

The Language of Slavery in Greek Literature

Emma Bodner, BA (Hons.)

Department of Classics and Archaeology

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Classics  
Text and Culture

Faculty of Humanities, Brock University  
St. Catharines, Ontario

©Emma Bodner 2022

Signature Page

## Abstract

Slavery was woven into the culture of ancient Greece. Greek literature reflects this reality but is distorted by the author's perspective—a free (often elite) male. Though people were enslaved throughout antiquity, we rarely hear their voices and can be misled about their experiences by the surviving work that favours the enslaver and characterizes the enslaved in relationship to them. This MRP examines the considerations that can be taken in translating Greek literature, focusing on the conflicting demands of reflecting accurately the author's voice and perspective and humanizing the enslaved to a fuller extent. I analyze the practice of translation and the definitions and terminology of Greek slavery to inform a series of case studies comparing and critiquing several translations of Homer's *Odyssey*, Euripides's *Andromache*, and Chariton's *Callirhoe*. I conclude each case study with an alternative translation of my own to demonstrate a more humanizing approach to translation.

### Acknowledgments

I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Allison Glazebrook, and my second reader, Dr. Roberto Nickel. Without their classes that inspired my research (Dr. Glazebrook's course on Ancient Slavery and Dr. Nickel's course on Epic Poetry), and without their generous guidance, I would be at a loss. I offer thanks also to Brock University and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for granting me the funding which enabled me to pour all of my focus and efforts into this work. Further, I am thankful to my family, friends, and the faculty of the Department of Classics and Archaeology for their ongoing support and much-needed encouragement.

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Translating Slavery .....	2
Definitions of Slavery .....	7
Terminology .....	13
Case Studies .....	17
Case Study 1: Homer's <i>Odyssey</i> .....	19
Case Study 2: Euripides's <i>Andromache</i> .....	35
Case Study 3: Chariton's <i>Callirhoe</i> .....	46
Conclusion .....	58
Bibliography .....	62

## The Language of Slavery in Greek Literature<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

While spending a semester translating books 6-8 of Homer's *Odyssey* in an ancient Greek course, I was struck by the problem of representing enslaved people in a way that did not serve only to support the elite enslavers' perspectives. While fiction does not factually represent the treatment or lived experiences of the enslaved in the ancient world, the depiction of enslaved people in literature reveals how they might have been perceived and how free and elite people might have thought about themselves in contrast.<sup>2</sup> Is it better to translate more 'literally' to reflect the Greek? Or is it better to replace a generalized noun like 'slave' with a more humane construction, such as 'enslaved person'? How can a translator stay 'true' to the Greek, so to speak, but also produce an inclusive translation that recognizes the personhood of every character involved, even the minor unnamed ones? Contemplating these concerns, I begin by examining the appearance and representation of slavery and enslaved individuals in literature and how they can be viewed and translated. The issue of transmitting nuance in translation reveals

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper includes discussions of sensitive topics including slavery, captivity and abduction, violence and death, sexual abuse, and disrespectful or abusive language (including sexism, misogyny, and classism).

<sup>2</sup> Alston 2011, 1-2.

the tricky and difficult nature of translation as a discipline and how translators must reconcile their own and the broader cultural views of the original author along with the meaning and form of the text. Next, I inspect definitions of slavery, both ancient and modern, to demonstrate the multiplicity by which slavery can be perceived. I then conduct an analysis of the nuances of terminology of Greek slavery. I examine how the factors in the above sections operate in practice through three case studies using Homer's *Odyssey*, Euripides's *Andromache*, and Chariton's *Callirhoe*. I compare excerpts of prominent translations of these select works that vary in genre (epic poem, tragedy, and novel) and temporal period of origin (Iron age and Archaic period, Classical period, and Hellenistic period) in order to examine the general variations in ancient thinking regarding slavery. I guide my investigation by considering how slavery interacts with the conventions of the genres (does slavery manifest differently in an epic poem versus an erotic novel?), how enslaved individuals are viewed and represented (do we see their points of view? How much of their perspectives are influenced by the narrator/author?), and how elite, free, and enslaver characters interact with enslaved characters (are they friendly? Cruel? Distant? Familiar? Ambivalent?). The reasoning for the selection of each text and its translators is discussed in detail at the start of each case study. After interrogating the translations, I then posit my own alternatives to show how else the texts might be approached. In crafting my translations, I am motivated by considerations of inclusivity and culpability, which are elucidated in the following sections.

### **Translating Slavery**

Translation as a process is tricky and scholars generally agree that there can be no direct equivalency or sameness between a source text and a translated text.<sup>3</sup> Every language conveys its

---

<sup>3</sup> Malmkjær 2011.

ideas differently, using a specific arrangement of meaning (what is being said: literally, idiomatically, and metaphorically) and form (how it is being said: for example, poetry vs. prose). Translators must consider many factors, such as determining whether to favour meaning or form, how meaning can be transmitted most effectively, how form can be replicated to produce the same effect in each text, and how the text is to be received (is it showing how the meaning and form were received in the source text or is it aiming to replicate the original source text's response, regardless of changes to form or meaning?).<sup>4</sup> All of these considerations are further impacted by the purpose of the translation.<sup>5</sup> For example, regarding a translation of Homer's *Odyssey*, a translator could produce a text for the purposes of teaching epic poetry, teaching Greek language, showcasing historical or cultural evidence, or for entertainment and recreational reading. To continue this example, imagine a translator is approaching the word *dmôes* (δμῶες)<sup>6</sup> in a sentence describing a group of enslaved servants following orders. They could translate *dmôes* as a generalized "the slaves obeyed," which tells the reader clearly that enslavement is present in this society. An alternate translation could be "the servants obeyed." This version hints at the enslaved status of the *dmôes* but does not make it explicit, instead opting to create a sentence that reads more 'poetically.'<sup>7</sup> Neither option, however, discloses the etymological nuance of *dmôes* as individuals enslaved through captivity in war. "The war-won slaves obeyed"

---

<sup>4</sup> Köse 2011; Malmkjær 2011, 113-4, "8.2.3 How equivalence gives way to text type and purpose." Psarras (Holton 2022) adds a third contender in his focus on translating poetry in particular, considering three aspects: the sonic or sonorant element (form, rhythm, metre), the cognitive and semantic element (content/meaning), and the oral element (that it is intended to be recited or performed).

<sup>5</sup> The British School at Athens produced two panel discussions (Holton 2022; Van Steen 2022) that demonstrate different scholars' and authors' views and approaches to translation with a focus on inclusion and exclusion, from translating children's books to readapting classic tales in a feminist lens. Heywood and Provata-Carlone (Holton 2022) note the impact their reader base has on their approaches, aiming to remove barriers of language and broadening access to the text. Golden (1992, 331) discusses the use of cross-cultural comparisons in scholarship, which can be mapped onto the process of translation: "Our choices should be informed by some theory as to which factors are most relevant to the questions we wish to ask."

<sup>6</sup> Term to be discussed in detail in 'Terminology.'

<sup>7</sup> I.e., elegantly, or artistically: a subjective measure that also serves as an excuse for failing to confront the realities of slavery, sexual violence, and other exploitative practices.

could be a possible solution but now has the concern of inserting words which are not in the source text and could arguably alter the response to the translated text. Finally, the sentence could be translated more inclusively, recalling the humanity of the enslaved and the culpability of the enslaver, as “the enslaved obeyed” or “the enslaved servants obeyed.”<sup>8</sup> Again, this does not capture the etymological nuance, but it does reveal a socially and historically conscious perspective in translation. Though *dmôes* is a single word, its effect on translation is challenging, to say the least.

Since translations are always a product of the time and culture in which they are produced, translators must acknowledge the importance of revisiting texts so that translations can stay up to date with the time and culture in which they are consumed. Translation alone is complex, but it becomes increasingly complicated as contemporary language evolves. There is, of course, no way to reconcile every issue with a text and its translation, but recognition of these concerns by a translator helps to contextualize the process for those who engage with an ancient text only through its modern translations. George Theodoridis, a translator to be examined in the Euripides case study, explains of his work that:

There is a surfeit of excellent translations of all these dramaturges already available both here on the net and in the bookshops of the world and I know that my own efforts will only add to that surfeit as well as to the befuddlement of those who search for the definitive translation. Alas, the “befuddled” will remain so, no matter how many more translations are placed in the web and upon the book

---

<sup>8</sup> The distinctions between words such as ‘slave’, ‘servant,’ and ‘enslaved’ are minute but significant. ‘Slave’ encompasses the whole personhood and identity of an individual into a plain noun, marking them as different from normal (free) people. ‘Servant’ is an occupational role often used as a synonym for ‘slave.’ This fusion muddles the nuance of ‘servant’ which could denote free or enslaved service throughout history and creates a false link between both words: a ‘slave’ may be a ‘servant’ (subjugated and placed in that role); a ‘servant’ may be a ‘slave’ (someone holding a particular occupational role is also enslaved); a ‘slave’ may not be a ‘servant’ (working instead as a shepherd or a sexual labourer, for instance); and a ‘servant’ may not be a ‘slave’ (a free person working for hire). ‘Enslaved,’ elucidated further below, denotes an individual as being marked by their dominated status but not fully encompassed by it (i.e., being modified by an adjective rather than being replaced by a noun).

shelves because such a thing as a definitive translation can never exist. As language changes, as it evolves with the ever-tilling of its cultural ground ... new words, new notions, new imagination must be applied and translators should keep their eyes, ears and minds well awake to these changes and evolutions and must constantly revisit the original works.<sup>9</sup>

In revisiting texts, it is also important to consider creating a translation that has “socially and culturally rooted expressions [in order] to be more easily understood and accepted than [to use] direct” or literal constructions of the source language.<sup>10</sup>

Overarching all these translation concerns is how the language of slavery is treated in English. Aside from the fact that English does not have the variety Greek does, English treatments of slavery in scholarship are working to consider language that recalls the humanity of enslaved individuals, for example, by indicating enslaved status with an adjective rather than a noun (‘enslaved’ vs. ‘slave’) and placing responsibility on the elite upper class who benefitted from the institution, especially in discussions of the sexual assault and labour of enslaved people. A community sourced document by P. Gabrielle Foreman guides scholars and educators through language to consider adopting and avoiding. Foreman explains that “using enslaved (as an adjective) rather than “slave” (as a noun) disaggregates the condition of being enslaved with the status of “being” a slave. People weren’t slaves; they were enslaved ... The term “master” transmits the aspirations and values of the enslaving class without naming the practices they engaged.”<sup>11</sup> Additionally, the document asks scholars and educators to consider using ‘fugitives from slavery’ or ‘self-liberated individuals’ rather than ‘runaway slave’ and, if writing about “sexual violence, rape, assault and coercion under slavery, [naming] that violence rather than

---

<sup>9</sup> Theodoridis 2012.

<sup>10</sup> Ji 2021, 11.

<sup>11</sup> Foreman, et al.

obscuring it by using terms such as ‘interracial sex’ or ‘sexual intercourse.’” The discussion of sexual assault and the coercion or exploitation of sexual labour, especially among the enslaved, is a growing topic of scholarly investigation. Serena Witzke, writing about the terminology of sex labour in Roman comedy, contends that:

[W]hen situations involving sex labor are translated, the realities of the laborers are often obscured: euphemisms prejudice readers, moralizing judgments are perpetuated, and lived realities of sex laborers in antiquity are easily glossed over or dismissed. This phenomenon has occurred, for example, in translations of Roman Comedy with regard to rape, which historically has been bowdlerized into “seduction” in English translations or has been edited out altogether.<sup>12</sup>

Just as the realities of sexual labour in Roman Comedy are neglected in translation, including the disregard for differences in culture between ancient Rome and contemporary Anglophone societies (English has more words for sexual labour and sexual interaction, including insults or derogatory words, than Latin and thus trying to exchange one for another results in the Latin being misrepresented<sup>13</sup>), so too are the enslaved and their mistreatment disregarded in translation.<sup>14</sup> The endeavour to assign more agency to enslaved people and include their perspectives is particularly challenging in translation because translators must evaluate the purpose and aesthetics of their translation while now also grappling with whether to maintain the historical elite perspective (by using the enslavers’ vocabulary) or to humanize enslaved characters. Even outside translation, English-speaking scholars display reluctance to adopt more empathetic language in their work, continuing to call enslaved people ‘slaves’ and enslavers

---

<sup>12</sup> Witzke 2015, 8. See also Kapparis 2011 on misuse of euphemism.

<sup>13</sup> Witzke 2015, 12-20.

<sup>14</sup> Miner (2003, 21-2 n.10) demonstrates how the basic ‘literal’ meaning of a phrase can be glossed over in English translations, noting the difference between ‘earning money by her body’ and ‘working as a prostitute.’

‘masters,’ citing awkwardness, wordiness, or inauthenticity.<sup>15</sup> The emerging alternate English terminology aims not just at revealing the agency of victims of slavery but also calling attention to their suffering and holding enslavers accountable.<sup>16</sup> It is the responsibility of those producing work for others to consume to say exactly what they mean and ensure any implicit meaning aligns with their stance.<sup>17</sup>

### **Definitions of Slavery**

The rendering of a text in another language is challenging and requires thorough consideration from the translator. Since form and meaning differ from language to language, it is necessary then to explore some definitions of slavery, ancient and modern, in order to see how perceptions vary and how those variations impact the inclusion and representation of slavery. Modern scholars take many approaches to defining slavery;<sup>18</sup> often, they debate the relevance of a status as property in defining an enslaved individual. Orlando Patterson, arguing for the omission of status as property in the definition, posits that “slavery is the permanent, violent domination of natively alienated and generally dishonored persons.”<sup>19</sup> This definition, accepted by many scholars, views slavery as a “social death” for the enslaved individual and argues against the need to include status as property, pointing out that “ownership is more complex than it seems” when compared to the custom of marriage wherein a man buys his wife from her father with a

---

<sup>15</sup> Waldman (2015) and Zorn (2019) discuss both sides of the terminology debate, focusing mostly on the discussion of slavery in the United States. See also Rinehart 2022.

<sup>16</sup> As Waldman (2015) puts it: “Language should be a light cast back on the past, not another set of chains.”

<sup>17</sup> This is not to say that ‘enslaved person’ and ‘enslaver’ are always the terms to use. As Rebecca Onion explains (2022), “The problem is that the history of slavery is huge: It spans centuries, continents, and contexts. And the need to be sensitive—not to multiply harms by reusing the language that enslavers favored, for example—is acute. For a person writing about slavery without a deep level of knowledge, there really isn’t any substitute for the investment of time and attention.” See also Johnson 2003, 116 and Kapparis 2011, 222.

<sup>18</sup> Zelnick-Abramovitz (2005, 15-60 “Slavery and Freedom: Definitions and Approaches”) and Hunt (2018, 17-29 “Definitions and Evidence”) explore many definitions and approaches.

<sup>19</sup> Patterson 1982, 13.

‘bride-price.’<sup>20</sup> It allows for a wider range of dominated people to be considered enslaved across many cultures and times. In contrast, David Lewis, for example, contends that Aristotle’s idea of the enslaved as ‘living tools’ is a key factor in defining slavery.<sup>21</sup> He focuses his definition more precisely on the Greek world of slavery and argues strongly for the consideration of ancient attitudes about enslaved individuals, asserting that “Greeks had little to do with the primary processes of enslavement; rather, slaves were an abundant native ‘commodity’ exchanged for Greek wares through commercial interactions.”<sup>22</sup> Kyle Harper relies heavily on the objectification of the enslaved in his examination of their sale prices.<sup>23</sup> Vincent Gabrielsen, in his investigation of slavery and piracy, similarly maintains that enslaved people were viewed as commodities to trade.<sup>24</sup> John Oakley too stresses that status as property is important in defining slavery, drawing on a dehumanizing Greek term for enslaved individuals, *andrapodon* (ἀνδράποδον, “man-footed creature”), which is related to *tetrapodos* (τετράποδος), a word which describes an animal in its most basic sense—a four-footed creature—and links the enslaved to animals specifically sold as goods.<sup>25</sup>

Ancient definitions of slavery vary through time; the Greek perception of slavery began informally in the Homeric period but progressed into more concrete theories through the Classical period in the forms of law and philosophy.<sup>26</sup> Due to a growing contempt for menial labour (deemed unfit for free and elite people), the argument that enslaved individuals were naturally inferior and held a place between human and animal, between person and inanimate

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Hunt (2018, 18-9) who discusses the complexities of women’s legal status vis-à-vis the issue of property both as daughters and as wives.

<sup>21</sup> Lewis 2018, 25.

<sup>22</sup> Lewis 2015, 319.

<sup>23</sup> Harper 2010.

<sup>24</sup> Gabrielsen 2003, 389.

<sup>25</sup> Oakley 2000, 227.

<sup>26</sup> Schlaifer 1936, 165; Cartledge 2001, 162. While slavery itself was ever-present from the early Iron Age through to the Hellenistic period, it is the formulation of legal status that had major developments (Lewis 2018, 120-4).

tool, gradually arose.<sup>27</sup> Aristotle, for instance, discusses the constituent aspects of power hierarchies in a household, beginning with the relationship between an enslaver and those they enslaved. He emphasizes the function of an enslaved individual, drawing the conclusion that “the manager of a household must have his tools, and of tools some are lifeless and others living” and that “an article of property is a tool for the purpose of life, and property generally is a collection of tools, and a slave is a live article of property” (Arist. *Pol.* 1.1253b).<sup>28</sup> Aristotle not only considers slavery a natural part of human hierarchies (that if there is a ruler of a household there must be a ruled member, if a husband a wife, if a father a child, if a king a subject, if an enslaver an enslaved individual) but also asserts that some people are naturally suited to being enslaved (Arist. *Pol.* 1253b1-18, 1255a1-2).<sup>29</sup> He argues that, as Peter Garnsey explains,

the natural slave is said to suffer from a deficiency of the reasoning part of the soul. This has moral and intellectual implications: it means that he is incapable of living a life of autonomy and independence, in other words, the life of a free man. His best hope of fulfilling his (limited) potential is to serve a natural master, who can guarantee him security, while harnessing his capacities, essentially for bodily service, to his own ends and those of the household.<sup>30</sup>

Plato too expresses the belief that enslaved people are naturally lesser, but advocates for their humane treatment. This compassion does not stem from genuine philanthropy; the superior morality of elite enslavers is reflected in how well they treat those beneath them (Pl. *Leg.* 6.777e). Xenophon echoes this, explaining that mistreatment of one’s enslaved population is a result of the enslaver’s bad management (Xen. *Oec.* 3.4). But to Plato it is not that an enslaved

---

<sup>27</sup> Schlaifer 1936, 172-4, 189. cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1.1254a. See also Gavriljuk 2003, 76.

<sup>28</sup> Trans. Rackham 1932.

<sup>29</sup> His widely criticized argument is examined in depth by Monoson (2011).

<sup>30</sup> Garnsey 1996, 38. Schalifer (1936, 193) also discusses the perceived absence of these traits, *bouleutikon* and *proairesis*, as defining an enslaved person’s predisposed inferiority and justified objectification.

individual is in a *position* of inferiority but that they have *become* wholly inferior due to their having been enslaved.<sup>31</sup> In suggesting how slavery should be conducted, he concludes that “it is plain that [a person] is not at all likely to be or become easy to deal with in respect of the necessary distinction between slave and free-born master in actual experience” (Pl. *Leg.* 6.777c).<sup>32</sup> Enslaved people are a different kind altogether from free and ruling people, regardless of their behaviour and pre-enslavement status. His view is not universal in ancient thought, though.

The distinction between natural and conventional slavery permeates much ancient literature. Aristotle even notes the conflicting idea of the enslavement of prisoners of war: that if a war was unjust in origin, the enslavement of a captive could not then be justified, and further, that those who are rightly and naturally suited to be enslaved are not just prisoners of war but barbarian, non-Greek prisoners (Arist. *Pol.* 1255a22-9, cf. Arr. *Anab.* 1.16.1-7 and Ath. *Deip.* 6.88).<sup>33</sup> War and piracy were major causes for enslavement (though not the only ones) and the enslavement of an individual through either method was almost always a result of force and violence.<sup>34</sup> The forceful, violent aspect of power and domination played a major role in the ancient conception of enslavement, leading to the common idea that “the person of the vanquished belongs to the victor.”<sup>35</sup> To be able to force someone into submission demonstrates that the dominator is justified in their domination and that the prisoner is rightfully subjugated.

---

<sup>31</sup> The two ideas set out so far (enslaved as object and as inferior in some way) interact with a third, seldom explicitly expressed perception of the enslaved: that they “can be loyal, capable of affection for their master and his family and of self-sacrifice in their behalf” (Thalmann 2011, 75). The perception of enslaved people is frequently complex in this way, arguing that they are inherently not capable of free elite human activities (like rational thinking, an enslaved person needs instruction and guidance in order to survive) but at the same time are capable of those same things (an enslaved person can be clever and helpful).

<sup>32</sup> Trans. Bury 1926.

<sup>33</sup> See also Schlaifer 1936, 191, Rosivach 1999, and Kyrtatas 2011.

<sup>34</sup> Kyrtatas 2001; Thompson 2003, 1-5; Rankine 2011, 35; Wrenhaven 2013, 4-5.

<sup>35</sup> Garland 1987, 8.

Euripides explores the perspective of enslaved people, particularly the enslavement of noble women, tackling not only the power dynamics of the enslaver-enslaved relationship but also the male-female power hierarchy. For example, in his *Andromache*, Euripides considers how a noble woman might cope with losing her only sense of power and being forced into a position of complete powerlessness. As she struggles with her new inferior position and the animosity of the wife of her enslaver, the women of the chorus tell Andromache that she will suffer force from her enslavers regardless of her reaction to it, whether she laments her enslavement or endures it nobly (Eur. *Andr.* 130-4). In Euripides's *Helen*, the Messenger laments the difference between his mind and his status: he was born into slavery but considers himself noble of mind and explains that he does not have a 'servile spirit' (Eur. *Hel.* 728-33).

Kelly Wrenhaven analyzes the depiction of enslavement both in Euripides's Trojan plays and in Aristotle's *Politics*, drawing attention to the distinction between natural and conventional slavery which "Andromache implies...when she complains that she was thrown into slavery 'undeservedly'."<sup>36</sup> She discusses the unstable nature of slavery as both an institution and a metaphor, saying:

The term 'slave' and its cognates cannot be neatly defined as one might like. Because slavery is not only a reality but also a concept, slave ideology is fluid and could apply to more than just legal slaves.<sup>37</sup>

Her focus on the representation of slavery in art and literature exhibits the many ways the ancients perceived the enslaved and attempted to justify or reinforce their domination. Only the elite (and thus free) could afford to spend the time or money producing artistic or literary pieces which included enslaved figures, thus those same pieces are coming from the perspective of the

---

<sup>36</sup> Wrenhaven 2012, 133; Eur. *Andr.* 99.

<sup>37</sup> Wrenhaven 2012, 6.

enslaver and reveal what they thought about the enslaved combined with how they wanted the enslaved and themselves as enslavers to be viewed.<sup>38</sup>

Lydia Wilson Marshall examines the significance that maintaining a strict definition of slavery holds when investigating enslavement and enslaved individuals. Marshall notes, following Timothy Taylor,<sup>39</sup> that enslavement “is a status defined by a series of traits, only some of which will be pertinent in any individual enslaved person, including loss of contact with [the] natal group, loss of natal language, a destiny controlled by others, coercion of labor, lack of social honor, physical maltreatment, treatment as an object of exchange, and a perception of unfreedom.”<sup>40</sup> Thus a definition of slavery can be fluid and adapt to each instance of enslavement: some may focus on the function of an enslaved individual as property, some on the natural inferiority assigned by the position, and others on the social death of the process of enslavement. Marshall questions the value of narrowing down any one definition and argues, rather, that considering each definition, not resolving distinctions, is what is necessary so as to avoid limiting the lens of comparison and analysis.<sup>41</sup> Peter Hunt takes a similar approach; he includes and considers each constituent aspect of slavery (ownership, social death, legal status, captivity and foreignness, etc.), reviewing what is typical or exceptional of any one representation and aiming to avoid oversimplification and creating strict categorizations.<sup>42</sup>

Since notions of slavery and its defining features vary between person, time, and place,<sup>43</sup> I approach slavery without any concrete definitions, drawing on the different ideas set out in this

---

<sup>38</sup> Thalmann 1998, 54; Wrenhaven 2012, 5; Tordoff 2022. For example, the former enslaved status of Neaera is used to question her character in Dem. 59.18-49.

<sup>39</sup> Taylor 2005.

<sup>40</sup> Marshall 2014, 4.

<sup>41</sup> Marshall 2014, 5.

<sup>42</sup> Hunt 2018, 17-20.

<sup>43</sup> Page DuBois (2009, 322-3. “26.6 The Politics of Scholarship) expands on the analysis of scholars’ definitions from how different demarcations impact the scope of investigation to the personal biases that determine one’s approach to the concepts themselves. She explains that Classical scholars’ perspectives on slavery are influenced by their political

section. Social status is complicated and multilayered, and there are many factors to consider at each appearance of an enslaved character, not just whether or not they fit the rule of ‘legal property’ or ‘generally dishonoured.’<sup>44</sup>

### Terminology

Considering the numerous and various perceptions of slavery, it is no wonder that its terminology yields difficulty in transmitting meaning, nuance, and socio-historical context in translation. English has one main term for an enslaved person, ‘slave,’ unlike ancient Greek which has a variety describing origin, servile occupation, or social status. The excerpts of the texts examined as a case study below exhibit this variety. The generic term *dmôes* is largely accepted as deriving from the root *\*dam-*, meaning ‘to subject’ or ‘tame,’ which may suggest that slavery’s original source was a result of capture in war.<sup>45</sup> A word meaning ‘person enslaved by defeat in war,’ then, also highlights the displacement and foreignness of the enslaved individual. It is additionally linked to *domos* (δῶμος, ‘house’), associating the enslaved with the household by which they are confined and regarded as property.<sup>46</sup> A related word, *doulos* (δοῦλος), is a generic term for an enslaved person. Its origins are highly speculated, some tracing it to the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE Mycenaean word *do-e-ro*, and others arguing that it has semitic roots.<sup>47</sup> Given its uncertain etymology, the word’s exact nuance is indeterminable, though the LSJ reports it as referring to someone born into enslaved status rather than being enslaved

---

tendencies, from those who idealize antiquity and thus accept slavery for its “relatively benign treatment” of enslaved people or because it promoted rapid economic growth among the free, to those who condemn slavery, focusing on class struggles and the exploitation of the enslaved.

<sup>44</sup> Lewis 2018, 77-9.

<sup>45</sup> Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, “Otherness and domination.”

<sup>46</sup> Thalmann 1998, 55.

<sup>47</sup> Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, “Otherness and domination”; Bernal 2020, 388-90.

through other means.<sup>48</sup> Though Homer does not use *doulos*, he does employ its derivatives, including an adjective (δουλικός ‘slavish’), verb (δουλεύω ‘to be a slave’), and abstract noun (δουλεία ‘slavery’). This term is notable also in being the main contrast to *eleutheros* (ἐλεύθερος, ‘free’) and could point to the origin of each word, vis-à-vis the disdain for menial labour, as groups subject or not subject to production quotas.<sup>49</sup>

As mentioned in the above section, *andrapodon* (plural: *andrapoda*, ἀνδράποδα) is a word used to describe enslaved people in the most inhumane sense, likening them to traded goods and animals, for example in Xenophon’s *Anabasis* (7.3.48).<sup>50</sup> This is an especially dehumanizing and ‘othering’ term for enslaved people because it is neuter (lack of gender relates more to articles of property and animals) and appears often in the plural, thus forming the people into a group of nameless, faceless, sellable items under the total control of another, as if they were cattle (cf. Thuc. *Hist.* 5.116.4).<sup>51</sup> The word highlights the aspect of total control by the enslaver, since *andrapoda* were captured in war, but were not themselves fighters, instead being the women and children of the raided locale.<sup>52</sup> It reflects the pervasive depiction of enslaved people as animalistic or nothing more than live property.<sup>53</sup>

A term for an enslaved person that denotes both origin and servile role or status is *oiketês* (οἰκέτης). It derives from the word *oikos* (οἶκος, ‘household’) and marks the enslaved person as “inseparable” from it.<sup>54</sup> While *oiketês* originally described any person doing household work, it eventually came to designate household-based enslaved persons only, and consequently marked

---

<sup>48</sup> LSJ δοῦλος A. See also Uchitel (1985, 173) who notes that the connection between *doulos* and *do-e-ro* confuses the nuance of each word in historical economic context.

<sup>49</sup> Wrenhaven 2012, 11.

<sup>50</sup> See Wrenhaven 2012, 13-6; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, “The slave as property.”

<sup>51</sup> Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, “The slave as property.”

<sup>52</sup> Gaca 2010, 119-32.

<sup>53</sup> Wrenhaven 2012, 16-7. See also Lissarrague 2000 on the animalistic ‘Othering’ of Aesop.

<sup>54</sup> Wrenhaven 2012, 17.

the enslaved as part of a household, rather than reporting their foreignness or displacement, as with *dmôes*.<sup>55</sup> Defining them based on their relationship to a household recalls Aristotle's argument that all hierarchies are natural and in a household there must naturally be a hierarchical relationship between the household manager (enslaver) and the household labourers (enslaved) (Arist. *Pol.* 1253b1-18).

There are many terms that denote servile status in specific occupations. These terms often do not explicitly denote slavery but almost always appear in a context that confirms the referents' statuses and views them only by their functions.<sup>56</sup> For example, *amhipoloi* (ἀμφίπολοι) refers to handmaids or attendant women, more literally meaning 'those who busy about.'<sup>57</sup> The word itself does not make enslaved status specific, but context makes this clear: both Nausicaa's and Penelope's *amhipoloi* in the *Odyssey* are attendant upon the women of a royal household and so, logically, are enslaved like the other domestic labourers present (Hom. *Od.* 6.80-246, 22.483). This contextually determined enslavement is true also of other occupational words, like *subôtês* (συβώτης) and *huphorbos* (ὑφορβός)—both meaning 'swineherd'—and *boukolos* (βούκολος, 'cowherd'). The characters with these titles in the *Odyssey* are clearly enslaved, demonstrated by their reference to Odysseus as *anax* (ἄναξ, 'master' or 'lord') and to themselves as partaking in experiences typical of enslavement, such as being forced to do things or fearing their enslavers (Hom. *Od.* 14.1-70). *Trophos* (τροφός) means 'rearer' or 'nurse' and, again, enslavement is made clear primarily through context. The *trophos* in the *Odyssey* is Eurykleia, the woman who raised Odysseus and Telemachus. Her enslaved status is made apparent more through the third-person narrative than by explicit

---

<sup>55</sup> Thalmann 1998, 62-4; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, "The slave and the household (oikos)."

<sup>56</sup> Thalmann 1998, 50-3.

<sup>57</sup> LSJ ἀμφίπολος, A.

terminological references to her, as in book one, where she is described as having been bought by Laertes, Odysseus's father, and while Laertes could have forced her to have sex with him, "he did not exercise the right out of respect for his wife."<sup>58</sup> Other terms for household staff include *tamia* (ταμία, 'steward') and *therapôn* (θεράπων, 'attendant', and the feminine *therapaina*, θεράπινα, 'handmaid' or 'waiting maid'). These terms are especially vague but their use, again, seems to consistently indicate enslaved labour.<sup>59</sup> The *tamia* may well just be the head domestic (free) labourer, organizing the work of the household, but likely is at the top of a hierarchy of enslaved domestic servants.<sup>60</sup> The gendered terms *therapôn* and *therapaina* also generally indicate domestic service (free or enslaved) and their nuance varies through time and region, on the one hand referring to a slightly inferior but free attendant in the Homeric age (such as Patroclus to Achilles, Hom. *Il.* 16.647-53<sup>61</sup>) but on the other becoming the Chian's term for their enslaved population.<sup>62</sup> Moses Finley explains that, for Greeks in later periods:

[They] thought of personal and domestic service as 'slave-like' by its nature. That is why free Greeks simply cannot be found as servants, and that in turn is why words like *oiketês* and *therapôn*, which in the strictest sense mean no more than 'servant', were regularly employed to mean 'slave' without creating confusion or a feeling of ill-usage.<sup>63</sup>

Terms denoting the social status of enslavement are difficult to pin down with certainty, as is the case with the occupational terms. Often, they are common words used for free as well as

<sup>58</sup> Hom. *Od.* 1.428-33. For discussion on the passage, see Harris 2020, 388.

<sup>59</sup> Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, "Occupations."

<sup>60</sup> Thalmann 1998, 64.

<sup>61</sup> Cunliffe (2012, 188: θεράπων 2) defines the term as "a warrior in honourable personal attendance on another, the relation of the two resembling generally that of a squire and knight."

<sup>62</sup> LSJ θεράπων. The *therapaina* in Euripides's *Hecuba* is most likely enslaved, for instance. Though the play is set in the Homeric period, it was produced in the Classical period, a time by which the word had come generally to refer to unfree people. See also Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, "Occupations."

<sup>63</sup> Finley 1981, 144. The association of servile labour with slavery is an attitude largely of the Classical and Hellenistic periods (*supra* n. 26).

enslaved people, but context reveals if the use is meant to demean the enslaved. Diminutive terms like *pais* (παῖς, meaning ‘child’ or ‘boy’) were used commonly for the people they actually described, but, when used for the enslaved, had a dehumanizing and denigrating effect,<sup>64</sup> for example when the enslaved are traded one-to-one for a jar of wine between Italian merchants and the Gauls (Diod. 5.26.3). The use of *pais* for an enslaved person also expresses a paternalistic view, connecting them again with the household and the young (relatively powerless) members of the family.<sup>65</sup> Wrenhaven notes that “when used in the context of slavery, *pais* is particularly demonstrative of the perception of the slave as interminably puerile. This is because the word was applied indiscriminately to slaves of all ages, much as ‘boy’ was applied to male slaves of any age in the slave-holding American South.”<sup>66</sup> The use of *pais* to express the inability of enslaved persons to reach intellectual and moral maturity recalls Aristotle’s assertion of ‘natural slaves’ who are incapable of thinking for themselves and rely on their enslaver to make them useful.<sup>67</sup>

### Case Studies

Bearing in mind the considerations required for the process of translation, the multiple perspectives of slavery, and the reflection of terminological nuances, how does a translator approach the rendering of literature from an obsolete language and culture to contemporary English? In order to investigate the issue of translation and the role of the translator, I compare translations of texts from different time periods and genres. The genres represented span large periods of ancient Greek civilization: Homer’s epic from the early Iron Age and Archaic period,

---

<sup>64</sup> Golden 1985.

<sup>65</sup> Wrenhaven 2012, 19; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2018, “The slave and the household (oikos).”

<sup>66</sup> Golden 1985, 100-1; Wrenhaven 2012, 19.

<sup>67</sup> Garnsey 1996, 38; Wrenhaven 2012, 19; Arist. *Pol.* 1255a1-2. Cf. Dem. 34.10.

Euripides's tragedy from the Classical period, and Chariton's novel from the Hellenistic period.

The incorporation of multiple genres and temporal periods allows me to explore how the language of slavery varied or stayed consistent through the years and conversely how each genre and era viewed slavery and used enslaved characters differently. The excerpts I am using are from Homer's *Odyssey* (books 6, 14, and 22), Euripides's *Andromache*, and Chariton's *Callirhoe* (also called *Chaereas and Callirhoe*). That each genre takes a different perspective on the enslaved, from epic's elite perspective to tragedy's mixed perspective to the novel's changing perspectives, showcases how the institution of slavery and the Greek world's perception of it shifted and transformed throughout the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. It also shows how slavery was viewed differently by different people and was used to drive personal arguments or points regarding nobility or inferiority.

I have selected translations that are well-known and diverse to showcase how translators can affect a text by means of variations in their stated intents, grammatical and aesthetic preferences, and the inherent social and cultural attitudes toward slavery embedded in their publication time and place.<sup>68</sup> For example, George Chapman wrote his version hundreds of years ago, when slavery was still prevalent, and his text is formed by vocabulary and sentence structure of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, whereas Richmond Lattimore produced his version in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century and uses plainer, more modern language. While one might assume the translations would treat slavery and its terms entirely differently, the two translators make many similar or identical terminological choices and neither focuses on the themes of slavery. Their diction and rhythms are different, but Lattimore, though writing in a time without slavery, considers enslaved people

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Sabnis 2021, "General Considerations."

in his translation in much the same way Chapman does. I explain my selections in the beginning of each case study.

### **Case Study 1: Homer's *Odyssey***

Homer's language is complex and distinct from much other Greek literature due to its archaic word forms, repetition and formulaic elements, rhythm and metre, grammar, and syntax.<sup>69</sup> For translations of the *Odyssey*, I look at Richmond Lattimore, Emily Wilson, and George Chapman. Lattimore's text, published in the 1960s, has long been a classroom staple (I myself first approached the *Odyssey* with his translation). His priorities in translation are to reflect as closely as possible the formulaic nature of the Greek while using 'plain' language as well, and he does not concentrate on slavery or its themes.<sup>70</sup> Wilson published the most recent translation and is the first woman to publish an English translation of the *Odyssey*. Her translation goals align with the growing contemporary concern for reframing historical texts (fictional and factual alike) from their elite (often male) perspective towards the incorporation of marginalized or silenced voices.<sup>71</sup> Aiming to emulate the original reception of the Greek text while providing an English translation that is easier to read and study, she imitates the dactylic hexameter of the Greek with iambic pentameter and uses plain language in contemporary constructions.<sup>72</sup> Chapman produced the first ever English translation of the *Odyssey* in 1616. His translation expands on the original lengthwise and mimics the dactylic hexameter with a rhyming iambic pentameter. Chapman's 17<sup>th</sup> century translation stands out because it is the only text among those in the case study that

---

<sup>69</sup> Bakker 2020.

<sup>70</sup> He uses a flexible hexameter, translates mostly according to the Greek word order, and employs Homer's highly repetitive structure, see Lattimore 1951, 67; 2007, 22.

<sup>71</sup> Wilson 2018, 81-91. See also, for example, Kapparis 2011; Trimble 2016; Wilson 2021, 18; Marshall and Kamen 2021, 8-9; Tordoff 2022.

<sup>72</sup> Wilson 2018, 81-91.

was produced in a time when slavery still existed. Slavery is a part of the story just as it was a part of his culture and so his language remains solidly fixed on the point of view of a free, elite narrator.

The *Odyssey* highlights some of the oldest extant perspectives of slavery and utilizes enslaved characters to support the elite ones who enslaved them, namely they show Odysseus as a ‘good’ and ‘benevolent’ king, leader, and ‘master.’<sup>73</sup> He rewards with trust those who have remained loyal and fixated on serving him as best as possible (for example, Eurykleia the beloved elderly nurse to Odysseus and Telemachus, and Eumaios the loyal swineherd Odysseus first meets when he returns to Ithaca). Conversely, Odysseus brutally punishes those who do not comply with cultural expectations, who present (from the ruler’s perspective) disobedience, disloyalty and shifting alliances, and disrespect of political hierarchies and social customs. He slaughters the suitors who over-stayed their welcome and orders the hanging of the enslaved women who had sex with them (Hom. *Od.* 22.415-73). The poem represents each group in conflicting ways that justify their deaths.<sup>74</sup> The suitors have taken advantage of guest-host customs and had sex with the enslaved women of Odysseus’s estate, posing a threat to Odysseus’s power and honour. Thus, they are described as having raped the enslaved women (22.38). In contrast, the enslaved women willfully betrayed Odysseus by aligning themselves with different ‘masters’ and sullying his honour with their sexual promiscuity. He then justifies their deaths by presenting the women as being fully complicit in their sexual misconduct.<sup>75</sup> By

---

<sup>73</sup> Thalmann 1998; Lewis 2018, 112.

<sup>74</sup> Wilson 2021, 31. Cf. Pl. *Leg.* 6.777: their treatment must be justified so as to reflect positively on Odysseus.

<sup>75</sup> For example, the enslaved women leave the house late at night laughing and having a good time, which angers Odysseus (Hom. *Od.* 20.6-13). This scene as evidence for their complicity is an instance of victim-blaming, though. Since the women’s perspectives and motives are not voiced in the text, their apparent pleasure and agency cannot be concretely understood as equaling consent. Victims of sexual assault may submit for a variety of reasons and in various ways: perhaps the women see cooperation with the suitors as a means for survival in the case that Odysseus never returns; perhaps they fear for their lives and see submission as the lesser evil; perhaps they grew dissociative and desensitized to their treatment and found joy in a seemingly connected but actually irrelevant source. On the other

virtue of being enslaved, the women cannot fully consent due to the power dynamics at play—the suitors have a level of authority over them that inexorably influences their sexual interactions. Regardless, the women’s actions are seen as disloyal to Odysseus, and poorly reflective of Penelope’s fidelity.<sup>76</sup>

The pervasive idea that enslaved people demonstrate the power and honour of their enslavers is present too outside Odysseus’s home in Ithaca. The Phaeacian books show how king Alcinous and queen Arete run their kingdom, and the relationship of their daughter Nausicaa to everyone else. In books 6-13, Nausicaa, inspired by a dream from Athene, asks her father for the resources to go wash clothing at a river. This trip leads to Nausicaa meeting Odysseus and inviting him back to town, where he is received well, promised a safe conveyance homeward, and tells the story of how he got to Scheria, where the Phaeacians live, after his many trials and much suffering. The resources required for her trip to the river include the *dmôes* who load the cart and the *amhipoloi* that join her on the journey (6.69-71, 80-4). The *dmôes* are seldom seen and will be discussed at length later. It is reasonable to suppose that Nausicaa’s *amhipoloi* are enslaved, since they do work commanded by Alcinous and Nausicaa, but their status is only confirmed by the sole appearance of *dmôai*,<sup>77</sup> almost 20 lines after their first expressed appearance (6.99). They are treated fairly well in descriptions, doing mostly all of what Nausicaa

---

hand, the women may not have seen themselves as victims of sexual abuse, rather enjoying their relationships with the suitors and gaining agency where there is seldom an opportunity for them. While their enslaved status removes their power to decline, they might have not even wanted to reject the suitors’ advances. Hierarchies of power are constantly present in the understanding of relationships in antiquity: men have power over women, the older over the younger, gods over humans, and enslavers over the enslaved. If a woman already accepts that she is doubly inferior in a standard sexual relationship by virtue of being female and younger, does another layer (being enslaved to her partner) make much of a difference? Again, without the express views of these women, no conclusion can be reached. See Glazebrook (2021) on the complexities of sexual agency between free and enslaved women, Porter (2021) on the motives and modes for sexual agency of enslaved individuals, and Wilson (2021) for further analysis of the hanged enslaved women’s portrayal.

<sup>76</sup> They do not represent the feminine ideals exemplified by proper (free) women. Wrenhaven (2021, 76) explains that ‘while prostitutes must allow their bodies to be used, respectable women must protest even if they are powerless to stop the assault.’ See also Wilson 2021, 27-34.

<sup>77</sup> Feminine form of *dmôes*.

herself does, except that they do a little more work (like being the ones to tend to Odysseus, 6.247-8) and do not enjoy all the advantages Nausicaa does (like walking beside the cart while she rides it, 6.81-4). They receive compliments for their youth and beauty which, in combination with the seldom explicit reference to them as enslaved, makes their statuses ambiguous.

Nausicaa's relationship with the *amphipoloi* could be misinterpreted, perhaps as the contemporary trope of a toxic friendship among teenage girls wherein one is the leader, the 'Queen Bee,' and the others are her loyal, slightly less rich, popular, and/or desirable followers. Is Nausicaa simply naturally superior in beauty and leadership? When she and the *amphipoloi* dance and play ball on the beach, Nausicaa is compared to Artemis, setting her above the group (6.101-9)—maybe Nausicaa is just an amazing princess. But later, she orders the *amphipoloi* to bathe and feed Odysseus (6.209-10)—is this her royal privilege or her exploitative right as the daughter of their enslaver? The *amphipoloi* are described positively in this episode, with compliments to their white arms and beautiful hair, and are even called *kourai*, 'maidens,' a word which denotes their ideal marriageable young age, showing that they are peers of Nausicaa (6.222, 238-9). But her persistent authority over them while appearing like a normal group of friends in the foreground reminds the audience that though Scheria looks like a paradise, it is nevertheless engaged in the harmful norms of the regular civilized world. Enslaved people still face subjugation and are subjected to the whims of their enslavers here.

Recall that in book 6 Nausicaa asks her father, king Alcinous, for the clothes-washing supplies which include the *dmôes* loading her wagon.<sup>78</sup> The *dmôes* appear only twice, at lines 69 and 71, first mentioned by Alcinous and then by the narrator. Lattimore calls them 'serving men'

---

<sup>78</sup> Greek text for the *Odyssey* is taken from Von der Mühl 1962. Hom. *Od.* 6.69-70: ἔρχεν· ἀτὰρ τοὶ δμῶες ἐφοπλίσσουσιν ἀπήνην / ὑψηλὴν εὐκυκλον, ὑπερτερὴν ἀραρυῖαν." / ὣς εἰπὼν δμῶεσσιν ἐκέκλετο, τοὶ δ' ἐπίθοντο. I have also used the aid of Garvie (2003) for the translation of some of the grammar in book 6, though he supplies no discussion of slavery terminology.

in both instances.<sup>79</sup> Wilson has Alcinous call them ‘slaves’ and the narrator call them ‘household slaves.’<sup>80</sup> Chapman, like Lattimore, calls them ‘servants’ at each appearance.<sup>81</sup> Chapman and Lattimore’s choice to translate the term the same way in its two occurrences is useful in signaling to the reader that these are the same word in Greek. However, neither ‘serving men’ nor ‘servants’ makes explicitly clear the enslaved status of these people. Wilson, on the other hand, does expose their subjugation. Her translation of *dmôes* changes between the direct speech and the narrative. The note she prefaces her translation with sets out her goals and provides several explanations as to why she made these choices. The variation is likely due to her construction of the text in iambic pentameter to mimic the Greek’s dactylic hexameter, and her stance that repetitive constructions feel optional in a highly-literate culture.<sup>82</sup> Wilson uses ‘slave’ specifically “to acknowledge the fact and the horror of slavery, and to mark the fact that the idealized society depicted...is one where slavery is...taken for granted.”<sup>83</sup> Her intent is unquestionably a good one, but she neglects a consideration of using ‘enslaved’ in the place of ‘slave.’ She notes that she values contemporary language, and that her translation does not and should not pretend to be a product of the same time and place as the original.<sup>84</sup> Why, then, not use ‘enslaved’? Wilson explains that she uses language of plantation slavery in the antebellum American South as a closer modern analogy.<sup>85</sup> While this does not hide the exploitation of enslaved individuals, it also does not impart to them, as she intends, a “rounded, complete

---

<sup>79</sup> Lattimore 2007, 104; 69: “So go, and the serving men will harness the wagon...” 71: “He spoke, and gave the order to the serving men. These obeyed...”

<sup>80</sup> Wilson 2018, 199: “Go on! The slaves / can fit the wagon with its cargo rack. / He called the household slaves, and they obeyed.”

<sup>81</sup> Chapman 2015, c. lines 72-3: “Go, my servants shall / serve thy desires...” c. line 74: “The servants then commanded soon obey’d...”

<sup>82</sup> Wilson 2018, 82-4.

<sup>83</sup> Wilson 2018, 88.

<sup>84</sup> Wilson 2018, 87.

<sup>85</sup> Wilson 2018, 89.

perspective on their own lives.”<sup>86</sup> Considering that she welcomes variation, a possible alternative is to keep ‘slave’ in dialogue, thus not altering too much the perspective of the speaker, but to use ‘enslaved’ in the third person narrative. This disrupts a metrical translation, but suits one focussing its lens on socio-historical awareness. I posit the following alternative of these lines:

“Go along. The slaves will prepare the wagon,  
a tall one with good wheels, equipped with a box on top.”  
So speaking, he ordered the enslaved, and they obeyed.

A construction such as this allows a reader to see more explicitly the true nature of each participant in the story. King Alcinous is not just the ruler of a household and city but exercises full control over some of his inhabitants. The distinction is important to make because, especially for a modern reader, domestic labourers (i.e., servants) can be viewed as wage-labourers, living and working in the household of some nobleman but free to move on to another contract as they please. The domestic labourers in the *Odyssey* do not have a choice in their ‘employment’ and this fact should be recognizable in the text.

From lines 80-246 in book 6, Nausicaa gathers her requested resources and goes to the river. When she arrives, she and the *amhipoloi* attending her wash the clothes and then begin to play ball games. A stray ball leads to Nausicaa meeting the washed-ashore Odysseus. Nausicaa’s *amhipoloi* are revealed to be enslaved upon their single reference as *dmôai* at 99. Other than this instance the group members are described by their occupation (*amhipoloi*) or by their similarity in age to Nausicaa (*kourai*). Looking at select appearances of the description of this group of enslaved women, I compare how the variation is treated among each translator. The terms appearing in this passage are *amhipoloi* (at 80, 84, 209, 217, 218, 238, 239, and 246),

---

<sup>86</sup> Wilson 2018, 86.

*dmôai* (at 99), and *kourai* (at 222).<sup>87</sup> Lattimore translates *amphipoloi* as ‘attendant women,’ ‘handmaidens,’ ‘attendants,’ ‘serving maids,’ ‘girls,’ and ‘serving women.’ He translates *dmôai* as ‘maids’ and *kourai* as ‘girls.’ His variation for *amphipoloi* is inconsistent with his aim to reflect the repetition and formulaic construction fundamental to epic. ‘Attendant women,’ ‘handmaidens,’ ‘attendants,’ and ‘serving maids’ are all suitable to translate *amphipoloi* (the variation of ‘attendant women’ at 80 is acceptable considering the accompaniment of *gunaikes*, ‘women’) but ‘girls’ entirely neglects their servile status and occupation, and ‘serving women’ conflicts with Lattimore’s repetitive translation of *dmôes* and *dmôai* as ‘serving men’ and ‘serving women’ respectively. It is then striking that he chooses not to call attention to the most common word describing slavery in Homer, *dmôai*, when it appears at 99, and calls them ‘maids.’ Wilson’s translation, though having the same number of lines as the Greek, does not reflect every appearance of the Greek terms due to her metrical construction. For *amphipoloi* she uses ‘slaves’ and ‘girls.’ She does not translate the *dmôai* at 99.<sup>88</sup> And for *kourai*, Wilson uses ‘girls.’ While she incorporates the group’s enslaved status and their youth, she completely ignores their occupational role. She employs ‘girls’ the most and its use does not give any hint to the group’s inferiority. Chapman, like the others, uses a variety, sometimes repeating or omitting the translation of a term due to his expanded, not very ‘literal’ translation in rhyming elegiac pentameter. For *amphipoloi* he uses ‘handmaids,’ ‘virgins,’ ‘maids,’ and ‘consorts.’ He translates *dmôai* as ‘virgins’ and *kourai* as ‘maidens,’ without distinguishing these descriptors from one another. His use of ‘virgins’ as a synonym for maidens or girls is particularly dated, but

---

<sup>87</sup> 80: εἶος χυτλώσασαίτο σὸν ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξίν. 84: οὐκ οἶγν· ἅμα τῆ γε καὶ ἀμφίπολοι κίον ἄλλαι. 99: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτου τάρφθεν δμοαί τε καὶ αὐτή. 209 and 246: ἀλλὰ δότ’, ἀμφίπολοι, ξείνω βρωσίν τε πόσιν τε. 217-8: δὴ ῥα τότε ἀμφιπόλοισι μετηύδα δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς· / “ἀμφίπολοι, στήθ’ οὕτω ἀπόπροθεν, ὄφρ’ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς”. 222: γυμνοῦσθαι κούρησιν εὐπλοκάμοισι μετελθών. 238-9: δὴ ῥα τότε ἀμφιπόλοισιν εὐπλοκάμοισι μετηύδα· / “κλυτέ μοι, ἀμφίπολοι λευκώλενοι, ὄφρα τι εἴπω.”

<sup>88</sup> Wilson 2018, 200 ll. 99-100: “But when they finished eating, they took off their head-scarves to play ball.”

unsurprising considering the time in which he lived. ‘Virgins’ for *dmôai*, though, is disappointing in not representing even servile or inferior status, let alone enslavement, and ignores the sexual exploitation that regularly accompanied slavery. It is also inconsistent with his translation of *dmôes* earlier, where he used ‘servants.’ His choice to use ‘consorts’ is interesting, though, in that it indicates the group’s relationship to Nausicaa simultaneously as peers and as servants. I posit the following alternatives of each term’s phrase:

80: “...so that she could anoint herself after bathing with her attendant women.”

84: “She wasn’t alone; her handmaidens went along with her.”

99: “But when she and the enslaved girls had their fill of food...”

209 and 246: “Give the stranger food and wine, girls.”

217-8: “Then shining Odysseus addressed the handmaidens:

‘Girls, stand at a distance here...’”

222: “Since I’m embarrassed to be naked in front of you pretty-haired girls.”

238-9: “Then she addressed her pretty-haired handmaidens:

‘Listen up, my white-armed girls, so I can tell you something.’”

My translations are influenced heavily by Wilson’s *Odyssey*, particularly in the variation I use at each appearance of a term. The word *amhipoloi* is used both in the narrative at 80, 84, 217, and 238 and in direct speech at 209, 218, 239, and 246. As discussed above, the context of a word in part dictates how best to translate it. Where *amhipoloi* is in the narrative, I use ‘handmaidens’ to highlight their occupational role, aside from line 80 where I write ‘attendant women’ to capture *gunaikes*. When it appears in dialogue, I opt instead to use ‘girls’ in order to make the speech flow more naturally and to give the speaker a tone of voice that denotes affection, as a diminutive might be used.<sup>89</sup> This choice also recalls Wilson’s antebellum American South analogizing language. At 99, I translate *dmôai* as ‘enslaved girls’ to make their enslaved status

---

<sup>89</sup> See Schlaifer 1936, 184-5 for the normalized association of enslaved domestic labourers and free family members.

clear while also humanizing them, bringing their description closer to the other terms used for the group throughout the passage. It is a brief moment and the only time the group are denoted explicitly as enslaved, thus I find it imperative to spotlight.

In book 14, Odysseus has returned to Ithaca, conveyed by the Phaeacians, and, disguised as a beggar, approaches his enslaved swineherd Eumaios, “a kind of idealized caricature of what a slave should be like, displaying total loyalty to his long-absent owner.”<sup>90</sup> From lines 1-71, Eumaios discusses his life, reflecting on the hardships of being enslaved and lamenting the prolonged absence of his enslaver. The juxtaposition of terms for the enslaved and terms for an enslaver is notable. The enslaved terms draw on the sufferings of a life in slavery while the enslaver terms praise ‘good’ leadership and authority. Eumaios is only referred to by his occupation, *subôtês*, (‘swineherd’, at 7, 18, 22, 33, and 55), once even being called *dios hyphorbos* (‘shining/excellent swineherd’ at 48). He uses language that describes his state of being enslaved at 27 (*anankê*, ἀνάγκη, ‘by force/necessity/compulsion’) and 59-61.<sup>91</sup> Finally, this section uses the term for an enslaver, *anax*, frequently (at 8, 36, 40, 60, 63, and 67), along with a single instance of a female equivalent to describe Penelope, *despoina*, (δέσποινα, ‘mistress,’ ‘lady of the house,’ ‘female ruler’, at 9).<sup>92</sup> Lattimore consistently uses ‘swineherd’ for *subôtês*. For *anax* he uses ‘master’ and ‘lord’ interchangeably and calls the *despoina* a ‘mistress.’ At 59 he translates *dmôôn* as ‘servants’ where ‘slaves’ would work better, since this phrase

---

<sup>90</sup> Lewis 2018, 111.

<sup>91</sup> 59-61: ἡ γὰρ δμῶων δίκη ἐστίν, / αἰεὶ δευδιότων, ὄτ’ ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες / οἱ νέοι.

<sup>92</sup> *Despoina* is used as the equivalent of *anax* here because the context calls for a word that highlights her control over a household and the people in it. *Despoina* consistently has the sense of a ruler of a household, a queen, and a mistress (as the feminine form of ‘master’ over enslaved people). The masculine form, *despotês*, (δεσπότης) is not used in Homer (likely for metrical reasons, see LSJ δεσπότης II) and thus *anax* connotes a variety of positions of authority: a god, a king, a lord or chief of a people, a ruler of a household, and a ‘master’ of enslaved people. The feminine form of *anax*, *anassa* (ἄνασσα), is used more specifically of female figures as queens or goddesses. In book 6, Odysseus calls Nausicaa *anassa* twice, since he does not know her yet and will not assume whether she is a goddess or a mortal (6.149, 175).

describes the high degree of control enslaved people experience in slavery rather than the plight of the working class. Wilson also consistently uses ‘swineherd’ for *subôtês* and inserts ‘slave’ after Eumaios’s introduction at the start of the book to mark his station. She uses ‘slave’ for *dmôôn* at 59 and calls the *despoina* ‘the mistress.’ She mostly uses ‘master’ for *anax*, though occasionally using ‘lord’ as well. In direct speech, she has Eumaios use *anax* like an honorific title, intensifying his ‘loyal slave’ characterization. Her approach aligns well with her Antebellum American South analogy. Still, she acknowledges the presence of slavery and the idealized relationship between an enslaver and an enslaved individual wherein the enslaved is ‘loyal’ to and supportive of their enslaver, using ‘master’ and ‘lord’ as positions of honour.<sup>93</sup> Chapman, as usual, provides the most variation and the least adherence to nuance or ‘literalness.’ He calls the *subôtês* both ‘swain’ and ‘herdsman’ and, like Lattimore, uses ‘servants’ for the one appearance of *dmôôn*. He calls the *despoina* the ‘queen’ which suits Penelope’s royal status but does not connote her position of authority in her household and over enslaved people. He uses a different word for *anax* every time it appears: ‘sovereign,’ ‘majesty,’ ‘lords,’ ‘king,’ and ‘my liege.’ The variation is striking and each term nearly completely ignores Odysseus’s domination over enslaved people, focusing instead on his kingship.

For alternative translations, I suggest firstly that each appearance of *subôtês* and the one use of *hyphorbos* be translated consistently as ‘swineherd’ to make it clear that Eumaios is specifically in charge of pigs; variation is of no benefit regarding these terms. For the translation of *despoina*, *anax*, and *dmôôn* in their respective phrases, I suggest the following alternatives:

8-9: “The swineherd himself built it for his absent enslaver’s pigs,  
unaided by the lady of the house or old Laertes.”

36: “...and then he spoke to his enslaver:”

---

<sup>93</sup> Sabnis (2021, “Homeric Epic”) explains that for Homeric enslaved people, “loyalty and compliance are not just honourable traits but also essential survival tactics.” See also Thalmann 1998.

- 40: “I sit, overtaken by grieving for my godlike master...”  
 59-61: “This is the way of slaves, those who are always afraid when new lords become their overseers.”  
 63: “...such things a generous master grants to his household...”  
 67: “My master would have showed me plenty good will, if he’d grown old here.”<sup>94</sup>

Similar to my approach to the translations of book 6, I integrate each word’s context and function into its translation. The first two alternatives (8-9 and 36) show *anax* and *despoina* in the third person narrative. In both appearances of *anax* here, I use ‘enslaver’ to draw attention to the relationship between Odysseus and Eumaios (even though Eumaios is not aware of Odysseus’s true identity). Translating *despoina* is trickier, though, and I opted to use ‘lady of the house’ for several reasons. Firstly, the word ‘enslaver’ is not gendered and thus a repetition of it would be confusing. Since ‘enslaver’ is being used for *anax* in the line above, *despoina* can be translated with a word that is a part of the enslaver’s vocabulary to make the connection clear and also to reflect Eumaios’s perspective as a ‘loyal slave’ who (seemingly) happily accepts his status and subjugation.<sup>95</sup> I used ‘lady of the house’ over ‘mistress’ or ‘lady’ to prevent ambiguity. While ‘mistress’ is the feminine equivalent of ‘master,’ it more frequently in English connotes a woman in an extramarital relationship with a (usually married) man. Since its usage has come to be synonymous with ‘girlfriend,’ ‘courtesan,’ and ‘lover,’ it no longer clearly refers to authority and power. ‘Lady of the house’ also has the benefit of working fluidly with a definite article, which further prevents ambiguity (for example, ‘his mistress’ or ‘his lady’ could refer to either Eumaios or Odysseus. Context and familiarity with the poem reveal that the referent is not

---

<sup>94</sup> 8-9: αὐτὸς δεῖμαθ’ ὕεσσιν ἀποιοχόμενιο ἄνακτος, / νόσφιν δεσποίνης καὶ Λαέρταο γέροντος. 36: ὁ δὲ προσέειπεν ἄνακτα. 40: ἀντιθέου γὰρ ἄνακτος ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων / ἦμαι. 59-61: ἡ γὰρ δμῶων δίκη ἐστίν, / αἰεὶ δειδιότων, ὅτ’ ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες / οἱ νέοι. 63: οἶά τε ᾧ οἰκῆϊ ἄναξ εὐθυμος ἔδωκεν. 67: τῷ κέ με πόλλ’ ὤνησεν ἄναξ, εἰ αὐτόθ’ ἐγήρα.

<sup>95</sup> Thalmann examines Eumaios’ position as the ‘good’ slave at length (1998, 84-100).

Eumaios, but it is helpful for those unfamiliar with the text to prevent any potential confusion). ‘The mistress’ and ‘the lady’ are less ambiguous but then have the disadvantage of not indicating authority, power, and control as much as ‘lady of the house’ does. When *anax* and *dmôôn* appear in direct speech, I translate them as ‘master’ and ‘slaves,’ respectively, except at 59-61, where I translate *anakes* (plural of *anax*) as ‘overseers’ to display the enslaved perspective of the relationship, highlighting the aspect of control rather than social superiority. The difference in terminological translations between the narrative and dialogue is intended to alert the reader to the kind of language we tend to see as ‘default’ versus language that more fully and accurately describes individuals’ circumstances and relationships.

Later in the epic, in book 22, Odysseus orders his enslaved nurse Eurykleia to summon Penelope, Penelope’s *amphipoloi*, and all the other *dmôai* out from the house after he has killed the suitors and the enslaved women.<sup>96</sup> Lines 483-4 are useful for exploring the differences between *amphipoloi* and *dmôai*. The female *dmôai* are distinguished from Penelope’s *amphipoloi* which could point to a hierarchy of positions among the enslaved or mark specificity in occupation—the enslaved women around Penelope are there solely to attend to her while the others do generic household work. Lattimore calls the *amphipoloi* *gunaikes* ‘attendant women’ and the *dmôai* ‘serving maids.’<sup>97</sup> His translation is consistent in its formulaic construction; he transmits each Greek word into English and denotes the feminine form of *dmôai* as distinct from *dmôes* by calling them ‘serving women’ rather than ‘serving men.’ As in book 6, though, his choices neglect the enslaved nature of these women. Wilson uses ‘her slaves’ and ‘the slave girls’ respectively, not attempting to closely reflect the Greek, a choice discussed above with

<sup>96</sup> 22.482-4: σὺ δὲ Πηνελόπειαν / ἐλθεῖν ἐνθάδ’ ἄνωχθι σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξί· / πάσας δ’ ὄτρυνον δμῶας κατὰ δῶμα νέεσθαι.

<sup>97</sup> Lattimore 2007, 333: “and tell Penelope / to come here now, together with her attendant women, / and tell all the serving maids to come here to the palace.”

book 6.<sup>98</sup> Chapman moves the furthest from a ‘literal’ translation, calling them ‘ladies’ and ‘handmaids.’<sup>99</sup> His choice of ‘ladies’ for *amphipoloi gunaikes* removes any hint of enslaved servitude and ignores their occupation as ‘attendants.’ By translating the pair as ‘ladies,’ he implies that these women could possibly be close friends of Penelope, given that ‘ladies’ in English is a term for female nobility. He further passes over the nuances of each word by translating *dmôai* as ‘handmaids,’ a word arguably better suited to represent *amphipoloi*. ‘Handmaids’ are servants who work specifically for and around the noble women of a household. *Dmôai* is a more generic term encompassing all household work, as seen with *dmôes*. Again, the use of these terms in the context of the narrative dictates in part how best to translate them. Considering this is direct speech, I posit the following alternative of lines 482 to 484:

“... And urge Penelope  
to come here, along with her attendant women.  
And tell all the other slave girls in the house to come.”

This alternative keeps the more literal translation of *amphipoloi gunaikes*, as Lattimore has it, but marks the enslaved status of both groups by the inclusion of ‘other’ in the translation of *dmôai* as ‘slave girls,’ drawing on Wilson’s analogy of Antebellum slavery in the United States.

Just before this speech, the scene at lines 468 to 473 depicts the hanging of the ‘unfaithful maids’ who had (coerced) sex with the suitors and are condemned to death by Odysseus.<sup>100</sup> During the scene of their deaths, they are not named or even titled (like ‘handmaidens’ or ‘servants’) but are referred to by their body parts and compared to animals. The last time they are directly labelled is at line 458, *dmôai*; the space between their last direct reference and their

<sup>98</sup> Wilson 2018, 492: “And call / Penelope, her slaves, and all the slave girls / inside the house.”

<sup>99</sup> Chapman 2015: “she should call / her Queen and ladies; still yet charging her / that all the handmaids she should first confer.”

<sup>100</sup> 468-73: ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ἂν ἡ κίχλαι τανυσίπτεροι ἠὲ πέλειαι / ἔρκει ἐνυπλήξωσι, τό θ’ ἐστήκη ἐνὶ θάμνω, / αὐλὴν ἐσιέμεναι, στυγερός δ’ ὑπεδέξατο κοῖτος, / ὡς αἶ γ’ ἐξείης κεφαλὰς ἔχον, ἀμφὶ δὲ πάσαις / δειρῆσι βρόχοι ἦσαν, ὅπως οἴκτιστα θάνοιεν. / ἦσπαιρον δὲ πόδεσσι μίνυνθά περ, οὐ τι μάλα δῆν.

deaths serves to separate Telemachus from his actions (he is the one hanging them) and to dehumanize them in order to make their deaths less depressing.<sup>101</sup> Lines 468-70 comprise the bird simile, describing thrushes and doves having been caught in a trap after trying to find places for their nests. The nest itself is then referred to as *stugeros koitos* ('hateful bed' or 'hateful sleep'), making a direct connection between this simile and the enslaved women's supposed crimes. That they are compared to birds degrades them and the image of them being caught in a net expresses part of how Greek enslavers viewed their own authority.<sup>102</sup> Hunters can set traps and kill animals without remorse because they are stronger and know how to do it; just so, enslavers can punish and kill their enslaved population legally because they are 'stronger' and have the right to do it.<sup>103</sup> From 471-3, the women are lined up in a row, fitted with nooses, and then executed. Their final mention is with the brief struggling of their feet. The imagery of this scene plays like a series of extreme close-ups: the camera sweeps along a row of heads bent in sadness, then shows a shot of a neck being fitted with a noose, and finishes with a stationary shot of the platform being removed and a bodiless set of legs writhe around and quickly fall still. While it is impactful, the scene of the enslaved women's hanging focuses on the process of execution and total death, disregarding the people who are actually being killed.<sup>104</sup> Lattimore translates this section fairly 'literally' and does not attempt to attach more humanity to the victims or blame to the executioners:

and like thrushes, who spread their wings, or pigeons, who have  
flown into a snare set up for them in a thicket, trying  
to find a resting place, but the sleep given to them was hateful;  
so their heads were all in a line, and each had her neck caught

---

<sup>101</sup> I view this scene as Thalmann does: "no pathos intended here, only a stern justice" (1998, 61).

<sup>102</sup> See discussion of dehumanizing comparison to animals with *andrapodon* in the Terminology section above.

<sup>103</sup> Rankine (2011, 40) notes that "the hanging of the twelve disloyal slave women recalls the master's complete domination of the slave, showing that his requirement for labour was secondary to his requirement for honour."

<sup>104</sup> Additionally, there is no mention of their corpses after they are killed, demonstrating their total lack of honour, see Harris 2020, 388-9.

fast in a noose, so that their death would be most pitiful.  
They struggled with their feet for a little, not for very long.<sup>105</sup>

While *koitos* can mean both bed and sleep, ‘bed’ works better to relate to the women’s sexual ‘crimes.’ What is most disappointing about Lattimore’s translation is his construction of “and each had her neck caught fast in a noose.” His phrasing makes it seem as if they, of their own volition, happened to get caught there or are completely compliant in their own murders. The phrase more ‘literally’ translates to something like: “and there were nooses around all (their) necks.” He switches the agent of the phrase, removing responsibility from those taking the women’s lives. Chapman, adding more lines than in the original, captures the dehumanization of the women, making no moral judgements of their deaths:

Look how a mavis, or a pigeon  
in any grove caught with a springe or net,  
with struggling pinions ‘gainst the ground doth beat  
her tender body, and that then strait bed  
is sour to that swing in which she was bred;  
So striv’d these taken birds, till ev’ry one  
her pliant halter had enforc’d upon  
her stubborn neck, and then aloft was haul’d  
to wretched death. A little space they sprawl’d,  
their feet fast moving, but were quickly still.<sup>106</sup>

He enhances the animal-like otherness of the women in this scene in a way that openly supports an enslaver’s ‘right’ to the whole enslaved body. Wilson, in contrast, notes specifically in her introduction that she aimed to bestow upon the women in this scene more personhood and to give their deaths more tragedy.<sup>107</sup> She does this by noting even briefly the agents of actions

---

<sup>105</sup> Lattimore 2007, 333.

<sup>106</sup> Chapman 2015.

<sup>107</sup> Wilson 2018, 86: “For instance, in my version of the hanging of the slave women, I aim to invite genuine empathy rather than an objectifying thrill; while other translators call their death “piteous” or “pitiful,” in my version we glimpse their pain, not the feelings of a spectator: it is “an agony.”

against the birds and bringing out the women's lack of agency, not implying any responsibility or willingness on their part:

As doves or thrushes spread their wings to fly  
home to their nests, but someone sets a trap—  
they crash into a net, a bitter bedtime;  
just so the girls, their heads all in a row,  
were strung up with the noose around their necks  
to make their death an agony. They gasped,  
feet twitching for a while, but not for long.<sup>108</sup>

She presents the same focus on the bodies of the women, as in the Greek, but intersperses those shots with their identities, that they are a group of enslaved 'girls.' Wilson's translation captures the enslaved characters' humanity but overlooks the association of the bird simile with their sexual 'crimes.' The translation of "were strung up with the noose around their necks" does make an improvement on the literal "and around all their necks were nooses" but it still lacks the culpability of the executioner. I posit the following alternative of lines 468-73, borrowing much from Wilson:

As when thrushes and doves spread their wings to fly  
but fall into a net, a trap set in a bush,  
searching for their nests they meet a hateful bed;  
just so, he set the girls with their heads in a row and strung  
their necks with nooses to make their death an agony.  
They gasped, feet struggling a little, but not for very long.

My translation preserves the primary focus of the women's bodies as they are killed but I add the culpability of the executioner by altering the verb's voice and person. Following Wilson, I aim to evoke the utter sadness and tragedy of the women's deaths. Their hanging was punishment for a crime determined by Odysseus and the method of murder reflects his (and his son's) perspective on the situation, especially in comparison with the suitors' deaths. The suitors were killed

---

<sup>108</sup> Wilson 2018, 492.

violently in a slaughter by Odysseus and Telemachus, imitating in one sense the glory men receive in war<sup>109</sup> and reflecting in another how intensely Odysseus perceived their disrespect to be (his weapons enter their bodies in an unwelcome assault, spilling much blood and resulting in their deaths being slow and painful). The enslaved women, on the other hand, are too associated with sexual impurity to be killed the same way. Telemachus hangs them to avoid touching them (he is sexually inexperienced and will not penetrate them, so to speak, with his weapon. *Od.* 22.462-4).<sup>110</sup> Hanging also prevents their sexually polluted blood from defiling the space and permanently shuts their mouths (recall Odysseus's anger at their laughter at 20.6-13).<sup>111</sup>

### **Case Study 2: Euripides's *Andromache***

The translations I chose for the *Andromache* are those of Michael Llyod, David Kovacs, and George Theodoridis. There is less variation in publication dates with translations of Euripides, but each translator still provides a distinct perspective and a different approach to translating the text. Lloyd produced his translation for a university audience—students who have been aware of Euripides before using his text but are still new to Greek and/or tragedy and thus benefit from the facing Greek/English text and ample notes and introduction.<sup>112</sup> Having published his translation in the mid-1990s, when social awareness was not yet a common focus of study, he does not attempt to empathize with the enslaved or place blame on the enslavers. Rather he discusses the reality and logistics of a male running a household having both a wife and a 'concubine' at the same time and concludes that Andromache is better off than Hermione in the end, despite her

---

<sup>109</sup> Gaca (2021, 51) explains that they have sex with the enslaved women without Penelope's permission, evoking the practice of martial rape in warfare. Thus, if the suitors are behaving as if they are in battle-culture, outside the norms of civilization, it follows that they should be punished and killed as if they were in battle.

<sup>110</sup> Wilson 2021, 33.

<sup>111</sup> Wilson 2021, 29-30.

<sup>112</sup> Collard 1994, vi.

subjugation, because she continues to uphold the ideals and behaviours expected of a proper woman.<sup>113</sup> Kovacs's 1995 translation is useful in comparison because it is part of the Loeb Classical Library, thus making it a 'go-to' text for many. It is widely available since it has been made accessible online and many universities provide access through their own libraries to it, but it is not part of the public domain. As part of a reputable series of translations, the Loeb text holds more weight, so to speak, for readers than other texts. Kovacs, like Lloyd, does not concentrate on the aspect of slavery in the play, instead examining the moral qualities and changes of fortunes of the characters. Finally, Theodoridis's translation is the most recent of the three, having been published in 2012. His text is open-access and is available across multiple platforms, including his own blog, "Bacchicstage," an open-access translation collective by A.S. Kline called "Poetry in Translation," and as a physical book. As the most recent and most widely accessible, Theodoridis's translation stands out, but terminologically it is not radically different from Kovacs' and Lloyd's texts. Since the play concentrates directly on the perspective of a newly enslaved formerly noble woman, we can explore the extent to which modern translators reflect the fact of her recent changed status.

Euripides's tragedy *Andromache* explores the hardships the title character, Andromache, faces in her new lot in slavery following the fall of Troy and the distribution of the Trojan women to the Greek heroes. Andromache has been assigned to Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles. This is an especially miserable situation for Andromache because, as we learn in the *Iliad*, Achilles killed all of Andromache's family before she came to Troy and married Hector, and then he killed Hector (Hom. *Il.* 6.409-30, 22.321-67). At the end of the war, she has no family

---

<sup>113</sup> Lloyd 1994, 9: "Euripides could have enlisted more sympathy for Hermione, but he does in fact give Andromache every advantage. She is the innocent victim of Hermione's plot, which ends in a humiliating debacle; she has the better of the argument about the proper behaviour of a wife; she is resolute in facing real danger, while Hermione is terrified by imaginary danger; and she gives birth to the son who turns out to be the sole survivor of the House of Aeacus."

left except her newborn son, Astyanax, who is killed by being thrown off a wall (Eur. *Andr.* 8-11). Her torment by Achilles continues past his death when she learns that she is now ‘owned’ by his son (12-5). Andromache, though suffering, represents the ideal woman in her character and actions. As a royal wife and mother, she did her duties and never caused any trouble. Euripides explores how Andromache, now enslaved, can maintain her inner nobility and proper femininity while grappling with her complete loss of authority and agency.

Rather than serving to highlight how the enslaved impact the honour of their enslavers (as in Homer), Euripides’s tragedy emphasizes the concepts of natural vs. conventional slavery. Even while Hermione, the wife of her enslaver Neoptolemus, attempts to kill Andromache and her son out of jealousy, Andromache continues to exemplify ideal characteristics: being resolute in the face of danger, keeping her focus on the stability of the household, being prepared to sacrifice herself for her child, and obeying the orders of her superiors but still voicing her opinion (245-260, 411-5, 445-63).<sup>114</sup> Hermione, a free woman, also tries to exemplify the characteristics of an ideal woman and thus does not want to share her husband with an enslaved woman who cannot deny him sex. Hermione’s behaviour, however, does not line up with the proper expression of feminine ideals due to her plotting against Andromache, and she is led off at the end of the play by Orestes, the man to whom she was engaged before marrying Neoptolemus—this second marriage is not a reward though, because Orestes killed Neoptolemus and also comes from the cursed house of Atreus (147-269, 957-1008). Andromache must face her imposed inferiority to Hermione and Neoptolemus while preserving the upright qualities she is being praised and abhorred for.

---

<sup>114</sup>See also Schlaifer 1936, 199 and Demand 1998, 69.

Euripides presents both the enslaved and elite perspectives distinctly in this tragedy; Andromache discusses her own plight and how horrible her situation is, but the focus of the play is on how households and the hierarchies within them should work, namely the authority of a free married woman and the right of the *philoï* (family and close friends) of an enslaver to claim an enslaved person in his absence. Hermione, the childless wife of Neoptolemus, is angry that Andromache has produced a child fathered by Neoptolemus, especially since Andromache is enslaved and thus positioned as a concubine in the household (31-5, 154-160). Others in the play, Menelaus (Hermione's father) and Peleus (Neoptolemus's grandfather), debate the treatment and authority an enslaver should have over their own enslaved population and those of their close friends, and the discussion leads to several mentions of the process of enslavement and who is determined as the rightful 'owner' of a captive (577-746). The selections for this case study are lines 583-4, 927-8, and 940-2.

At lines 583 and 584, Menelaus and Peleus contend for rightful possession of Andromache while her direct enslaver Neoptolemus is absent.<sup>115</sup> The interesting words to consider in translation are the verbs (both of which denote the quick or forceful obtainment of something or someone) and the words used to qualify Andromache. Regarding the verbs, Menelaus uses *heilon* while Peleus uses *elabe*: both mean 'seize' but their senses differ slightly. *Heilon* is more forceful in its sense of 'taking' and refers often to seizure in battle.<sup>116</sup> *Elabe* has more of an extended meaning, since it is a very common word, and can refer to seizure as receipt, possession, or winning.<sup>117</sup> Moreover, Menelaus describes Andromache as his *aichmalôton*, 'someone held captive at spearpoint,' and Peleus has her as Neoptolemus's *geras*,

---

<sup>115</sup> Greek text for the *Andromache* is taken from Diggle 1984. Eur. *Andr.* 583-4: Με. εἶλόν νιν αἰχμάλωτον ἐκ Τροίας ἐγώ. / Πη. σύμῳς δέ γ' αὐτήν ἔλαβε παῖς παιδὸς γέρας.

<sup>116</sup> LSJ αἰρέω A.II.

<sup>117</sup> LSJ λαμβάνω I.11, II.1.

‘a prize of honour,’ i.e., the spoils awarded to a noble man in war. Lloyd translates the pair of lines as follows:

Menelaus: It was I that took her as prisoner from Troy.

Peleus: Yes, but my grandson took her as his prize.<sup>118</sup>

His translation of the verbs as ‘took’ in both lines neglects that they are different verbs with slight changes in nuance, which also ignores the tone of each speaker. Further, he does not fully capture the senses of either *aichmalôton* or *geras*, simplifying both and leaving Andromache’s enslavement origin in the shadows. *Aichmalôton* names her not just as ‘prisoner’ but as someone forcefully held captive and threatened with physical harm; *geras* is not simply that she was ‘won’ by Neoptolemus but that she was distributed with other captives and loot like nothing more than an item of property. Kovacs translates 583-4 as:

Menelaus: It was I who took her captive from Troy.

Peleus: Yes, but my grandson received her as his prize of valor.<sup>119</sup>

His translation is quite similar to Lloyd’s version, but he makes some improvements. His diverse translation of the verbs better suits their nuances. He does not fully capture the sense of *aichmalôton* with ‘captive,’ but it works better than ‘prisoner’ because it implies more of a forceful taking, rather than the forceful keeping implied by ‘prisoner.’ Finally, he draws out the sense of *geras* to include its use as a regular part of the terminology of war, honour, and slavery, denoting the type of society depicted that supports and even idealizes those who have total, forceful control over another. Theodoridis, lastly, translates the interaction as:

Menelaos: It was I who had captured her in Troy!

Peleas: Yes but she was handed to my grandson as a prize.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Lloyd 1994, 61.

<sup>119</sup> Kovacs 1995, 327.

<sup>120</sup> Theodoridis 2012.

His use of ‘captured’ to blend the verb and qualifier into one is an interesting choice but one I do not think is warranted. It neglects the juxtaposition of the two senses of ‘seizing’ in the verbs and chops off the paralleled appositional qualifiers. In the second line, he changes the verb again, making Andromache the subject of a passive construction which removes culpability from Neoptolemus. Instead of Neoptolemus taking or winning Andromache as his *geras*, he is merely the one to whom she was handed off. His translation not only changes the grammatical structure of the Greek but makes both characters supportive of the institution of slavery more indirectly (that they, as enslavers, are mere participants in the doling out of people, rather than the ones taking people captive), when before they openly acknowledged their authority and control over enslaved people. As in my discussions of the *Odyssey*, I find it pertinent to make the text more inclusive or to recognise responsibility and agency wherever I can while preserving the complex and varied language of slavery in the original Greek text. Since all of tragedy is direct dialogue, using ‘enslaved’ and ‘enslaver’ will not be suitable. For these lines I posit the following alternative:

Menelaus: *I* seized her as a captive by my spear at Troy.

Peles: But *my* son’s son took her as his prize of honour.

Rather than putting emphasis on the speaker’s claims of possession (as Llyod, Kovacs, and Theodoridis have all done, for instance in “it was I who took...”), I lengthened the lines to draw out the nuances of the appositional nouns *aichmalôton* and *geras*. The prominence of the speakers’ proposed right to claim her is now brought out with emphatic italicization. The italics serve to highlight more succinctly that each speaker has his own interest at heart while providing a deictic image, as if each is pointing at himself. Further, it imitates the prominence that the first-person insertions have in the Greek: in both lines the words hold emphatic metrical positions (*egô* at line end and *houmos* at line opening) and, by Greek sentence construction, neither are

strictly necessary for each sentence to make sense, demonstrating that they are present purely for emphasis. With the speaker's self-references shortened, there is more space to expand on the specific meanings of *aichmalôton* and *geras*. Menelaus's *aichmalôton* now explicitly describes the violent, forceful capture of Andromache, and Peleus's *geras* is linked to the custom of honour, slavery, and glory in war, as seen in Kovacs's version.

Later in the play, at lines 927-8,<sup>121</sup> Hermione is complaining about what may happen to her because she tried to kill Andromache; she comments on the arbitrary nature of slavery—that she could be enslaved by her husband to become the servant of her step-son, the child of a free man and enslaved woman, and that she should have been better off from the start, since she is free and Andromache is enslaved (recalling the idea of natural slavery in which people are naturally inferior and thus suited to be enslaved). These two passages present a variety of terms for the enslaved, enslaver, legitimacy of childbearing, and the hierarchy of slavery. Lines 927-8 exhibit two denominative verbs, one for being an enslaved person and one for holding another in slavery, as well as a reductive phrase to describe Andromache's position. The first verb, *douleusomen*, means “I will be a slave.” Its stem is the noun *doulos*, discussed above, and is made a verb by the termination *-euô* (denoting a condition or activity, so meaning ‘be a slave’ or ‘do the slave thing’).<sup>122</sup> The second verb, *edespozon*, is similarly constructed and means “I used to be a lord/master.” This verb is comprised of the noun-stem *despotes* (the masculine form of *despoina*, as seen in the first case study) and is made a verb by the ending *-izô* or *-ozô* (denoting action, and meaning “be a lord or master of”).<sup>123</sup> The reductive phrase, *nothoisi lektrois*, means something like ‘concubine’ here. Literally, the phrase is comprised of *nothos* (‘illegitimate,

<sup>121</sup> Eur. *Andr.* 927-8: κτενεῖ μ' ἐπ' αἰσχίστοισιν, ἢ δουλεύσομεν / νόθοισι λέκτροις ὧν ἐδέεσποζον πρὸ τοῦ.

<sup>122</sup> For more on agentive suffixes, see Smyth 1984, entry 866.4.

<sup>123</sup> cf. Smyth 1984, entry 866.6.

spurious, baseborn') and *lektron* ('a bed'). The meaning is expanded by the relationship between the two words and the use of *lektron* in the plural. In the plural, *lektron* means 'marriage-bed,' i.e., sex. The meaning is then further expanded here to mean 'bed-fellow' or 'sexual partner.'<sup>124</sup> Thus, an 'illegitimate sexual partner' would be a concubine.<sup>125</sup> Lloyd translates lines 927-8 as:

He will put me to a most disgraceful death, or I shall be subject to  
the concubine who was formerly my slave.<sup>126</sup>

His translation treats *nothoisi lektrois* appropriately but is disappointing in the transmission of the verbs. His translation of *douleusomen* as 'I shall be subject to' does not indicate that the verb is quite literally about being 'a slave.' Additionally, he changes the agent of *edespozon*, making it passive with Andromache (implied) as the subject. This change of voice detaches Hermione from her active domination over Andromache and relieves her of responsibility. Kovacs constructs the lines as:

He will kill me amidst great disgrace or I shall be a slave to the  
concubine who was once my slave.<sup>127</sup>

Kovacs makes some improvements; he has 'concubine' for *nothoisi lektrois*, just as Lloyd translated, but he also reflects the *doulos* root of *douleusomen*. His translation of *edespozon*, however, like Lloyd's, is unsatisfactory. Finally, Theodoridis, adding more to his translation than exists in the Greek (and using inconsistent line numbering), translates this as:

He'll kill me when he sees me, Orestes. Kill me under some  
shameful charge.

---

<sup>124</sup> Stevens, 1971, 202 n. 928.

<sup>125</sup> The term 'concubine' is an unfortunate one, as it implies more voluntary intimacy from both parties than is likely present. It refers most plainly to a relationship between two people who have sex and live together but are not formally married, see Kushner 2008. The problem with this definition is that an enslaved person who 'has sex' with an enslaver is in a position of inferiority and can be coerced and forced into sexual labour. The enslaved person may refer to themselves as participating in concubinage or even call the interaction a 'marriage' in order to regain some sense of agency and sexual modesty, see Wrenhaven 2012, 131-3. As with lines 583-4, concubine is the most suitable option for translating this phrase, considering tragedy is composed of dialogue and the 'relationship' is what Hermione, from a free woman's perspective, is talking about.

<sup>126</sup> Lloyd 1994, 83.

<sup>127</sup> Kovacs 1995, 359.

Or he could make me a slave to his mistress, who was my slave  
before all this!<sup>128</sup>

He misses the mark by translating *nothoisi lektrois* as ‘mistress,’ since the term ‘mistress’ in English can apply both to a sexual partner outside of one’s marriage (both parties may be free or one could be enslaved; both may be married or just one could be married), and also to a ‘lady of the house,’ the female form of ‘master.’ He exposes the *doulos* nature of *douleusomen* but changes the subject, describing Neoptolemus enslaving Hermione rather than Hermione becoming enslaved. The distinction is important because Hermione is focusing on what will happen to her specifically, thus she laments the possible process of enslavement and loss of nobility.<sup>129</sup> Finally, he treats *edespozon* just as the former two translators do, leaving much to be desired. For these lines, a fairly ‘literal’ word for word translation seems to highlight the issues of agent and implication best. I propose the following alternative of lines 927-8:

He will kill me in great shame, or I will be a slave  
to the concubine whose master I used to be.

With this construction, the juxtaposition between becoming enslaved after being free and in control of enslaved people is clear. By keeping both verbs with Hermione as the subject, I highlight the focus she places on herself, rather than on her relationships with other people (that is, being enslaved by Neoptolemus and becoming outranked by her current inferior, the enslaved woman she hates).

Shortly following this statement, Hermione recounts how her life was and should have been before her plot against Andromache.<sup>130</sup> She notes her position of power in the household (*dômatôn ênassomen*, ‘I was lady of the house’) and the hierarchy of reproduction that should

---

<sup>128</sup> Theodoridis 2012.

<sup>129</sup> Stevens 1971, 202 n. 927.

<sup>130</sup> Eur. *Andr.* 940-2: πολλὸς μὲν ὄλβος, δωμάτων δ’ ἠνάσσομεν, / παῖδας δ’ ἐγὼ μὲν γνησίους ἔτικτον ἄν, / ἢ δ’ ἡμιδούλους τοῖς ἐμοῖς νοθαγενεῖς.

have taken place (*gnêsious etikton*, ‘I would have given birth to legitimate children’ vs. *hêmidoulous nothageneis*, ‘[she would have given birth to] half-slave bastard-born children’ *tois emois* ‘for (i.e., to serve) mine’). The verb *ênassomen*, meaning ‘I was lord/master,’ is constructed like *douleusomen* and *edespozon*: the stem derives from the noun *anax* and is made a verb by the ending *-ssô*. The verb governs *dômatôn*, ‘house,’ and thus the phrase refers both to her position as the female head of the household but also to her position of authority over the enslaved people in the household. In Hermione’s comparison of how the childbearing should have come to pass, she uses *gnêsious* and *nothageneis*. Both words refer to *genos*, one’s ‘race,’ ‘stock’ or ‘family line.’ Her own children (if she had any) would have been *gnêsious*, ‘legitimate’ (literally ‘part of her race’). Andromache’s children then would be *nothageneis*, ‘of illegitimate race/stock’ (i.e., bastard) and *hêmidoulous*, ‘half-slave.’ Since we saw *nothos* used to demean Andromache’s position above, it is reasonable to use the derogatory term ‘bastard’ for *nothageneis* in order to highlight the insult. Lloyd translates these lines as:

I had abundant wealth, and I was queen of the house; my children  
would have been legitimate, hers bastards and half-slaves to mine.<sup>131</sup>

He treats *gnêsious*, *nothageneis*, and *hêmidoulous* appropriately but his translation of the verbs is lacking. Rather than having Hermione say ‘I would have birthed legitimate children,’ he changes the subject to the children themselves. As with lines 927-8, it is important to keep the focus on Hermione—she is concerned with herself: her social standing and what will happen to her. Of course her children would have been legitimate if she were able to have any. The significance here is that Hermione, as a free-born woman at the head of a household, in an ideal world, would have birthed children for her husband (rather than an enslaved woman bearing children for him).

---

<sup>131</sup> Lloyd 1994, 83.

Lloyd also neglects the full nuance of *ênassomen*. As seen in the *Odyssey*, *anax* can extend its meaning from ‘master/lord’ to king, but that does not suit this phrase. In combination with *dômatôn*, it is best to bring out the ownership and control aspect of the verb, rather than just the authority sense. ‘Queen of the house’ creates more of a lavish, luxurious image than a powerful one; it only looks back to the first part of the sentence about wealth rather than ahead to the legitimacy juxtaposition. Kovacs translates the phrase as:

I had great wealth, I was mistress in the house, and I would have borne legitimate children, while she would have borne bastards with half-slave parentage to serve my children.<sup>132</sup>

His translation effectively touches on each aspect of power, hierarchy, and slavery here. He adds more than is present in the Greek (I suspect for fluidity and clarity) but most of it works with the meaning of Hermione’s speech. The preposition ‘in’ with his translation of *ênassomen dômatôn* is slightly awkward, though, and makes her seem more like she is in Andromache’s position rather than having total authority. Additionally, his translation of *hêmidououlos* as modifying *nothageneis* instead of being in apposition lessens the degradative effect of the phrase:

Andromache’s children are seen as coming from an enslaved mother rather than being enslaved at birth by their parentage (focus on legitimacy vs. station). Finally, Theodoridis’s translation constructs the lines as:

I was rich. I was the mistress of my house. I could have given birth to legitimate children, masters over her bastards.<sup>133</sup>

He brings out Hermione’s focus on authority and position well with his translation. His rendition of *hêmidououlos nothageneis* with *tois emois* is striking and conveys Hermione’s concerns aptly, though he takes some liberties with grammar and slightly omits *hêmidououlos*. ‘Masters over her

---

<sup>132</sup> Kovacs 1995, 359.

<sup>133</sup> Theodoridis 2012.

bastards' emphasizes the power her children would have had over Andromache's children, but it does not expose the utter insult of Andromache's children as both illegitimate and enslaved at birth because of their mother's enslavement. I posit the following alternative of lines 940-2:

I had a great fortune; I was lady of the house,  
and I would have birthed legitimate children  
while she'd bear bastard half-slaves to serve mine.

Like Kovacs, I construct the dative of advantage of *tois emois* as 'to serve mine' rather than 'for mine' in order to bring out the hierarchy of power in the household. I use civil, legal language for Hermione's children, the *gnêsious*, but I use insulting language for Andromache's children to highlight how the enslaved are held in disdain. I bring out the offensive and slavery-normalizing sense of the language in this play, taking inspiration from Emily Wilson's approach to the *Odyssey*—that it is important not to make the language coming directly from a character too euphemistic or else one risks censoring the realities of slavery.

### **Case Study 3: Chariton's *Callirhoe***

For Chariton's *Callirhoe*, I compare only two prominent translations, the Loeb text by George Goold, for the same reasons as Kovacs' translation of Euripides's *Andromache* (that it is reputable and fairly accessible) and Bryan Reardon's text in a compilation of Ancient Greek novels. Reardon's translation was published first in 1989 and had a revised edition produced in 2008, after the publishing team realized there was more desire for their book than expected.<sup>134</sup> The compilation became a prescribed textbook in many university courses studying the genre (such was the case for myself) and thus is useful in examining how slavery as a plot device in a love story can be approached by newcomers to the Greek novel. Goold's Loeb translation does

---

<sup>134</sup> Morgan 2008, ix.

not offer much in the way of introduction or notes and, when he does include something, focuses more on the historicity of the text rather than its themes. Still, he offers an interesting perspective. For example, when he makes a note on the enslavement of Callirhoe, he concentrates on the cost and legality of the sale, leaving her perspective to be interpreted only from the text.<sup>135</sup> Both translations were originally published in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and scholarship on ancient slavery has changed significantly since that time, most notably in how to approach and discuss enslaved people in the ancient world—for example, using more inclusive language (like ‘enslaved’ for ‘slave’), calling attention to the actions of enslavers (e.g., saying “he tortured the enslaved woman” rather than “the slave was punished”), and re-interpreting texts and evidence to uncover marginalized perspectives.<sup>136</sup>

Chariton’s novel *Callirhoe (or Chaereas and Callirhoe)*<sup>137</sup> details the romantic drama of a separated pair of lovers. Callirhoe, the most beautiful maiden in Syracuse, marries her true love, Chaereas, the most beautiful young man in Syracuse. They both happen to come from wealthy families and thus Chaereas is the subject of envy by many other young suitors who contrive a plot that results in Chaereas kicking Callirhoe into a death-like coma—an assault he regrets but is not punished for. The town has a funeral for her, setting her body in a seaside cave tomb. Pirates observe the town loading the cave with riches—funeral offerings—and decide to do a grave robbing. As the pirates are stealing the tomb gifts, Callirhoe wakes up and they take her with them. They sell her into slavery in Miletus to Leonas, steward of the wealthy Dionysius, a

---

<sup>135</sup> Goold 1995, 81 n. a-b.

<sup>136</sup> Trimble (2016) demonstrates how re-interpretation can be done regarding physical evidence as she examines how a collar might have been perceived by the enslaver who forced the collar on an enslaved person, by readers of the collars tags and other bystanders, and by the enslaved person wearing the collar. See also Kapparis 2011; Waldman 2015; Witzke 2015; Zorn 2019; Owens 2020; Wilson 2021, 18; Marshall and Kamen 2021, 8-9; Tordoff 2022.

<sup>137</sup> See Goold 1995, 3-4 for speculation on the title.

recent widower (Charit. *Callirhoe* 1).<sup>138</sup> When Dionysius meets his new purchase for the first time, he falls head over heels in love with Callirhoe (because she is exceedingly beautiful) and believes her when she says that she is actually a nobleman's daughter enslaved through kidnapping. He decides to marry her and Callirhoe accepts after secretly finding out she is pregnant with Chaereas's child; she does not want to give birth to an illegitimate child, so she encourages a swift marriage in order to create a believable timeline when the child is born (book 2). In Syracuse, the robbing of Callirhoe's tomb is discovered and eventually the lead pirate is caught, confesses, and is punished. Chaereas sets out to find her but is intercepted and attacked by Dionysius's estate manager, who falsely tells Callirhoe that Chaereas is dead. Chaereas is then enslaved by Mithridates, the governor of Caria (book 3). Dionysius holds a memorial for Chaereas to convince Callirhoe that he is truly dead; Mithridates appears and, like Dionysius, immediately falls in love with Callirhoe. Mithridates plots to steal Callirhoe away with a letter from Chaereas which leads the whole group to the king of Persia (book 4). The king, having also immediately fallen in love with Callirhoe, avoids deciding which man she belongs to and takes her to Egypt when a revolt breaks out (books 5-6). Chaereas, having come to the Persian king with Mithridates, fights in the war and displays some prowess, which leads him to the place where the Persian queen (and, unbeknownst to him, Callirhoe) were left for safety (book 7). He discovers Callirhoe's presence and, reunited, they leave, living happily ever after (book 8).

The novel incorporates several approaches to slavery. Like the *Andromache*, it looks at the arbitrariness and complexities of slavery. It touches upon the idea of natural vs. conventional slavery but twists it into a comparison of 'real slaves' vs. 'not real slaves.' William Owens uses the concept of the 'real slave' to explore the explicit and implicit narratives of *Callirhoe* and how

---

<sup>138</sup> Aside from defeat/capture in war, piracy was a common vehicle for enslavement, cf. Paus. 4.35.6-7 and Strabo *Geog.* 14.5.2.

slavery might be viewed by an elite, never-enslaved reader (explicit) and by a formerly-enslaved reader (implicit). The elite protagonists are not ‘real slaves’ because the audience knows they will gain their freedom by the end of the novel. The enslaved secondary characters, though, are ‘real slaves.’<sup>139</sup> They were enslaved before the story began and generally continue to be enslaved past its conclusion. The distinction is useful for examining the complex, ambivalent perspectives present: a now elite freed-person can identify with the enslaved protagonists doing what they must in order to survive, even if it is ‘bad slave’ behaviour, but would not want their own ‘real slaves’ engaging in that same behaviour.<sup>140</sup>

Though both Callirhoe and Chaereas resort to ‘bad slave’ behaviour in order to survive (lying, deceiving, and using violence, for example), they do this through the compulsion of their enslaved peers, ‘real slaves.’ For example, at 2.10.7 (a selection examined in detail below), Callirhoe agrees to deceive Dionysius about the true parentage of her pregnancy and to take advantage of her sexual relationship with Dionysius as a result of Plangon’s influence and cunning. Where the protagonists engage in immoral, ‘slavish’ behaviour in order to survive, other enslaved characters embody completely the negative stereotypes of enslaved people. What is thought of as wickedly cunning, servile behaviour in one circumstance may be deemed as an expression of noble *sôphrosynê* (σωφροσύνη, ‘sound-mindedness, prudence’) in another: Callirhoe deceives Dionysius about her sexual experience (a manipulative ‘bad slave’ behaviour) but similarly deceives the Persian king in her rejection of his sexual advances near the end of the novel (an intelligent, modesty-focussed behaviour, 2.8.4-3.2.6, 6.4.8-6.5.10).<sup>141</sup> What is viewed

---

<sup>139</sup> Owens 2020, 3.

<sup>140</sup> Owens 2020, 3.

<sup>141</sup> Owens 2020, 73.

by the elite as enslaved incompetence or wickedness can simultaneously be viewed by freed and enslaved people as the resistance necessary for survival.<sup>142</sup>

Chariton depicts Callirhoe as a free woman unlawfully enslaved due to her beauty—a physiognomic feature denoting that her enslavement is merely circumstantial (2.5.6).<sup>143</sup> Beauty, however, is also what objectifies Callirhoe and leads to her captivity and domination throughout the novel. Each antagonist that finds her exceedingly beautiful describes her as a possession, a *ktêma* (κτήμα): the pirates see her as a stolen item they can sell for a high price; Leonas as something to cheer his master; and Dionysius as a prized possession in his household (1.12.1, 1.12.10, 2.6.4).<sup>144</sup>

*Callirhoe* also makes use of the ‘othering’ of enslavement through distinctions of foreignness. Callirhoe laments that she has become a foreigner together with her enslavement (2.5.7). Conversely, Greek slavery is contrasted with barbarian slavery when the Persian king decides to woo Callirhoe: the king of Persia runs a ‘*doulotopia*,’ in a sense, having total control over literally everything and everyone in his kingdom.<sup>145</sup> The enslaved are further ‘othered’ by the imbalance in power of an enslaver over an enslaved individual. Dionysius as Callirhoe’s enslaver has power over how he and others treat her, her freedom, and her body. Though he claims he intends to treat Callirhoe as a noble woman, a supposed equal, Dionysius continues to disregard her agency and wishes. He feigns morality reminiscent of Plato’s Athenian when he chooses not to rape Callirhoe, but still exercises authority in that he can make promises without

---

<sup>142</sup> Owens 2020, 11-2.

<sup>143</sup> Beauty being the outward reflection of the superiority of one’s character. Thus beauty = nobility. Wrenhaven 2012, 44-8; Owens 2020, 61; Sabnis 2021, “Novels.”

<sup>144</sup> Owens 2020, 59, 66. cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1253b32 and Schalifer 1936, 192.

<sup>145</sup> Owens 2020, 73; Charit. *Callirhoe*. 6.3.4: “ποῖον” ἔφη “κάλλος δύναται τῆς σῆς κρατῆσαι, δέσποτα, ψυχῆς, ὧ̄ τὰ καλὰ πάντα δουλεύει, χρυσός, ἄργυρος, ἐσθῆς, ἵπποι, πόλεις, ἔθνη;” Schlaifer (1936, 168) notes that “subjection to tyranny, the equivalent of slavery, was considered the mark of the barbarian.”

keeping them and coerce her into marriage (2.4.10, 2.6.2-3).<sup>146</sup> The emotional toil of realizing one's loss of freedom unsurprisingly results in Callirhoe (and Chaereas) behaving inconsistently with their noble upbringings while enslaved, but regaining their morality, their *kalokagathia* (καλοκάγαθία, 'beauty and goodness'),<sup>147</sup> when they near the end of their sufferings.

The selections I examine in this case study are 1.11.3, 2.1.5, and 2.10.7.<sup>148</sup> Each excerpt takes a different perspective—1.11.3 is direct speech from Callirhoe, 2.1.5 is Dionysius's perception of Callirhoe in the narrative, and 2.10.7 is the omniscient narrator's assessment of Callirhoe. While the three selections have differing viewpoints, they all carry through a common theme of slavery and social hierarchy, contemplating what is worthy and unworthy of each status.

In the first excerpt, 1.11.3, Callirhoe is lamenting her enslavement on board the pirate ship, surrendering in the fear that the pirates would kill her otherwise.<sup>149</sup> She contrasts *douleuein* ('be a slave') with *eugenê* ('well-born' or 'of noble birth'), implying that those born with excessive privilege should not be subject to domination or enslavement. The juxtaposition of these two words also makes explicit the immediacy of the process of enslavement and her total misery because of it (she has expected a certain kind of treatment her entire life based on her high social standing which has been stripped from her in an instant). Alongside the lament of her enslavement, Callirhoe cries that she is being taken to a *xenên gên* ('foreign land'). Not only is she losing her freedom and elite advantages, but she is also losing her home and identity, becoming a foreigner in a foreign place. The word *xenos* often denotes the widespread Greek concept of *xenia* (ξενία), a relationship between a guest and a host and therefore between

<sup>146</sup> Owens 2020, 67. cf. Pl. *Leg.* 6.777e.

<sup>147</sup> See Schlaifer (1936, 194) for the virtues and morals assigned to the free and enslaved.

<sup>148</sup> Greek text for the *Callirhoe* is taken from Goold 1995.

<sup>149</sup> 1.11.3: ἐπὶ ξένην ἄγομαι γῆν καὶ δουλεύειν με δεῖ τὴν εὐγενῆ.

strangers or friends. Here, though, it serves to stress her position as an outsider, an ‘other’: she is foreign both because she is not a local but also because she is strange and unusual to the new place (and so possibly unwelcome).<sup>150</sup> Her brief description of her situation draws on many of the common constituent aspects modern scholars use to define slavery, such as Patterson’s “permanent, violent domination of natively alienated and generally dishonored persons” along with the objectification and imminent sale of Callirhoe as property by the pirates at Miletus.<sup>151</sup>

Goold translates this sentence as:

I am being taken abroad and, in spite of noble birth, am to become a slave.<sup>152</sup>

He effectively reflects the comparison between *eugenê* and *douleuein*, making it clear that Callirhoe sees the two as conflicting yet informing one another: she is not just a prisoner on a pirate ship, she is losing all of her humanity which should have been protected by the circumstances of her birth. His translation of *xenên gên*, however, is lacking its alienating and ‘othering’ quality. ‘Being taken abroad’ does reveal that the pirates are trafficking her, but it is euphemistic and does not emphasize the uncertainty and separation she is experiencing. Reardon constructs this selection as:

I am being taken off to a foreign land; I must be a slave—I, who was born noble.<sup>153</sup>

His translation encapsulates the nuances of each key word in this sentence, highlighting Callirhoe’s expectations of social hierarchy and her hostile displacement. He uses plain language and does not hide the transferred meaning of the sentence (that is to say, where he could have translated *xenên gên* more ‘poetically’ as Goold does, he maintains the more literal word order

---

<sup>150</sup> See LSJ ξένοσ B.III for more on the nuances of this word.

<sup>151</sup> Patterson 1982, 13.

<sup>152</sup> Goold 1995, 67.

<sup>153</sup> Reardon 2008, 33.

and meaning from the Greek). He could have brought out Callirhoe's focus on her change in status further, however, by using 'enslaved' rather than 'slave.' This change conveys that, while Callirhoe is aware of her situation which denotes her as an enslaved person, she continues to identify with her nobility. I thus posit the following alternative:

I am being taken off to a foreign land. I must be enslaved—I, who was born noble.

In the next selection, 2.1.5, the narrator describes Dionysius's reaction to learning about Callirhoe.<sup>154</sup> As with the first excerpt, the juxtaposition of elite status with slavery conveys the character's views on social hierarchy. Dionysius is a man of noble birth (*basilikos*) with a high degree of authority and respect from his community.<sup>155</sup> Being at the top of the social hierarchy, he is unwilling to lower himself by having a sexual relationship with an enslaved woman (*koitên therapainidos*). This passage also demonstrates the objectification of Callirhoe, regardless of her status. She is beautiful, which Dionysius is happy to hear about (*hêdeôs êkouse*); her beauty is her defining trait and makes her valuable to others. In the description of Dionysius's response to Callirhoe's beauty, the word for beauty, *to kallos*, is the direct object of the verb, while she, 'the woman' (*gunaikos*), is left to the end of the phrase and is merely the possessor of *to kallos*. While Callirhoe's appearance makes her desirable (as an acquisition) to others, her enslavement disappoints Dionysius (*aêdôs*). To him, her objectification is acceptable as long as it does not impact her social standing (and his by association). Her enslavement positions her at the bottom of the social hierarchy. Dionysius wants to have sex with her, but not if she is in the position of concubine (*koitên therapainidos*). Goold translates this section as:

---

<sup>154</sup> 2.1.5: ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος τὸ μὲν κάλλος ἠδέως ἤκουσε τῆς γυναικός (ἦν γὰρ φιλογύνης ἀληθῶς), τὴν δὲ δουλείαν ἀηδῶς· ἀνὴρ γὰρ βασιλικός, διαφέρων ἀξιώματι καὶ παιδείᾳ τῆς ὅλης Ἰωνίας, ἀπηξίου κοίτην θεραπαινίδος.

<sup>155</sup> “διαφέρων ἀξιώματι καὶ παιδείᾳ τῆς ὅλης Ἰωνίας”

Although Dionysius was pleased to hear of the girl's beauty, for he was a great admirer of women, he was not pleased to hear she was a slave. Being an aristocrat and preeminent all over Ionia in rank and culture, he refused to take a slave as a concubine.<sup>156</sup>

His translation brings out the concerns of social hierarchy but lacks some of the overt objectification of Callirhoe. Namely, Goold does not balance Dionysius's reaction to Callirhoe's beauty and enslavement. The Greek text is constructed with a *men-de* clause, a grammatical comparison that parallels two sides of one thought. He reflects the particles denoting this construction with the 'although' he uses to introduce the first part of the sentence, but he does not reflect *doubleian* as parallel to *to kallos* grammatically. Both are the accusative direct objects of the verb *êkouse* (which is implicitly repeated in the second half, being modified by the negative version of the adverb used in the first half, *hêdeôs*, 'with pleasure,' vs. *aêdôs*, 'without pleasure') and both are possessed by Callirhoe, 'the woman,' (though not reduplicated outright in the text, *gunaikos* is understood to govern both objects). Goold neglects the type of objectification occurring in this passage by translating Callirhoe's condition of being in slavery as instead being a characteristic of her as a person. The focus should be on the nouns themselves, beauty and slavery, rather than on Callirhoe's relationship to them. If we think about a physical object being described in this way, the difference is clearer: "he liked the taste of the drink, but did not like its temperature" describes two of the drink's qualities whereas "he liked the taste of the drink, but did not like that it was cold" contrasts one of the drink's qualities against its current state of being. Just as temperature is a feature and being cold is a condition, enslavement is a feature and being an enslaved person is a condition. By disregarding the objectifying

---

<sup>156</sup> Goold 1995, 87.

structure of the paralleled features of Callirhoe, he disrupts the sentence's balance and weakens its effect. Reardon translates this selection as:

Dionysius was glad to learn that the woman was beautiful—he was deeply attracted to women—but not glad to learn she was a slave, for he was a true aristocrat, preeminent in rank and in culture throughout Ionia, and would not contemplate taking a slave as concubine.<sup>157</sup>

While Reardon's construction of the beauty/enslavement parallel is balanced in his translation, it contrasts Callirhoe's conditions rather than her qualities, eliminating some of the objectification.

Both translate the final phrase of this passage similarly, with the more idiomatic, extended sense of *koitên* ('bed' or 'marriage-bed') transmitted, as with *lektron* in Euripides's *Andromache* discussed above. Rather than the more 'literal' translation with a possessive genitive and the common meaning associated with *koitên*, 'marriage-bed' ('he refused the bed of a slave/servant'), *koitên* is extended to mean 'sexual partner' and thus the grammatical perception of the sentence can shift a bit, using instead a genitive of simple apposition for *therapainidos* and supplying some extra information to ensure clarity of meaning: "he deemed it shameful (to have) a sexual partner who is a slave," i.e., "he refused to take a slave as concubine."

I propose the following alternative for this selection at 2.1.5, focusing on the paralleled objectification at the beginning of the passage:

Dionysius was pleased to hear of the woman's beauty (for he was truly a lover of women) but displeased to hear of her enslavement. For he was a kingly man, distinguished in reputation and culture throughout Ionia, and refused to bed an enslaved concubine.

---

<sup>157</sup> Reardon 2008, 38.

My translation makes the beauty/slavery parallel clearer by replicating word order very closely. Rather than Dionysius being particularly invested in Callirhoe and seeing her beauty as a perk, the sentence now reads as a buyer examining the features of an item for sale and weighing its pros and cons, demonstrating how Callirhoe is seen as a piece of property in both respects. I also differed in my translation of *koitên therapainidos* in order to emphasize that it is just Callirhoe's inferior status that is preventing him from making sexual advances. I chose to bring out both senses of *koitên* by giving it a verbal sense to complete the verb of refusal (Goold and Reardon also supply a verbal complement, but they choose 'take.' My choice of 'bed' relates more closely to the action associated with concubinage). I also brought out the sense of sexual coupling in *koitên* by using it in conjunction with *therapainidos* to mean 'concubine.' I then added 'enslaved' as a modifier to remind the reader of Dionysius's power.

Lastly, at 2.10.7 Chariton describes Callirhoe's inability to perceive Plangon's scheme.<sup>158</sup> Plangon, an enslaved peer of Callirhoe, has just successfully convinced Callirhoe to keep her baby (whose father is Chaereas) but accept Dionysius's request for marriage and tell him the baby is his own. The narrator tells the reader that Plangon's persuasion worked on Callirhoe because Callirhoe is a *meirax eugenês* ('a noble-born young girl') and is inexperienced in *panourgias doulikês* ('slavish villainy'). As with the prior two excerpts, there is a reflection on what is expected of someone based on their social class and the circumstances of their birth. Since Callirhoe is *eugenês*, she is understood to have *kalokagathia*, inherent virtue and superiority. But Plangon is a 'real slave' and so assumed to embody the opposite of *kalokagathia*, inherent wickedness and inferiority.<sup>159</sup> Goold translates this sentence as:

---

<sup>158</sup> 2.10.7: Ταῦτα τῆς Πλαγγόνος παραινούσης οὐδὲν ὑπόπτειε Καλλιρόη, μεῖραξ εὐγενῆς καὶ πανουργίας ἄπειρος δουλικῆς.

<sup>159</sup> Typical of Greek novels, Sabnis (2021, "Novels") notes that "slaves are depicted more fully, but often embodying extremes of loyalty and wickedness."

Callirhoe was quite unsuspecting of Plangon's advice, since she was a well-bred young girl and ignorant of servile cunning.<sup>160</sup>

His translation of *eugenês* as 'well-bred' over 'noble' or 'well-born' ignores the implied view of natural slavery here: being well-bred connotes more the idea that someone is well-educated and cultured, rather than being innately better by birthright. His translation of *panourgias apeiros doulikês* is also lackluster. His choice for *panourgias*, 'cunning,' is technically correct but does not suit the sense of the phrase. The word comes from the verb *ergô* ('do') and the prefix *pan-* ('all'), giving it a meaning of 'ready/willing to do anything,' often in an extremely negative sense. Goold uses the slightly more positive sense, which frames Plangon as less wicked but still crafty (simultaneously humanizing her but also erasing some of the degradation of the enslaved). This word is not *mêtis* (the common word to describe cunning intelligence, in a neutral, positive, or negative sense) and so should be translated to make the distinction, namely that *panourgias* is an intense insult. Additionally, Goold translates *doulikês* as 'servile.' As has been noted throughout this paper, the choice to use 'servant' over 'slave' or 'enslaved person' and 'servile' over 'slavish' or 'slave-like' is disappointing because it glosses over the reality of slavery.

Reardon translates this sentence as:

Plangon's advice aroused no suspicion in Callirhoe; she was a young lady of quality and knew nothing of slaves' tricks.<sup>161</sup>

His rearrangement of the subject and verbal voice is interesting and unexplained but does not affect the representation of slavery and status in this passage. His construction of *meirax eugenês* as 'young lady of quality' works the same way as Goold's 'well-bred' does: it disregards the implication of natural superiority. Reardon's translation of *panourgias* as 'tricks' is closer to the

---

<sup>160</sup> Goold 1995, 127.

<sup>161</sup> Reardon 2008, 48.

very negative sense of the word than Goold's 'cunning,' but it still lacks explicit disdain. He does use 'slave' to reflect *doulikês*, however, and even adds a higher degree of social hierarchical comparison by his translation of *meirax* as 'young lady' (since 'lady,' as already discussed, is a term for a noble woman). I posit the following alternative of this sentence:

Callirhoe had no suspicions of Plangon's advice, being a nobly-born young lady and inexperienced in slavish villainy.

I translate *meirax* as Reardon did, but differ from both in my translation of *eugenês*, preferring to keep a consistent translation of the word, as in 1.11.3, in order to bring out the juxtaposition of slavery and elite freedom. I transmit *panourgias* in its most negative sense, 'villainy,' so that the stereotyping and disdain of the 'real slave' is reflected. The narrator's voice is a feature of the tale and thus 'slavish' is more suited to the translation, rather than a more humanizing 'enslaved.' As stated in my conclusion to Case Study 2, I deem it necessary to reflect the mistreatment of enslaved individuals through terminology to prevent the concealment of their sufferings.

## **Conclusion**

As demonstrated in the case studies, the matter of slavery in translation is remarkably complex. The form, historical and social context, and purpose of each text greatly influence how it can be approached in translation. These aspects and smaller constituents of them (like the constraints of metre for form) pose unique challenges for each text, as demonstrated in the three case studies.

The *Odyssey* is an epic poem originating from a time when Greek societies were still in the early stages of their development, revealing that slavery was widespread and deeply embedded in everyday practice and economic systems, though it had yet to focus on theorizing

and strictly defining legal statuses.<sup>162</sup> The poem is highly stylistic, being written in metre with a heavy use of formula and repetition, a product of its oral performance. A translator must consider all these features and more and then determine whether to closely replicate all or some of them, whether to favour some aspects over others (like the poetic style over its historical context), and what terminology is most appropriate, both in reflecting the source text's origin and the translated text's contemporary ideals. Homer includes slavery thoroughly in his epic, but it is not a central focus of the poem.

The *Andromache* revealed the fluid nature of slavery in Greek thought, basing its story off the aftermath of the fall of Troy but giving more attention to the hierarchies of slavery: who else can claim an enslaved person other than their primary enslaver? What should happen in a household that includes enslaved people? How should we think about enslaved people vis-à-vis natural vs. conventional slavery? The tragedy considers the enslaved perspective (a dramatic fascination of Euripides) but does not dwell on it: while the titular character is enslaved, her former nobility takes precedence, and her subjugated status seems to fall to the sidelines. In the end *Andromache* is set to marry a prince and regain her freedom, proving how little the play is actually concerned with her prolonged endurance of slavery. A tragic play like *Andromache* has no third-person narrative and thus less opportunity exists for variation in terminological translations because it is difficult to justify changing so explicitly the words and meaning of a character from an enslaver's vocabulary to a contemporary, humanizing one.

*Callirhoe* exhibited to a fuller extent how complex perceptions of slavery were in Greek thought, encompassing many prevalent but also contradictory ideas and views on enslaved people, enslavement, and elite privilege. The novel combines elements of slavery seen in the

---

<sup>162</sup> Lewis 2018, 120.

*Odyssey* and *Andromache*—enslaved secondary characters with no attention to their perspective, and the enslavement and eventual freedom of noble protagonists—placing slavery as its central focus. It is a novel, a piece of stylized prose, and so it has opportunities for terminological variation similar to the *Odyssey*. But with the narrator’s voice being a key feature of the text, a translator is stuck yet again with challenging decisions to make. The possibility that Chariton was formerly enslaved but, at the time of his writing, had enslaved servants himself complicates the perspectives set forth.<sup>163</sup> The narrator can at once abhor the institution that made him suffer and justify his own exploitation of that institution, now that he is free. The negative stereotypes of enslaved characters are juxtaposed with the elite, temporarily enslaved protagonists, who engage in the same bad behaviour, but receive a pass due to their ‘undeserved’ enslavement. The novel grapples with objectification, supposed inherent superiority or inferiority, and power imbalances that make it difficult to transmit the explicit narrative of an adventurous love story between two elite protagonists trying to reunite and the implicit narrative of the realities of slavery and the difficult choices enslaved people made for their survival and potential freedom.

Recalling the questions I posited in my introduction, it is clear that none can be answered with any certainty. The goal of a translation and its focuses and influences necessarily vary from translator to translator. The important thing is that translators continue to revisit texts and approach them from their new and diverse perspectives.<sup>164</sup> In the case studies, I put forth my own translations of the texts I critiqued to demonstrate how changes might be made based on one’s goals but also how a translated text can never have the same complete effect as its source text. My suggestions prioritize reflection of the Greek’s form while representing the enslaved as fully as possible. I neglect metre or rhythm and do not attempt to add any ‘poetry’ to my translations.

---

<sup>163</sup> Owens 2020, 3.

<sup>164</sup> Supra n. 9.

No translation can be perfect because it cannot be exactly the same as the source text in any respect. Yet a translation can provide more than its source text in its ability both to support the elite protagonists and simultaneously represent with more humanity those they exploit.

Translations also have the advantage of being accompanied by notes which can close gaps in understanding or transmission and can explain the translator's perspective. A translation relies on its source text for its material but is still a product of its own time. If translators agree that slavery in ancient Greece was an imposed condition, then their translations should reflect not just the attitude of the ancient society, but work to reveal the humanity and even agency of the enslaved balanced against the dominance of the enslaver.

## Bibliography

- Alston, R. 2011. "Introduction: Rereading Ancient Slavery." In *Reading Ancient Slavery*, edited by R. Alston, E. Hall, and L. Proffitt, 1-33. London and New York: Bristol Classical Press.
- Bakker, E.J. 2020. "The Language of Homer." In *The Cambridge Guide to Homer*, edited by C.O. Pache, C. Dué, S. Lupack, and R. Lamberton, 1st ed., 70–79. Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/9781139225649.
- Bernal, M. 2020. Reprint. "More Semitic Loans into Greek." In *Black Athena: Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Volume III: The Linguistic Evidence*, 386-403. New Brunswick and New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. Original edition, 2006. doi.org/10.36019/9781978807235.
- Bury, R.G., trans. 1926. *Plato: Laws, Books 1-6*. Loeb 187. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cartledge, P. 2001. "The Political Economy of Greek Slavery." In *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economics of Ancient Greece*, edited by E.E. Cohen, L. Foxhall, and P. Cartledge, 156–66. London, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Chapman, G., trans. 2015. *The Odysseys of Homer*. Urbana, Illinois: Project Gutenberg. Reproduced by P. Schempf. Original edition, London: George Newnes Limited, 1616.
- Collard, C. 1994. "General Editor's Foreword." In *Andromache*, vi. The Plays of Euripides. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Cunliffe, R.J. 2012. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect: Expanded Edition*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Demand, N. 1998. "Women and Slaves as Hippocratic Patients." In *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*, edited by S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan, 69–84. Florence, United States: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Diggle, J. 1984. *Euripidis fabulae*. Vol. 1. Oxford Classical Texts. 277-332. Oxford: Clarendon Press. stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0006:039:0.
- DuBois, P. 2009. "Slavery." In *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, edited by B. Graziosi, P. Vasunia, and G. Boys-Stones, 315–27. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286140.013.0028.
- Finley, M.I. 1981. "Servile Statuses." In *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, edited by B.D. Shaw and R.P. Saller, 133-49. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Foreman, P.G. et al. n.d. "Writing About Slavery? Teaching About Slavery?" *Liberating Narratives* (blog). Accessed January 28, 2022. www.liberatingnarratives.com/slavery-language/.

- Gabrielsen, V. 2003. "Piracy and the Slave-Trade." In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. Erskine, 389–404. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gaca, K.L. 2010. "The Andrapodizing of War Captives in Greek Historical Memory." *TAPA* 140(1):117–61. doi.org/10.1353/apa.0.0051.
- — —. 2021. "Controlling Female Slave Sexuality and Men's War-Driven Sexual Desires." In *Slavery and Sexuality in Classical Antiquity*, edited by D. Kamen and C.W. Marshall, 40–65. University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q3z25w.8.
- Garlan, Y. 1987. "War, Piracy and Slavery in the Greek World." In *Classical Slavery*, edited by M.I. Finley, 7–21. London: Frank Cass.
- Garnsey, P. 1996. *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garvie, A.F., ed. 2003. Reprint. *Homer: Odyssey: Books VI-VIII*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Original edition, 1994.
- Gavriljuk, N.A. 2003. "The Graeco-Scythian Slave-Trade in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC." In *The Cauldron of Ariantas: Studies Presented to A.N. Ščeglov on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, edited by P. Guldager Bilde, J.M. Højte, and V.F. Stolba, 75–85. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Glazebrook, A. 2021. "Female Sexual Agency and an Enslaved 'Olynthian': Demosthenes 19.196–98." In *Slavery and Sexuality in Classical Antiquity*, edited by D. Kamen and C.W. Marshall, 141–58. University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q3z25w.13.
- Golden, M. 1985. "Pais, «Child» and «Slave»." *Ant. Class.* 54:91–104. doi.org/10.3406/antiqu.1985.2143.
- — —. 1992. "The Uses of Cross-Cultural Comparison in Ancient Social History." *Echos Du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 36:309–31.
- Goold, G.P., ed. and trans. 1995. *Chariton. Callirhoe*. Loeb 481. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harper, K. 2010. "Slave Prices in Late Antiquity (and in the Very Long Term)." *Hist.* 59(2):206–38.
- Harris, E.M. 2020. "Slavery in Homer and Hesiod." In *The Cambridge Guide to Homer*, edited by C.O. Pache, C. Dué, S. Lupack, and R. Lamberton, 1st ed., 387–89. Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/9781139225649.
- Holton, D. 2022. "British School at Athens: Translation & Exclusion vs. Inclusion I." January 17. www.bsa.ac.uk/videos/translation-exclusion-vs-inclusion/.

- Hunt, P. 2018. *Ancient Greek and Roman Slavery*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Ji, M. 2021. "Translation and Social Practices." In *The Oxford Handbook of Translation and Social Practices*, edited by M. Ji and S. Laviosa, 1–21. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190067205.013.2.
- Johnson, W. 2003. "On Agency." *Journal of Social History* 37(1):113–24.
- Kamen, D., and C.W. Marshall. 2021. "Introduction: Mere Sex Objects?" In *Slavery and Sexuality in Classical Antiquity*, edited by C.W. Marshall and D. Kamen, 3–14. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q3z25w.6.
- Kapparis, K. 2011. "The Terminology of Prostitution in the Ancient Greek World." In *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE–200 CE*, edited by M.M. Henry and A. Glazebrook, 222–55. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.1515/9783110557954.
- Köse, S. 2011. "The Effect of Form and Meaning Focused Translation Instruction to the Language Skill Levels of ELT Students." *Kastamonu Education Journal* 19(2):475–88.
- Kovacs, D., trans. 1995. "Andromache." In *Euripides: Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba.*, 267–389. Loeb 484. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kushner, N. 2008. "Concubinage." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia Women in World History*, edited by B.G. Smith. Oxford University Press.
- Kyrtatas, D.J. 2001. "Domination and Exploitation." In *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economics of Ancient Greece*, edited by P. Cartledge, E.E. Cohen, and L. Foxhall, 140–55. London, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis Group.
- — —. 2011. "Slavery and Economy in the Greek World." In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, edited by K. Bradley and P. Cartledge, 1st ed., 91–111. Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521840668.007.
- Lattimore, R. 1951. "Translator's Note." In *The Iliad of Homer*, 67–8. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- — —, trans. 2007. *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics. Original edition, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Lewis, D.M. 2015. "The Market for Slaves in the Fifth- and Fourth-Century Aegean: Achaemenid Anatolia as a Case Study." In *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*, edited by E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis, and M. Woolmer, 316–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139565530.
- — —. 2018. *Slave Systems in Their Eastern Mediterranean Context, c.800-146 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lissarrague, F. 2000. "Aesop, Between Man and Beast: Ancient Portraits and Illustrations." In *Not The Classical Ideal: Athens and the Constructions of the Other in Greek Art*, edited by B. Cohen. Leiden: Brill.
- Lloyd, M., trans. 1994. *Andromache*. The Plays of Euripides. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Malmkjær, K. 2011. "Meaning and Translation." In *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by K. Malmkjær and K. Windle. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199239306.013.0009.
- Marshall, L.W., ed. 2014. *The Archaeology of Slavery: A Comparative Approach to Captivity and Coercion*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Miner, J. 2003. "Courtesan, Concubine, Whore: Apollodorus' Deliberate Use of Terms for Prostitutes." *AJPhil* 124(1):19–37.
- Monoson, S.S. 2011. "Navigating Race, Class, Polis and Empire: The Place of Empirical Analysis in Aristotle's Account of Natural Slavery." In *Reading Ancient Slavery*, edited by R. Alston, E. Hall, and L. Proffitt, 133–51. London and New York: Bristol Classical Press.
- Morgan, J.R. 2008. "Foreword to the 2008 Edition." In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, edited by B.P. Reardon, rev. ed., ix–xix. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Oakley, J.H. 2000. "Some 'Other' Members of the Athenian Household: Maids and Their Mistresses in Fifth-Century Athenian Art." In *Not The Classical Ideal: Athens and the Constructions of the Other in Greek Art*, edited by B. Cohen, 227–47. Leiden: Brill.
- Onion, R. 2022. "Why Grammarly's New Suggestions for Writing About Slavery Were Always Going to Miss the Mark." *Slate: Future Tense*, February 8, 2022. slate.com/technology/2022/02/grammarly-slavery-language-suggestions.html.
- Owens, W.M. 2020. *The Representation of Slavery in the Greek Novel: Resistance and Appropriation*. London: Routledge.
- Patterson, O. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Porter, J.D. 2021. "The Sexual Agency of Slaves in Classical Athens." In *Slavery and Sexuality in Classical Antiquity*, edited by D. Kamen and C.W. Marshall, 89–103. University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q3z25w.10.
- Rackham, H., trans. 1932. *Aristotle: Politics*. Loeb 264. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Rankine, P. 2011. "Odysseus as Slave: The Ritual of Domination and Social Death in Homeric Society." In *Reading Ancient Slavery*, edited by R. Alston, E. Hall, and L. Proffitt, 34-50. London and New York: Bristol Classical Press.
- Reardon, B.P., ed. and trans. 2008. "Chariton: Chæreas and Callirhoe." In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, rev. ed., 17–124. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Rinehart, N. 2022. "Reparative Semantics: On Slavery and the Language of History." *Commonplace: The Journal of Early American Life*, January. [commonplace.online/article/reparative-semantics/](https://commonplace.online/article/reparative-semantics/).
- Rosivach, V.J. 1999. "Enslaving 'Barbaroi' and the Athenian Ideology of Slavery." *Hist.* 48(2):129–57.
- Sabnis, S. 2021. "Literary Evidence: Fiction." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Slavery*, edited by S. Hodkinson, M. Kleijwegt, and K. Vlassopoulos. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199575251.013.34.
- Schlaifer, R. 1936. "Greek Theories of Slavery from Homer to Aristotle." *Harv. Stud.* 47:165–204. doi.org/10.2307/310574.
- Smyth, H.W. 1984. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G.M. Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Original edition, United States: American Book Company, 1920.
- Stevens, P.T. 1971. *Euripides Andromache: Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Taylor, T. 2005. "Ambushed by a Grotesque: Archaeology, Slavery, and the Third Paradigm." In *Warfare, Violence and Slavery in Prehistory*, edited by M.P. Pearson and I.J.N. Thorpe, 225–233. BAR International Series 1374. Archaeopress, Oxford.
- Thalmann, W.G. 1998. "The View from Above: The Representation of Slaves in the Odyssey." In *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the Odyssey*, 49–107. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- — —. 2011. "Some Ancient Greek Images of Slavery." In *Reading Ancient Slavery*, edited by R. Alston, E. Hall, and L. Proffitt, 72-96. London and New York: Bristol Classical Press.
- Theodoridis, G., ed. and trans. 2012. "Euripides' Andromache." *Bacchicstage* (blog). Accessed May 2, 2022. [bacchicstage.wordpress.com/euripides/andromache/](https://bacchicstage.wordpress.com/euripides/andromache/).
- Thompson, F.H. 2003. *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Slavery*. London: Duckworth.
- Tordoff, R. 2022. "Enslaved People and Slavery." In *Themes in Greek Society and Culture: An Introduction to Ancient Greece*, edited by A. Glazebrook and C. Vester, 2nd ed., 217–40. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Trimble, J. 2016. "The Zoninus Collar and the Archaeology of Roman Slavery." *AJArch* 120(3):447–72. doi.org/10.3764/aja.120.3.0447.
- Uchitel, A. 1985. "Mycenaean and Near Eastern Economic Archives." Ph.D. thesis, University of London. discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1317733/2/282090.pdf.
- Van Steen, G. 2022. "British School at Athens: Translation & Inclusion vs Exclusion II." January 31. www.bsa.ac.uk/videos/translation-and-inclusion-vs-exclusion-ii/.
- Von der Mühl, P. 1962. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn. stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0012:002:619124.
- Waldman, K. 2015. "Slave or Enslaved Person?" *Slate*, May 19, 2015. slate.com/human-interest/2015/05/historians-debate-whether-to-use-the-term-slave-or-enslaved-person.html.
- Wilson, E., ed. and trans. 2018. *Homer, The Odyssey*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- — —. 2021. "Slaves and Sex in the Odyssey." In *Slavery and Sexuality in Classical Antiquity*, edited by D. Kamen and C.W. Marshall, 15–39. University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q3z25w.7.
- Witzke, S.S. 2015. "Harlots, Tarts, and Hussies? A Problem of Terminology for Sex Labor in Roman Comedy." *Helios* 42(1):7–27. doi.org/10.1353/hel.2015.0000.
- Wrenhaven, K. 2012. *Reconstructing the Slave: The Image of the Slave in Ancient Greece*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- — —. 2013. "Barbarians at the Gate: Foreign Slaves in Greek City-States." *Electryone* 1:1–17.
- — —. 2021. "Slaves and Sex in Classical Greek Art." In *Slavery and Sexuality in Classical Antiquity*, edited by D. Kamen and C.W. Marshall, 66–88. University of Wisconsin Press. doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q3z25w.9.
- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 2005. *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- — —. 2018. "Greek and Roman Terminologies of Slavery." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Slavery*, edited by S. Hodkinson, M. Kleijwegt, and K. Vlassopoulos. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199575251.013.41.
- Zorn, E. 2019. "Column: Language Matters: The Shift from 'Slave' to 'Enslaved Person' May Be Difficult, but It's Important." *Chicago Tribune*, September 6, 2019. www.chicagotribune.com/columns/eric-zorn/ct-column-slave-enslaved-language-people-first-debate-zorn-20190906-audknectayrarfijimpz6uk7hvy-story.html.