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The Bitter Chain of Slavery

1. Introduction

Slavery is an institution universally attested in historical societies. Its most familiar manifestations are the slave regimes of the New World. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, slaves of African origin were widely used in Latin America, the Caribbean, and the southern regions of the United States to produce sugar, cotton, and tobacco, among other crops, for sale and distribution on world markets in economic systems that bound together three continents in a global, profit-motivated nexus. Their success was great enough to shape present-day conceptualisation of the institution as a whole, so that slavery is often imagined, wherever it has existed, primarily as a means of meeting a demand for labour from which financial rewards must be generated. Its associations with race and racial prejudice, moreover, have left the enduring legacy, especially in contemporary western democracies, that slavery tout court is a moral evil, so that despite the ill effects that still remain its abolition in the New World in the late nineteenth century is generally regarded as a sign of historical progress.

Slavery was an elemental feature of life in the ancient Mediterranean world, and had a much longer history than slavery in the New World. But the determinants of capitalism were not then in place to shape its course, nor was ancient slavery associated with race or thought morally problematical in any modern sense. Although often associated with labour, slavery in antiquity was in the first instance a state of

---

1 The slightly augmented text of a lecture given at Loyola University Maryland on April 2, 2014, the purpose of which was to survey the chief features of slavery in the ancient Mediterranean world at a colloquium entitled Slaveries Past and Present. I am grateful to Dr. Thomas McCreight for the invitation to participate. In this version I take the opportunity to cite sources for the views stated and to refer in the Bibliographical Notes to appropriate recent contributions or items on points of detail made in the text.
powerlessness imposed by the strong on the weak, in which the enslaved, as outsiders in the communities to which they were introduced or belonged, were deprived of freedom and denied all rights. It was initiated by violence, maintained by coercion, and was the outcome of an innate propensity for some to seek mastery over others which the elite among the ancient Romans sometimes called “the desire to dominate.”

To the Greek antiquarian Dionysius of Halicarnassus the relationship between master and slave was the ultimate expression of the exercise of power by one human being over another. The slave and the slave’s owner were required therefore to engage first and foremost in a social relationship. Opportunities for economic exploitation subsequently arose – the enslaved, once enslaved, could be used to work for those who owned them – but the extraction of labour was a matter of choice, as was the capacity to alienate what became de facto human property. Alternatively, or complementarily, slaves were sometimes kept as symbolic expressions of their owners’ power in societies that were highly competitive and placed a premium on the display of authority and rank. At an especially extravagant level of self-promotion a baboon and wild asses were once included with the slaves in a Roman aristocrat’s retinue. Slavery was, nonetheless, an extreme condition. The poet Lucretius considered the contrast between slavery and freedom as stark as that between poverty and wealth or war and peace, while to the polymath Pliny masters and slaves were comparable to kings and paupers. The jurist Florentinus considered the condition more or less synonymous with the end of life.

Slavery in the ancient Mediterranean is best known from the historical records of the classical Greeks and Romans, whose societies are often said to have been the first genuine slave societies in human history. Immediately visible in the epic poems of the eighth century BC with which the Greco-Roman literary tradition now begins, classical slavery was still flourishing and unchallenged in the Christian Roman Empire of the fourth and fifth centuries AD. On a minimal count, that is, slavery in the Greco-Roman world lasted well over a thousand years, a staggeringly long and often under-appreciated interval of time, in comparison with which the time span of the slave regimes of the
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3 Dion. Hal., 1.81.6.
4 Ath., 272c; Amm. Marc., 28.4.
5 Cic., Att., VI.1.25.
6 Lucr., 1.455-458; Plin., HN, 7.165.
7 Dig., 1.5.4.2.
New World seems almost negligible. In primitive form slavery existed even among the Mycenaean Greeks of the Late Bronze Age.

Other ancient peoples, Persians, Carthaginians, Celts, Sarmatians, Jews, practised forms of slavery as well, which was so common that Greeks and Romans were astonished on the rare occasions when they encountered societies—Ceylon was an example—from which it was absent. The institution can in fact be traced to a very early date, in Mesopotamia to the third millennium BC, and, memorably immortalised by the Ten Commandments in the book of Exodus, subsequently among the ancient Israelites. Yet the records left by Greeks and Romans are fuller than those of other ancient peoples, and it is their slave-owning practices, and the patterns of social relations those practices reveal, that are of concern here. The records, consistent over time, leave no doubt that the desire to dominate was a fundamental aspect of Greco-Roman mentality. By “records” I mean passages from Greek and Latin literature, documentary sources and occasionally items of material evidence. Literary texts are sometimes categorised as qualitative sources and regarded as less significant for historical understanding than models developed from theoretical starting-points. The opposite view is taken here. Ancient historians have always recognised the danger of reading literary texts at face value, but without them very little could be known about Greco-Roman slavery and together with documents they remain fundamentally important. The points of departure for the highly speculative enterprise of model-building, essential though it is, often depend in any case on items in the literary and documentary tradition.

2. Slave labour

The prime mechanism of enslavement in antiquity was warfare, the great constant through the main phases of Greek and Roman history, whether the Persian Wars or the Peloponnesian War of the classical Greek era, the wars that led to the rise of Macedon and Alexander’s crusade against the Persians, the wars of the Hellenistic monarchs, or the wars conducted by Rome that first created, then threatened to destroy, and finally drained to disintegration its Mediterranean-wide empire. (The era of the pax Romana was no exception: warfare was then only relatively infrequent.) It was accompanied by the never-changing convention that the victorious could dispose of the defeated as they wished: sparing, killing, or holding captives to ransom, or else enslaving them, a primordial option whose conceptual origins it is now impossible to determine. The jurist Gaius for

8 Plin., HN, 6.89.
instance preserves in his textbook of Roman law the tradition that the strongest claim to lawful possession of property came from its acquisition in warfare.\textsuperscript{9} The convention is already evident in the \textit{Iliad}, which opens, crucially, with a dispute among Greek warlords over the possession of enslaved prisoners of war, and the practice never disappeared: as Ammianus Marcellinus records, thousands of captives were carried off into slavery after the siege of Amida in the middle of the fourth century AD, the old who could not keep up being left on the road to die with their legs brutally severed.\textsuperscript{10} Aristotle had said much earlier that it was a convention in accordance with law.\textsuperscript{11}

Greeks and Romans were ruthlessly militaristic peoples, and in the warrior societies they created enslavement remained the potential consequence of every engagement in battle. It was celebrated not least in art, with the subjection of the defeated illustrated in media of all kinds: the decorations of classical Greek vases kept alive the memory of Briseis and other slaves from the Homeric world, and victory monuments commemorating the triumphs of emperors displayed the barbarian enemies Rome reduced to slavery: Germans, Syrians, Parthians. The results were sometimes absurd, as when the emperor Claudius, a most unlikely candidate for heroic nudity, was portrayed in sculpture as the conqueror of Britain. Yet the grisly realities of capture and enslavement were always vividly before the eyes of Greeks and Romans, from one generation to the next, reinforcing, if reinforcement were needed, the centrality of slavery in their lives. It did not matter, as issues of personal status in classical Athenian court cases well illustrate, that in the absence of racially characteristic features slaves were at times difficult to identify.

The dispute with which the \textit{Iliad} begins is a dispute over female captives, whose bodies are above all potential sources of sexual pleasure, as they always remained. But in the epic tradition the transition from the slave as prize to the slave as commodifiable worker is swift. Hector fears that Andromache, bereft of her “day of freedom,” will be forced to spin and weave or carry water, while in the \textit{Odyssey} Eumaeus, of aristocratic birth but sold into slavery as a child, toils as Odysseus’ loyal swineherd.\textsuperscript{12} The chattel slave worker is especially visible in the fully developed societies of Greco-Roman antiquity, in classical Greece, across the eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic age, and in Italy and other regions of the Latin west in the central era of Roman history. Other forms

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{9} Gaius, \textit{Inst.}, 4.16.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Amm. Marc., 19.6 (AD 359).
\item \textsuperscript{11} Arist., \textit{Pol.}, 1.2.16.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Hom., \textit{Il.}, 6.450-458; \textit{Od.}, 15.403-429.
\end{itemize}
of dependent labour, and other forms of unfreedom, were of course known, the most familiar case perhaps being that of the Helots of Sparta, a subject population against whom war was annually declared by the city’s ruling Spartiates, but a population that was permitted certain family and property rights. Slaves were used in a multitude of activities, some requiring physical strength alone, others demanding a high level of education and responsibility, so that the varieties of servile experience were limitless. In some cases slaves belonged to public rather than private owners. At Rome 600 slaves constituted a sort of fire-brigade that Augustus set up in 22 BC, and another 700 provided a staff for the maintenance of Rome’s water supply: 240 were first bequeathed to Augustus by Agrippa in 12 BC, while the rest were added by Claudius. In consequence there was never any possibility of slaves conceiving of themselves as a coherent social entity or “class”: the range of servile statuses prevented it. But no occupations were reserved exclusively for slaves. Nor was there any notion in antiquity of competition between slave labour and free labour. Slave and free indeed sometimes worked alongside one another, famously at Athens in the building of the Erectheion. This is one of the important ways in which classical slavery differs from slavery in the New World.

The point is best understood from the slave system of Roman Italy, which provides for antiquity the least controversial example of what historians commonly call “the slave mode of production.” Following Rome’s conquest of Italy, the expansion of empire overseas created a reservoir of captives large enough to allow slavery to dominate agricultural production in Campania and Etruria, with vines and olives the principal crops in a method of farming based on modestly sized rural estates whose owners sold wine and olive oil at substantial profits. As the evidence of shipwrecks increasingly shows, their products were exported extensively across the Mediterranean in containers (amphorae) whose manufacture, utilising slave labour, was a subsidiary aspect of their agricultural enterprises. However, the appetitive impulse that motivated estate-owners to seek and to maximise revenues by distributing their goods to an ever-increasing range of markets remained culturally and historically distinct from the capitalising impulse of entrepreneurial slave-owners in the slave systems of the Americas. A long tradition of Roman writing on estate management, represented now by the works of the elder Cato, Varro, Columella and Palladius assumes that in an essentially agrarian economy landowners always chose what they believed to be the most appropriate form of labour from a range of available resources according to need. Slave labour and free labour were

13 Poll., Onom., 3.78-83.
14 Frontinus, Ag., 99; 116.3-4.
complementary, not mutually exclusive, options, and both might be used simultaneously. In some circumstances it was better not to risk the loss of investment slave property represented but to use free labour instead. (To the extent that there was a labour market in antiquity it was affected by factors of chronology, region, and ideology.) Whether slave labour competed with free labour, whether slave labour was more efficient than free labour, whether profit was sought principally for the sake of re-investment – these are largely anachronistic issues, which means that cliometric studies of New World slavery on these and related topics cannot serve as reliable guides to ancient servile economic performance. Modern economic theory has indeed been used to suggest that over the longue durée modest growth occurred in antiquity and that living conditions for a majority of people slowly improved; but if so the role played by slavery is not obvious. In any case, a distinction must be preserved between the ancient economy, in which the degree of economic integration from one period to another is a highly problematical variable, and the capitalistic economies of modern slave regimes.

Any consideration of slave labour implicitly raises issues of number. How many slaves were there in any one region of the ancient Mediterranean at any one time? The question cannot be answered absolutely because the source-material that has survived from antiquity, while immense in volume, is deficient in statistical information of the sort required. Population figures are occasionally recorded in ancient sources, but their reliability is dubious and their aggregate meaning elusive. Typically therefore historians redefine the question and try to assess the proportion of slaves in overall Greco-Roman populations. Even here, however, no more than estimates are possible, although the factors involved in discussion are invaluable for understanding ancient living conditions. The relative distribution of slaves between urban and rural sites, importations from extra-Mediterranean sources of supply, the extent of natural reproduction among already existing slave communities, the geographical location of natural resources, especially precious metals, for the extraction of which slave labour was desirable, the relative incidence of warfare, variations over time and place in determinants such as disease, morbidity, and life-expectancy – these are just a few of the criteria that control discussion. For classical Athens, it is sometimes said that slaves made up as much as 30% or 40% of the overall population, and a similarly high figure has been postulated for Italy in Rome’s central era. But the extent of slave-owning in Attica, especially the extent of slave labour in Athenian agriculture, is an intensely contested question – in Athens itself slaves, whose names incidentally (a complicating factor) differ little from those of Athenian citizens, seem often to have been occupied in manufactories – and for the Roman slave population...
some historians have called for as low a proportion as 10% or 15%. The truth is that no matter how sophisticated the calculations made, all answers are impressionistic and precise numbers are unachievable. The disadvantage for history is obvious. What can be said is that authors from Homer to Augustine, whose works (again) provide the chief evidence from which knowledge of ancient slavery must derive, unhesitatingly assume the vital presence of slaves in their societies and never complain of slaves’ unavailability. This is the most important fact. Slavery has sometimes been thought to have declined in the later imperial age, but the period’s incessant wars alone render such a notion unlikely.

3. Management

As subject beings from whom services and labour were demanded, but whose cooperation could not be assumed or guaranteed, slaves required supervision and regulation. A considerable body of thought consequently developed concerning how Greek and Roman slave-owners might induce compliance and consent in their slaves. This can be understood from the Roman handbooks on estate management just mentioned and related Greek texts, principally works by Xenophon and an anonymous writer in the tradition of Aristotle, but also from the book of Bryson, a probable contemporary of Columella, which has recently been reconstructed from a mediaeval Arabic translation. What stands out in this evidence is the sheer cold-bloodedness of attitude slave-owners exhibited in securing their self-interest. It was understood that slaves, although items of property, had human feelings; but the property’s human character needed recognition only to the extent that it brought slave-owners an advantage.\(^\text{15}\) The guiding principle in all matters was to exercise and maintain control in whatever mechanistic manner would best succeed.

The prescriptions formulated are clear and consistent over time. Defuse the potential rebelliousness inherent in slaves by ensuring that they originate from different geographical areas, cannot speak the same language, and cannot therefore easily collude with one another.\(^\text{16}\) (The principle was understood earlier by no less a figure than the God of the Old Testament.)\(^\text{17}\) Encourage competitiveness or deliberately promote discord and divisiveness among them; play upon their sense of self-worth by sometimes appearing to take their views into consideration (opinions differed on this point: some thought

\(^{15}\) Cic., *Fam.*, XI.28.3.

\(^{16}\) Arist., *Oec.*, 1.5.6; *Pol.*, 7.9.9; Varro, *Rust.*, 1.17.5; Ath., 264f-265a.

\(^{17}\) Genesis 11:7.
consultation or familiarity was a mistake); appoint to managerial status those who will identify with their owners’ interests.\(^\text{18}\) Foster obedience by rewarding slaves who perform well and penalising those who perform poorly: give the former better clothes and shoes than the latter, and more food, which was always an incentive to work well.\(^\text{19}\) Save on outlay at the same time by limiting the rations of the sick, and, to prevent insolence, refrain from giving slaves wine to drink.\(^\text{20}\) To elicit obedience give occasional holidays, or permit slaves to have a few possessions of their own; and cater especially to their sex lives: the favoured could be given partners –perhaps paying the master a fee for the privilege of intercourse– and demonstrably fertile women could be promised relief from work to encourage further reproduction: they provided their owners with new generations of servile replacements, and the children could be held meantime as guarantees of their parents’ good behaviour.\(^\text{21}\) Above all, give slaves something for which to hope, particularly the hope of one day being set free –this was the most devious method of manipulating emotions–and if none of these methods worked resort to physical punishment.\(^\text{22}\)

The degree of calculation implicit in all this is staggering. The prescriptions, which evidently reflect real methods of treatment, equated the management of human property with the management of animals and were founded on an immanent social prejudice, which meant for instance that a woman who worked as a child’s nurse could earn better wages if she cared for a freeborn child than if she cared for a slave child.\(^\text{23}\) They reveal nothing about antiquity that is uplifting, but are marked by a deeply ingrained cynicism and form a sobering contrast to the high achievements of Greco-Roman culture that the western liberal tradition (rightly) values. They presumably stretched back to the beginnings of Greco-Roman history: Eumaeus was aware that when “the day of slavery” came no man was inclined to work willingly.\(^\text{24}\)


\(^{19}\) Xen., \textit{Oec.}, 13.9-11; Arist., \textit{Oec.}, 1.5.2-4; Varro, \textit{Rust.}, 1.17.7.

\(^{20}\) Arist., \textit{Oec.}, 1.5.2; Cato, \textit{Agr.}, 2.4.

\(^{21}\) Arist., \textit{Oec.}, 1.5.6; Varro, \textit{Rust.}, 1.17.5; 1.17.7. Xen., \textit{Oec.}, 9.5; Arist., \textit{Oec.}, 1.5.6; Varro, \textit{Rust.}, 1.17.5; 2.10.6; Columella, \textit{Rust.}, 1.8.5; 1.8.19; Plut., \textit{Cat. Mai.}, 21.2.

\(^{22}\) Xen., \textit{Oec.}, 5.16; Arist., \textit{Oec.}, 1.5.6; \textit{Pol.}, 7.9.9; Columella, \textit{Rust.}, 1.8.19. Xen., \textit{Oec.}, 5.15; 7.41; 13.12; Arist., \textit{Oec.}, 1.5.3; Pl., \textit{Leg.}, 777\textbf{e}; Varro, \textit{Rust.}, 1.17.7; Columella, \textit{Rust.}, 1.8.16; 1.9.8; Bryson 64-72 (Swain).


\(^{24}\) Hom., \textit{Od.}, 17.320-323.

\textit{DHA} 41/1-2015
The infliction of physical pain has been thought a particularly effective means of achieving productivity among slaves who worked in occupations such as agriculture, mining and construction, where pure strength rather than technical knowledge was chiefly required. The option of rewarding slaves with preferential material treatment has also been thought more cost-effective and characteristic for slaves who were used in more skilled positions, especially those in their owners’ personal service. There is little doubt for instance that slave miners in antiquity were exposed to constant hardships. Diodorus Siculus describes labourers in Rome’s Spanish gold mines as “physical wrecks... forced by the beatings of their supervisors to stay at their places and throw away their lives.”

The high rate of mortality implied can be assumed normative earlier in the silver mines of Attic Laurium and the gold mines of Hellenistic Egypt. Similarly there is evidence that Roman slaves engaged in viticulture were regularly put to work in chains. In societies where mechanisation was relatively minimal and human beings were needed as sources of energy in great quantities, a fact often neglected, treatment of this kind will have affected inordinate numbers of people over time.

Domestic service, however, did not necessarily provide a safe haven. The poet Juvenal observed that one way for a Roman father to set a bad example for his children was to indulge an appetite for indiscriminately inflicting pain on household slaves, even for trivial offences, and, with inappropriate delight, create thereby a widespread atmosphere of fear among them: he could draw for instance on the services of a torturer to brand the slaves with red-hot iron, or put them in chains, dungeons, and prison-camps. The image is a caricature, appropriate for a satirist. But Juvenal assumed in creating it that his readers would recognise the underlying reality that the slave-owner might punish the domestic who stole two towels as savagely as the slave who worked on his landed estates. Proximity gave no protection, nor the intimacy between owner and owned that sometimes arose from it, nor even the slave’s capabilities. The trusted responsible slave might well be, and perhaps often was, the beneficiary of generous treatment – Cicero’s slave Tiro is perhaps the classic case – but there could be no guarantees. In the notorious inscription from Puteoli establishing procedures and costs for slave-owners who wished to use public

---

27 Columella, Rust., 1.9.4; Plin., Ep., 3.19.7; cf. Cato, Ag., 56; Sen., De ben., 7.10.5.
resources to flog or crucify their slaves, no allowance is made for distinctions of servile status. They were irrelevant.²⁹

Demosthenes said that the slave, unable to own anything, differed from the free man by having to answer for his offences with his body, while Cicero laid down the principle that the master should rule the slave by coercing and breaking him.³⁰ Hardly anyone would have disagreed. The humiliation the free might feel on being physically struck was not unknown to slaves: the philosopher Seneca, speaking either from experience or projecting his own values onto slaves as he distinguished injury (iniuria) from insult (contumelia), once remarked that the slave preferred to be beaten than to be hit by a fist and found beatings, and even death, preferable to verbal insults.³¹ But their finer feelings were of little real account and in all manner of circumstances slaves, throughout antiquity, paid and suffered with their bodies regardless of their place in the servile hierarchy. Beating and chaining were common elements of ordinary slave life in a world where violence reigned supreme – Seneca thought it natural to imagine that a slave accountant would be flogged when his master surveyed his work – as too was branding, which ironically created an opening for the rise of experts to remove the scars the practice left.³² A marble relief from Smyrna now in the Ashmolean Museum shows two pairs of chained and collared slaves, naked except for loin-cloths, pulled along by guards on their way to fight in the amphitheatre, while a terracotta panel in the British Museum showing part of a Roman triumphal procession includes two chained figures, seated in a cart, thought to be captives from Trajan’s wars against the Dacians. They were men of the sort Ovid imagined the people of Rome pointing out, their faces downcast or defiantly hostile, in the triumph he anticipated the future emperor Tiberius might celebrate for his German exploits.³³ The late Roman poet Ausonius was notably aware that the prospect of being led as a captive in a triumph induced nightmares.³⁴

Physical force moreover was institutionalised. Taking evidence from slaves by torture was routine in criminal cases in both Greek and Roman procedure, despite awareness of its unreliability.³⁵ Augustus, for instance, investigating a situation at Cnidos

³⁰ Dem., Or., 22.55; Cic., Rep., 3.37.
³¹ Sen., De prov., 5.1.
³³ Ov., Trist., 4.2.
³⁴ Auson., Ephem., 8.18.
³⁵ Cic., Pro Sulla, 78.
after a householding couple had ordered a slave to pour the contents of a chamber-pot onto an intruder who, in the event, was killed by the pot itself, did not hesitate to order the torture of slaves in the household to determine if the death was due to accident or was a case of murder. In addition, burning alive, condemnation to the amphitheatre, and crucifixion were normative “servile” forms of execution in the application of Roman law, for which there were many precedents. The citizens of Hellenistic Amyzon in Caria crucified and left as carrion a slave who had murdered his master and apparently attempted to conceal the crime by burning the master’s house with the body inside.

Altogether, the ideal slave-owner was supposed to avoid cruelty in disciplining his slaves, and social or legal pressure might be applied against owners thought to be excessively brutal. There were few effective limits on their authority, however, and punishing the slave, even with crucifixion, was as individualistic and uncontroversial as setting the slave free. It is no surprise therefore that Plutarch observed that the first thing a newly purchased slave wished to know about his owner was whether he was ill-tempered. Many slave-owners in antiquity can indeed be regarded as sadists. Sassia of Larinum who, according to Cicero, among other atrocities persecuted the admittedly nefarious slave Strato –he was crucified after his tongue was cut out– was perhaps exceptional, but only in degree. No less a figure than the distinguished Herodes Atticus was reputed in the age of the Second Sophistic to treat his slaves harshly.

4. Manumission

The hope of freedom proffered to slaves was sometimes realised, and various vehicles were devised to allow those without a social personality to cross the divide from slavery to freedom and to assume a legitimate identity. At times the vehicles were unsurprisingly rational, testamentary manumission for example or outright purchase of freedom, but sometimes culturally specific. Greek paramone (obligation) agreements required slaves to pay their owners a fee and owners to sell their slaves fictitiously to a god before freedom was conferred. At Rome manumission by vindicta required a claim
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36 IGRR IV 1031b.
38 Dion. Hal., 20.13 (2); Sen., De dem., 1.18.1.
40 Plut., Mor., 462a.
41 Cic., Pro Cluent., 179-187; cf. Sen., De ira, 3.34; Ep., 14.4.6; Mart., 2.82. Philostr., VS, 549.
to be made before a magistrate that a slave was free, the master to offer no objection, and the magistrate then to touch the slave with his rod of office (vindicata) to validate the liberation.

In classical Greece manumission was relatively infrequent as far as can be told, and freedom was not usually accompanied by the award of political rights. At Athens former slaves became metics, resident aliens subject to many formal restrictions. Romans, in contrast, were prepared to grant slaves freedom and citizenship together, although the creation of Junian status in the early Principate left many former slaves in an intermediate position (not always recognised), free but not citizens until and unless certain conditions were subsequently met. Both Greeks and Romans knew the principle of conditional manumission, which served the interests of owners particularly well then and offsets now any notion that the conferment of freedom was generally prompted by humanitarian factors. A paramone agreement of the first century AD, known from an inscription at Delphi, illustrates what might happen. A house-born slave named Onasiphoron agreed to work for her mistress for the rest of her life in return for her freedom and also to give the mistress a child, who would in effect replace her. If the agreement were broken, the mistress had the right to punish Onasiphoron in any way she wished, which other evidence indicates would mean by beating, imprisoning, or re-enslaving her. Her freedom was to be protected by Apollo. Roman slave-owners regularly bound their slaves at the moment of manumission to work or provide services (operae) for certain intervals of time afterwards, which meant that the freed slaves continued to work for their former owners, or their owners’ heirs, just as they had done previously. Those freed by testament were known as Orcivi, “men of Orcus.” The willingness of slaves to accept the obligations of conditional manumission in order to be free, and the attitudes of their owners in imposing them, stand as polar opposites. In an extreme case the motivating power of freedom is seen in the triumviral edict issued in 43 BC by M. Antonius, C. Caesar and M. Aemilius Lepidus: together with a cash reward of HS 10 000 they promised freedom to any slave who presented the decapitated heads of those on the list of the proscribed.

The relative liberality of Rome’s manumission practices might be taken to mean that most Roman slaves would eventually be freed. In the absence of statistics, however, the relationship between cultural disposition and real rates of manumission is irresoluble, no matter that Cicero in a rhetorical flourish suggests that war captives could expect to

---

42 Fouilles de Delphi 3.6.36.
44 App., BC. 4.11.
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be set free after a mere six years of enslavement. Large numbers of Latin sepulchral inscriptions commemorate freedmen and freedwomen, and inherently indicate that many acts of manumission took place over time, as do innumerable references to the freed in literary and legal sources. They provide no guide, however, to the incidence of manumission in Roman society at large. Manumission could not in any case be regularly practised unless new supplies of slaves were continually being procured, and regularity cannot by itself be taken as evidence that most Roman slaves were set free, or as some historians allege, that Roman slavery was mild in character. (Surely an oxymoron.) Domestic slaves with important responsibilities in urban households might have enjoyed greater hopes of freedom than rural workers or miners; but the harsh regimen of management under which they as well as other slaves lived brought no promise of rapid manumission, or of manumission at all. Most slaves were probably never set free, if, as is likely, many in the central era of Roman history were engaged in agriculture and mining. Sometimes manumission was simply a matter of chance, as with the odd slave who wisely advised a master to make amends for drunken indiscretions, or, in late antiquity, with those set free each year in the Circus at Constantinople when the new consuls entered office. Sometimes freedom was awarded but later cancelled, as when Cicero blithely rescinded the manumission of two of his slaves he had come to think of as criminous. This could be one circumstance that led to legal disputes over status.

Conferring freedom was above all a means to sustain and maintain slavery as a system, one result being the benefit to the slave-owner of the future services of a grateful freedman. Its unchanging structural utility in classical culture is well illustrated by the way in which new forms were invented as historical conditions changed: thus manumission in ecclesia, a form which allowed slave-owning Christians to free slaves before a priest of the new cult, was the special contribution of early Christianity. What was involved psychologically as the transition was made from one status to another it is difficult now to understand: how for instance a slave woman at Rome felt when she was set free and married her former master, a seemingly common occurrence, is beyond knowledge. But the desire for freedom itself can be taken for granted.

45 Cic., Phil., 8.11.32.
46 Sen., De ben., 3.27.1-4; Amm. Marc., 22.7.
47 Cic., Att., VII2.8.
48 Cic., Fam., XIII21.
49 Epict., 4.1.33.
5. Sale

If warfare always generated new supplies of slaves, in the fully developed systems of classical Greece and Rome other means of supply were also available: natural reproduction, the reclamation of exposed children, raiding and trading. The preponderance of one mechanism over another shifted from age to age and region to region, but attempts to quantify again lead to controversy and inconclusive results. There is no doubt, however, that for most periods in antiquity the practice of buying and selling slaves was as commonplace as acts of manumission. Cicero refers offhandedly in a letter written when provincial governor of Cilicia in 51 BC to the sale of prisoners he had captured at Pindenissum—they made, he said, for a happy Saturnalia—and once in the hands of the traders who followed Rome’s armies, such slaves might be disposed of locally or transported over long distances, across land or sea, to places where they were needed. It was what Tacitus called the “commerce of war,” which at a time of civil war, as in Roman Asia in the thirties BC, could involve the sheer looting by some of slaves belonging to others. In a later age Pausanias refers to the Tithoreans’ twice-yearly fairs at their sanctuary of Isis at which dealers sold slaves together with livestock, clothes, and precious metals; and later still Ammianus tells of Julian’s chamberlain Eutherius, who was born of free parents in Armenia but captured as a child and sold to Roman merchants, suffered castration, and was taken to Constantine’s court where he grew up and was educated. Slaves from the Black Sea were sold to Greek cities as early as the sixth century BC.

Sales records from Roman Egypt show in detail how men, women, and children were moved from place to place, and how new slaves were constantly imported from far distant regions of the Mediterranean. The transactions they record usually involved individual slaves, which suggests that the slaves concerned had been separated from their relatives as well as from their places of origin, although dealers may occasionally have been prepared to preserve familial connections despite possibly lower margins of profit. The transactions nonetheless display patterns of compulsion and deracination that applied wherever slave-trading took place, which was everywhere Greco-Roman culture
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manifested itself. The records also allow glimpses of real individuals, such as the female slave Plousia who at about the age of twenty-three was sold in the late first century AD by her owner, a married woman who had apparently inherited Plousia from her mother.  

Occasionally a record appears from another region, such as a fragmentary bill of sale from London documenting the transfer at the turn of the second century AD of a Gallic slave ironically named Fortunata, from her current owner Albicianus to a purchaser named Vegetus. This particular document impresses upon its modern reader the anomalies as well as the enormities of classical slavery, since Vegetus was himself a slave, but a slave of elevated status: he belonged to the Roman emperor. How Fortunata, who is said to be “by nationality a Diablintian,” came to be transported across the English Channel is unknown, but she changed hands for 600 denarii. (Albicianus was perhaps a slave-trader: slaves were exported from Britain). The words “or by whatever name she is known” that accompany her name in the document are entirely conventional, and together with the price illustrate the long-held perception that the slave was an object devoid of human personality. The indignities to which she will have been exposed in the transaction are best understood from the Roman law that governed sale, which included the requirement that sellers disclose every physical defect a slave might have, and allowed the purchaser to conduct a physical inspection to ensure the commodity’s soundness. All that mattered was protection of the purchaser’s interest.

6. Accommodation and resistance

The response of slaves to slavery was complex and multi-faceted. As in later slave societies, Greek and Roman slaves sometimes accepted their circumstances and worked within its limits to make their lives as tolerable as possible; and because slavery as a social category was never challenged in antiquity, it can be presumed that over time many slaves were psychologically and culturally conditioned to regard their status as inevitable. This was perhaps particularly true in a world where notions of radical social change were minimal, opportunities for significant upward mobility limited, and gradations of social status many and sharp. It can be no more than speculation, but the Greek-speaking slaves mentioned in an Egyptian papyrus from the second century BC who were required by the
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doctor who owned them to learn Demotic in order to increase their value may represent such people. At Rome, the willingness of many slaves to acquiesce, to manoeuvre within the established structures of society, is illustrated in the way that slave \textit{ministri} participated with freed and freeborn \textit{magistri} in the crossroads cult of the emperor’s Lares and Genius that began under Augustus, and by the tomb portraits of successful former slaves who remained visible, as it were, long after they had died, as fully fashioned Roman citizens dressed in toga and stola, with faces expressing the \textit{gravitas} they thought appropriate to Roman patriarchs and matriarchs. Some became slave-owners themselves, and in the imperial age those who belonged to the emperor’s household and held positions \textit{as de facto} imperial administrators found themselves at times so eminent that they became attractive as marital candidates for freeborn women—a truly bizarre social outcome. To grasp that the prosperous freed might once have lived as slaves in small, poorly lit and poorly ventilated cells of the type, with stone beds, known from the basement of a late Republican house on the Sacra Via in which there were fifty such rooms is a test of the imagination.

In contrast, the fixation evident among Greek and Roman slave-owners with managing their slave property implies that accommodation to servitude was a strategy of survival only, and that slaves were prepared whenever feasible to offer short-term challenges to their enslavement, no matter what their long-term hopes of eventual freedom. There could be no reason otherwise for the adoption of mechanisms of control. The enormous duration in time of the institution cannot of course be taken to indicate that slavery was an uncontested condition unlikely to provoke opposition, despite certain theoretical arguments, best represented now by a passage from the \textit{Politics} of Aristotle, that slavery was in accord with nature. Rather, a basic human instinct for acquiring freedom by any means possible must be recognised and direct servile resistance to slavery be understood as endemic and multi-dimensional. The sheer volume of evidence, whatever questions might be raised about individual items, leaves no room for doubt. Its forms ranged from outright revolt—turning the violence of slavery against slave-owners—to evasion of demands and assignments through dissimulation and guile.

In the Greek world revolt is notably attested on the island of Chios at the turn of the fourth century BC. It was led by a slave named Drimakos, who was able to organise a resilient community of fugitive slaves and became powerful enough to conduct
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negotiations with, and to achieve concessions from, the island’s slave-owners. The location of the revolt is arresting because Chios is said to have been the site where Greeks first bought and imported non-Greeks as chattels. How long the rebels maintained their community, a striking precursor of the maroon communities of the New World, is unknown, but Drimakos himself became and long remained a heroic object of veneration from slaves. Nothing in this episode, however, suggests that the revolt had a revolutionary aspect: its purpose was to improve local conditions, not to attack slavery as an institution; but it is important as an indication of slaves’ capacity to assert their human agency, as also for showing the need for dynamic leadership in initiating and maintaining insurgence.

The most famous slave revolt in antiquity was that led by the gladiator Spartacus in Italy in the late seventies of the first century BC. It began when Spartacus and some seventy gladiators broke out of their training-school in Capua and were spontaneously joined by slaves from the surrounding countryside. They took up a position on Mount Vesuvius on the Bay of Naples and defeated the troops quickly sent against them, but as servile support consequently increased into the thousands they were faced with the issue of how to sustain their revolt, or of how to convert the temporary freedom acquired by the initial act of resistance into something permanent. For two years the slave rebels wandered up and down Italy, first attempting to leave the peninsula across the Alps, then returning to the south to try to escape by sea. Their military fortunes were mixed, and fissures in strategy set in as rivals to Spartacus’ leadership emerged. In the event Rome crushed the revolt—the future triumvir M. Licinius Crassus famously crucified 6 000 of Spartacus’ defeated followers along the Appian Way from Capua to Rome— and nothing of lasting value was achieved, except that Spartacus became a symbol among the slave-owning sectors of society in later ages of the violence that might potentially be unleashed against them at any moment. The powerful were always aware of their vulnerability to servile assault, as even the younger Pliny reveals in his generally gentle portrait of imperial upper-class society. Much later in history, “the black Spartacus” Toussaint L’Ouverture was to perpetuate the myth of the Thracian rebel in the revolution that resulted in the creation of the state of Haiti. But as with Drimakos there was nothing revolutionary about Spartacus’ revolt or any other violent uprising of slaves in Greco-Roman antiquity. The motivations were purely individualistic: to preserve as long as possible the fragile hold on independence the act of revolt conferred.
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Slaves indeed seem never to have hoped for more than their own release from servitude. In Rome’s high imperial age Artemidorus of Daldis suggested in his book on dream interpretation many meanings for the dreams dreamt by slaves, but the most common is that the slave dreamer would be set free. And as Artemidorus knew this sometimes happened: he cites the case of a male slave who dreamed that he had three sets of genitals (*aidoia*) and who subsequently acquired three names in place of the single name by which he was known previously, a clear example of Roman manumission in which the slave took the *praenomen* and *nomen* of his former master and retained his original slave name as a *cognomen*. Yet in all the hundreds of dream interpretations Artemidorus offers nothing indicates a threat to the slavery system at large, either from slaves or slave-owners.

Major revolts of the Spartacan kind were in fact few and far between. The dangers to slaves involved are sufficient explanation. Relatively less hazardous, and far more common throughout antiquity, were attempts to run away, either temporarily to seek short-term relief or to shake off for ever the constraints of oppression. At a minimum, the obsessive interest Greek and Roman authors display in fugitive slaves proves that running away was a widespread form of servile protest, whether *en masse*, as with the 20,000 Athenian slaves who ran away during the Peloponnesian War when the Spartans occupied Decelea, or individually, as with Amianus, a slave who belonged to Cicero’s friend Atticus, or Onesimus, a slave who ran away from his Christian master Philemon and took refuge with the apostle Paul in Rome, only to be uncharitably returned. Slaves knew that there was no safe haven in which freedom could be guaranteed – harbouring fugitives was prohibited under Roman law – and that efforts to recover and punish them were predictable. Slave-owners posted notices in public places describing runaways and offered rewards for their return: examples have survived from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt and provide eloquent testimony to the sense of outrage owners felt when slaves abscended and to their determination not to tolerate any loss of property. They also hired professional slave-catchers and drew on personal contacts to track and capture runaways. The reach of powerful men such as Cicero and Symmachus was extraordinary. Slaves nonetheless took whatever opportunities to flee there were. How many were able to secure permanent freedom cannot be determined, but errant slaves were a source of irritation to their owners, and in comparison with New World slaves their chances of
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successful escape may have been increased by the absence of a direct connection between slavery and skin-colour. On the other hand, the unavailability of “free soil” was a serious limitation, and at all times the decision to run away is likely to have been difficult, contingent upon practical and psychological factors. The slave-like Lucius the Ass in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* asks the all-important question: “Where in the world are you to flee to, and who will take you in?”

Independence of mind and opposition to authority could be shown more easily through acts of sabotage against slave-owners’ property. Greek and Roman slave-owners complained incessantly that their slaves were troublesome, lazy and unreliable: apart from running away, they stole food and clothing, embezzled money, neglected or injured animals in their charge, pretended to be ill to avoid work, lied when it was time to assess work completed, ruined the harvest, set fire to buildings – all were culpable, no matter what their status or the type of work they did. The slave as thief and fugitive was indeed a stereotype. The similarity of these laments to complaints made by slave-owners in New World and other slave societies is remarkable, and must be taken to reflect jaundiced characterisations of actions slaves took from day to day to frustrate their owners and empower themselves. The potential for antagonism, as the philosopher, and former slave, Epictetus makes clear, was well understood. Such actions, however, did not derive from class solidarity. As seen earlier, ancient slave populations were far too heterogeneous for that ideological notion ever to emerge, and slave-owners themselves understood that their slaves responded to the way they were treated. Revenge for castration for instance led to the murder of the slave-owner Minucius Basilus, one of the assassins of Julius Caesar. As in the New World, however, the vexation to which the actions led allowed the human character of the slave property to express itself, and in this undercurrent of defiance a glimpse of servile mentality becomes perceptible. Slaves in Greco-Roman antiquity were constantly engaged in sporadic acts of low-level resistance, offsetting thereby Seneca’s remark that the bitterest part of slavery was that the slave had no free will. A slave named Telephus who once assaulted Augustus was said to have suffered
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from delusions of grandeur—he thought he was destined to become emperor—but he was capable enough of making a decision.\textsuperscript{72}

7. Intellectualism

Aristotle was only one of many classical authors whose theories of, or speculations about, slavery may still be read. The catalogue extends to Augustine and others in late antiquity, and its extent may be due to supposing that among intellectuals slavery was from time to time a provocative source of debate. This is implicit for example in Philo’s attribution of slavery to divine providence, or Augustine’s view that slavery was the result of the Fall.\textsuperscript{73} Aristotle’s particular argument that slavery was natural is a seeming response to others who thought the opposite. The discussions concerned may be taken as indications of the real-life tensions between owners and owned that both prescriptions of management and acts of resistance logically require, or indeed of the state of enmity that was sometimes said to exist between slave-owner and slave.\textsuperscript{74} Through the long history of classical slavery, however, there is no sure evidence that Greeks and Romans ever came to regard slavery, as men and women in later history were to do, as a social ill in need of amelioration; nor as far as can be told did the idea of abolition ever present itself. This is surprising given the ethical preoccupations of Greek philosophy and the highly moralistic traditions of Roman culture writ large, but the failure—and it was a failure—cannot be attributed to any lack of imaginative capacity. At certain stages of their history both Greeks and Romans, as other ancient Mediterranean peoples, allowed creditors to enslave debtors who could not repay their debts. Yet when the practice became inflammatory enslavement for debt was stopped, at Athens in the early sixth century BC, at Rome in the late fourth century BC. Social reform was not altogether unknown in antiquity.

Greco-Roman intellectuals, however, seem to have inspired no sustained challenge to slavery as an institution, a reality complicated by the paradox that despite the incontestable prejudice felt and communicated by representatives of the slave-owning sectors of society against slaves, individual slave-owners can sometimes be seen to have treated individual slaves and former slaves very well. Cicero is a prime illustration. Advising his brother on how to comport himself as proconsul of Asia, Cicero insisted
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that Quintus keep his slaves firmly under control for the sake of his own reputation, a statement in which generic disdain is clearly in play; but any number of former slaves were subjects of enthusiastic letters of recommendation from him, and Tiro was evidently a close companion, almost a member of the family. Later the poet Martial set free his slave amanuensis Demetrius, fatally sick from plague, in order that the slave would die a free man.

The explanation lies in cultural disposition. Legend held that in the deep recesses of the primeval past men had once lived together peacefully as free equals, sharing a communal bounty of the earth, a fantasy which celebrations of the Greek Cronia and even more so the Roman Saturnalia kept vivid for centuries. Yet in reality there was no concept of social egalitarianism of the kind that now predominates in the modern western liberal tradition: freedom in antiquity was not imagined as a universal right but as a prerogative of the special few, and it was a right to be jealously protected. Antiquity indeed knew no human rights at all. Aristotle said that “the condition of the free man is that he does not live under the constraint of another,” a remark that by definition embodied an exclusionary mode of thought that made it impossible for everyone to enjoy a comparable status. And whereas in modern discourse slavery serves as a metaphorical counter to freedom, in antiquity it was a literal necessity by which the freedom of those who were privileged to possess it was preserved. As long as warfare shaped life this could hardly be otherwise: the instinctual “desire to dominate” demanded that some should live in a state of total subjection.

Legend and intellectualism came together in the Stoic doctrine that all men were brothers. But the common freedom that the brotherhood of man implied was a freedom of the spirit only, and the concept had no substantial impact on everyday realities. The Roman Stoic Seneca certainly advocated kindly treatment of slaves, and decried what he saw in his day as widespread abuses of power by his social peers. His object, however, was to create, in his own image, ethically whole slave-owners, not to promote a gospel of sympathy through which slaves’ sufferings might be alleviated because the sufferings were due to a social evil. Any benefit slaves derived from his teaching was incidental. Similarly, Dio Chrysostom’s argument that war captives were not true slaves because they had once been free, and somehow still were, impresses with its ingenuity but not
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its compassion, and it can hardly have afforded much consolation to actual prisoners.\textsuperscript{79} As for the philosophical commonplace, known for instance from an anecdote about the great biographer Plutarch, that a slave-owner should flog his slaves only when in control of his emotions, not in anger, the benefit to the slave is again unlikely to have been great.\textsuperscript{80} Stoic and other moralists were doubtless men of principle, but their view that degradation and ill-treatment meant nothing in comparison with the freedom of the spirit slaves enjoyed, that nobility of character somehow elevated slaves, and that their station in life was due to providence, was clearly complacent.

Stoic teachings were in due course redeployed in Christian teachings, especially in the so-called household codes of the New Testament –the ubiquity of slavery in the New Testament is no accident– where the claim was repeatedly made that all were equal in the sight of the god of the new mystery cult that emerged and prospered in the Roman imperial age: neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female, neither slave nor free. But no practical improvements accompanied this comforting message, ecclesiastical manumission apart, and the injunction that Christian slaves were to obey their owners “in fear and trembling, as unto God,” introduced a new method of psychological control that far exceeded anything ever previously devised. The threat of eternal damnation as the price of servile disobedience was a terrible and terrifying sanction. It was not of course that Christian leaders were blind to reality. Ambrose knew that slavery was wretched, and maintained in the wake of the battle of Hadrianople that it was an act of Christian charity to redeem enslaved prisoners of war.\textsuperscript{81} Gregory of Nyssa pointed to the sin of pride and the barring of the path to salvation that slave-owning promoted among slave-owners.\textsuperscript{82} Salvian was emphatic that it was wrong for Christian men to use their female slaves as objects of sexual gratification.\textsuperscript{83} Yet no Christian leader called for an end to slavery, and it remains a stumbling-block to modern perception that the advocacy of Christian equality in a work such as Lactantius’ \textit{Divine Institutes} was not followed by practical improvement.\textsuperscript{84} In the centuries when the new cult transformed the religious complexion of the Greco-Roman Mediterranean this was the greatest failure of all.
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8. Conclusion

Early in the first century AD, a certain Valerius Maximus, an obscure figure, compiled an aide-mémoire of historical anecdotes in which he coined the striking phrase, “the bitter chain of slavery,” a revealing metaphor that communicates the uncontroversial presence of slavery in the world around him – slavery was not a peculiar institution – but with all the connotations of slavery’s essential harshness. As Lactantius later put it, the slave-owner was supreme in the power he wielded to reprove or punish and the ideal state was one in which the slave feared his master. Across the history of the ancient Mediterranean, untold numbers of men, women, and children experienced slavery’s bitter chain, and when the world was no longer ruled by Rome they were succeeded by many others in the Byzantine empire of the east and the Germanic kingdoms of the west until, in turn, the rise of Islam brought a new demand for slaves in the Middle East, Spain, and North Africa. In its heyday Rome had imported a certain number of African slaves from sub-Saharan sources whose Mediterranean presence is perceptible now above all in visual sources, especially in the grand mosaics with which wealthy Roman magnates decorated their houses. From the bend of the Niger and elsewhere in central Africa to the shores of the Mediterranean transportation routes across the desert had been known for centuries, and the slave-trade of Islam was to draw heavily on them. As the New World gradually entered the European consciousness, however, this pattern of supply gave way to the transportation of Africans across the Atlantic, with collusion from African peoples themselves, among whom systems of slavery had long flourished independently that Europeans were duly able to exploit. The result was the capitalistic slave societies with which I began. The propensity of ancient Mediterranean peoples to rely on cruelty, coercion and constraint in the creation of their cultures was not historically unique. On any objective estimate, however, it remains beyond apology.

Bibliographical Notes

The bibliography on slavery in antiquity is immense. For an overview see Bradley and Cartledge 2011, and for access to specialised sources see Bellen and Heinen 2003. Patterson 1982 is crucial on the universal institution; see also especially Meillasoux 1991, and for comparative refinements Dal Lago and Katsari 2008. Alston 2011 speculates on origins, but historians might be more concerned with realia. On the Near East see
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Cuthbertson 2011, and for Jewish slavery in antiquity see Hezser 2005. There is much of general interest in duBois 2003. For the importance of slavery in Roman imperial discourse see Lavan 2013. A comprehensive study of slaves in Greco-Roman art remains to be written, but for representative Greek vases see Finley 2002 and the discussion of Wrenhaven 2012: 75-89. For Claudius as conqueror of Britain see Smith 1987: 115-117 with pl. XIV. Lenski 2011 gives many examples of late imperial enslavements due to war. On classical Athenian court cases see Vlassopoulos 2009. On slavery and the Roman economy the theoretical determinants are clearly set out in Scheidel 2012; on modern economic theory see Scheidel, Morris, Saller 2007: ch. 4. Roth 2007 stresses the importance of female slave labour. Richlin 2014: 218-219 finds reason in the theatre of Plautus to believe in a servile group consciousness that seems to me distinct from class consciousness. For the building of the Erechtheion see Burford 1972: 90-91. Slave numbers are tied to questions of total population numbers: for Italy in the late Republic debate centres on relatively high and low extrapolations from the few inherently problematical census figures on record; see for access to discussion Scheidel 2004, Rosenstein 2004, Lo Cascio 2010, Hin 2013. Andreau and Descat 2011 retain high estimates for both Athens and Rome. Harper 2011 makes the vibrancy of slavery in late antiquity indisputable. For Athenian slaves’ names see Vlassopoulos 2010. On pain incentives see Fenoalta 1984. The use of chain-gangs in Italian agriculture is strenuously but controversially denied by Roth 2011. On manumission see respectively for Greek and Roman practices Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005 and Mouritsen 2011. Kamen 2014 underscores with regard to sexually exploited female slaves at Delphi the limits of manumission, while Perry 2014 examines the circumstances at large of manumitted female slaves in Roman society. Connolly 2004-2005 draws attention to rescripts in the Codex Justinianus concerned with disputes over servile status. For debate on the Roman slave supply see Scheidel 1997, Scheidel 2004, Harris 2011: ch. 4 (original 1999). Modelling techniques have not yet produced more conclusive results than impressions formed from conventional sources. For sale of war captives see Welwei 2000 and for sales documents see Scholl 1990, Straus 2004, and, for Fortunata, Tomlin 2003 (cf. Camodeca 2006); cf. also Binsfeld 2008. Benaisa 2011 and McLeod 2012 identify new evidence of individual slave sales, the former of special interest given the double sale of a twelve-year old girl transported from Syria Palaestina to Oxyrhynchus. Jones 2008 in contrast offers evidence for the preservation of familial ties among slaves at time of sale. Thompson 2003 is a rich collection of evidence of shackles and related materials, while Weaver 1972 remains standard on Roman imperial freedmen. For freedmen portraits see Kleiner 1977. On slave resistance see the respective approaches of McKeown 2011.
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