

W W

Women

 Quick Submit Quick Submit Department of Electrical and Electrical Engineering (EEE)_EXT, RA & TA

Document Details

Submission ID**trn:oid::1:3517284992****Submission Date****Mar 26, 2026, 1:37 AM GMT+6****Download Date****Mar 26, 2026, 1:39 AM GMT+6****File Name****Women_Rome_China_Comparative_Essay.docx****File Size****13.1 KB****6 Pages****1,851 Words****10,708 Characters**

94% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Detection Groups

-  **6 AI-generated only 94%**
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.
-  **0 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%**
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (i.e., our AI models may produce either false positive results or false negative results), so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



Law, Governance, and the Position of Women: A Comparative Analysis of Ancient Rome and Han Dynasty China

Introduction

Across the ancient world, the legal and political status of women was shaped not merely by custom, but by deliberate frameworks of governance and the philosophical traditions underpinning them. In both the late Roman Republic (roughly the second and first centuries B.C.E.) and Han Dynasty China (202 B.C.E.–220 C.E.), women occupied formally subordinate roles in law and public life, yet the specific mechanisms of that subordination — and the spaces of agency within it — differed markedly between the two civilisations. This essay compares the legal status and governance roles of women in these two societies, analyses the philosophical and political justifications offered for their positions, and concludes that, by the standards of measured civic and legal autonomy, the late Roman Republican framework provided women with a comparatively more equitable — though still deeply patriarchal — foundation than the Chinese imperial model.

Legal Frameworks and Formal Status

In the late Roman Republic, women were formally classified as legal minors. They could not vote, hold office, or speak in public assemblies. They required the approval of a male guardian — first a father exercising *patria potestas*, then a husband, and later an appointed guardian — for property transactions and many legal acts (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a). The institution of *patria potestas* granted the eldest male ancestor in a family (the *paterfamilias*) sweeping powers, including, in earlier epochs, the power of life and death over his children. Women passed from the control of their fathers to the control of their husbands through *manus* marriage, effectively transferring their legal personhood along with their dowries.

However, the late republic witnessed a significant and documented erosion of these formal restraints in practice. As scholar Susan Treggiari demonstrates, by Cicero's time the norm of *manus* marriage had largely faded; women were more often retained under their father's *potestas*, and given the short life expectancies of the ancient world, many women were fatherless — and thus

effectively independent — for substantial portions of their adult lives (cited in Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a). Treggiari calculates that roughly 50% of women were already fatherless at the time of their first marriage. This demographic reality, combined with the growing wealth of the Roman upper classes, gave many women de facto legal and economic independence that exceeded their formal status. Cicero's wife Terentia, for instance, sold her own property and managed her husband's political affairs without his direct approval — acts technically beyond her legal standing (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a). Roman law thus exhibited a widening gap between its patriarchal prescriptions and the lived realities of elite women.

In Han China, women were also formally subordinate within a Confucian framework that organised society hierarchically around filial piety, gender differentiation, and a rigid division between the inner (domestic) and outer (public) spheres. The Confucian canon articulated the doctrine of the 'three obediences' (*san cong*), by which a woman obeyed her father before marriage, her husband after marriage, and her son in widowhood (Ebrey, 1993). Unlike Roman law, which was a codified, evolving body of jurisprudence with mechanisms for change, Chinese governance of women was grounded in ritual and moral philosophy rather than formal statute. This meant that while Chinese women, like Roman women, had no formal political voice, their subordination was framed as cosmically and morally necessary — not merely legally convenient.

The property rights of Chinese women were also more constrained in philosophical intent. Dowries were transferred as part of marriage negotiations, but inheritance and property tenure operated principally through the patrilineal clan structure (Bray, 1997). A woman's identity was absorbed into her husband's lineage upon marriage; her children belonged to his clan, not hers. This is in contrast to the Roman situation, where elite women like Hortensia and Terentia are documented as holding substantial independent property — farms, houses, slaves, and jewellery (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a). Indeed, Hortensia's famous speech before the triumvirs in 43 B.C.E. implicitly acknowledges women's property ownership as a civic matter, contesting the right of the state to tax women who were excluded from political life (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a).

Governance Roles and Political Influence

Neither civilisation formally included women in public governance. However, both created space — deliberately or inadvertently — for certain categories of women to exercise significant political power. The nature of that space differed considerably.

In Han China, the political power available to women was institutionalised within the palace system. Imperial women — empresses, empress dowagers, and princesses — had defined, traditional governance functions that were recognised, if also circumscribed, by the dynastic structure (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-b). The most significant of these was the regency: when an emperor was a minor or incapacitated, a female regent, typically the empress dowager or grandmother, could assume full imperial authority. The career of Empress Dowager Lu (195–181 B.C.E.) illustrates this phenomenon vividly. She issued imperial edicts in her own name, controlled appointments, reorganised succession, and eliminated rivals with ruthless efficiency — all within a framework that, however grudgingly, acknowledged her right to govern (Dubs, cited in Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-b). Historian Homer H. Dubs notes that she proved a good ruler despite her crimes, precisely because she could not afford the unpopularity of misrule and was intelligent enough to avoid it.

Jennifer Holmgren's analysis of imperial princesses adds a further dimension: Chinese princesses held ranks and titles in their own right, independent of their husbands, and were exempt from the severe punishments meted out to members of a husband's lineage (cited in Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-b). This gave them a legal and political identity that paradoxically exceeded that of other women — and of most men outside the imperial clan. Their role as 'power brokers' between the throne and the wider elite was structurally significant: they were deliberately deployed to extend imperial loyalty into potentially dangerous lineages.

Yet this power was contingent on proximity to the imperial family, and it operated primarily through the palace's inner quarters — through influence, access, and manipulation rather than formal office. Outside the palace, governance was an entirely male domain staffed by a Confucian-educated bureaucracy from which women were categorically excluded. The political agency of Chinese women was, therefore, institutionalised but enclosed: real within a bounded space, but structurally incapable of extending beyond it.

In Rome, by contrast, there was no formal mechanism by which women could hold governance roles. Women could not be magistrates, senators, or tribunes. However, the political interventions of Roman women documented in the sources suggest a different kind of informal influence — one exercised in the public sphere rather than the domestic. Terentia's management of Cicero's political restoration during his exile involved coordinating senatorial allies, managing finances, and navigating factional conflict: activities that, however unofficial, were directed at the levers of the republican system (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a). Hortensia's speech in the forum — contested by the triumvirs precisely because women had dared to hold a public meeting — represents an instance of women asserting civic standing directly and vocally, however exceptionally (Hughes & Hughes, n.d.-a). These acts suggest that, for elite Roman women, political influence was exercised through the cracks of the republican system rather than through designated palace roles.

Philosophical and Ideological Justifications

The philosophical underpinnings of women's subordination in each civilisation were distinct in character and implications. Roman legal patriarchy was justified primarily through the practical logic of familial and civic order. The paterfamilias system was rooted in agricultural and military republicanism: a citizen owned land, served in the army, and governed his household as an extension of the civic body (Gardner, 1986). Women's exclusion from public life reflected their exclusion from the military obligations that were the prerequisite of Roman citizenship. This justification was pragmatic rather than cosmological — and as Rome's conditions changed (long wars, absentee husbands, growing wealth), the law adapted, however slowly, to accommodate women's expanding roles.

In contrast, the Confucian framework governing Chinese women's status was explicitly philosophical and moral. The hierarchical differentiation of gender was understood as a reflection of the cosmological order of Heaven and Earth, yang and yin (Guisso, 1981). Women's confinement to the inner sphere was not merely convenient but cosmically correct: the stability of the family, the dynasty, and the cosmos itself depended on each element remaining in its proper place. This made the subordination of Chinese women much more resistant to reform from within

the legal system, since it was grounded in a comprehensive moral philosophy rather than in adaptable civil law.

Conclusion: A Comparative Assessment of Fairness

Both civilisations confined women to formal subordination in law and governance, and both permitted exceptional women to exercise real power under specific conditions. However, in terms of comparative fairness — understood as the degree to which the legal and governance framework afforded women recognised civic standing, property rights, and space for public agency — the late Roman Republican system was marginally but meaningfully more equitable.

Roman women of the elite, while legally classified as minors, owned property in their own names, could initiate divorce, recovered their dowries upon separation, and, crucially, were observed exercising public influence in ways that the Roman system acknowledged as significant even when it resisted them formally. Hortensia's speech is a remarkable document not only for what it argues but for the fact that it was delivered, recorded, and partially heeded. The Roman legal system contained within it the mechanisms — demographic reality, property ownership, practical necessity — by which women's status could and did evolve.

The Han Chinese system, by contrast, concentrated the political power of women within the palace and grounded women's subordination in a moral philosophy that rendered reform ideologically suspect. Outside the imperial family, women had no recognised public role and limited independent property rights. The power of an Empress Dowager was real but precarious, contingent on dynastic accident, and always at risk of violent reversal — as the massacre of the Lu clan following Empress Lu's death demonstrates.

Neither system was fair by modern standards. But Rome's was the less enclosed: it offered more women — not just imperial ones — the possibility of property, action, and even, in exceptional moments, voice.

References

- Bray, F. (1997). *Technology and gender: Fabrics of power in late imperial China*. University of California Press.
- Ebrey, P. B. (1993). *The inner quarters: Marriage and the lives of Chinese women in the Sung period*. University of California Press.
- Gardner, J. F. (1986). *Women in Roman law and society*. Indiana University Press.
- Guisso, R. W. (1981). Thunder over the lake: The Five Classics and the perception of women in early China. *Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historiques*, 8(3), 47–62.
- Hughes, S., & Hughes, B. (n.d.-a). Women in the late Roman Republic: Independence, divorce, and serial marriages. In *Women in world history to 1500* (pp. 114–128). [Course reading].
- Hughes, S., & Hughes, B. (n.d.-b). Imperial women of the Han Dynasty (202 B.C.E.–220 C.E.). In *Women in world history to 1500* (pp. 98–111). [Course reading].
- Pomeroy, S. B. (1975). *Goddesses, whores, wives, and slaves: Women in classical antiquity*. Schocken Books.
- Treggiari, S. (1991). Divorce Roman style: How easy and how frequent was it? In B. Rawson (Ed.), *Marriage, divorce, and children in ancient Rome* (pp. 31–46). Oxford University Press.