

The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity; Istoria Sclavajului in Dacia Romana; Struktur der Antiken Sklavenkriege



Review Author[s]:
P. A. Brunt

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 48, No. 1/2 (1958), 164-170.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4358%281958%2948%3A1%2F2%3C164%3ATSSOGA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

The Journal of Roman Studies is currently published by Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sprs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

efficient cultivation as reckoned by (ancient) agricultural experts' (A. H. M. Jones, *JRS* XLIII, 1953, 57). And so on. Yet the eastern Empire did not 'fall'. Only once does Boak face the problem, when he explains that the eastern emperors avoided the disaster of a barbarized army by finding 'a source of recruits in the Romanized population of the East with which to counterbalance their Germanic mercenaries' (p. 117). This will not do. If manpower shortage was the key to every difficulty from the third century on, including army recruitment, by what magic were the eastern emperors able to discover manpower which did not exist? Stated in general terms, if manpower shortage did not bring down the eastern Empire, it is not the key to the fall of the western Empire. (On this basic problem, see N. H. Baynes, 'The Decline of the Roman Power in Western Europe: Some Modern Explanations', *JRS* xxxiii, 1943, 29-35; reprinted in his *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*, London 1955, ch. v.)

IV. The short of it is that population is never an independent variable. We can understand how a severe plague or great war brings about an immediate reduction, or how improved sanitation and greater medical knowledge change the average age of death. But these tell us nothing about long-term trends. Professor Boak does not seem to have asked himself what causes a population to rise or fall over a long period. Apart from the brief and not very helpful life-expectancy analysis, his account simply assumes some kind of inevitability—in this instance, inevitably downwards. He is right to insist that population *is* a factor, and to protest against the prevailing indifference among historians of antiquity. That is a service. But with it goes a danger, that his way of insisting, and in particular his pretended scientific laws, will satisfy the longing for neat solutions. Declining population will then take the place of soil exhaustion and race mixture, to become the fashionable explanation of the '50s and '60s of the fall of Rome.

M. I. FINLEY.

W. L. WESTERMANN, *THE SLAVE SYSTEMS OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1955. Pp. xii + 180. \$3.

D. TUDOR, *ISTORIA SCLAVAYULUI IN DACIA ROMANA*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1957. Pp. 310. Lei 23.

J. VOGT, *STRUKTUR DER ANTIKEN SKLAVENKRIEGE*. *Abhandlungen der Geistes- u. Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Akad. der Wiss. u. der Lit.* Wiesbaden: Akademie des Wissenschaften, 1957. Pp. 57. DM 4.80.

Professor Westermann was already dead when the work reviewed here was published. It is a much revised edition of his well-known article on slavery in P-W. He had devoted much of his life to the subject, and it would be agreeable to say that he has provided us with a reliable survey. Candour forbids. Not only is his style and arrangement often unclear; there are also serious errors and omissions, both of ancient evidence and modern discussions, which will greatly detract from the value of his work, unless it is read with the utmost caution: see the review in *CR* 1957, 54-9 by G.E.M. de Ste Croix, to whom I am also grateful for further assistance. Still, W. has undoubtedly collected copious material, especially from the papyri, for assessing an institution whose effects permeated ancient civilization, and to such an assessment he himself brought a judgement less biased than Wallon, whose work he has not wholly superseded. A more thorough and accurate survey still needs to be made, but whoever attempts the task will often have to build on W.'s treatment. For further study a brief examination of a few important questions relating to Roman slavery that W. raised or should have raised may be more helpful than a mere catalogue of defects in his account. Here and there I shall refer to American analogies, for which I have drawn chiefly on L. C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern U.S. to 1860* (Washington, 1933, 2 vols. with abundant material) and K. M. Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution* (New York, 1956); in the light of these works the much cited opinions of Cairnes appear antiquated.

Manumission etc. The prospect of freedom and citizenship was the slave's chief incentive to efficiency; indeed the frugality which enabled him to amass a *peculium*, available for buying his freedom, actually enhanced his market value (*Dig.* 21, 1, 18). The great number of freedmen may have profoundly modified Roman society. Yet W. has little to say on such essential matters. He fails to examine the modes of manumission or their antiquity (D. Daube, *JRS* 36, 57 ff., is not cited), or even to mention Junian Latinity. While rightly rejecting (89) Suetonius' racial motive for Augustus' restrictions on manumission, he states neither the invincible objection—that Augustus also encouraged freedmen to increase and multiply (see e.g. *CAH* x, 449-51; cf. also the *ius anniculi*)—nor what I think the correct explanation: that Augustus wished to ensure, so far as possible, that enfranchisement should reward merit, and in any event to limit the flow of new citizens to the extent that their *cultural* absorption could be achieved. Of the voting rights of freedmen he gives (63-4) an incomplete but, so far as it goes, erroneous account. He even says that they 'were accepted into political and economic life without any manifestation of prejudice arising from their former status' (79), thus ignoring their political disabilities in municipalities as at Rome, and the

limitations on their rights of succession, litigation, and perhaps marriage. C. Cosentini has indeed contended that the freedman was at one time legally, but not socially, on a par with the *ingenuus* and that his status declined as a result of innovations made by praetors, statutes, and *constitutiones* (*Studi sui Liberti*, 1948–50; see *contra* M. Kaser, *ZSS* 68, 576 ff.); but, though he may be right on the imperial period (hardly on the Republican), his important work is not noticed by W.

From W. we have only a hint of the economic importance of freedmen in Italy; yet, since many must have been pursuing the same occupations as in slavery, this is strictly relevant to an economic assessment of Roman slavery. Augustales are not mentioned; we are not allowed to see that even outside the imperial *familia* slavery could provide ‘la carrière ouverte aux talents’—as the later serfdom did not. Not indeed that wealth or influence is likely to have been the freedman’s normal lot. Bequests, like Pliny’s (*ILS* 2927), of *alimenta* to freedmen were common (*Dig.* 34, 1, 3 *pr.*), suggesting that often they were poor, perhaps elderly dependents. A man’s earnings might go in purchasing freedom. He might secure it only by undertaking to perform a specified number of days of service or even as many as his patron might reasonably demand, without remuneration other than mere subsistence, and at the patron’s convenience; he could thus be required to labour for the patron in his craft, as when a slave, and ‘*alio vocabulo eosdem labores perferre*’. Thus economically an owner might lose little by manumissions (one reason for their frequency): to the slave higher status remained a valuable prize. W. says nothing of this, though he expatiates on the rather similar contracts of *παράμωνή* in Greece. For the obligations of freedmen see now M. Kaser, *Röm. Privatrecht* I 256–8 and literature there cited.

Slave Numbers etc. Beloch (*Bevölkerung* 433 ff.) held that in 28 B.C. the citizen population of Italy was about 3,500,000 and slaves perhaps 2,000,000; W. (69) rather pardonably misrepresents him. Beloch’s interpretation of the Augustan census figures seems to me certainly correct, though the case cannot be re-argued here; his figure for slaves is a mere guess, but if he is right about citizen numbers, Italy would have been a strangely empty country without so many slaves. Is his ratio of free men to slaves credible? Analogy may help. In the Southern States in 1850 slaves formed a third of the population. Yet only eleven owners had over 500 apiece. Augustus forbade owners of over 500 slaves to manumit more than 100 by will. Pliny, whose fortune was, for a Senator, modest (II, 4), bequeathed *alimenta* to 100, probably mostly freed by will. Might we allow 500 on an average for Senators, or 300,000 in all in their ownership? Many *equites*, some freedmen were as rich, the imperial *familia* immense. W. tries to depreciate the size of slave-holdings, but with more than one *suggestio falsi* (88); the slaves whose ashes reposed in *columbaria* and the 400 put to death for Pedanius Secundus’ murder (‘*sub eodem tecto*’) belonged to urban *familiae*; the latter number suggests the multitude working in the fields to support Secundus’ pomp and luxury at Rome, perhaps as many as the 4,116 Isidorus claimed to own in A.D. 8 (Pliny, *NH* 33, 135, not cited by W.). After all, is Trimalchio pure fantasy?

Of course W. is right to insist (69) that even in the late Republic, when slavery had assumed unparalleled dimensions in Italy (63), free labour had not disappeared from the land. For much evidence (that he does not give) see e.g. H. Bolkestein, *De colonatu Romano eiusque origine*, cap. II. Catilina’s rural followers, and the great armies, hardly ever recruited from the urban *plebs*, did not spring from dragons’ teeth. Even Isidorus needed many free labourers for his estates, to judge from their size. But the writers on agriculture leave no doubt that cultivation by slaves was considered most profitable to the *latifondista*—at least, if the land were not too unhealthy, or too remote for personal supervision—and was extensively employed; Spartacus’ revolt tells the same story. W. must be wrong in denying that Cato’s *operarii* (*de agric.* 10–11) were slaves; they are clearly the ‘*compediti*’ of 56–7, and are part of the *instrumentum* in 10–11, whereas free labourers are hired only for a day at a time (5, 4): W.’s argument from the number of beds is ingenious (68), but how many might sleep in one bed? As for trade and industry, he approves Gummerus’ conclusions, without bringing out, except for pottery, the overwhelming preponderance of slaves and freedmen that Gummerus proved (P-W IX, 1500–9; E. G. Maier, *Historia* 2, 336 ff. has cast doubt on all such statistics as Gummerus gives, on grounds I find unconvincing; in particular, if the inscriptions do not give a ‘fair sample’, they are more likely to suggest an under-estimate than an over-estimate of servile labour). To the large-scale employment of slaves in these occupations, and in the ‘professions’, and to the vast urban *familiae*, serving the luxury and self-esteem of their owners, America affords hardly any parallel. We might thus expect slaves in Italy to form more than a third of the population, more than in America or in Galen’s Pergamum (W. 127), and Beloch’s ratio will stand as at least plausible.

W. holds (93–5, 120–8) that in many provinces slavery was less prevalent. *A priori* this is probable; evidence is hard to obtain or assess. Epigraphic traces of slaves in Spain are few, yet the country was famed ‘*exercitio servorum*’ (Pliny, *NH* 37, 203). Galen’s figures for Pergamum suggest that even under the *pax Augusta* slavery remained important in prosperous Greek or Hellenized cities. (Strikes of free workers, which would indicate a paucity of slaves, are not, as W. says, 127, known to have been frequent in Asia.) There were certainly few slaves in the Egyptian *chora*, and

perhaps in other agricultural areas ; yet the unusual wealth of literary and inscriptional evidence for Africa enabled Gsell to show that there large slave-holdings were found, and quite extensively used in the fields (*Mél. Glotz* 1, 397 sqq.). Caution is requisite, till we have complete collections of the evidence for each region—and probably even then.

D. Tudor has assembled in a useful *Supplementum Epigraphicum* all the 127 inscriptions (not all in *CIL* or *AE*) about slaves and freedmen in Roman Dacia ; his study of slavery there depends wholly on this material. It will not justify more than the prudent conclusions formulated in the French résumé of his work (which hardly reveals anything striking). He believes that slaves were employed on large estates in Dacia. Perhaps : but villas do not in themselves betoken slave labour, and the alleged slave quarters of one villa (pp. 145–6) might have housed an urban *familia* (cf. *Dig.* 33, 7, 18, 9 etc.), or even hired workers (compare our ‘ tied cottages ’). The *vilici* whom he connects with estates could belong to the mining or tax collecting staffs. (I do not read Rumanian, but Professor L. R. Palmer has kindly elucidated relevant parts of the full text.)

W. adopts what he first notes to be an ‘ assumption ’ that when the *pax Augusta* closed the two great sources of Republican slavery, war and piracy, numbers fell (101, 118, etc.). This view is common : M. Bloch (*Annales* 2, 30 ff.) suggested, however, that slavery revived in the disturbed conditions of the later empire, and put its virtual disappearance in Europe in the early Middle Ages. But is the assumption of a decline, temporary or permanent, justified by the evidence ?

Admittedly under the *pax Augusta* most slaves must have been bred ; W. gives some evidence for this, 86, 96–7, 119. Bloch (*Camb. Ec. Hist.* 1, 235) remarked that experience shows that the birth-rate on an estate hardly ever suffices to keep up numbers. But in America total slave imports down to 1860 did not much exceed 600,000, and the number of slaves was then almost 4,500,000. There slave-breeding continually increased the number of slaves ; why must it, in Italy, have failed even to maintain the existing strength ? T. Frank’s statistics (*Am. Hist. Rev.* 21, 689 ff.) show that in a large number of inscriptions half or less of the slaves recorded ‘ marriage ’, and fewer still, children. But this takes us nowhere ; we do not even know how many died too young. Slave babies could hardly be exposed without the consent of masters ; if they were now more generally humane, they would surely have authorized them to be reared. But was not this economically hazardous ? In America the slave’s expectation of life at birth was 21, in Italy hardly more (despite *Dig.* 35, 2, 68 ; cf. A. R. Burn, *Past and Present*, 1953, 2 ff.). Surely maintenance costs would swallow up future profits. But, granting this assumption, Roman accounting methods (cf. Mickwitz, *EHR* 1937, 577 ff.) were no more likely to have revealed the economic facts than those of Southern planters. On farms that aimed at self-sufficiency, maintenance costs were probably not assessed precisely ; and even slaves born in the town might be sent to the villa to be reared (*Dig.* 50, 16, 210). Deaths would be most common in infancy, before much expense had been incurred. Work could be extracted from children at ten (implied in *CJ* VI, 43, 3, 1) or even five (*Dig.* 7, 7, 6, 1). There was a chance to train children, so that their value might double (ibid. 17, 1, 26, 8 ; cf. *Nepos, Att.* 13, 4) ; few would be as precious as the prodigious young *calculator* of *ILS* 7755. True, agricultural writers seldom mention child labour on the farm (but cf. Varro, *RR* II, 10, 1 ; Colum. 8, 2, 7 ; 11, 2, 44) ; yet we must surely assume it ; women and children are attested in rural *familiae* (e.g. *App., BC* 1, 7, perhaps applying contemporary experience to the past ; *Petron.* 53 ; *Dig.* 20, 1, 26, 2 ; 33, 7, 12, 7 and 27, 1) ; Columella encouraged his *ancillae* to bear children (1, 8, 19). It is indeed clear that the Romans did not recognize the alleged unprofitability of slave-breeding ; an *ancilla* is worth more if capable of child-bearing (*Dig.* 19, 1, 21 *pr.* ; 21, 1, 14 *pr.*), and though you would hardly acquire them for that purpose alone, the children they bear enhance the value of the estate (*Dig.* 5, 3, 27 *pr.* ; for the same conception in America cf. Gray, *o.c.* 472 ; see also Jonkers, *Economische en sociale Toestanden in het romeinsche Rijk* 113 for over 70 such legal texts). Some say that scarcity made slaves dearer ; this could be proved or refuted only if we were able to determine average prices for slaves, region by region, and period by period, and compare them with average prices for other commodities. And, whatever the economic realities, the prestige of a large slave-holding, the completeness of control over labour that ownership secured, even mere habit might lead masters to rear slaves, at least to replace losses.*

Gummerus (*o.c.* 1532) asserts that in the second and third centuries A.D. *ingenui* engaged in trade and industry were already more numerous in proportion to slaves than in the past ; but he gives no evidence. (I note that in *CIL* 6, 33858 of 80 *fabri tignuarii* in Severan Rome only three boast filiation.) He observed that members of the later corporations were clearly free ; but since they were often also men of property, who might belong or aspire to a high social class, they are employers, rather than labourers, and their status casts no light on that of their employees. Moreover many, e.g. the *monetarii*, operated in provinces, where free labour is said to have always prevailed. The Roman *pistores* and the imperial weaving factories certainly employed slaves (*CT* 14, 3, 7 ; 10, 20, 2 and 9). Gummerus himself gave further late evidence of slave labour in industry and failed to prove that it had dwindled.

* See above, p. 158.—Ed.

In agriculture Pliny parcelled out lands to free tenants; the practice was not new, nor did he abandon the use of slaves; we do not know how typical of landlords he was, or how far earlier landlords had behaved differently. (*Contra*, Seeck, P-W IV, 487, *Dig.* 20, 1, 32, relating to one individual case, does not prove tenancy to have been the norm.) In the *Digest* we read frequently both of *coloni* and of a *familia rustica*; the texts relevant to both come from all periods, from the late Republic to the third century. Even *coloni* might own slaves or lease them as part of the *instrumentum*; evidence, however, is mainly early (*Dig.* 9, 2, 27, 9 and 11; 19, 2, 30, 4; *ILS* 7455; Heitland, *Agricola* 368). In the late Empire rural slaves as well as *coloni* are 'adscripti censibus'. In late census returns from Thera and Tralles slaves on the land are to freemen as 1:8 or 1:7½, in Lesbos perhaps rather more (A. H. M. Jones, *JRS* 43, 57); in these places slave labour may never have preponderated. A decline of slave labour in agriculture may be postulated, but must still be proved.

The classical jurists in the late-second and early-third centuries everywhere presuppose the prevalence of a slave economy, not least on the farms (*Dig.* 33, 7 *passim*), cf. Buckland, *Roman Law of Slavery* v. F. Schulz has explained by this factor the feeble development of the classical law of hire (*Class. Roman Law* 544). Would classical—and post-classical—law have retained this character if in Italy free labour had largely replaced servile labour? In a muddled discussion, W. (132) seems to infer that in fixing maximum *mercedes operariorum* Diocletian was concerned only with free workers; but slaves too could be hired out, and probably, as in fifth century Athens, at the same rates as free men. Diocletian assumes that the *operarii* will also get food free from their employers (as in Dacian labour contracts, Arangio-Ruiz, *FIR* 3, no. 150). This kind of arrangement was most natural in an economy where the labour of slaves, maintained by their employers, set the pattern. Cf. *Dig.* 7, 8, 4 *pr.* for 'mercennarii' who live in the employer's house and perform *operae* 'servorum loco'.

Ingenui as Slaves. Under the *pax Augusta* most slaves whose nationality is recorded are provincials, or even Italians (W. 96 ff.; but note 14 is important). Bang (*Röm. Mitt.* 27, 200 ff.) inferred that they were of free birth. This need not be so. A man born a slave in Italy might well be designated as Italian. Yet *ingenui* could become slaves. In legal texts we hear much of *liber homo bona fide serviens*. Apart from kidnapping, there were three main avenues from freedom to slavery, exposure and sale of children and self-sale. 'Facultatium angustiae' clearly explains not only the first (*Lact., Inst.* VI, 20, 24) but also sale of children (Paul 5, 1, 1) or self. 'Homo liber nullo pretio aestimatur' (Paul *l.c.*) must have been an empty phrase to the poor and starving. With certain exceptions free persons in slavery could reclaim their ingenuity, but proof might not be easy to provide. Moreover cases were known where free men had not declared their freedom when sold (*Cf.* 7, 16, 15 and 39), perhaps not always because of force and fear (for which cf. *Dig.* 40, 12, 16, 1; Paul 5, 1, 4), or where they would not themselves vindicate their liberty (*Dig.* 40, 12, 1; 47, 10, 1, 5; *Cf.* 7, 16, 19). The free man might go in want, but self-interest and, later, imperial rescripts (*Coll.* 3, 3) required the master to support his slave and treat him well; and if the free man had sold himself and shared in the price (*infra*), he had the nucleus of a *peculium*, with which he might re-emerge into freedom in more favourable circumstances, e.g. with his former debts extinguished (*Dig.* 44, 7, 30).

Classical Roman law permitted exposure of infants; the milder course of selling children who could not be supported was frowned on. To buy or sell, give or receive a free person in slavery, in knowledge of his status, were capital offences under the *Lex Fabia* (*Dig.* 48, 15); even a creditor who received a free *filiusfamilias* as a pledge merited deportation (20, 3, 5). But enactment and enforcement of laws are two very different things. Caracalla reproaches a mother for dishonourably and illegally selling her sons, but grants her petition for the right to vindicate their freedom; he does not threaten, nor could she have expected, punishment (*Cf.* 7, 16, 1). The very existence of a civil action *in duplum* available to the purchaser (in ignorance) of a free man against the vendor who knew the facts—and also against the free man himself, if he had been an accomplice to the sale—if that man's freedom is later reclaimed, argues that the *Lex Fabia* was of little practical effect (*Dig.* 40, 12, 14–20). In the case of self-sale, some texts bar a man's right to reclaim freedom, if he is sold or given (e.g. 'in dotem' or 'pignori') into slavery with his own consent; most add the qualification 'if he shared in the purchase price' (Buckland *o.c.* 427 ff.). No doubt these rules were designed to frustrate fraud, but in effect they opened paths to slavery. Not only the man who shared in his own purchase price remained a slave, but also whoever had sold himself or his children and could not meet a claim for twofold damages, once his or their freedom was restored. And free persons exposed or sold and transported to distant parts had little chance of demonstrating their *ingenuitas*. Nor would all wish to recover the freedom to starve.

W.'s account of exposure (86) is adequate; to the literature he cites add Mommsen, *Strafr.* 618–20; Frank, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 21; Bang, *o.c.* (Modern writers are apt to take *alumni* to be always foundlings, but cf. *Thes. LL, s.v.* and e.g. *CIL* 8, 2396.) Sale of children or self W. mentions but does not discuss (except for Egypt, 135). It is hard to say how common these practices were. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht u. Volksrecht* 358 ff., pointed out that they had been indigenous among some of Rome's

subjects (cf. W. 30, 52 on Egypt) and reasonably doubted whether Rome strenuously suppressed them; he gave some evidence for their continuance, cf. also Plut., *Luc.* 20, App., *BC* IV, 64 (which with Tac., *Ann.*, IV 72 show how Roman exactions could stimulate sale of children); Petron. 57, 4 (self-sale; in other texts Bang cited to illustrate this, 'slavery' has a figurative sense); A. H. M. Jones, *Ec. Hist. Rev.* 1956, 197. There seems to be some elaboration of case-law relating to self-sale. We may not deny that there were many causes that might commonly bring free persons into bondage (*Cf* 7, 16, 28).

And there were other forms of bondage, perhaps little preferable to slavery, into which the free man might fall, though ignored by W. :—the bondage of the ransomed war captive and the *auctoratus* (Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* 3, 1–21), or of the *filiusfamilias*, obviously of a poor man, who was 'noxae datus' under a penal action and came to be 'servi loco' to the injured party (Steinwenter, P-W s.v. *mancipium*; only after Gaius' day could he obtain manumission by working off the damage). Nor is W. right in thinking (59, 70, 123) that the *Lex Poetelia* ended personal execution for debt; see v. Woess, *ZSS* 43, 485 ff.; Schulz, *o.c.* pp. 26, 213–5, 402–5, 460, and also the following texts :—Liv. 23, 14, 3; Cic., *Verr.* 2, 2, 63; *Flacc.* 45, 48; Sall., *Cat.* 33; *Lex Urson.* 61; *Lex Rubria* 21–2. Such debtors might still be forced to work for their creditors in *ergastula*, cf. Colum. 1, 3, 12; SHA, *Hadr.* 18; Ps-Quint., *Declam.* 311. Varro (*RR* 1, 17, 2) says that there were no such *obaerarii* in Italy in his day; perhaps debtors, like the 'inopes ac vagi' of Tac., *Ann.* 4, 4, could then easily escape into the inflated triumphal armies. But he acknowledges their presence elsewhere, and in Gaul they persisted, cf. Tac., *Ann.* 3, 42 with Caes., *BG* 1, 4; 6, 13. See also W. 123, 135.

All this casts a sombre light on the condition of the free poor under Roman rule.

Economic Effects. W. brings out clearly how the great influx of slaves into Italy under the Republic produced an economic efflorescence. But for the great *razzias* of this period the labour force could never have grown so quickly, nor would the skills of the East so soon have been naturalized. The products of such slave workers as the potters of Arretium survive to show that in industry their efficiency was not low. Doubtless it is true that with most of the population, not only slaves, but free workers suffering from slave competition, reduced to the same level of mere subsistence, or little more, the effective demand for goods was kept down, and large scale production hindered for lack of a market. But technical backwardness and high transport costs must in any event have limited economic progress. It is often said that the cheapness of slave labour made employers indifferent to improvements in technique, or that slaves were incapable of handling complex processes, or that the degradation of manual skill involved in the use of slaves inhibited the best minds from all interest in technology. If these views were justified, we might expect to find more progress in regions (such as Gaul), where (it is thought) slave labour was less prevalent; but such expectations would be disappointed. In fact, the skilled slave craftsmen of Italy, sometimes capable of minor inventions (Sen. *ep.* 90, 25), were clearly able to mind machines, and however cheap their labour was, increased productivity would have brought in greater profits to their owners, if the market had been susceptible of expansion. And even societies where there are no slaves have failed to recognise the 'dignity of labour' (even when they pay it lip-service).

It is also sometimes alleged that slave labour ruined Italian agriculture, a fundamental question on which W. expresses no opinion. Pliny (*NH* 18, 36) offers some support, contrasting an idyllic past, of which he knew nothing, with his own day when the fields were cultivated by 'men without hope'. Certainly rural slaves, unlike those employed in industry or the household, were seldom freed. Columella takes it for granted that even the *vilicus* will be a slave; numerous inscriptions provide confirmation (e.g. *ILS* 7377 for an *actor* dying at 60, still a slave). *Peculium* they might get, to give them an interest in their work, but not to enable them to buy freedom (Varro 1, 2, 17; 17, 7; 19, 3; *CIL* 9, 3386; *Dig.* 15, 2, 3); so too in America *peculium* was common, manumission rare. Occasionally a rural slave might be given some kind of independence as 'quasi colonus'. But many worked in chains. It is plausible to hold that work that such men did was inefficient. Yet the agricultural writers all hold that with certain qualifications (*supra*) the owner made most profit if he employed slaves, rather than leased his land to tenants. Of course, if the net return of land cultivated by slaves is 75 to the owner, but if let to tenants 100, of which he gets only half, private, though not national interest, will make him prefer the former course. But that need not be the whole explanation. Had the often indebted *coloni* of Italy, or the oppressed *fellahin* of Egypt, more hope, or interest in their work, even than slaves? Perhaps slaves were not more unwilling workers; it is certain that they were more subject to control. Might their bad cultivation be held responsible for the (alleged) exhaustion of the Italian soil? Much soil in the Southern states was exhausted under slave labour, but much elsewhere in America with free workers; labour was scarce, land abundant; the farmer worked to death what he had, and moved on. If Italian soil was exhausted, we have no proof in ancient testimony or modern analogy that slavery was the cause.

In two recent articles, stimulating but not free from errors and over-statements (*Finanzarchiv* XIII), C. A. Yeo has argued from American experience that slaves are best employed in growing a

crop suited to mass production and requiring cultivation all the year round, within an area not so extensive as to make the indispensable supervision too difficult and costly, and not taxing the versatility they do not possess. Such crops in America were cotton, sugar, rice, tobacco; in Italy vines and olives. Grain, involving extensive operations during only a part of the year, is less suitable and best leased to *coloni* (cf. Colum. 1, 7, 6 which he pressed too far). Now it is perfectly true that in America slaves yielded the largest profit in cotton; but this was because of the expanding market; despite fluctuations, supply and demand almost doubled every decade. Italian wine and oil can have had no like success. They may have provided the best cash crops, but regions and even individual estates aimed at self-sufficiency, and probably grain almost always covered the largest acreage: Wallon (*Hist. de l'esclavage* 2², 98) remarked that in S.E. France in 1840 (where conditions might have been similar to ancient Italy) acreage under grain was to acreage under vines and olives as 11 : 1, and that on this basis two out of every three farm-workers would have been engaged in grain production. In practice, of course, most would have been employed in mixed farming, recommended by agricultural writers and adopted by Pliny and others (cf. Varro 1, 23; Colum. 1, 2; Mart. 3, 58; Plin. *epp.* 1, 20; 2, 11, 25; 3, 19, etc.; *Dig.* 33, 7, 6 and 12 *passim*, etc.); apart from a few specialists, the operations of the hands were multifarious, and even artisans, *e.g.* potters, might be turned on to agricultural work (*Dig.* 33, 7, 25, 1). In America too negroes were successfully used in grain production and mixed farming, and even in restoring exhausted land. Cato advised that slaves should be kept busy in a multitude of operations. It is time that we gave up assuming the slave's lack of versatility. The latest examination of the economic efficiency of slave labour in America, by Stamp, no apologist for the institution, does not support the biased strictures of Cairnes; nor does the ancient evidence reveal that its use prejudiced Italian agricultural prosperity.

Slave Revolts. W.'s book suggests that before any adequate general survey of ancient slavery can be undertaken many more preliminary studies are needed. This need the Mainz Academy is meeting, *auspice Vogt*. He himself has now made a second contribution to the series, distinguished by its accuracy, learning, and judgement. (I note one slip on p. 28, n. 2: for 'F. Cumont' read 'J. Bidez'.) His subject is the great slave wars of c. 135-70 B.C., their causes and characteristics; he does not retell the story, nor re-examine problems of sources or numbers. I need offer no full summary, since every one interested in the subject must read V. for himself; suffice it to say that in his view the revolts were not prompted by abolitionist ideals, and did not take on a 'socialist' colour; they are explained by the vast increase in numbers, harsh treatment, often curiously combined with a remarkable degree of license, recollections of former freedom, unity in national sentiment, the appearance of leaders of ability usually surrounded by a religious aura, and the mixture of violence and weakness in Roman policy which created revolutionary conditions. The organisation the leaders created was determined by the exigencies of the wars and the pattern of societies with which they were familiar. A few doubts, or amplifications, may be propounded.

(a) Posidonius, I think, made the treatment of slaves rather more than a concern of individual morals (p. 8). If he is correctly represented in fr. 108 c. and f. (Jacoby), he saw that ill-usage by individual masters was a danger to the whole community. Precisely on such grounds Pius later justified the legal protection of slaves against their owners (*Coll.* 3, 3, 2 and 6).

(b) Ill-usage is probable, and recorded, in all periods. Pius' measures, and the savagery of the *SC Silanianum*, illustrate the unceasing fear that masses of slaves inspired in the master class. (W. 82, misled by Buckland, goes wrong on this *SC*, which provided for execution, as well as torture, of all slaves domiciled with a master who had been murdered, cf. *Dig.* 29, 5, 1, 21 and 28; there was much case law under the rule, *ibid.* 27 etc.; its scope was extended rather than reduced, *ibid.* 29, 5, 10, etc. and it was re-affirmed by the Christian Justinian.) Yet, after 70, though flight was common, few risings are known. But minor outbreaks would elude the record of history, especially as for long periods we lack detailed annalistic accounts; but for their having occurred about the same time as the great Sicilian revolts, the lesser risings in Attica, Minturnae etc. might well have gone unmentioned. Moreover, to organize revolt on a large scale was difficult. It was possible only when Rome was preoccupied or inert. The greater efficiency of Roman government under the Principate is probably the chief reason for the apparent quiescence of the slaves.

(c) I am uneasy at the classification of the war with Aristonicus as a slave war. True, Aristonicus had to appeal to *douloi* in the Anatolian hinterland and presumably promised them rights in the new city of the Sun of Righteousness (V. has dispelled much speculation about Heliopolis that passed for truth). But many rulers had freed slaves in desperate crises; Rome had done so after Cannae. Aristonicus took this step only after his defeat off Cyme. Of royal birth, and a king in his own eyes, he is hardly likely to have come forward at first as champion of the oppressed. The grant by Pergamum of paroecic rights to royal and public 'slaves' under its jurisdiction (*OGIS* 338) is held to be proof that he had, from the first, played on social discontent. But this document cannot be dated with precision. It is before Rome confirmed Attalus' will, but Rome's acceptance of the inheritance in summer 133 B.C. (Plut., *Ti. Gr.* 14) need not be equated with confirmation of every clause in the will;

Attalus' grant of freedom to Pergamum may have been a sort of *fideicommissum*, and the Senate may have awaited reports from legates and proconsuls before giving its sanction. Thus the document may be later than Aristonicus' desperate resort to the support of *douloi*. Further the *douloi* he appealed to, and those Pergamum enfranchised (royal and public *douloi* only), may be serfs rather than the chattel-slaves of the other slave wars. And even at this stage Pergamum has cause to fear desertions to him of royal mercenaries (*katoikountes*), men with property; so too, it was men with property to confiscate who suffered when Mithridates intervened there, presumably against Aristonicus' adherents (*IGR* 4, 292 cf. Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW* p. 1523). Perhaps then Aristonicus' resistance to Rome appealed primarily to national or dynastic loyalty, though ultimately he was ready to enlist slaves or serfs in his forces. If Posidonius assimilated his supporters to those of Eunus, that may represent a tendentious Roman view. So too Augustus, when he removed a rival dynast in Sicily, who had been forced to mobilize slaves, claimed to have won a 'bellum servile'. But fortune, not design, had made Sex. Pompey—and Aristonicus—slave leaders.

P. A. BRUNT.

EDUARD FRAENKEL, *HORACE*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957. Pp. xiv + 464. £2 15s.

Eduard Fraenkel's series of masterpieces began in 1922 with *Plautinisches im Plautus*. It continued in the same sphere with *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (1928), and in a quite different field with the great *Agamemnon* commentary (1950). Now in the author's seventieth year follows a work on one of the great poets of the Augustan age. Such is the freshness with which this book is written, so inspiring the author's delight in his subject, that I hope and believe we can look forward to further fruits of this *viridis senecta*.

Yet the book is far from having been written hastily in the first flush of a new discovery. It is a safe assumption that more solid work has gone into it than into the majority of books on Horace of recent decades. We may guess that the author must many times have interpreted poems of Horace to his pupils to have accumulated this wealth of observations. In his published works, too, he long ago sketched the main lines of some of his chief ideas, in papers on the development of Horace's satire (*Festschrift R. Reitzenstein*, Berlin, 1931, 119 ff.), on Epistles 1, 7 (250 *Jahre Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, Beilage zu Heft 4 der *Monatsschrift für höhere Schulen*, Berlin, 1930, 13 ff.), and on the Pindar ode (iv, 2; *Sitzber. Heidelberg*, 1932-3, Abh. 2).

It is perhaps just for this reason that the book is not easy to review. Fraenkel is a master of detail. Each time one dips into the book, one is delighted afresh by linguistic observations, comparisons of motifs and well-chosen quotations. The notes especially are like the drawers of a jewel-cabinet which the connoisseur opens in succession with intense pleasure and ever recurring wonder. The text, too, takes the form of interpretations of individual poems; and the method of interpretation is often to single out and elucidate disputed or otherwise interesting passages. The structure and unity of a poem is indeed often considered, but the emphasis is not on this and even less on understanding the essential unity of all Horace's work, although in this connexion too I shall have important things to mention.

The declared aim of the author is to understand Horace's poetry, not to write a biography or to place the poet in a wider context. In this undertaking he sees himself faced by a serious obstacle in the accumulated exegesis of centuries. He sets himself the task of clearing away its mistakes. The ideal would be an unprejudiced view of the poems themselves. This does not mean, however, as is clear from the course which the investigation takes, that he has abandoned the methods of inquiry of his predecessors, their way of approaching the poems, as well as the content of earlier false interpretations. At least he often does not begin with an unprejudiced and purely intuitive view of a poem, which is then tested and clarified with the resources of scholarship. He likes rather to start from given problems of scholarship and by critical discussion to reach his own conclusion and Horace himself. The central section of the book, for example (pp. 154-307), on the first three books of lyrics, begins with two chapters, 'Odes related to Alcaeus' and 'Odes related to other Greek poems'. Even if Fraenkel may not attach too great importance to the arrangement of the book, nevertheless the reader is soon aware of its methodical plan. The interpretation of Horace's lyric poetry begins with esoteric questions of scholarship: 'Is the poem *O navis referent* (1, 14) allegorical, as has been believed since Quintilian, or not? What is its relationship in this respect to the partly preserved poem of Alcaeus which formed its model?' So it goes on with regard to the series of odes modelled on Alcaeus and other Greek poets. The interpreter comes soon, if not at once, to the important question of the relationship to the Greek model. In the chapter on the epodes, too, the interpretation of the ninth poem is essentially the (highly illuminating) discussion of a wrong interpretation by Franz Buecheler (pp. 71 ff.). The same method can be observed everywhere in the treatment of the satires. For example, the interpretation of the first satire (pp. 90 ff.) consists almost entirely of a discussion of the old, much disputed question of the unity and consistency of this poem; this is followed by several pages dealing with the various views on v. 108 (pp. 97 ff.).