

CLAS 404

**History and Historiography
The Rise and Fall of Rome**



TRIMESTERS 1 and 2 2009

(March 2 –November 14)



SCHOOL OF ART HISTORY, CLASSICS & RELIGIOUS STUDIES

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Classics Programme (SACR)

CLAS 404 – History and Historiography (The Rise and Fall of Rome) (CRN 867) 2009

COURSE ORGANISATION

- The teachers are Matthew Trundle OK 514 Tel. 463-6785 and Arthur Pomeroy OK 515 Tel. 463-6781. In their absence, messages may be left with the Admin. Assistant Hannah Webling OK 508 ph. 463-5319.
- The class will run from the week of Monday 2nd March until a point in the middle of the second trimester and there will be a final exam in the second trimester examination period yet to be scheduled in the period from 19th October and 15th November 2009. It will meet each week for about two hours on a day and time to be announced in the Classics Library.
- Any important information involving the Classics Programmes (e.g. unofficial exam results) are posted on the notice boards situated opposite OK 504 and 505.

OVERVIEW OF THE COURSE

This course looks at the Roman conquest of the Mediterranean Basin in the period of transmarine expansion and the so-called Great Wars of the middle Republic and its decline and fall or transformation in the period of late antiquity, roughly from AD 300 to about AD 600. We will explore the reasons for Roman imperialism, whether Rome aimed at conquest, or justly (and successfully) countered foreign aggression. We will assess how Rome came into conflict with Carthage and the Hellenistic dynasties, and examine the conquest of the Celtic peoples of northern Italy and Spain that laid the foundations for the future empire. In the second half of the course, we will study the structure of government and administration in the developed empire and the pressures that the empire came under economically and militarily. In particular, developments in social structures (particularly the rise of the Christian church) will be examined to consider their effects on society as a whole. A continuing question will be the extent to which change was internal or the result of external pressures. Underpinning the course will be the ancient sources of information and successful students will gain a firm grasp of the strengths and weaknesses of our primary evidence.

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND COURSE DELIVERY

- To develop, through a detailed study of the rise and fall of the Roman empire in the period of transmarine expansion of the middle republic, a deeper understanding of the sources that underpin our information about this subject and a thorough knowledge of the historiographic debates and arguments over the reasons for Roman imperialism.
- To develop through an examination of the changes in the Roman empire from the fourth to the sixth centuries AD, an understanding of our sources of information for this period (including archaeology) and their biases and a knowledge of the debate over the decline vs. transformation debate.
- Each week a student will present a seminar on a specific aspect of the topic under consideration. This seminar will take the form of an academic paper presentation. These seminar presentations will last no longer than fifty minutes, but students are strongly encouraged to use up all of their allotted time. A question and answer session will then probe each presenter's knowledge of his/her subject more deeply and clarify points of uncertainty arising from the paper. The seminar group will then break for ten minutes and reconvene to discuss the wider issues around the subject of the seminar presentation and aspects of the topic not covered by the presentation or the question and answer period.
- Students will subsequently write-up their presentation paper into an academic paper for submission to the examiners of this course (please note that work in this course is assessed outside of Victoria University of Wellington by members of other Classics Departments in New Zealand). Style and format will conform to the Harvard system, although both endnotes and footnotes are acceptable in addition (see attached sheet).
- Students are required to give two presentations and to write two papers in the course.
- **Required Texts:**

Students are responsible for researching the subject as thoroughly as they can. As a starting point you are directed towards reading parts of the following texts: Polybius, *The Rise of the Roman Republic* (Penguin); Livy, *The War with Hannibal* (Penguin) and *Rome and the Mediterranean* (Penguin); Craig Champion, *Roman Imperialism* (Oxford, 2009). Note also the seminal work of William Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1985).

For the later empire, the required text is: David Potter, *The Roman Empire at Bay* (Routledge, 2004). Students will find many of the primary sources in Michael Maas, *Readings in Late Antiquity: A Sourcebook* (Routledge, 2000) – multiple copies in the library; Ammianus Marcellinus, *The Late Roman Empire* (Penguin); and Augustine, *Confessions* (Oxford World's Classics).

ASSESSMENT

Course Requirements

In order to pass this course, a student must obtain an overall mark of at least 50% from the combination of assessed work. Students must hand in in-term work, which makes up more than half of the overall assessment for the course.

Students must attend at least 75% of seminars in this course. Failure to do so will result in failure of the course.

ESSAYS

Students are required to write two essays in the course based on the two seminars they present in each half of the course. Seminar topics will be allocated in the first class (the specific subject of the essay should be arranged with each lecturer). The seminar presentation will be taken into consideration if students perform at a lower level in their essays.

Please note that you are required to hand in to the lecturer TWO copies of each of the two essays in the course.

❖ **(A) Essay One: Due FRIDAY 5 JUNE 2009** **25%**
LENGTH: 2500-3000 words (including notes and bibliography).

❖ **(B) Essay Two: Due FRIDAY 9 OCTOBER 2009** **25%**
LENGTH: 2500-3000 words (including notes and bibliography).

- (i) **Extensions** (on genuine medical grounds supported by a doctor's certificate, or for some other necessary and demonstrable reason) must be applied for from Dr Matthew Trundle or Prof Art Pomeroy in advance of the final date for acceptance. Late essays, for which an extension has not been granted, will be accepted. However, little or no comment will be written on them. It is absolutely essential that, if you have not completed your essay by the final date for acceptance and have not already been granted an extension, you contact Matthew Trundle or Art Pomeroy immediately, by telephone if necessary. **Late essays will be penalized at 10% per day.**
- (ii) **Handing in assignments.** Exercises and essays must be placed in the locked assignment box outside the Admin. Assistant's Office (OK 508). No responsibility will be taken for essays placed in open staff pigeonholes, pushed under doors etc. You should never throw out notes or rough drafts of an essay until you receive back your marked essay.
- (iii) **Return of written work.** It is Classics policy that all written work **received by the due date** will be returned wherever possible within two weeks. Clearly, there may well be circumstances (e.g. sickness of markers) when this aim cannot be achieved, but it is our objective to provide you with the earliest possible feedback on your work. In an

Honours course with 10 or more students and lengthy assignments, it is unlikely that the two week time period will be achievable!

- (iv) **A policy of reasonable accommodation with respect to assessment procedures for students with disabilities will be followed.**

- ❖ (C) **3 hour final exam - end of year** **50%**

The format will be as follows:

Section A: a range of gobbets from the sources (secondary as well as primary) that you have read in this course. Students will be required to attempt one from each section of the course.

Section B: essay questions on the general themes (such as the reasons for imperialism, the quality of our sources, the background to the periods studied, historiography). Students will be required to attempt one from each section of the course.

- NB** The goal of the assessment in this paper is to establish the extent to which a student can demonstrate his/her understanding of different aspects of Roman imperialism and imperial government and his/her ability to write critically about them.

This paper, as part of the overall BA (Hons) programme, is subject to external assessment by the Classics Department of another New Zealand university. For this paper you will be awarded a grade and for your performance overall you will be awarded a class of honours.

WORK LOADS AND MANDATORY COURSE REQUIREMENTS

- ❖ The estimated average workload is 12 hours per week. The workload will be heaviest when written assignments are being prepared.
- ❖ In order to gain a passing grade for this paper, a student must obtain at least 50% from the combination of assessed in-term work and the final examination, and a mark of at least 40% on the final examination itself. It is mandatory to complete the two essays and the final examination.
- ❖ Attendance is mandatory for at least 75% of classes.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND POLICIES

Students should familiarise themselves with the University's policies and statutes, particularly the Assessment Statute, the Personal Courses of Study Statute, the Statute on Student Conduct and any statutes relating to the particular qualifications being studied; see the *Victoria University Calendar* or go to the Academic Policy and Student Policy sections on:

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy>

This website also provides information for students in a number of areas including Academic Grievances, Student and Staff conduct, Meeting the needs of students with impairments, and student support/VUWSA student advocates.

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Academic integrity means that university staff and students, in their teaching and learning are expected to treat others honestly, fairly and with respect at all times. It is not acceptable to mistreat academic, intellectual or creative work that has been done by other people by representing it as your own original work.

Academic integrity is important because it is the core value on which the University's learning, teaching and research activities are based. Victoria University's reputation for academic integrity adds value to your qualification.

The University defines plagiarism as presenting someone else's work as if it were your own, whether you mean to or not. 'Someone else's work' means anything that is not your own idea. Even if it is presented in your own style, you must acknowledge your sources fully and appropriately. This includes:

- Material from books, journals or any other printed source
- The work of other students or staff
- Information from the internet
- Software programs and other electronic material
- Designs and ideas
- The organisation or structuring of any such material

Find out more about plagiarism, how to avoid it and penalties, on the University's website: <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx>

The Seminars

Research and Further Reading

We have not provided more than a limited bibliography for each seminar in this course to give those students who are not giving the seminar some assistance in their readings on the subject. For the sessions that you are presenting or topics on which you are writing, you will be required to search out more bibliography than we have provided. There are several books and articles that ought to be read in association with the course as a whole and some of these have detailed and specific arguments that relate to individual wars and policies in specific periods. The primary sources are essential reading and these are listed alongside each of the seminar topics. You are responsible for researching detailed bibliographies for your respective seminars. I have taken the liberty of liberating from the library many of the more significant books on the reading list to prevent individual students from hogging reading material themselves. Students are therefore encouraged to borrow books from me and read them in the Classics Library and return them to me at a pre-arranged time.

Journal articles ought never to be over-looked. The library homepage (www.vuw.ac.nz/library) gives entrance access to several excellent journals on-line (some of which are not available in hard copy in the library, but can be accessed through VUW's on-line membership). In particular, JStor offers access to many of the most important journals in the area. But do not overlook the rich store of periodicals in print in the library.

Do not rely on the *Internet* for information unless you are absolutely certain of a specific URL's provenance. Some sites are useful, though I would prefer you to check these out with me before you use them in your research. Below are some useful tools and reference points.

Perseus (http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cache/perscoll_Greco-Roman.html) provides good access to primary source material.

BMCR reviews can be a valuable source of information (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/>).

TOCs-in-Search (<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/cgi-bin/amphoras/toctfind>) provides a searchable database of many journals on-line, but see also *l'annee philologique* (Library catalogue: Z8414.84 P119 B) in the reference section of the library for relevant published material by year, author and subject.

Recommended General Texts on Roman Imperialism (Course Part One)

There are a number of key texts that will provide lots of information for each and every seminar. These should be consulted as a matter of course for what they have to say generally and specifically. Most of the material found in these volumes will form the background to the discussion of Seminar 4 on Expansion as a Roman Aim.

In addition to the required readings, William V Harris' *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* is essential and has chapters on each of the wars below as well as lengthy discussions on the social and economic context of Roman imperialism. Sherwin-White's review of Harris

"Rome the Aggressor?" *Journal of Roman Studies (JRS)* 70 (1980): 177-81 is an important corrective. For the Romans in the Greek world Holleaux's *Rome, la Grece et les monarchies Hellenistiques au IIIe siecle avant J.-C. (273-205)*, A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*, Errington's *Dawn of Empire* and Gruen's *Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* are also essential reading. Tenney Frank's *Roman Imperialism*, John Rich's *Declaring War in Republican Rome*, John North's "The Development of Roman Imperialism" *JRS* 71 (1981) 1-9 and Greg Woolf's "Imperialism, Empire and the Integration of the Roman Economy", *World Archaeology* 23.3 (1992) are all useful reading. Useful discussions of the period can also be found in the *Cambridge Ancient History* (see Holleaux's article in an earlier edition vols. 8 and 9) the *Oxford History of the Classical World* (Rawson's article pp. 417-437), Claude Nicolet's *Rome et le conquete du monde méditerranéen*. See also Chester Starr, *The Beginnings of Imperial Rome*, Michigan 1980; A.M. Eckstein, *Senate and General: Individual Decision Making and Roman Foreign Relations, 264-194 B.C.*, Berkeley, 1987; Erich S. Gruen, ed. *Imperialism in the Roman Republic*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston [1970]; Paul Erdkamp *Hunger and the Sword: Warfare and Food Supply in Roman Republican Wars (264-30 B.C.)* Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1998; John Rich and Graham Shipley eds. *War and society in the Roman World* London; New York: Routledge, 1993; Keith Hopkins *Conquerors and Slaves*. Cambridge: CUP, 1977; Westington, N. 1938. *Atrocities in Roman Warfare to 133 B.C.* Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago (Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1938). See also, *The Cambridge Ancient History Series*, especially v. 7, pt. 1. The Hellenistic world, edited by F.W. Walbank ... [et al.]. 2nd ed., v. 7, pt. 2. The rise of Rome to 220 B.C., edited by F.W. Walbank ... [et al.]. 2nd ed. and v. 8. Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C., edited by A.E. Astin ... [et al.]. 2nd ed. Finally the very recent book by Nathan Rosenstein, *Rome at War, Farms Families and Death in the Middle Republic* discusses a potential model to explain the so-called second century crisis that came in the wake of the Roman conquest of the Mediterranean.

For the military events of the great wars and the mechanics of war-making see good maps, illustrations and overviews in Peter Connolly's *Greece and Rome at War* and John Warry's *Warfare in the Classical World* and Terence Wise's *Armies of the Carthaginian Wars*. These are available from the lecturer.

Brief Outline of Seminar Topics

Part One: The Rise of Rome 270 – 133 BCE

1. Introduction 1: What is this course about? Content, questions, requirements; Rome, Italy and the Mediterranean in 270 BCE (MT)
2. Introduction 2: Sources and Evidence (MT)
3. Themes: Expansion as Roman Aim? Rome Aggressor vs Defensive Imperialism; Economics of Imperialism; Religion and the Just War; consequences (general)
4. The Origins of the First Punic War 264 BCE
5. The Origins of the Second Punic War 218 – 202 BCE
6. The Macedonian Wars 215 – 168 BCE
7. The Origins of the First Antiochan War 191 – 188 BCE
8. Rome and the West (Spain, Italy) 221 – 170 BCE
9. New Roman Policies? Third Punic War, Greece 200 – 146 BCE
10. Why was Rome so Successful in the Period 264 – 133 BCE
11. The Consequences of Roman Imperialism (bridges to late antiquity)

Part Two: The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire

12. Introduction: the structure of the Roman Empire in the 3rd century AD (AP)
13. Diocletian and his reforms: government and economy (AP)
14. The Constantinian monarchy: government and church (AP)
15. Julian and paganism (including Neoplatonism, Manichaeism)
16. The city and the empire (esp. Antioch)
17. Asceticism and monasticism; the development of an orthodox church
18. Corruption in late antiquity
19. Barbarian and Roman kingdoms from Theodosius to Justinian
20. Justinian and the Justinianic revival
21. Urban change from the 3rd to 6th centuries: continuity or decline?
22. Models of late antiquity/early middle ages. A system that failed or one that reinvented itself? (AP/MT)

Seminar Topics in-Detail

Week One: Week Commencing 2 March 2009

Introduction 1: What is this course about? Content, questions, requirements; Rome, Italy and the Mediterranean in 270 BCE

Each seminar will investigate the problems related to the topic under consideration. The three initial seminars provide context and background to all that follows and will be presented by the lecturer. In this first meeting we will allocate seminar topics and discuss the mechanics of the course and the expectations for seminar presentations, discussions and essays. Readings are both required and highly recommended for the successful outcome of the course. Most seminar presentations will only deal with specific aspects of the topics under consideration therefore it is essential that students grasp a general picture of the problems of that week's discussion. The crux of the course is the question of empire. This question will, as will become clear, dominate the universal and specific discussions within the course.

By 270 BCE Rome was the dominant power in all Italy south of the Rubicon through a system of alliances and because Roman citizens had settled a great deal of the land of central Italy. The Mediterranean was divided between the successor kingdoms of Alexander the Great, Macedonia, Syria, Egypt, Pergamum in the east, Greece by two federal leagues and several important cities, while Carthage dominated the western Mediterranean with interests in Sicily, Sardinia, Spain and north Africa. This Seminar outlines the general political situation of Italy and the Mediterranean on the eve of Roman transmarine expansion.

Additional Recommended Readings

T. Cornell *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

L. Homo, *Primitive Italy and the Beginnings of Roman Imperialism*; [translated from the French by V. Gordon Childe]. [1st ed.] re-issued (*Italie primitive et les debuts de l'imperialisme romain*).

H.H. Scullard *A History of the Roman World 753 – 146 BCE*, London, 1978 (et al.)

See also, *The Cambridge Ancient History Series*, especially v. 7, pt. 1. The Hellenistic World, edited by F.W. Walbank ... [et al.]. 2nd ed. and v. 7, pt. 2. The rise of Rome to 220 B.C., edited by F.W. Walbank ... [et al.]. 2nd ed.

Week Two: 9 March 2009

Introduction 2: Sources and Evidence

Detailed knowledge of the evidence for Roman imperialism in the period of the Middle Republic and the problems of its interpretation and validity are fundamentally important to success in this course. Polybius is the most important of all of our sources for this period. He wrote the narrative of Roman conquests from 264 – 146 BCE, which explained to a Greek audience how the Romans had defeated most of the major powers of the Mediterranean Basin so quickly. Much of Polybius' material came from Roman sources and especially from Roman aristocratic traditions. He and his sources lived through many of the events about

which he wrote. For earlier material he relied upon Roman and Greek writers, like Fabius Pictor, Chaereas and Sosylus. Polybius believed that the Romans aimed at world conquest and that fate or fortune (*tyche*) intervened to enable the Romans to achieve this goal. We shall spend a considerable amount of time questioning the validity of Polybius' conclusions as well as the basis of the information that he provides to us. Later Roman writers wrote histories of the Roman achievement and not the least of these was Livy (30 BCE – 9 CE). Livy wrote a complete history of Rome from its foundation. For our purposes the extant Books of Livy's History, 21 – 45, covering the period from 218 – 167 BCE are crucial. Livy's research led him to use Polybius extensively, but he also used earlier Roman writers, now lost to us, like the very biased annalists, Valerius Antias and Claudius Quadrigarius. Like the annalists, Livy was a patriot and much of his Roman histories paint Rome in the best possible light. Other relevant sources include Diodorus, who wrote a universal library of history in the first century BCE, Plutarch the biographer and essayist who wrote several lives of prominent Roman figures of the period we are studying, and the second century CE writer Appian who wrote histories of Rome's wars region by region in Greek and is particularly useful for Rome's conquest of Spain. You must grasp the historiographical significance for each of these authors and their works in order to be successful in this course.

Additional Recommended Readings

You should read the introductions to The Penguin Translations to Polybius' *The Rise of the Roman Empire* and Livy's *Rome and The Mediterranean*.

T. Cornell 'Review of Wiseman', in the *Journal of Roman Studies*.

G. Forsythe *Livy and Early Rome: a Study in Historical Method and Judgment*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999

C.S. Kraus & A.J. Woodman *Latin Historians*. Oxford; New York: Published for the Classical Association [by] Oxford University Press, 1997

T.J. Luce *The Greek Historians*. London; New York: Routledge, 1997.

T.J. Luce *Livy: the Composition of his History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977

G. Rogers, 'Polybius was Right' in *Rome, the Greek world, and the East*. Fergus Millar, Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers eds. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002

F.W. Walbank *Historical Commentary on Polybius* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957-79

F.W. Walbank *Selected Papers: Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1985

P. G. Walsh *Livy*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1974S. Usher *The Historians of Greece and Rome*. London, Hamilton, 1969

T.P. Wiseman *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester University Press; Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979

Week Three: Week Commencing 16 March 2009

Themes: Expansion as Roman Aim? Rome as Aggressor vs Defensive Imperialism; Economics of Imperialism; Religion and the Just War; Consequences of Empire

The central question in this course is the extent to which Romans planned, *pace* Polybius, to conquer the world and so imposed wars of aggression on their neighbors in the period of 264 – 133 BCE, as opposed to an accidental and unplanned conquest due to circumstances outside the control of the Roman authorities. Some have argued that Rome's empire came about because of 'Defensive Imperialism', that is Rome fell into wars with neighboring powers to counter their aggression or defend Roman allies. In this seminar we will look at the themes of the course and the circumstantial evidence for imperialism. The economic and social benefits of successful war-making within the Roman state as well as Rome's obsession after the fact to justify their wars as just, which may well have had important ramifications for the presentation of the evidence concerning specific wars. These themes, like the problems concerning our sources, will constantly surface as we discuss the reasons for Rome's involvement in several specific wars.

Additional Recommended Readings

See recommended general texts above.

Week Four: Week Commencing 23 March 2009

The Origins of the First Punic War 264 BCE

In 264 BCE Rome and Carthage clashed over the city of Messana in northern Sicily when a band of mercenary-brigands appealed to Carthage for help against the Syracusans and then to Rome against Carthaginian occupation. The senate at Rome debated whether to cross the straits and enter Sicily and so risk war with Carthage or Syracuse or both. In the end, the Romans did cross the straits and so began a 23 years war for possession of the island. Questions to consider include: What role did Romano-Punic relations prior to 264 BCE play in fermenting enmity between Carthage and Rome? Why did Rome enter Sicily in 264 BCE? Could Rome claim that the first Punic war was a justifiable or just war? How responsible were the Mamertini, Carthage or Syracuse in starting the first Punic war? Was this war inevitable and/but/or as Hoyos recently argued unplanned? What were Roman ambitions and war-aims at the start of the war? How did Roman war-aims change as the war developed and, if they did, why? Was Polybius right to attribute so much weight to the capture of Agrigentum in 262 BCE based on later Roman ambitions? How much did aristocratic desires for enrichment, glory play in starting the war? To what extent did the settlement of the war in 241 BCE support arguments regarding Roman desires and ambitions at the war's inception?

Additional Recommended Readings

B. Caven, *The Punic Wars*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980.

T. A. Dorey, and D. R. Dudley. *Rome Against Carthage*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1971.

A. Goldsworthy, 2000 *The Punic Wars*, London.

L.-M. Guenther, "Carthaginian Parties during the Punic Wars" *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14.1 (1999) 18-30

- B.D. Hoyos 1989 [1991] "A Forgotten Roman Historian: L. Arruntius and the "True" Causes of the First Punic War", *Antichthon* 23: 51-66.
- B.D. Hoyos, *Unplanned Wars: The Origins of the First and Second Punic War* New York: De Gruyter 1997.
- B.D. Hoyos, "The Roman-Punic Pact of 279 B.C.: Its Problems and Its Purpose," *Historia* 33 (1984) 402-439.
- B.D. Hoyos, "Treaties True and False: The Error of Philinus of Agrigentum," *Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985) 92-109.
- B.D. Hoyos, *Hannibal's Dynasty* (London and New York, 2005)
- D. Kagan *On the Origins of War* New York 1995: 248 – 252.
- J. Lazenby *The First Punic War* London: UCL Press, 1996
- B. H. Warmington, *Carthage*. London: Robert Hale, 1960.

Week Five: Week Commencing 30 March 2009

The Origins of the Second Punic War 218 – 202 BCE

The greatest and most famous war of the period was the Second Punic War, often called the Hannibalic War because of the exploits of the Carthaginian general Hannibal Barca who defeated the Romans in several battles and almost won the war in Italy. Roman traditions blamed Hannibal for starting the war and attributed its origins to Barcid ambitions and hatred of Rome. Questions to consider include the role of the First Punic War in making the second war inevitable. The annexation of Sardinia and the indemnity on the Carthaginians exacerbated Romano-Carthaginian enmity. The extent to which Roman and Greek sources colored the reality of Barcid premeditation and pre-planning for the war. How important was the Roman seizure of Sardinia as a catalyst for the war? What were Hannibal's ambitions? What was the meaning of the so-called Ebro Treaty? What was the role of Saguntum and the legitimacy of Roman relations with Spain south of the Ebro? How much did Massilia ferment hatred between Romans and Carthaginians? To what extent was the war unplanned and accidental? Why do the sources present us with certain images of the war's origins?

Additional Recommended Readings

- A.E. Astin, "Saguntum and the Origins of the Second Punic War" *Latomus* 26 (1967) 577-596
- E.D. Clark, "Roman Legionary Forces in Sicily During the Second Punic War: The Number of Legions Stationed on the Island from 214 to 210 B.C." *Ancient History Bulletin* 8.4 (1994) 133-140
- T. Cornell, B. Rankov and P. Sabin eds. *The Second Punic War: a Reappraisal*, London, 1996.
- A.Goldsworthy, *The Punic Wars*, London 2000.
- B.D. Hoyos, *Hannibal's Dynasty* (London and New York, 2005)
- J. F. Lazenby. *Hannibal's War : a Military History of the Second Punic War* Warminster, Eng.: Aris and Phillips, 1978.
- D. Kagan, *On the Origins of War*, New York 1995: 232 – 280.

Week Six: Week Commencing 6 April 2009

3. The Macedonian Wars 215 – 168 BC

The First Macedonian War: During the Hannibalic War, Philip V of Macedonia saw opportunities of westward expansion at Roman expense. After Cannae he signed a treaty with the Carthaginians. This started the First Macedonian War fought between Philip and Rome's allies, specifically the Aetolians. While this was a sideshow of the greater struggle in Italy it brought Rome into closer relations with the Greek east. Questions to consider include what were the motives of Philip V in concluding the treaty with Hannibal? How aggressive were the Hellenistic monarchs themselves in their warmaking? Were the Romans victims of Macedonian aggression? Did the Romans maltreat their Greek allies? What was the historical significance of the Peace of Phoenice?

Additional Recommended Readings

- H.J. Dell, "Macedon and Rome: the Illyrian Question in the Second Century B.C.", in K. Metsakes, ed., *Ancient Macedonia*, Thessaloniki, 1977, pp. 305-315,
- P.S. Derow, "Polybius, Rome and the East", *JRS* 69 (1979): 1-15
- R.M. Errington, *The Dawn of Empire: Rome's Rise to World Power*. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press [1972]
- P. Garnsey and C. Whittaker, *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 1978.
- E.S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*, Berkeley, c1984
- M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grece et les monarchies hellenistiques au IIIe siecle avant J.-C. (273-205)* Paris, [1935]
- W.V. Harris, "On War and Greed in the Second Century B.C.", *A.H.R.* vol. 76, 1971, pp. 1371-1384,
- R.K. Sherk, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus*, Cambridge, 1984
- F.W. Walbank, "Polybius and Rome's Eastern Policy," *JRS* 53 (1963): 1-13.
- Antwerp Fine, J. van, "Macedon, Illyria and Rome, 220-219 B.C." *Journal of Roman Studies* 26 (1936) 24-39.
- J.M.F. May, "Macedonia and Illyria (217-167)" *JRS* 36 (1946) 48-56.
- E. Badian, 1952 'Notes on Roman Policy in Illyria' *PBSR* 20:72-93.
- H. J. Dell, 1967 'The origin and nature of Illyrian piracy' *Historia* 16(3): 344-58.
- A.M. Eckstein, "Polybius, Demetrius of Pharos, and the Origins of the Second Illyrian War," *Classical Philology* 89.1 (1994) 46.
- A. Goldsworthy, 2000 *The Punic Wars*, London.
- N.G.L. Hammond, 1966 'The Kingdoms of Illyria c.400-167 BC' *ABSA* 61: 239-54.
- N.G.L. Hammond, "Illyris, Rome and Macedon in 229-205 B.C." *JRS* 58 (1968) 1-21.
- Holleaux, M., 1928 'The Romans in Illyria' *CAH* 7: 822-857.
- J.M.F. May, 1946 'Macedonia and Illyria (217-167 BC)' *JRS* 36: 48-56.
- M.G. Morgan, 1971 'Lucius Cotta and Metellus: Roman Campaigns in Illyria during the Late Second Century' *Latomus* 49 (3-4): 271-301.
- P. de Souza, 1999 *Piracy in the Ancient Greek and Roman world* Cambridge: 76-80.
- J. Wallace, 1998 'A (Hi)story of Illyria' *Greece & Rome* 45 (2): 213-25.
- J. J. Wilkes, 1992 *The Illyrians*, Oxford & Cambridge

The Second Macedonian War: The First Macedonian War created enmity between Philip and the Romans and a distrust of the Macedonian monarch among the Roman elite. At the

end of the Second Punic War Rome decided to settle the score with Philip. The Roman sources paint a damning picture of Philip's actions and a coalition of his enemies brought several complaints to the senate about the king's activities. Among these complaints was the claim that Philip and Antiochus III of Syria had secretly signed a treaty agreement to carve up Egypt and Ptolemaic possessions in the Mediterranean. In a complicated series of events the Senate decided on war, but the people rejected the proposal, presumably they were shattered after years of fighting Hannibal. In a second vote war was carried by the people and declared. Questions to consider include the extent to which the evidence and accusations against Philip V were founded in fact and the amount of justification there was for the war. How much of a threat to Italy and to the stability of the Greek world was Philip? How much was the second Macedonian War simply a war of revenge? How innocent was Philip? What role did philhellenism play in Roman decision-making? How influential were the allies and friends of the Romans, especially Pergamum and Rhodes, in bringing war down on Philip? Why was the senate so keen on war and why were the people against it? What does the pressure the senate brought to bear on the people to secure a war declaration tell us about the Roman social relations and attitudes towards warfare?

Additional Recommended Readings

D. Baronowski, "A Reconsideration of the Roman Approval of Peace with Macedonia in 196 B.C." *Phoenix* 37 (1983) 218.

J.P.V.D. Balsdon, "Rome and Macedon, 205-200 B.C." *JRS* 44 (1944) 30-42.

K. Buraselis, "Vix aerarium sufficeret. Roman Finances and the Outbreak of the Second Macedonian War" *GRBS* 37.2 (1996) 149-172

E.S. Gruen *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* Berkeley, c1984

Hammond, N.G.L. "The Opening Campaigns and the Battle of the Aoi Stena in the Second Macedonian War" *JRS* 56 (1966) 39-54.

A.H. McDonald and F.W. Walbank, "The Origins of the Second Macedonian War," *Journal Roman Studies* 27 (1937) 180-207

A.R. Meadows, "Greek and Roman Diplomacy on the Eve of the Second Macedonian War" *Historia* 42.1 (1993) 40

P. Treves, "Walbank's Philip V of Macedon" *JHS* 63 (1943) 117-120.

R. Vishnia, "The Refusal of the Centuriate Assembly to Declare War on Macedon (200 BC) - A Reappraisal" *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998) 34-44

V.M. Warrior, *The initiation of the Second Macedonian War: an Explication of Livy Book 31*, Stuttgart, 1996.

The Third Macedonian War: Philip V's son, Perseus seems to have added a renewed energy to the Macedonian kingdom. Roman suspicions grew through the 170s BCE and in 171 Rome forced war on the king. The war resulted in the catastrophic defeat of the Macedonian monarchy at Pydna in 168 BCE and its dissolution in 167. As ever questions remain about the justice of the war waged against Perseus and the legitimacy of Roman fears concerning the Macedonians. Was Perseus a threat to the Romans, or even to his Greek neighbors? What were his intentions? What were the real reasons for the war? Why did the war occur when it did and not earlier? Why did Rome settle the war in the way that they did and why did they punish Rhodes so severely? Does the third Macedonian war represent a turning point in Roman foreign policy or is it merely a part of an ongoing process?

Additional Recommended Readings

A.P. Belikov, "The Third Macedonian War: The Problem of the Guilt of the Parties [in Russian]," *VDI* 222 (1997) 149-157.

-----, 1967 *Scipio Aemilianus*. London: Oxford University Press.

O.P. Dany, "Livy and the chronology of the years 168-167," *CQ* 50.2 (2000) 432-439.

A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*, London, 1984

F.W. Walbank, "The Causes of the Third Macedonian War: Recent Views," in K. Metsakes, ed., *Ancient Macedonia*, Thessaloniki, 1977, pp. 81-94.

Week Seven: Week Commencing 27 April 2009

The First Antiochan War and the East 191 – 133 BCE

As a result of the Roman withdrawal from Greece and the weakened status of Philip V, Antiochus III of Syria, now master of almost all of Alexander's old empire, dispatched an occupation force to Greece. The Romans now found themselves pitted against a very formidable ruler indeed. Nevertheless, in a series of swift campaigns and an enormous pitched battle at Magnesia-ad-Sypilum the military strength of Antiochus was destroyed and the settlement of Apamea severely crippled the power of the king. The indemnity imposed upon him was enormous, fuelling the evidence for Roman economic greed in war making. Questions to consider include discussion of the reasons for Antiochus' attempt to dominate the Greek mainland. Was he justified in trying to strengthen his western position? Were the Romans justified in returning to Greece and evicting Antiochus' generals? What role did Pergamum and the Greeks play in the origins of the Antiochan war? What does this action tell us about Roman attitudes to their Greek allies? Were the Romans acting idealistically in invading Asia Minor? Why was the indemnity imposed on Antiochus so great and does it provide good evidence of Roman avarice? Why did Rome leave the Greek world after the defeat of Antiochus? Was this responsible and diplomatic or irresponsible and cynical?

Additional Recommended Readings

J. D. Grainger, *The Roman war of Antiochos the Great*, Leiden 2002. (PA9 M686 S 239)

Week Eight: Week Commencing 4 May 2009

Rome and the West 221 – 150 BCE

The Spains: As a result of the Second Punic War, Rome found itself with commitments and allies (as well as enemies) in Spain. Several campaigns were fought in the 190s BCE to establish control over the Spanish tribes. Unlike in the east the Romans annexed parts of Iberia and created provinces (as they had in Sicily and Sardinia). Harris accused the Roman commanders in Spain of deliberately starting wars on neighboring tribes and triumph hunting for glory in the period. Questions to consider include why Rome appears to have treated Spain in a different way to the Greek east at the same time period. Why did the Romans annex some Spanish territory? Were Roman commanders guilty of fighting un-provoked wars? What benefits accrued from Spanish war-making? Can we identify a coherent foreign policy in Spain or was Roman imperialism there simply a product of individual commanders and their specific ambitions and reactions?

Additional Recommended Readings

J.S. Richardson *Hispaniae, Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 BC*. Cambridge, 1986.

C.H.V. Sutherland, "Aspects of Imperialism in Roman Spain," *JRS* 24 (1934) 31-42

A.W. Lintott, "What Was the Imperium Romanum?" *Greece and Rome* 28 (1981) 53-67

A.W. Lintott, *Imperium Romanum* (London and New York, 1993).

Northern Italy: The Romans had several small colonies in the Po valley in the 220s BCE. Hannibal had done much to weaken Roman influence in this region. The Celtic tribes of northern Italy had fought with Hannibal and Roman interests turned there after the Hannibalic war. In a series of campaigns in the 190s in the Po Valley and in the 170s in Liguria Rome asserted its authority on the region. Questions to consider include the level of self-defense and interests of security inherent in these wars. To what extent were these wars of revenge, or of settlement for colonists? Significantly, why did the Romans not conquer all of northern Italy in this period and why was the job not completed until the time of Augustus? Are the wars against the Ligurians to be viewed separately from the wars against the Celts? Can we see a coherent foreign policy at work or simply a random series of wars fought for ad hoc reasons?

Additional Recommended Readings

B.L. Twyman, "The Influence of the Northern Italian Frontier on Roman Imperialism," *Ancient World* 23.1 (1992): 91-106.

S.P. Oakley, "The Roman Conquest of Italy" in Rich, J.W. ed. *War and Society in the Roman World* (London, 1993), pp. 9-37.

E.T. Salmon, *The Making of Roman Italy* (London, 1982)

E.T. Salmon, *Roman Colonization Under the Republic* (London, 1969)

Week Nine: Week Commencing 11May 2009

New Policies? Third Punic War, Greece 200 – 146 BCE

Carthaginian power was curtailed in 201, but under sound management the city's fortunes revived. Rome's friend in Numidia, Massinissa, continued to harass the Carthaginians and in 151 events came to a head during a border dispute between the north African communities. Rome intervened on behalf of Massinissa and Carthage had no choice but to fight a final war in defense of its territory. The war was essentially a siege that culminated in the destruction of Carthage. Questions to consider include the culpability of Roman aggression in this war. Was it at all justified? Did Massinissa dupe the Romans into the war or were they willing conspirators in the destruction of the city? Can we identify competing foreign policy agendas within Roman the aristocracy? Does this war represent a departure from previous Roman policy?

Additional Recommended Readings

- F.E. Adcock, "Delenda est Carthago'," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 8 (1946): 117-28.
A.E. Astin, *Cato the Censor*. London, 1978.
D.W. Baronowski, "Polybius on the Causes of the Third Punic War," *CPh* 90.1 (1995) 16.
R.T. Ridley, "To Be Taken With A Pinch of Salt: The Destruction of Carthage," *Classical Philology* 81 (1986): 140-46.

With the defeat of Philip V the Romans left a restructured Greek world between the federal leagues of Achaia and Aetolia, Sparta in the south and a weakened, but not destroyed Philip of Macedonia in the north. The Romans declared the freedom of the Greeks, a political slogan that dated back to the Persian wars of the fifth century, which usually meant the removal of one ruling power over the Greeks in favor of another. The Romans amazed the Greeks by leaving the Greek world free of garrisons. This was a high watermark of Roman philhellenism, but we should question Roman motives and Greek perceptions of those motives. In 146 BCE Rome destroyed the city of Corinth at the end of the Achaean war as an exemplum to other Greeks who had disagreed with Roman foreign policy. Almost simultaneously Macedonia rose against Roman political arrangements resulting in the creation of the Roman provinces of Macedonia and Achaia. Much of Greece was laid waste in this war and many see it as a departure from the philhellenism of previous Roman policy. Was this the case? To what extent was Roman policy in Greece dictated by cynical self-interest throughout the second century or by mutual misunderstandings and cultural clashes? Is Polybius' account of the origins of the Achaean war satisfactory? Why was Corinth destroyed? Why did the Romans only annex the Greek mainland at this time and not earlier? Can we identify a different treatment of Greeks in the east to Celts of the west? How much responsibility for the disasters that befell Greece in this period lay with the Greeks?

Additional Recommended Readings

- R.J. Evans, "The Structure and Source of Livy, 38.44.9-39.44.9" *Klio* 75 (1993): 180-187.
E.S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley, c1984
E.S. Gruen, "The Origins of the Achaean War" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 96 (1976): 46-69.
Week Seventeen: Week Commencing 1 August 2009

Week Ten: Week Commencing 18 May 2009

Why Was Rome So Successful in the Period

This seminar discusses the reasons why Rome was able to conquer so many peoples and such diverse territories in a relatively short period of time. Was it simply that Roman military technology was better than that of the other peoples of the Mediterranean? Did, as Polybius thought, the Roman constitution lay the foundations for Roman success? Were other aspects of Roman social and economic institutions responsible for the expansion of the Roman state, as Harris argues, were the Romans more aggressive, more glory hunting or more violent than other peoples? This is a complex seminar topic and will require some insightful commentary and a sophisticated knowledge of the subject.

Week Eleven: Week Commencing 25 May 2009

The Consequences of Roman Imperialism – segues into late antiquity...

The growth of Roman power brought changes to the Roman state in Rome and Italy. Rome's wealth increased greatly. Historians have seen several negative consequences and what is called the second century crisis as a result of empire. Roman campaigning and subsequent responsibilities to the provinces overseas brought the need for garrisons and year round military service. The numbers of slaves in Italian farms increased and poor Romans struggled to compete against large slave-run estates. The city of Rome grew exponentially as poor Roman farmers left the countryside for the city and non-Italians sought their fortunes in the city. The numbers of poor citizen farmers who were the backbone of the Roman army declined. Senatorial power decline in the second century as individual generals grew in power due to the wealth and position established by conquest. Soldiering became more professionalized and the poor saw military service more as a career than as an obligation of citizenship. Ultimately the empire led the way towards the destruction of the republic through the competition of individual generals for power.

Week Twelve: Week Commencing 13 July 2009.

Introduction: the structure of the Roman Empire in the 3rd century AD (AP)

The governmental system of the Roman Republic gave way to the Imperial system of Augustus that developed through the Julio-Claudians and Flavians into a stable system under the Antonines. Outbreaks of anarchy, such as after the death of Commodus that led to the Severan monarchy, became much more common in the third century. This offered opportunities for those on the borders of the empire (e.g. the Herulians and Goths). In particular, the return of Persian power after the Parthians put substantial strain on the eastern frontier.

For introductions to the period of Late Antiquity, there is the classic text of Peter Brown (*The World of Late Antiquity*, Thames and Hudson 1971). G.W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, Oleg Grabar eds., *Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA. 1999) has a selection of excellent essays on our topic (see esp. Christopher Kelly, 'Empire Building') and an encyclopedic section that summarises most topics for this period. The general texts of Averil Cameron (e.g. *The Later Roman Empire*) follow the Brown tradition of incorporating substantial cultural history.

Additional Recommended Readings

A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, A. Cameron, *Cambridge Ancient History, vol. 12 The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193-337* (esp. ch. 1-2, 'The Severan Dynasty' and 'Maximinus to Diocletian and the "crisis"').

Week Thirteen: Week Commencing 20 July 2009

Diocletian and his reforms: government and economy (AP)

The reign of Diocletian sees not only a return to stability on the empire's frontiers, but also major changes in the government of the empire and attempts to control its economy. What prompted the reforms in the imperial system? What actually occurred through Diocletian's economic reforms and coinage decrees? To understand these events, it will be necessary to understand how these systems functioned previously and what changes Diocletian's reforms sought to achieve.

A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, A. Cameron, *Cambridge Ancient History, vol. 12 The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193-337* (esp. ch. 3, 'Diocletian and the first tetrarchy, A.D. 284-305', ch. 6 'The new state of Diocletian and Constantine', ch. 11, 'Coinage and taxation', ch. 12 'Coinage, society and economy').

Potter, *Roman Empire at Bay* ch. 7, 9

Brian Campbell, 'The army: II. The military reforms of Diocletian and Constantine'. *Cambridge Ancient History* 12.120-130 (2005)

Simon Corcoran, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government*² (2000)

Hugh Elton, 'The Transformation of Government under Diocletian and Constantine', in D. Potter, ed. *Companion to the Roman Empire* (Malden/Oxford 2006) 193-205

C.E.V. Nixon and B.S. Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini* (Berkeley 1994)

Week Fourteen: Week commencing 27 July 2009

The Constantinian monarchy: government and church (AP)

Constantine is remembered as the first Christian emperor. To understand what this might mean, we need to consider first how Constantine saw himself as a ruler in the Diocletianic tradition and how he created his own dynasty. Then, the relationship of Christianity to other belief systems in the period and possible advantages of adopting this exclusive religion. A 'Christian imperial system' also involved the emperor in the governance of the Christian church, with both benefits and liabilities. In particular, the establishment of 'Constantine's city' on the Bosphorus changed the nature of governance in the eastern empire.

T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: theology and politics in the Constantinian empire* (1993)

H.A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops* (Baltimore, 2000)

P. Fredriksen, 'Christians in the Roman Empire in the First Three Centuries CE', in D. Potter, ed. *Companion to the Roman Empire* (Malden/Oxford 2006) 587-606.

S.G. Hall, *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* (London 1991)

D. Hunt, 'The Church as a public institution' in *CAH* 13.238-276.

N. Lenski, ed. *Cambridge Companion to Age of Constantine* (2006)

R. Macmullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (AD 100-400)* (1984)

R. Van Dam, *The Revolution of Constantine* (2007)

Texts:

S. Lieu, D. Montserrat, *History, Historiography, and Legend* (1998)

S. Lieu, D. Montserrat, *From Constantine to Julian* (1995)

Roger Rees, *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy* (2004)

Week Fifteen: Week commencing 3 August

Julian and paganism (including Neoplatonism, Manichaeism)

The figure of the emperor Julian stands out as a reaction to the Christian empire of the Constantinian period. Ammianus Marcellinus offers a clear (tho' not necessarily impartial) history of his reign. What was Julian trying to do and how successful (or likely to be successful, given the length of his reign) was he? For alternatives to Christianity, consideration of the system of thought known as 'neo-platonism' (which might be both pagan or Christian) and the 'improved' version of Christianity in Manichaeism should be considered (both are interestingly described in a Christian context in Augustine's Confessions).

John Matthews, *Roman Empire of Ammianus Marcellinus* (1989)

G. Kelly, *Ammianus, the Allusive Historian* (2008)

P. Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism* (1981)

G. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (1978)

D. Hunt, 'Julian' in *CAH* 13.44-77.

S. Tougher, *Julian the Apostate* (2007) – texts around Julian

Mark Edwards, *Culture and Philosophy in the Age of Plotinus* (2006)

J. BeDuhn, *Manichaean Body* (2000)

S. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (1992)

Week Sixteen: Week commencing 10 August

The city and the empire (esp. Antioch)

The city is the basic building block for Roman administration. How does the city council change in late antiquity in the face of the power of the Roman imperial administration (particularly military officials) and the development of the Christian church as another administrative power. Because Antioch is so well documented for this period, it makes a useful test case for historical change.

W. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: city and imperial administration in the later Roman empire* (1972)

W. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and bishops: army, church and state in the age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (1990)

A.F. Norman, *Antioch as a centre of Hellenic culture as observed by Libanius* (2000).

B. Ward-Perkins, 'The cities' in *CAH* 13. 371-410.

Week 17: Week commencing 17 August

Asceticism and monasticism; the development of an orthodox church

A particular feature of Christianity in late antiquity is the rise of hermits (such as Saint Antony) and the development of communities of ascetics (monks and monasteries). The phenomenon has precedents, but seems to be particularly prevalent in this time (and in some places, such as Egypt and Syria). What are the reasons behind this phenomenon?

At the same time, the mainstream Christian church is seeking to define itself by a series of councils and creeds. Some emperors (e.g. Constantius) held beliefs at odds with the orthodox church, which caused tension again between powers of religion and state. How were these problems sorted out?

Peter Brown, 'The rise and function of the holy man in late antiquity', *JRS* 61 (1971) 80-101.

Peter Brown, 'Asceticism: pagan and Christian' in *CAH* 13.601-31.

Peter Brown, 'Holy Men', in *CAH* 14.781-811.

P. Rousseau, 'Monasticism' in *CAH* 14.745-780.

P. Allen, 'The definition and enforcement of orthodoxy', in *CAH* 14.811-834.

S.G. Hall, 'The organization of the church', in *CAH* 14. 731-744.

N.B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1991)

Week 18: Week commencing 7 September

Corruption in late antiquity

S. Barnish, 'Government and administration', in *CAH* 14.164-206.

C. Kelly, 'Emperors, government and bureaucracy' in *CAH* 14.138-163.

R. Macmullen, *Corruption and the Decline of Rome* (1988).

M.McCormick, 'Emperor and Court' in *CAH* 14.135-163.

Week 19: Week commencing 14 September

Barbarian and Roman kingdoms from Theodosius to Justinian

The fifth and sixth centuries see the final disintegration of the Roman empire in the West and the development of the Byzantine empire in the East. Why do these two areas of the Roman world develop so differently? Also, is the history of the West simply one of the Roman areas being overwhelmed by barbarian hordes or is the story more complex? What is happening on the eastern frontier? How do the two parts of the empire come to separate (and where does Africa belong?).

A. Cameron, *Claudian* (Oxford 1970)

A. Cameron, J. Long, *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1993)

P. Heather, *The Goths* (1996)

P. Heather, *Fall of the Roman empire: a new history of Rome and the barbarians* (2005)

J. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and the imperial court* (1975)

Week 20: Week Commencing 21 September

Justinian and the Justinianic revival

Procopius' historical writings (*Wars*, *Buildings*, and especially, *The Secret History*) are our main source for the reign of Justinian. Unfortunately, the historian is clearly in contradiction with himself. The question is how to explain his attitude and to consider whether Procopius actually gives a reasonable treatment of Justinian's activities.

A. Cameron, *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium* (1976).

A. Cameron, *Porphyrius the Charioteer* (1973)

Averil Cameron, 'Justin I and Justinian' in *CAH* 14.63-85.

A. Kaldellis, *Procopius of Caesarea* (2004).

M. Maas, *Cambridge Companion to the age of Justinian* (2005).

P. Sarris, *Economy and society in the Age of Justinian* (2006).

Week 21: Week Commencing 28 September

Urban change from the 3rd to 6th centuries: continuity or decline?

If the old story of the Roman empire 'falling' before the pressures of barbarian hordes is rejected, there is still a question of whether there was a major decline in the Roman or ex-Roman world. Archaeology in particular shows an uneven pattern of change and change may not necessarily be an indication of decline. This is one of the most important topics of current debate and in many ways sums up the entire course.

S.J.B. Barnish, 'The transformation of classical cities and the Pirenne debate', *JRA* 2 (1989) 385-400.

W. Liebeschuetz, *Decline and Fall of the Roman City* (2001).

B. Ward-Perkins, 'Land, labour, and settlement', in *CAH* 14.315-345.

B. Ward-Perkins, 'Specialized production and exchange' in *CAH* 14.346-391.

Week 22: Week Commencing 5 October

Models of late antiquity/early middle ages. A system that failed or one that reinvented itself? (AP/MT)

COURSE ENDS: SECOND ESSAY DUE 9 OCTOBER 2009