper

The research paper is the major piece of work for this course. You will need (with guidance) to identify a topic on which you wish to write, draw up a proposal which identifies your research question, the ancient evidence which you will consult and the most relevant bibliographical items. We will then discuss your paper before you submit a 5-10 page draft and again before the final deadline.

Resources

Make an appointment with the History Lab at any stage of the writing process. They can help you:

- (a) brainstorm ideas
- (b) write a research proposal
- (c) structure a paper
- (d) develop an argument
- (e) help with writing

Proposal

The proposal consists of a 1 page outline of your question with appropriate source material and bibliography.

It should include:

- (i) your research question, as well as a three-sentence explanation of why you think this is a good research question
- (ii) a short annotated bibliography with at least two secondary sources and two primary sources that you think might be helpful. The annotated bibliography should include a short description of the source and an explanation of how it will help you to explore your historical question.

Deadline: **Monday 23 March**

Draft paper

In order to provide you with the most effective feedback, I will read a draft of your paper, but you will need to submit more than incomprehensible notes. Drafts need to be structured, as much as possible, as if they were your final paper: you need to write in complete sentences, provide proper references, and give me a sense of your argument and writing style.

Length: 5-10 pages (1.5 or double spaced, size 12 font).
Deadline: **Friday 17 April, 4pm (in mailbox)**

Final paper

The final paper will address your research question, demonstrate your understanding of the issues of the course, and your familiarity with the ancient evidence and modern scholarship.

Length: 15-20 pages (1.5 or double spaced, size 12 font).
Deadline: **Monday 4 May, 12 noon (in mailbox)**

Readings

You will need to refer to the following throughout the course:

Kamen, D. (2013) *Status in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Other useful works:

Finley, M.I. (1981) *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* edited by B.D. Shaw & R.P. Saller. New York: Penguin [out of print, but available in the library; a masterful collection of essays on topics related to this course].

Fisher, N.R.E. (1993) *Slavery in Classical Greece*. London: Bristol Classical Press [a very quick introductory text].

Vlassopoulos, K. (2007) *Unthinking the Greek Polis: Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [a good – though wide-ranging – overview of historiography relevant to this class].

Wiedemann, T. (1981) *Greek and Roman Slavery*. London & New York: Routledge [a useful sourcebook on slavery, but note that it includes Roman material too].

Schedule

Week	Date	Discussion theme	Basic readings
Week 2	27 Jan	Introduction: citizens, non-citizens and the <i>polis</i>	Kamen 2013
Week 3	3 Feb	Citizens & democracy (Athens)	[Demosthenes] 59 Hamel 2003: ch. 3
Week 4	10 Feb	Citizens & oligarchy (Sparta)	Xenophon, <i>Constitution of the Spartans</i> Finley 1981c: 24-40

Week 5	17 Feb	Approaches to citizenship: Citizens, the <i>polis</i> and the Other	Cartledge 1993: ch. 1, 5 Vlassopoulos 2007: 52-67
Week 6	24 Feb	Metics	Osborne 2011: ch. 5 Stager 2005
Week 7	2 Mar	Slaveries 1: slaves in the household	Lysias 1 Golden 2011 Wolpert 2001
Week 8	9 Mar	Slaveries 2: helots and other dependent labour	Talbert 1989 Cartledge 1991
Week 9		Spring break	
Week 10	23 Mar	Approaches to slavery	DuBois 2008: ch. 2 Forsdyke 2012: ch. 2 Hunt 2015
		<i>Proposals due</i>	
Week 11	30 Mar	Freedmen	Kamen 2011 Zelnick-Abramowitz 2005
Week 12	6 Apr	Evaluating status	Finley 1981a, 1981b; Vlassopoulos 2009
Week 13	12 Apr	No class: work on papers <i>Drafts due</i> (Friday 17 April)	
Week 14	20 Apr	No class: revision week (individual meetings)	
Week 15		No class: individual meetings <i>Final paper due</i> (Monday 4 May)	

Bibliography

- Cartledge, P. (1991) 'Richard Talbert's revision of the Spartan-helot struggle: a reply', *Historia* 40: 379-81.
- . (1993) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DuBois, P. (2008) *Slaves and other Objects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Finley, M.I. (1981a) 'Between slavery and freedom', in *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, edited by B. D. Saller and R. P. Shaw. New York: Penguin, 116-32.
- . (1981b) 'The servile statuses of ancient Greece', in *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, edited by B. D. Saller and R. P. Shaw. New York: Penguin, 133-49.
- . (1981c). 'Sparta and Spartan society,' in *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, edited by B. D. Saller and R. P. Shaw. New York: Penguin, 24-40.

- Forsdyke, S. (2012) *Slaves Tell Tales. And Other Episodes in the Politics of Popular Culture in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Golden, M. (2011) 'Slavery and the Greek family', in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery. Volume 1: The Ancient Mediterranean World*, edited by K. Bradley and P. Cartledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 134-52.
- Hamel, D. (2003) *Trying Neaira: The True Story of a Courtesan's Scandalous Life in Ancient Greece*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hunt, P. 2015. 'Trojan Slaves in Classical Athens: Ethnic Identity among Athenian Slaves'. In *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos, 128–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamen, D. (2011) 'Reconsidering the status of *khōris oikountes*', *Dike* 11: 43-53.
- . (2013) *Status in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Osborne, R. (2011) *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stager, J.M.S. (2005) "'Let no one wonder at this image": a Phoenician funerary stele in Athens', *Hesperia* 74 (3): 427-49.
- Talbert, R. (1989) 'The role of the helots in the class struggle at Sparta', *Historia* 38: 24-40.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2007) *Unthinking the Greek Polis: Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2009) 'Slavery, freedom and citizenship in classical Athens: beyond a legalistic approach', *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 16 (3): 347-63.
- Wolpert, A. (2001) 'Lysias 1 and the politics of the oikos', *Classical Journal* 96 (4): 415-24.
- Zelnick-Abramowitz, R. (2005). *Not Wholly Free. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*. Leiden: Brill

Marking criteria

Characteristics of an **A** paper:

An A paper is clearly argued and has a well-articulated thesis. It is clear, right from the beginning, where the argument is going and what is at stake in discussing the question posed. It demonstrates careful analysis of ancient source material and excellent knowledge of the relevant scholarship, and shows how the author has thoughtfully considered this material and used it to answer the question. It is laid out in an appropriate academic style (i.e. with correct referencing) and is written in excellent English with no grammatical or spelling errors. There will be no significant proofreading mistakes.

Characteristics of a **B** paper:

A B paper has a thesis and demonstrates a clear understanding and wide-ranging knowledge of the subject, with a direct focus on question. It has a coherent structure and synthesises scholarship well. It shows clear evidence of in-depth reading, with substantial coverage of appropriate evidence. It is well-presented, with detailed referencing in an acceptable style and a properly formatted bibliography. It has a fluent style, with few errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar.

Characteristics of a **C** paper:

The thesis of a C paper will be unclear or it will not adequately answer the question posed. It has an adequate structure, usually drawing heavily on class work or other direct teaching. It shows evidence of limited reading or misunderstanding of material. The claims made are not supported by the evidence cited. It is adequately presented, with some referencing of sources and a short bibliography. The style of writing is straightforward or simplistic, and it may include some errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar. It will be poorly proofread.

Characteristics of a **D** paper:

A D paper will have no thesis or does not otherwise answer the question posed. It will be poorly written or presented and will show deficiencies in understanding of the ancient evidence or scholarship. The claims made will be unsubstantiated.

Characteristics of an **F** paper:

An F paper will have been submitted late and/or will demonstrate no understanding of the subject. It will fail to address the question in any meaningful way. Information supplied is largely erroneous or has little or no relevance to the question. It is poorly presented with significant errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar.

Grade scheme

A = 93-100

AB = 88-92

B = 82-87

BC = 77-81

C = 72-76

D = 67-71

F = 66 or below.