## **Did Most Romans Enjoy The Games?**

**Mission**: to analyse and evaluate historical sources to gain a better understanding about how Romans felt about the games.



'I went to the games one day hoping for some excitement. I was bitterly disappointed. It was really butchery (lots of killing). Men were thrown to lions and to bears there was no escape for them.. "Kill him! burn him alive" was the cry: "Why is he such a coward? Why won't he rush (run) on the steel? Why does he fall so meekly (easily)? Why won't he die willingly?" Unhappy that I am I can now choose not to go again. Why must I look on such a scene as this? Do not, my Lucilius, attend the games, I pray you. Either you will be corrupted or if you show disgust, be hated by the crowd.. So stay away.'

A letter from Petronius to his nephew Lucilius, AD 62. Petronius was a Roman writer and author.

The Romans loved gladiators. They loved the men, the weapons, the fighting and the blood. The great amphitheaters of Rome, like the Colosseum, were always full with people, who watched men fight bloody battles, both with each other and with a dazzling array of wild and dangerous animals. It's not hard to imagine the excitement

www.romanguide.com, 2005.

'All of the lions were killed as they came out of the floor. It was not very exciting, as the lions did not fight like they do when let out of cages. Many of them unwilling to attack, were killed with arrows without a fight.'

A Roman writer explain what he saw when 100 lions were let into the arena. cAD 60



All the previous fighting had been merciful by comparison. Now we have pure murder. The gladiators have no protective covering; their entire bodies are exposed to the blows. No blow falls in vain. This is what lots of people prefer to the regular contests, And it is obvious why. There is no helmet, no shield to stop the sword. Why have armour? Why bother with skill? All that just delays death. In the morning, men are thrown to lions and bears. At mid-day they are thrown to the spectators themselves. No sooner has a man killed, than they shout for him to kill another, or to be killed. The final victor is kept for some other slaughter. In the end, every fighter dies. And all this goes on while the arena is half empty. You may think that the victims committed robbery or were murderers. So what? Even if they deserved to suffer, what's your compulsion to watch their sufferings? Seneca, the Younger (born 4BC) was a Roman senator and philosopher. tells of a visit he once paid to the arena in a letter to a friend.

| Name: | Class: |
|-------|--------|
|       |        |

## Source Skills 1 - Analysis ( a careful study )

Mission: to understand the basic Content and Origins of source A

| Study Source 🛕  | / 15 |
|---|------|
| Who created the source:   | 🗆    |
| What is their job, role or position:  |      |
| Where is the person who made the source from:   |      |
| Who is it for / to / audience:  |      |
| When was the source created ( year ) this is in the century   |      |
| When ( tick 2 ): BCE O CE O AND BC O AD O   |      |
| When / type of source ( tick 1 ): Primary O Contemporary O Secondary O Tertiary   |      |
| What / type of source: letter, speech, diary, other:  |      |
| What does the source say: (Summarise in your own words rather than copy out lines)  The MAIN point of the source is:  The source also tells us: |      |
| Furthermore it shows:   |      |
| Finally the source reveals:   |      |
| What: is the overall TONE of the source. ( write one word / emotion to show how the writer feels )  |      |

## Source Skills 2 - Evaluation (testing for reliability)

| Mission: to evaluate the source A  | · , .  |
|--|--|
| Now that you have analysed source A you are going to evaluate source A.  Analysis = to study the source very carefully.  Evaluation = to judge the source and decide if it is reliable or not.  To help with your evaluation remember the COP method and when evaluating the content look out for the 'bias indicators'. For example a reliable source will use more facts than opinions or compared to calmer, clear, words rather than strong or exaggerated language. | Origin Who, when, where Purpose Why, motive, reason  |
| Now use the COP method to evaluate ( judge) if the source  | is more reliable or unreliable.  |
| Unreliable What Reliable Uses opinions Uses facts One sided Strong Language T Emotional E Confused Boasts Modest Exaggerates Subjective Disrespectful Unreliable What Reliable Uses opinions Uses facts One sided Balanced R I G I S I S I S I S I S I S I S I S I S   | reconfused or y be recorded a reliability of a source. For example, a German in 1942 may be biased towards a Jewish person. Think national, regional or political hias regional or political hias. |
| Content 1 (what) - read the source carefully and look for 'bias in Point: The content makes the source MORE likely to be reliable   Explain:  Evidence from source: "  |  |
| Origin of the source: consider the who, when and where.  Point: The origin makes the source MORE likely to be reliable    Explain:   |  |
| Purpose of the source: consider the motive, the 'why' it was cre Point: The purpose makes the source MORE likely to be reliable  Explain:  | LESS likely to be reliable O   |
| Other reasons for / against reliability? Is the source corroborated  | by source D ?  |

**Unreliable** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 **Reliable** 

Finally, give the source A an overall judgement for its reliability by circling below.

| Name: | Class: |
|-------|--------|
|       |        |

## **Source Skills 3** - Comparing / corroboration

|  | nilar are sources B and C?  the sources are similar to (a limited, some, a large) extent'.   |
|--|--|
|  | ook for content / information that is similar or corroborated. support your <b>point</b> with <b>explanation, examples</b> and " <b>evidence</b> " from both sources.      |
| n example from the source B                        |  |
| This is also reflected in source C                 |  |
|  | ook for content / information that is different or not corroborated. support your <b>point</b> with <b>explanation, examples</b> and " <b>evidence</b> " from both sources |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Origins: are The source origins are / are not simi | the origins ( who, where, when ) of the sources similar or different?  |
|  |  |
| Purpose: ar  | e the motives ( why created ) of the sources similar or different?   |
| memouves of the sources are / u                    | ne not similar   |
|  |  |