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Schedule

Week 1
- Tuesday, 26 April, 12pm  Alex Antoniou

Week 2
- Monday, 2 May, 9am  Daniel Etches Jones
- Tuesday, 3 May, 12pm  Matt Hewitt

Week 3
- Monday, 9 May, 9am  Alexander Moore
- Tuesday, 10 May, 12pm  Will Szymanski
- Wednesday, 11 May, 9am  Oliver Clarke

Week 4
- Monday, 16 May, 9am  Luca Ricci
- Tuesday, 17 May, 12pm  Eddie Jones

Alex Antoniou

Title
Everything wrong with the late republic? M. Tullius Cicero on P. Clodius Pulcher

Finals paper(s) intended for
Republic in Crisis, 146-46 BC
Cicero: Politics and Thought

A brief synopsis
This lecture focuses primarily on the highly volatile relationship between M. Tullius Cicero and P. Clodius Pulcher in the late 60s and 50s BCE. Their relationship (through the lens of Cicero’s vitriol against Clodius) perhaps best exemplifies many of the wider socio-political stresses and agitations of the late republic. By delving into a handful of Cicero’s letters and a few post-exile speeches, this lecture will explore not only how Cicero dealt with one of his key political opponents in this period, but will critically examine key concepts such as libertas and contests of ‘popular’ rhetoric, the (mis-)use of religion, and the role and use of violence, and thus is intended to be of use primarily for Finalists of Republic in Crisis 146-46 BC, and Cicero: Politics in Thought.

Oliver Clarke

Title: Death, Resistance, Revival and Glory: The Polis as protagonist in the Early Hellenistic Era

Intended for students taking the papers “Alexander the Great and his Early Successors”, and “The Hellenistic World: Societies and Cultures, c.300-100 BC”

Synopsis:
In this lecture, I wish to present the period from the 330s to the middle of the third century BC from the perspective of the Greek poleis, where the usually far more prominent biographies of Alexander and his successors form instead the background for the cities’ histories. I will do this by drawing examples from four old Greek cities, two on the Greek mainland, one island and one on the mainland of Asia Minor: Thebes, Sparta, Samos and Ephesus. I will touch upon the cities’ strategies for navigating this era, dealing with the kings in peace and war, with their peers near and far and with their own territories and internal
politics. Evidence for these will be drawn from both the literary testimony, and epigraphic
texts (with reference to sources within the prescriptions of the respective papers e.g.
Plutarch’s *Lives of Agis and Cleomenes* and the inscriptions of Iasos and Samos honouring
Gorgos and Minnion). The failures and successes of these strategies within these complex
decades grant us insights into how these cities, all prominent in earlier periods of Greek
history, viewed the new Hellenistic world, and illuminate our own understanding of that key
Hellenistic feature, the interplay between *polis* and king.

**Daniel Etches Jones**

"Founder of his own greatness"? Lysander and the Construction of a Historical
Moment (Osborne and Rhodes No. 192)

*Intended Papers:* This lecture takes its starting point from an inscription in the epigraphic
dossier for Greek History 2. It would be most relevant for those sitting this paper, but would
also be of use for those sitting Athenian Democracy and Greek History 3. Students taking
Hellenistic World or Alexander may also find this of interest given that they will likely be
familiar with Lysander’s role in the development of cult honours for mortals.

*Synopsis:* Students of the Peloponnesian War will be well aware of the part played by
Lysander in its conclusion, particularly his role in securing Achaemenid support for the
Peloponnesians, loosening Athens' grip on the Aegean, and defeating the Athenian fleet at
Aegospotamoi. This latter was a moment of profound historical significance and it was
clearly recognised as such at the time.

In this lecture, I hope to demonstrate how Lysander – acutely alert to the role he was playing
in Greek history – helped to shape the presentation of Peloponnesian victory and Athenian
defeat whilst simultaneously implicating himself at its core. I thus begin by exploring OR 192
– the Delphic victory monument – as a document and as a monument before considering how
Lysander depicted himself more broadly (touching therefore on how he was received,
particularly with reference to the title quote, which is taken from Plutarch’s comparison of
Lysander and Sulla). I will then turn to how this might have influenced and connected with
non-Athenian presentations of Athenian power. These two halves are connected by the coins
of several cities in Asia Minor featuring Heracles Draconopnigon, iconography particularly
relevant to Lysander’s self-presentation as well as to anti-Athenian rhetoric more generally.
Finally, I will return to the Delphic monument to conclude that this was not just a case of the
victors writing history, but of a profoundly egotistical victor writing a very particular – and
very personal – history.

This lecture will therefore provide good consolidation of an important document that students
might face as a gobbet in a GH2 exam, whilst also providing revision of the more easily
neglected end of that syllabus. I also hope to remind students of the value of attempting to
extract non-Athenian views of the period: this is (rightly) a *topos* of exam papers and so I
believe that this lecture would be of great use in the run-up to exams.

**Matthew Hewitt**

**Lecture Title:** Slavery and Epigraphy in Classical Athens

**Relevant Finals papers:** Athenian Democracy in the Classical Age (less directly also to
Thucydides and the Greek World, 479-403 BC; The End of the Peloponnesian War to the Death
of Philip II of Macedon, 403-336 BC)

**Lecture synopsis:**

The object of the lecture is to provide students with an understanding of what epigraphy can
(and cannot) tell us about various aspects of enslavement in Classical Athens. Inscriptions
provide insights into aspects of enslavement with which our literary sources rarely concern
themselves, on issues of quantity (e.g. the assets of individual slaveholders, gender imbalance among the enslaved), the occupations of the enslaved, onomastics, and the punishment (and underlying ideology) sanctioned by the slave-owning community.

On the other hand, just as with the great majority of our literary sources, epigraphy fails (with a few rare exceptions) to provide us with the perspectives of the enslaved. Furthermore, we must be wary of the discrepancies between what we, as historians, would like to know and read into these inscriptions, and what the Greeks themselves were trying to record.

The lecture will introduce students to key epigraphic documents from Classical Athens (including the Attic Stelai; the ‘phialai exeleutherikai’; the Erechtheion accounts; the law of the dokimastai, and other laws relating to the punishment of slaves and their accountability; the lead letter of Lesis), with some comparanda from the wider Greek world (notably manumission inscriptions and the Dodona lamellae). The aim is to familiarise students with some of the key scholarly ideas and arguments surrounding these texts, and their significance for the construction of a social history of democratic Athens, while also encouraging critical engagement with often somewhat mystifying epigraphic evidence.

**Eddie Jones**

‘Inscribed Administrative Records from Athens’

Students taking GH2, GH3, and Athenian Democracy, are required to show awareness of certain inscribed documents in their exam answers. The faculty accordingly offers lectures covering the relevant material. However, inscribed legislation—specifically well-known Athenian decrees—is disproportionately represented among the prescribed, inscribed documents. This lecture therefore focuses especially on inscriptions other than decrees, e.g. inscribed inventories, lists, accounts of money, etc..

The lecture would help finalists consolidate their knowledge of this material, which is often neglected. That neglect is partly a product of reading transcribed or translated facsimiles of administrative inscriptions (which can admittedly appear quite boring) in isolation, whereas the lecture introduces a tripartite methodology, involving the parallel exploration of a given inscription’s materiality/formatting/content.

However, the aim of the lecture is not simply to refresh the students’ understanding, nor only to update their methodological toolbox. Around two thirds of the lecture will be devoted to providing concrete examples of how inscribed records can enrich the students’ understanding of a range topics, including but not limited to: the notion of epigraphic habits; literacy and numeracy; accountability; the role of public slaves in administering the polis; Athenian imperialism; the differences between Athens’ democracy in the fifth vs. fourth century; etc.

In sum, the lecture would demonstrate how students can integrate into their answers epigraphic evidence which is typically less well-handled or ignored.

**Alexander Moore**

‘The Grasping, Greedy Soldiery of the Late Republic’: The Fallacy of the “Post-Marian Army” and the Supposed Emergence of a Proletarian, Mercenary Force.


There is no denying that Marius’ levy of capite censi (those below the minimum property requirement to serve) in 107 BC sent shockwaves through both ancient and modern historiography. According to the ancient tradition, primarily espoused by Sallust, ‘ipse interea milites scribere, non more maiorum neque ex classibus, sed uti quoiusque lubido erat, capite censos plerosque. Id factum alii inopia bonorum, alii per ambitionem consulis memorabant, quod ab eo genere celebratus auctusque erat, et homini potentiam
Thus, we are presented with two possibilities: Marius either abandoned the *mos maiorum* because of a lack of “good men” (seemingly, recruits who possessed enough property to fulfil the requirement to serve) or owing to his own selfish political ambition. Both possibilities are of course integral to two important features explored within the above named FHS Roman History period paper: (i) the demographic debate surrounding the population of Italy and a potential lack of manpower in the mid-Second century BC; and (ii) the prominence of *popularis* politics in the aftermath of the Gracchi. However, though both themes naturally warrant discussion when dealing with Marius’ infamous levy in 107, the focus of this lecture is that whichever interpretation we accept, the fact seems to be that the Roman army definitively changed in 107 as *capite censi/proletarii* could now volunteer for service.

Modern scholars are here in disagreement. Traditionally, 107 was regarded as a watershed: by supposedly abolishing the property requirement to serve, the ranks of the Roman army were then flooded with volunteer *proletarii* whose only concern was the advancement of their own material wealth. Even after scholars began to critically approach Marius’ levy with greater scrutiny and subsequently determine that it was not a complete novelty (as the army had experienced a steady degree of proletarianization over the last century or more), most continue to accept that the character of the Roman army was fundamentally changed in this period. Whether Marius realised it or not, this inherently proletarian army seemingly had little interest in politics and, therefore, was a fundamental tool for the later generals of the Republic who were able to cultivate their own private, client armies with promises of land and the distribution of largesse. With some variation (i.e. whether Marius or the Social War was truly to blame), this has remained the *communis opinio* of scholars until Cadiou’s recent monograph. Labelling the above view of the “post-Marian” army as a historiographical mirage, he demonstrates that the late republican army was never homogenous in social or political outlook. Certainly, a degree of proletarianization took place, but the question is how great was the proportion of *proletarii*, and did this ever lead to a ‘grasping, greedy soldiery’ as Lawrence Keppie famously remarked?

Naturally, therefore, Cadiou’s work and the continued debate surrounding Marius’ “reforms” remains a vital feature of any discussion on the late republican army and its subsequent relationship with politics (themselves significant themes for the above FHS paper). However, Cadiou’s monograph is unfortunately still only available entirely in French, and thus struggles to be accessible to the masses. Consequently, this lecture provides an opportunity for undergraduates to not only think more critically about the Marian “reforms” and the nature of the Roman army in the Late Republic, but significantly benefit from Cadiou’s

1 Sall. *lug.* 86.2-3. Cf. Plut. *Mar.* 9.1: ‘Ἀναγορευθεὶς δὲ λαμπρῶς ἐὐθὺς ἐστρατολόγει, παρὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τὴν συνήθειαν πολλὸν τῶν ἄπορον καὶ φαῦλον καταγραφών, τῶν πρόσδεχεν ἡγεμόνων ὧν προσδέχομένων τοὺς τοιούτους, ἀλλ᾿ ὦσπερ ἄλλο τι τῶν καλῶν, τὰ ὅπλα μετὰ τιμῆς τοῖς ἀξίοις νεμόντων, ἐνέχυρον τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκ τοῦτο τιθέναι δοκοῦντος’ (he [Marius] was triumphantly elected, and at once began to levy troops. Contrary to law and custom he enlisted many a poor and insignificant man, although former commanders had not accepted such persons, but bestowed arms, just as they would any other honour, only on those whose property assessment made them worthy to receive these, each soldier being supposed to put his substance in pledge to the state).
hypothesis which they otherwise may never be able to consult due to the unfortunate language barrier.

Luca Ricci
Title – Agricultural crisis in the Italian peninsula? Historiographical (re)considerations
This lecture is intended for the course 405/425/485 ‘Republic in Crisis, 146-46 BC’ and it examines the broader socio-economic crisis that affected Italy in the late second century BCE. Due to a reliance on literary evidence (e.g., Appian and Plutarch), late-second-century Italy was seen as undergoing a shift from free landholding to slave-staffed farms (latifundia), resulting in a large mass of dispossessed people, while concurrently experiencing a decrease in population. Recently, such a picture has been amply deconstructed and criticised. In the lecture, I will focus on the historiographical developments that brought about a more granular understanding of the crisis. In particular, I will show how scholars have determined that the latifundia system is largely unaccounted for in the ancient evidence, and how landholding patterns present no uniformity across the peninsula, instead acquiring regional connotations. At the same time, I will show that the notion of landholding, especially in relation to the Gracchan reforms, must be tackled together with themes of demography and migration. Hence, I will explain the modalities according to which population was increasing (distinguishing between high and low counts), against the traditional picture of population decline, and how this demographic issue impacted on migratory movements and the urban centres (most notably, Rome) that received these migratory waves. I believe that such a lecture would prove beneficial to undergraduate and postgraduate students who want to acquire a better grasp of the ample evidence (both literary and archaeological) at our disposal and who want to cement their knowledge of how recent and complex historiographical debates on the socio-economic crisis of the Late Republic have come about.

Will Szymanski
Title: Sulla’s example and the fall of the Roman Republic
Finals papers: RH5, with some contextual relevance for both Cicero papers and RH6

Synopsis:
- Sulla has been described as an enigma, and he appears in our set texts as a puzzling figure. The ‘fortissimus vir et summus imperator’ (Cic. Leg. Man. 8) is the same man as the ‘scaevos iste Romulus’ (Sall. Hist. 1.55.5).
- Syme famously claimed that he ‘could not abolish his own example’, referring to Sulla’s two marches on Rome. They were unprecedented and transgressive, and leave a significant impact on our sources. In this light, scholars have argued that Sulla played a major role in the ‘fall of the Roman Republic’, or the political transformations that occurred during this period.
- In this lecture, I will set out exactly what Sulla’s example was. I will discuss the evidence behind his acts as dictator, which are vital to our understanding of several late Republic political institutions, such as the Senate, the tribunate, and the courts.
- I will also discuss the evidence for the reaction to Sulla, considering what we can know of responses from the Roman elite, the people, the army, non-Romans, and other groups.
- Finally, I will discuss how we can think about Sulla’s impact on the late Republic. I will look at the contemporary discussions of his legacy in Cicero and Sallust, and talk about
how imperial authors such as Plutarch and Appian used Sulla in their narratives. I will also consider how the memory of Sulla affected the discourse on Caesar’s civil war.

- This lecture will help students consolidate their knowledge of the diverse and ambiguous evidence on Sulla and his dictatorship, a good deal of which is in the set texts. It will encourage them to think about Sulla’s impact on a number of central themes of this paper, including land distribution, the enfranchisement of Italian communities, civil war, and the concentration of political power.