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OFFICIAL SUBMISSION FORM/REGISTRATION INFORMATION
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PROGRAM INFORMATION
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Message from the President

As I write these words the leaves in southern New England are just beginning to turn when you read them, how-ever, the autumn in our region will, for the most part, no longer be autumn. By then, also, the deadline will have passed for submitting abstracts for the papers and workshops at our Annual Meeting in March. Ideally, I would like to be able to say that the entire program for the meeting will be set by the end of November. However, if you have an idea for a paper or workshop which you have not yet sent in, I would encourage you to contact me to inquire if there is still available time in the program. If so, and if your topic seems to be appropriate for and of interest to our members, we will do our best to include your presentation.

As many of you already know, Ruth Breindel, our hard-working Treasurer and the Managing Editor of NECE, has offered to take on the responsibility of producing a CANE newsletter as a supplement to this journal. (Where do you find the time, Ruth?) At the most recent meeting of the Executive Committee Ruth presented a sample layout of this newsletter, which will come out a minimum of twice a year when there is need to supply our members with information that will no longer will helpful, topical, or of interest if its communication has to wait until the publication date of NECE. A wonderful advantage of this newsletter is the fact that the deadline for copy can be as recent as a week prior to the publication date. If you have announcements you would like to make within such a format, and you want them to reach our members well before February of next year, please don't hesitate to contact Ruth. As I understand, the title of the newsletter has not yet been confirmed: a member of the Executive Committee, who shall remain anonymous (mainly because I can't recall who it was), suggested Nunciquod. Another member suggested that we open it up to the members in the form of a contest. In any case, if you have an idea, I'm sure Ruth would be pleased to hear it.

The members of the committee charged with choosing the recipient of this year's Barlow-Beach Distinguished Service Award met this summer at Dartmouth College to draw up a preliminary list of worthy candidates. We would like, however, to receive further guidance from our members. If you would like to nominate a colleague for this, generally considered to be our most prestigious award, please send a letter to me, preferably by the end of calendar year 2000 (e-mail is acceptable) which includes brief anecdotal evidence of that person's worthiness.

The newly established CANE Student Prize will again be presented at our next Annual Meeting. (Please see the separate notice in this issue for further information about the prize and the process of nomination.) Since the introduction of this prize, some of our members have understandably confused it with the long-established CANE Writing Contest, the details of which were published in their entirety in the August issue
of NECJ. Please bear in mind that the new Student Prize is open to both high school students and college undergraduates. The Writing Contest is open only to students in grade 12 or below. To nominate candidates for the Student Prize, please send their papers to me at the address below; to nominate someone for the Writing Contest, you should contact John Lawless, our President-Elect.

It seems that I owe an apology to our beloved colleague and friend John Ambrose, who, now that he is retired from Bowdoin College, spends the cold months of the year in Persephone's exile in Arizona. John, as many of you know, has been a loyal (and—it goes with the territory—frustrated) fan of the Red Sox for many years. In mentioning the personal moves that the Sox were making (or not making) in their efforts to acquire the elusive world championship, I apparently renewed what for John is an infatuation dolorum. As a mid-life immigrant to New England, John, I cannot say that I "feel your pain," but I'm sorry to have exacerbated it. John was pleased, however, that the Old Towne Team picked up slick-fielding first baseman Rico Brogna, the son of his friend Joe Brogna, whom many of us know to be a highly respected Latin teacher and coach at The Taft School in Watertown, CT.

Rosemary Zuravel, the Local Coordinator for our 2001 Annual Meeting at Berwick Academy in South Berwick, ME, has been continuing her efforts and, judging by the content of her recent report to the Executive Committee, seems to have nearly all of the details already in place. As always, a preliminary program will be sent to you, as well as information concerning accommodations, directions, etc. I hope that you will all make plans to attend this conference. If you are not familiar with Berwick Academy, you will be surprised at how accessible the school is, and what an ideal venue it is for our gathering.

Once again let me remind you of the availability of the discretionary grants and scholarships which we offer to our members. (For information regarding discretionary grants, please contact Donna Lyons, our Immediate Past President (11 Carver Circle, Simsbury, CT 06070; dollyons@worldnet.att.net; for that concerning scholarships, contact John McVey, chairman of the Scholarship Committee (see Scholarship announcement). Also note that the CANE website has been redesigned and enhanced by Ray Starr, and has a new address, www.caneweb.org, which you are urged to visit frequently.

I hope that the school year has gone as well as possible for all of you so far, and that you have a wonderful Thanksgiving break. As always, please don't hesitate to contact me with suggestions or requests for information.

Dennis Herer
Tabor Academy • Marion, MA 02738
dherer@taboracademy.org

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NEWS

Scholarships and Prizes

CANE Student Prize: A Five-Year Initiative

Having begun with the 1999-2000 academic year and continuing for four subsequent years, CANE will offer a Student Prize for a paper written by a high school or undergraduate student on a scholarly topic related to the classical world. The final paper must be suitable for a fifteen-minute presentation. To receive this Prize, which consists of a certificate and an award of $200, the student will be required to read the winning paper at the Annual Meeting of CANE. Those eligible for this Prize are full-time students in New England, high school or college, under the age of 30 years, who have not yet received a Bachelor's Degree. All undergraduate and high school students are encouraged to apply for the Student Prize.

Papers must be submitted to Dennis Herer, president of CANE, c/o Tabor Academy, Marion, MA 02738, by December 15, 2000. A committee of three, appointed by the president, will review the papers and make the final decision on the award by February 1, 2001, at which time the winner will be notified and invited to attend the Annual Meeting.

THE MATTHEW I. WIECZEK TEACHING AWARD

At the March 2001 CANE Annual Meeting, the award for excellence in teaching in honor of Matt Wiencze will be presented to a meritorious teacher. This year's recipient will be selected by the three at-large members of the Executive Committee from a list of candidates nominated in accordance with the following criteria. Each nominee must be:

1. a member of CANE
2. a current (i.e. not retired) teacher of the Classics at a New England primary, middle, or secondary school.
3. nominated by a professional colleague. ("Professional Colleague" is defined as:
   a. a fellow teacher
   b. an administrator at the nominee's school
   c. a classicist from another school who knows the nominee well in a professional capacity.)

Letters of nomination should contain specific evidence of the nominee's qualifications, particularly those qualities exemplified by Matt Wiencze in his personal life and professional career, among them his devotion to his teaching and to the welfare of his students; his sense of his career as a "calling" and "his dedication to the study of the ancient world..." (NECJ).
November 1996, Memorial to Matt Wiencke).
Please send all letters to:
Brian Donaher, Dept. of Classics, Boston College High School
160 Morrissey Blvd., Dorchester, MA 02125

Only those nominations received by December 31, 2000 will be considered for the March 2001 presentation. (Current members of the Executive Committee are not eligible for nomination.)

CANE Scholarships

The Cornelia Catlin Cogut Memorial Rome Scholarship is for study only at the summer session of the American Academy in Rome. Participants in this six-week program study the history and archaeology of the Roman world during visits to ancient sites in Rome and its environs. The total cost of the summer session including most personal expenses is approximately $4000. The 2001 Cogut Scholar will receive a stipend of $5502.

The CANE endowment Scholarship is awarded for summer study at some place other than the American Academy in Rome. Recent award winners have used the stipend to study at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the Cambridge Latin Teaches’ Tour in Pompeii, and the Vergilian Society programs in Roman Germany and at Cumae. The program in Athens runs for six weeks; other programs tend to be two to three weeks long. The 2001 Endowment Scholar will receive a stipend of $4510.

Applicants may apply for either scholarship – but not both at the same time.

Please take advantage of this wonderful opportunity – if you:
1. are currently a member of CANE and have been a member in good standing for at least the past two years,
2. and have lived in New England during that period of membership, or
3. taught in a New England public or private elementary or secondary school; N.B. preference for the Endowment Scholarship is given to secondary school teachers.

Also available in even years,

the Renata Poggioli Award for travel in Greece and/or Italy.
(NOT available summer 2001)

The Poggioli Award established by the Boston Fund in 1991, funds study and/or travel in Italy and/or Greece typically during the summer months. The CANE Scholarship Committee makes the Award, generally between $4000 - $6000, awarded other years.

To qualify you must:
1. be studying and/or teaching in New England at the secondary or college level,
2. have a rank no higher than untenured assistant professor; or have taught less than ten years at the secondary level and,
3. usually have no access to major university research-grant and travel-grant programs.

The recipient of the Poggioli Award need not be a member of CANE.

The application deadline for all awards for the summer of 2001 is February 1, 2001. Information and application materials are available from the Chairperson of the Scholarship Committee, John McVey, The Rivers School, 353 Winter Street, Weston, MA 02093; Tel: (781) 451-7831; Fax: (781) 239-3916; email j.mcvey@rivers.org, or online @ http://www.caneweb.org

The Edward Phinney Fellowship

The Edward Phinney Fellowship aims to encourage the teaching of Ancient Greek in the secondary schools. The fellowship began in 1999, and will be managed by CANE for a period of 20 years.

The fellowship is open to all secondary schools in New England, whether public, religious, or private which have not offered Greek as a normal part of their curriculum in recent years. A slight preference is given to public schools. The recipient will be a teacher who has demonstrated outstanding proficiency in the teaching of Latin for at least five years at the same school and who has studied Greek at the college level for two or more years. It is expected that the stipend will be extended to a second year, in which the recipient would teach both second year Greek and a new section of beginning Greek. For its part, the school must be willing to provide a room and time-slot for the course during the stipend period and agree that, at the end of the second year stipend period, if the program is deemed a success based on criteria established in advance by the school and the Committee, the school will be willing to continue the teaching of Greek at its own expense.

The stipend is a “proportional share of the recipient’s annual teaching salary,” depending on the number of Greek classes to be taught and the total number of other classes taught. The fellowship covers the “reasonable” expenses of one Greek course taken before the teaching starts or during the first term of teaching, as well as additional expenses such as textbooks and other materials for the course to be offered. The award is
normally offered for two years and thus applications are not being sought this year.

Potential applicants will want to plan ahead, for the award will next be offered to
support a Greek course to be offered in the Fall of 2002. Applicants will wish to begin
dialogue with their administrations who need advanced notice to include new courses in
curricula.

If you are interested in the program or have further questions, please feel free to
contact:

Kenneth F. Kitchel, Jr.
Chair, Phinney Fellowship
Classics Department
Herter 529
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003
413-545-4249
e-mail: kkitchel@classics.umass.edu

CANE Discretionary Grants

CANE Discretionary Grants are available for:

1. Classroom projects for teaching of the classics at all levels
2. Research or creative-writing projects in the classics which can be used
to enhance the teaching of the classics
3. Materials, such as slides, videos, or computer software, to further the
teaching of the classics

Applications are open to residents of New England and to students in New England.
Applicants need not be members of CANE, although membership is and will be strongly
encouraged. Three grant deadlines for Discretionary Grants end on November 1, March
1, and August 1, but applications may be submitted at any time. To apply, please
forward by e-mail or by post a full description of your project, including costs and the
specific project components for which funds are requested to:

Donna Lyons, CANE Past President
at
mdlyons@worldnet.att.net
or at
11 Carver Circle
Simsbury, CT 06070

Requests are considered for grants of $50 to $400. The grant award may be spent
over more than one semester. Limit of one Discretionary Grant per applicant per year.

Lyons at e-mail or home address above (or home telephone: 860-658-1676; school

Applicants will be notified of the Discretionary Grants Committee’s action no later
than the end of the month of the grant period. The Committee on Discretionary Grants
consists of the Immediate Past-President of CANE (Chair) and the three Members-at-
Large of the CANE Executive Committee (see the Annual Bulletin for listing of
committee names and contacts). Awards are reported to the CANE membership at the
Annual Meeting and/or through NECJ.

Good luck, and please contact Donna Lyons with any questions or proposals.

Scholarship for Study toward Teacher Certification in Latin and for Greek in New England

The Classical Association of New England invites applications for a scholarship of up
to $1500 either to an outstanding junior or senior undergraduate in New England who is
preparing for secondary-school certification as a teacher of Latin, Greek, or both in one
or more of the New England States; or to the holder of a bachelor’s or master’s degree to
cover the costs of tuition and other expenses required to obtain certification as a teacher
of Latin, Greek, or both in at least one of the New England states.

The deadline for applications is February 1, 2001. For further information, contact:

Professor Allen M. Ward
Dept. of History
Box U-2103
University of Connecticut
241 Glenbrook Rd.
Storrs, CT 06269-2103
Tel: 860-486-3722
Fax: 860-486-0641
Email:ward@uconnvm.uconn.edu

CANE Writing Contest: A Reminder

The topic for this year’s contest is: “Homo Faber: Artistry and Craftsmanship in the
Ancient World.” The detailed rules for the contest were published in the August 2000
issue of the New England Classical Journal and are also easily accessible on the CANE
website. Copies of the rules have also been provided to the State Representatives and are
available from the Executive Secretary. Everyone is urged to help make this year’s
competition a rich and stimulating experience for all.
Notice of Constitutional Change:

On September 23, 2000 the Executive Committee voted unanimously to change Article II, Section 3, Membership. The article currently reads:

Section 3. Life membership in the Association may be obtained by the payment of a graduated fee determined by the number of years during which the applicant has been an Active Member.

[editor’s note. This article was apparently amended twice, but the amendments do not appear in the Constitution as it is now published on the CANE website. The two amendments were for a Life Membership fee of $300 minus $1.00 for each year of continuous CANE membership. (March 6, 1992. On April 1, 1993 the amendment was changed to read “that the CANE Life Membership fee be set at $500 minus $1 for each year of membership in CANE.”) The Executive Committee agreed that the amount of $500 was appropriate, but decided to eliminate the graduated reduction as cumbersome and unnecessary.]

The new article, which must be approved at the Annual Meeting at Berwick Academy on March 16, 2001, if approved, will read:

Section 3. Life membership in the Association may be obtained by the payment of a $500.00 fee. The Life Membership fee will be reviewed by the Executive Committee every five years.

Reports from Scholarship Recipients

Editor’s note: a complete version of these reports may be found on the CANE web page: www.caneweb.org.

Couler Fund Scholarship

When I received word that I had won the Couler Scholarship, I blessed the committee for their confidence that a seasoned classroom teacher could benefit as much as a beginner and the millennium/Jubilee hype that may well have discouraged others from applying this year. Whatever the fate that smiled on me, the Classical Studies Summer School of the American Academy in Rome was the opportunity of a lifetime. In six weeks we trekked The Appian Way to the Museum of The Aurelian Walls and the villa of Maxentius, around the perimeter of the remnants of the Servian Wall, and along the route of the triumphal parades from the Campus Martius to the Roman Forum. . . . We absorbed the deep and timeless tranquillity of the Catacombs of Priscilla and of fourth century cloisters just steps from Rome’s busiest intersections. The geography of the city of Rome will never again be just a diagram on a textbook page.

Cheryl Spillane
East Catholic H.S.
Manchester, CT

Endowment Fund Scholarship

During the summer of 2000, I participated in the Summer Session of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, under the direction of Prof. Tim Winters. . . . It was an experience that not only was exciting and challenging for me as a student of the Classics, but has changed me as a professional classicist. I am now back in the classroom, and have already made considerable use of the experience—I use my slides regularly, and my new knowledge even more. I know that I am better as a beginning teacher of Greek than I would have been without the experience. I thank CANE from the bottom of my heart, and recommend to anyone in the profession the experience of becoming associated with the very special institution, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

John Higgins
The Gilbert School
Winsted, CT
Poggioli Scholarship

As the only Latin teacher at my high school I rarely have the chance to discuss issues relating to the field with other teachers of Latin. I enjoyed associating with a group of teachers and graduate students with similar interests and concerns. It was an excellent summer, and I would not hesitate to recommend the summer program at the American Academy in Rome to any classicist. I thank you again for all of your assistance.

Ron Urbinati
Hanover, CT

New England Latin Placement Service

NELPS is announcing a change in its co-directors, effective September 15, 2000. As of this date, the co-directors are Stephen Brunet of UNH and Kenneth Kitchell of U Mass, Amherst.

The role of NELPS remains the same. Candidates who wish to register for the service in order to be informed of job openings should contact Prof. Brunet. Schools with openings to announce should contact Prof. Kitchell.

The present directors wish to thank publicly and warmly Prof. Richard Desrosiers and Prof. Gilbert Lawall, the past co-directors for their long service to the profession in this position. Please be sure not to send them any further requests as this will delay action on your request and will disrupt their well deserved respite from NELPS chores.

Please feel free to contact either of the present co-directors for further information.

Prof. Stephen Brunet
Classics, 209G Murkland Hall
University of New Hampshire
Durham NH 03824
Tel: 603-862-2077
Fax: 603-862-4962
email: stephen.brunet@unh.edu

Prof. Kenneth F. Kitchell, Jr.
Classics, 529 Herter Hall
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003
Tel: 413-545-4249
Fax: 413-545-6995
email: kkitchel@classics.umass.edu

Errata

Please change the following addresses of the Executive Committee in your Annual Bulletin:

p. 1 - John Lawless, President Elect, email: jlawless@providence.edu (and passim)

p. 3 - Susan Brown, Vermont State Representative, email: sebrown@together.net
John Higgins, Connecticut State Representative, fax: (860) 379-6163
Karen Hopkins, Maine State Representative, email: KLHopkins2@aol.com
Jacqui Carlon, Massachusetts State Representative, Home: (978) 256-4737

p. 5 - Kenneth Kitchell, Phinney Scholarship Fund, email: kkitchel@classics.umass.edu

Other Announcements

LATIN CAROLS AND READINGS

On Monday, December 4, 8:00 p.m. the Classics Department of Brown University presents its annual program of readings and songs in the spirit of the season, conducted entirely in Latin. The event will be held in the beautiful First Baptist Church in America, 75 North Main Street, Providence RI. All are welcome.

For more information, please contact the Department of Classics (401) 865-2125 or Deborah_Boedecker@brown.edu.

Brown University and the Rhode Island Classical Association will again offer a free PRE-PROGRAM WORKSHOP for Latin students and their teachers from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Monday, December 4, in Alumnae Hall at Brown University. Please contact Ruth Breindel by December 1 if you plan to attend: rbreindel@yahoo.com or (401) 591-3204.
FLUENT LATIN: A TEACHER INSTITUTE PROGRAM

July 15-21, 2001

LOCATION: Georgetown University Conference Center, Washington DC.

DIRECTOR: Professor Dexter Hoyos, Department of Classics
The University of Sydney, Australia

Learn to read like a Roman read rather than decode or decipher the Latin. Comprehend the text as it is being read. Speed read and increase your comprehension at the same time. The techniques are simple; the advantages are obvious: more Latin can be read more easily and with greater comprehension.

By using the FLUENT LATIN APPROACH the circularity of students having to translate a text into English in order to find out what the Latin means and then using the translation as a basis for comprehending and appreciating the author’s implications, allusions and nuance, is avoided. These aims, which can be used with both beginning Latin students in high school and continued with college Latin majors, can moreover be attained without overlooking the proper claims of grammatical study.

This FLUENT LATIN PROGRAM (limited to 25 participants) is designed to introduce teachers (middle and high school as well as university faculty) to this highly successful, commonsensical and workable method for teaching Latin. During this five day intensive/interactive program, Professor Hoyos will explore the following topics:

1. Basic Reading Rules for Fluent Latin
2. Problems of Latin vs. English word-order
3. Word-groups as foundation structures
4. Sentence structures
5. Principles of narrative Latin
6. Descriptive Structures: places, peoples, characters
7. Analytical sentences and Paragraphs
8. Teaching and testing fluent reading skills without translation: line analysis, punctuation and manipulation.

DEADLINE FOR REGISTRATION: December 1, 2000
For additional details, see: http://www.campanian.org/edu-vacation.html
For Information and Registration Forms contact:
The Campanian Society, Inc.
Box 167
Oxford, Ohio 45056
Telephone: (513) 524-4846
Fax: (513) 523-0276
E-mail: campania@one.net
Web Site: http://www.campanian.org

SEMINAR ON THE AENEID 6 AT NOBLE AND GREENOUGH SCHOOL.

A special seminar on Aeneid 6 (focusing on AP Vergil Syllabus) will be held on Saturday, February 10th, 2001 at the Noble and Greenough School, Dedham, MA. (9:30-4:30). The keynote speakers will be: Professor Alexander G. McKay (McMaster University) and Professor Robert M. Wilhelm (The Campanian Society, Inc.)

During the morning session (9:30-12:30), Professor McKay’s carefully designed lecture-discussion session — The Underworld Experience: Vergil, Aeneid Six — will provide an opportunity for Latin teachers, teachers of the AP Vergil syllabus, undergraduate and graduate students and university faculty to engage in detailed analysis of the “Underworld Experience” in Aeneid 6. Vergil’s account of the preliminaries to Aeneas’ descent and his “rite de passage” through the House of Dis is the central, unforgettable event of Vergil’s epic. Professor McKay’s keynote offering on the “underworld experience” in Homer, Vergil and Dante, will suggest various approaches to the narrative, to its graphic and suggestive power, and to its significance in ancient and contemporary contexts. The evocative power of the Cumaean landscape will be illustrated and explored together with the imagery and the vigor of the matchless verse. Group discussions will deal primarily with the Advanced Placement prescription, accenting didactic approaches, philosophical and religious “readings,” details of translation and interpretation and metrical effects.

At the afternoon session (1:30-4:30), Professor Robert M. Wilhelm will focus on the Aeneid as a powerful generative source for pictorial artists — “How do artists respond to the Aeneid and the Underworld Experience?” Some artists scrupulously followed the Latin text; others more imaginatively portrayed the poem’s mood; still others simultaneously attempted to adhere to the narrative and so evoke the cinematographic qualities of Vergil’s poetry. Nicolo dell’Abate (1512-1571), a northern Italian painter, created narrative frescoes illustrating each of the books of the Aeneid. These text-based landscape paintings vividly highlight the cinematic power of Vergil’s poetic text and the painter’s ability to depict in one painting the dramatic action of each book. Following a brief illustrated review of Abate’s fresco paintings, Professor Wilhelm will focus on the fascinating range and variety of paintings, sculptures and music which illustrate “the underworld experience” in Aeneid 6. Provocative and suggestive, the visual depictions (by Brant, Dossi, Conca, Breughel and Rubens — to name but a few) of this “central, unforgettable event of Vergil’s epic” highlight transfers of the printed word into visual image. Afternoon group discussion sessions will integrate pictorial representations with selected Advanced Placement sections in Aeneid 6.

Registration in this seminar will be limited in order to facilitate maximum participation and discussion. Deadline for registration: Friday, January 19, 2001. Early registration is advised. For Registration Forms, please contact:
MEDUSA MYTHOLOGY EXAM 2001
Supporting Classics Education

The Medusa Committee announces the 6th annual "Medusa Mythology Exam." Available to students of Latin & Greek in grades 9-12, the Medusa was created in order to encourage the study of myth and to allow students to excel and be recognized in that field. The exam contains 50 multiple choice questions. Nine Committee Members and dozens of Review Panelists prepare the Medusa. The theme of this year's exam is "Monsters, Beasts, & Creatures." Sources include the works of ancient authors and modern secondary works. Top achievers on the exam receive certificates, and medals imported directly from Italy. High scorers will have the opportunity to apply for several cash prizes. Fees are $2 per student plus a $15 school fee. The exam will be administered during the week of April 2-6, 2001. Registration packets are available from December 1, 2000 through March 1, 2001. Downloading of packets via WWW is encouraged.

US MAIL:
Medusa Mythology Exam
8052 Crooked Oaks Court
Gainesville, Virginia 20155
VOX: (800) 886-4671
FAX: (703) 242-0718 Covington

WORLD WIDE WEB:
http://medusaexamLcjb.net

EMAIL:
medusaexam-laltavista.net

2000 FOX WRITING CONTEST AT MONMOUTH COLLEGE

The Department of Classics at Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois, is proud to announce the winners of the sixteenth annual Bernice L. Fox Classics Writing Contest. The goal of this year’s contest, open to all high school students, was for the students to describe twelve labors suitable to Hercules at the end of the second millennium, telling how he would accomplish them while making frequent reference to the original myth. 316 entries were received from forty-eight schools in 17 states. Each entrant receives a certificate of participation from Monmouth College, Palo Alto, California.

The winner of a $150 cash award is Shannon Perkins of Thornton Academy in Saco, Maine, student of Mrs. Sally Cody.

Honorable mentions (listed randomly by school) were awarded to the following fifteen students: Stefanie Resch at Academy of the Holy Names in Tampa, Florida (Teacher: Ms. Darlene Bailey); Brandi Hewitt at Shelbyville High School in Shelbyville, Indiana (Teacher: Mrs. Schwicrkrauth); Danielle Niedert at Bishop Dunne High School in Dallas, Texas (Teacher: Angela Cummings); Kate M. Bock at Rosary High School in Aurora, Illinois (Teacher: Mrs. Spencer); Steve Bohinc, Nick Iannamuto and Matt MacEwan at Hawken Upper School in Gates Mills, Ohio (Teacher: Mrs. Gill); Margo Bouchie at Thornton Academy in Saco, Maine (Teacher: Mrs. Sally Cody); Jeb White at James River High School in Midlothian, Virginia (Teacher: Mrs. Donna Dollings); Tara Schultz at Houston High School in Germantown, Tennessee (Teacher: Mr. Ryan Sellers); Sarah Woodson and Eric Dutko at Coginchaug Regional High School in Durham, Connecticut (Teacher: Mrs. Sersanti); Diana Rzaznek at Loyola Academy in Wilmette, Illinois (Teacher: Mr. David Mathers); Christopher R. Fiasni at University of Detroit Jesuit High School in Detroit, Michigan (Teacher: Mr. Young); and Rita Lomio at Castilleja School in Criswell.

This essay contest honors Bernice L. Fox who taught English, Latin, and Greek at Monmouth College from 1947 to 1981 and who also served for some time as chair of the Department of Classics. Dr. Fox has spent much of her life in promoting the study of Latin in Illinois high schools. The college welcomes suggestions for future contest topics. Please contact Dr. Thomas J. Sienkewicz, Capron Professor of Classics, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois, 309-457-2571. E-mail: toms@momm.edu. Visit the contest website at:
http://department.momm.edu/classics/Department/FoxContest/
**Meter And Meaning**

**Hanna Roisman**

**Colby College**

In Greek tragedy, meter is used mainly to distinguish between dialogue and song. Dialogue is usually in iambic trimeter, which Aristotle considers suitable for speech (Poetics 1449a18). Songs are sung in a variety of lyric meters, which are sometimes interspersed with iambics but rarely with iambic trimeter, and often serve as a setting for dance.

Meter can be used for other purposes as well, however. The first such instance in a surviving Greek play is found in the Agamemnon, in which Aeschylus plays off iambic and lyric to convey mood and further the development of the plot. A notable example occurs in the scene of Cassandra’s divinations, where meter underscores the Chorus’s change of mood as they listen to what Cassandra has to say. Cassandra’s _kommos_ (1072-1177) falls into two main parts, structured in a design of strophe and antistrope. In the first part (1072-1115), Cassandra sings in wild lyrics and the Chorus answers in the insistent iambic trimeter. The contrast between her song and the Chorus’s spoken reply is heightened by the divergence from the convention binding the strophic structure to iambic meters. The effect is to stress the Chorus’s aversion to the content of Cassandra’s utterances.

In the second part (1115-1177), Cassandra’s lyric utterances are tempered by the introduction of some iambic trimeters, while the Chorus and the Choral Leader (whichever is speaking) abandon their trimeters and start to sing with Cassandra, mainly in excited doxicae. The change in the choral meters coincides with the shift in the content of Cassandra’s statements. The Chorus and Choral Leader respond in iambic trimeter as long as Cassandra sings about the primal curse arising from Atreus’s crime—that is, as long as she sings about the past of which they are fully aware— as well as when she moves to divine Agamemnon’s murder as an outcome of the curse cast on the House of Atreus (1100-1104, 1107-1111, 1114-1118). Their trimeter conveys their calm, denial, and distancing. They lose their equilibrium and burst into lyrics when Cassandra personally predicts the king’s imminent death at his wife’s hands (1121 ff., 1138 ff.).

Some dramatists use meter for broader purposes as well: to enhance characterization, define interactions, and convey meaning. This paper analyzes two scenes, one from Euripides’ _Alcestis_, the other from Sophocles’ _Electra_, to show how the interplay of lyric and iambic trimeter works to these ends.

(a) Admetus in mourning

Euripides is well known for his use of meter to portray character and to accentuate his characters’ interaction. Prime examples of this can be found in the exchange between the dying Alcestis and her husband and in the Child’s song and Admetus’s reply. In both cases, the exploitation of contrasting meters highlights the emotional distance between the characters.

The exchange between Alcestis and her husband takes place in the shadow of the Chorus’s expression of doubt about the felicity of married life:

> oụ̂p̄tê σφού γούμων εὐφραίνειν
> πλέων ἡ λυπεία, τοῖς τε πάνοιρεν
> τεκμαφόρειναι καὶ πᾶς νόιαν
> λείασων βασιλέως, διὰ τοῦ τρίτίτης
> ἀπαλάκων δίλογον τίς ἀβίων
> τὸν ἔπεται χρόνον βιώσαντες.

(238-45)

> Never will I say that marriage brings
> more happiness than grief, judging from things

3. _Dochmiac_ is traditionally associated in Greek tragedy with heightened emotional excitement of either joy or sorrow, see Th. Rosenmeyer, M. Ostwald, J.W. Halporn, The Metre of Greek and Latin Poetry (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1963) 50-51; W.C. Scott, Musical Design in Aeschylean Theater (Harvard and London: University Press of New England, 1984) 66. Cf. also D.J. Conacher, _Aeschylus’_ Oresteia: Commentary (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987) 40–48. On the chorus’s doxicae see also Fraenkeli, _Aeschylus: Agamemnon_, vol II, 539: “Infected, as it were, by the outcry of the unfortunate maiden, they are swept off from their cool moderation and rushed into the excitement of doxicae and wild movements (1211 ff.). The elemental emotions are increased in the next stanzas of the Chorus: there are no stanzics at all.” W. Kranz, Stimmung, Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragedie (Berlin: Weidemann, 1933) 20, has pointed out that the Cassandra scene contains a reversal of the typical or probably older order in which the lyrics of the chorus are followed by trimeters of the actor. In this scene one finds for the first time that the actor is not answering the chorus but leading it.


from the past and seeing also these misfortunes of our king, who, once bereaved of his most excellent wife, will live without life an intolerable existence, for his remaining time.

Their doubts stem from the pain that the survivor endures when the couple is divided by death, but these words also introduce the hint that there may be other causes of marital unhappiness as well.

The very mention of marital unhappiness is rather jarring at this point in the play. The audience has not yet seen the main protagonists, but it has heard the Chorus acclaim Alcestis' bravery and5 wisely sacrifice and bewail the loneliness and misery that Admetus will face with her loss. They expect to see a warm and loving couple come on stage: Admetus grateful for his wife's readiness to sacrifice her life for him, and Alcestis exuding love for the husband for whom she has agreed to die.

Instead, the Chorus's ominous hint is developed in the couple's exchange in lines 244-79. I call it an 'exchange' rather than 'dialogue' because it contains none of the substance that one would expect at this moment of separation between two souls who care for each other. We hear Alcestis uttering faint, almost delirious cries on her deathbed, calling upon the sun and her native land of Iolcos, and maintaining that she can see Charon, his boat and Hades himself. Admetus, on the other hand, urges her to continue living, demands that she not leave him, and bids her pray to the gods for deliverance - totally ignoring his responsibility for her plight. Alcestis, for the most part, does not acknowledge her husband's pleading and talks at him rather than to him. Her disregard reaches its peak in her rending farewell, which is addressed only to her children, with not a word for Admetus.6

Euripides uses the meter in this exchange to emphasize the couple's lack of communication. While Alcestis sings in a variety of emotive lyrical meters, Admetus's brief contributions, inserted in the midst of her songs, are spoken in unemotional iambic trimeter (246-47, 265-51, 257-58, 264-65). Then when Admetus finally abandons his iambics after Alcestis' farewell to her children, he turns to recitative anapests (273-79), midway between unemotional trimeter and lyric verse. Accentuating his cold and unemotional character, Euripides does not allow him to sing.

In no other dialogue in the play does meter so clearly mark the communication between characters.7 The pattern is set from the beginning, when Alcestis invokes the sun, daylight, and racing clouds in lyric dactylic, also known as Doric dactylic, using a mixture of prosodies:

| Α. | ἄλιε καί φῶς άμέρας,  
| | οὐφάναι τε δίναι νεφέλας δραματικ. | (244-45) |
| Α. | Συν καὶ άλλαν νηφίου,  
| | ἀννέπτεραι νέφελες. | (246-47) |

Ad. | Ποῦδιν τε κάμϊ, τοῦτον κακοὺς πεπραγώτσας,  
| | οὐδέν θεοὺς δροσαντας ἀνθίστησθω σοι. | (246-47) |

The sun sees you and me, the two of us suffering, who have done nothing against the gods for which you should die.

Tragedians use iambic trimeter, the meter that Aristotle notes most closely approximates ordinary speech, when they do not want poetic elevation. Euripides has given this meter to Admetus in the emotionally charged scene of his wife's dying. Moreover, Admetus's iambics aim at minimum resolution, thus further reinforcing the conversational quality of his words.8

Alcestis' lyric dactylic are evocative and symbolic, with the sun and daylight symbolizing life in the Greek mind as early as Homer and the racing clouds, emblematic of Alcestis' imminent death, skirting preSocratic echoes. Admetus' iambic reply is couched in what Dale describes as the "matter-of-fact manner of the healthy earth-bound individual" (on lines 246-47). The difference in meter reinforces the discontinuity in content. Admetus's reply picks up the image of the sun; but instead of answering Alcestis' anguished cry for life, Admetus takes the opportunity to expel himself from

---

6 For a markedly different view see W.D. Smith, "The Iconic Structure in Alcestis," in Twenty-First Century Interpretations: Euripides' Alcestis ed. J.R. Wilson (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968) 47-55.45: "There is no indication in the play that Alcestis is disappointed in her husband in her final moments. Alcestis is not cold. Alcestis perhaps has a reason to be disappointed, but the text gives no indication that Euripides intended her to show it."

7 Cf. Roesensmeyer, Ostwald, Halpom, The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry 20-21; D.J. Coraloe, Euripides: Alcestis (Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1988) 244-79: "The contrast between Alcestis' lyric verses and Admetus' spoken and then chanted ones serves to emphasize the psychic distance which, for all Admetus' attempts to bridge it, continues throughout Alcestis' monody." Also, Barlow, The Imagery of Euripides 57: "At no point do her words engage in reciprocal relation with those of Admetus who is wrapped up in his own platitudes and concern for his own grief." Only when Admetus falters, Barlow maintains, does reality impinge on Admetus. At this point "his sudden outbreak into recitative anapests at 273 (the most, one is tempted to think, of which he is capable) reflects this emotional change." I doubt that even then there is a recognition of ultimate reality, but I admit that Euripides must have intended to show some kind of emotionality on Admetus' part.

8 That is, with two short substitutions for a long one, in line 276.
her death and whine that the gods are unfair. Admetus’s iambics highlight his egotism and insensitivity.

The contrasting meter similarly highlights the discontinuities in the next statement and counterstatement, in which Alcestis continues with her own train of thought and does not even trouble to comment on her husband’s complaint:

Al. γοία τε και μελάθρων στέγαι 
νωμίδοι τε κοίται πατρίας ἰωλκοῦ.

Ad. ἐπικοινωνεῖν, ὅ τάλανα, μὴ προδόσαι 
λίσσοι δὲ τοὺς κρατοῦντας οἰκτίραι θεοῦ. (248-51)

Al. My land and the chambers of my home, 
and the marriage beds of my homeland Ilocus.

Ad. Raise yourself, poor woman. Do not abandon me. 
Pray to those who have power, the gods, to pity us.

Here, Alcestis’ evocative lyric dactyls convey the poignant of her leave-taking. Moving from her contemplation of the sky, she lets her mind rest on the two places on earth that are most meaningful to her: her home Ilocus and Phereas, where she lived after her marriage. Whether her failure to acknowledge Admetus’s previous remarks is an intentional snub or indicative of her diminishing consciousness of her surroundings, she makes no effort to establish or maintain contact with him. Admetus, for his part, is even more detached from the reality of Alcestis’ impending death and, instead of comforting her, takes just this moment to scold and to accuse her of betraying him.

The cross-communication continues through the next three reprises. The first two are structured as strophe and antistrophe, as their first exchange was; the last is an epode answered by Admetus’s anapests. With one possible exception, Alcestis consistently follows her own train of thought with no regard for what her husband has said before, while Admetus picks up on her statements only insofar as they affect him.

In her third stanza, Alcestis sings of Charon waiting to ferry her to Hades, while Admetus responds with commonplace almost like a refrain:

εἴλεξις. ὁ δύσοδαμος, σοι πάσχωνε. (252-58)

Al. I see the little two-oared boat on the mere. 
Charon, the ferryman of the dead 
with his hand on the pole 
already summons me: “Why are you delaying?” 
Hurry up! You’re keeping us!” So urging he rushes me along.

Ad. Alas! Bitter indeed for me is the crossing you speak of. 
O ill-fated! How we are suffering!

Descending to her third landmark, Alcestis has reached the crossing point into the underworld, in the liminal position between earth and the Otherworld below. Her strophe and antistrophe are longer; more expressive, and more vivid than the two-line evocations that had preceded them. They depict what she hears and sees as her new reality engulfs her. While these lines continue to illustrate her detachment from her husband, they may also be understood as a desperate attempt to get his focused attention. It is as if they are saying: “Look at me, I have to go now!”

Her pain, isolation, and desperation are emphasized by the change in the structure and meter of her lines. Yet despite the change in the tone, substance, and rhythm of Alcestis’ song, Admetus’s response remains as tuneless and prosaic as ever. To her implicit plea for understanding, he replies with the assertion that her crossing will be painful for him. The persistent uniformity of his stichic, iambic lines, contrasting as it does with the metrical variety of Alcestis’ sung words, emphasizes his failure to be moved by her pain and his continued concentration on himself. Moreover, the likelihood that Alcestis’ singing was accompanied by a musical instrument, while Admetus’s statements were not, yet further reinforces the discrepancy between her emotion-filled farewell and his pragmatic self-concern.

By her fourth singing part, Alcestis moves from being a passenger on Charon’s boat awaiting her dispatch to Hades to being led or pulled away, first by some nameless figure (+οί), then by a winged Death (I accept Dale’s reading):

Al. ἁγεί μοι ἁγεί τις ἁγεί με τίς -- σοὶ ὀρᾶθι -- 
νεκύων ἐς αὐλών, 
ὑπ’ ἀφρέσε καυναγέσί 
βλέπων πτερωτὸς ὁ -- ταῖος. 
[μέθες με] τε βέκεις ἄρες -- σοι οἶαν οἶαν ὁ δει - 
λαό ματριστό προβαίνω. (259-263)

Al. Pulling me, someone pulling, someone is pulling me away — 
don’t you see? — to the edge of the dark.
Winged, looking at me from underneath
eyebrows gleaming blue-black — Hades.

[Let me go!] What are you doing? Let go! Such is the miserable
road I am setting out on.

The intent of Alcestis’ meter becomes somewhat ambiguous. Certainly, it takes her
further and further away from her prosaic husband. At the same time, one cannot be
sure that such is her purpose, and that her uneven, emotive meter does not reflect a last
attempt to rouse her husband to a more feeling and more meaningful response. The
likelihood that she is trying to rouse him is suggested by her agonized question “οὐχ
ὁδεῖς” — “Don’t you see?!” While this may be a purely impersonal invocation, it is more
likely that it is addressed to Admetus. Alcestis’ next address will be to Hades (μεθύς με),
and in the epode that follows she addresses her attendants. Her penchant for specificity
suggests that she is specific here as well. One should note that in the second time that
she mentions the word νεκρόν “the dead,” as if to remind Admetus of the immediacy of
her demise.

While Alcestis’ metrics and words leave open the question whether she is pointedly
ignoring her husband or is ambivalent, the contrast between her meters and her
husband’s steady iambs continues to underline the emotional distance between them:

A. oiktóron filoiōn, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μάλιστ’ ἔμοι
καὶ παιδίον, οἷς δὴ πένθος ἐν κοινῷ τόδε.
(264-65)

A pitiful road for your loved ones, and especially for me
And for the children, common partners in this grief.

Admetus’s reply that her death will grieve those dear to her - himself (put first) and her
children (put second) - makes it clear that he accepts her death as a fait accompli. The
grief he speaks of sharing in is the grief of those who will lose her, not her grief in dying.
His dull iambs reinforce his nonparticipation in Alcestis’ desperate clinging to her last
minutes of life.

The discontinuity of discourse between husband and wife reaches its peak in the
epode, where Alcestis sings of her decline into death and bids farewell to her children:

A. μήπετε μήπετε μ’ ἁπν.
κλίνατ’, οὗ σέθεν ποσίν
πλησίον Ἀιδώς,
σκότα β’ ἐπ’ ὅσα οἶός ἐφ’ ἐσται,
τέκνα, τέκν’ οὐκέτα, δὴ
οὐκέτα μάτηρ σφόν ἔστιν.
γαλαντεῖς, ἐκ τέκνα, τόδε οὖς οὐκέτον.
(266-72)

(to the attendants) Let go! Let go of me now!
Lay me down! I have no strength in my legs.
Hades is very near.
Shady night creeps over my eyes.
O children, children your mother
is no more, no more.
O children, farewell — may you look with joy at this light!

In response, Admetus, oblivious to both her anguish and her snub, yet again exhorts
her to stay alive and offers an exposition of the grief her death will cause him and their
children:

A. ὁμοὶ τέθ’ ἐπος λυποῦν ἄκοινο
καὶ παντὸς ξύλι βαθύναν μείζων.
μὴ πρός (σο) θεοὶ τής με προδοῦναι,
μὴ πρός παιδίων οὐς ἀφανισές,
ἀλλ’ ἄνα, τέλματα
σοι γὰρ φθιενῆς οὐκέτ’ ἐν εἴνην
ἐν σοι β’ ἐσμέν καὶ ζῶν καὶ μή
σιν γάρ φιλίαν σεβόμεθα.
(273-79)

Alas! This is a painful word I hear,
more so for me than any death.
By the gods, do not dare to abandon me!
By the children whom you orphan, do not.
Get up now! Be brave!
With you gone, I would be finished!
To live or die, we depend on you.
For we revere your love.

Admetus delivers his admonition in a recitative in an anapestic system. Unlike the
complicated lyric variations found in Alcestis’ last song, the meter here is gallingly
regular. In pure anapests, a longum and a double breve are equivalent, which enables
either to stand in place of the other without straining the rhythmic sequence. This
capacity makes anapests a firm and regular meter suitable for musical settings of marches
and processions, but not for emotional outbursts. To be sure, the anastepic system in
these lines is handled more freely; we see for example recurrence of resolutions (273,
275, 277), a considerable accumulation of longs in lines 276 and 278, catalexis in line 279.
Such freedom is often seen in anastepic series in lyrical passages. Nonetheless,
Admetus’s use of anastepes just when his wife is about to die illustrates his failure to
repond to her summons, suggests that he does not realize what is happening to her, and
yet further accentuates his emotional obtuseness and rigidity.

The contrast in the meters of the two participants in this ‘exchange’ thus shows each locked in his or her own separate reality. It both illustrates and reinforces the discontinuities of their discourse and their lack of emotional contact. In the context of the play as a whole, it brings home the tragic implications of their discord.

Euripides’ use of meter in Alcestis to show character and the interaction between characters is a first in Greek tragedy, and Alcestis is the only one of his tragedies in which meter has such an important function both in characterization and in conveying meaning. In other plays, he uses meter to emphasize character and, like Aeschylus, to convey mood, but not to virtually ‘make’ character, as he does in Alcestis.10

In Alcestis, Euripides reinforces the function of the meter in characterizing the main protagonists by embedding the exchange between husband and wife in a system of strophe and antistrophe. In this structure, generally conveyed in sung lyrical meters and accompanied by music and dance, the intrusion of iambic trimeter is particularly striking. Traditionally the strophic structure is used in Greek tragedy to frame the Chorus’s songs and at times exchanges between the chorus and a character. The rarity of its use when two characters are speaking suggests the deliberateness of Euripides’ choice. While other instances of its use with two characters can be found (Prom. 561-612; Eur. Andr. 501-544), they are few, and none develops character in the way that those in the Alcestis do.

(b) Emotional Electra and Pragmatic Orestes

In his Electra, Sophocles uses strategies similar to those of Euripides and Aeschylus. Aeschylus plays on the inherent emotional contrast between iambic and lyric meters to convey mood and to heighten the tension of the plot. Euripides uses the contrast to reveal character and the interplay and tension between characters. Sophocles does both.

W.C. Scott has already pointed out the extent to which the variation in lyric meters, especially in the kommos (825-70), is used to underscore the divergence of views between

Electra and the Chorus.11 However, Sophocles does not use the meter here for the purpose of characterization - perhaps because the exchange is with the Chorus, a twelve-member group, which is not a character.

A better illustration of the use of meter for characterization can be found in the recognition scene between brother and sister, which W.C. Scott regards as Electra’s most powerful dramatic scene in all her 1455 lines on stage.12 This is the only recognition scene structured as a quasi-duet in the extant Sophoclean drama. As soon as Orestes reveals himself and Electra realizes that the urn she holds does not contain his ashes, she bursts into song (1232-1257), overjoyed at seeing her brother and forgetful that the revenge she had longed for in his absence is still to be executed. Orestes, ever pragmatic and mindful of his mission, repeatedly tries to temper her premature joy. Electra’s song is arranged by strophe, antistrophe, and an epode. Within the strophe Orestes tries to calm her down in iambics, except for line 1280, where he declares in a bacchiac following Electra’s rhythm, with whom he shares the line. R.P. Winnington-Ingrain observes of this scene: “Surely the most striking feature in the episode is that, when Orestes joins his sister in her song of joy, he does not sing and contributes little except words of caution. Emotion is refueled.”13

Electra’s strophe starts with an iambic monometer, double dochmiac and dochmiac, conveying her emotional upheaval, then loosens into an iambic trimeter:

HAI.

| o γοναί, |
| γοναὶ σωμάτων ἔμοι φιλάττων |
| έμπλητ' ἄρτιος, |
| ἑρπὺρετ', ἥθετ', εἰδεβ' ὁ ἄρνητε. |

(1232-35)14

El. O child!
child of the body dearest to me,
now finally you have come, have found, arrived,
you have seen those for whom you longed.

Electra’s emotional upheaval reveals itself in her addressing Orestes as if he were her own child, even though he stands before her as a grown man, and in her physical, quasi-incestuous reference to her father’s body as most beloved to her. Further conveying her

10 This can be seen in the plays he wrote between 412-408 BCE, in which he experimented in reproducing Aeschylus’s use of meter to convey mood. In the Helen (625-97), Iphigenia in Tauris (827-99), Phoenissae (103-201), and Io (1457-509), the meter highlights the characters’ emotional states and heightens the tension of their exchanges by having characters move to lyrical meters as their excitement grows. Thus, Merenda adds a lyrical meter to his iambic trimeters Helen (625-97) and Cressus and Iphigenia move from iambic trimeter to lyrical meters as their excitement grows (Iphigenia in Tauris 627-99; Io 1437-509). The Phoenissae can serve as an example. In this tragedy, the play on meters occurs in the teloskphos (viewing from the wall) scene (103-201), in which, at Antigone’s request, her tutor describes the opponent who scheme to attack the seven gates of Thebes, and Antigone comments on the information. The exchange, put together in an irregular pattern, consists of the tutor’s relatively brief descriptions in unfailing iambic trimeter and of Antigone’s abrupt utterances in a variety of unpredictable lyrical meters, especially epeictic dochmiac. The variation in her meters conveys her inner turmoil and lack of moderation and restraint, and emphasizes the difference between her character and the tutor’s, but its main effect is to convey her emotional upset. It is not as carefully crafted as in the Alcestis and is less important both to Antigone’s characterization and the understanding of the play as a whole. Much the same can be said about the play of meter in other scenes noted above. Cf. Aesch. Seven 572-685, where Echeces and the Messenger speak iambics, the Chorus sings responsively until line 477 when they turn to iambics.


12 Musical Design in Sophoclean Theater 150.


14 Although the colometry and the text follow mostly A.C. Pearson, Sophocles Fabular (Oxford Classical Texts, 1967) the edition of H.Lloyd-Jones & N.G. Wilson, Sophocles Fabular (Oxford Classical Text, 1990) has been consulted.
confusion is her use of the plural σώματα (σώματα), which is not only "bold," as Jebb notes, but also illogical and uncommon.16

Then, as Electra seems to be losing her grip, Sophocles moves her to iambic trimeter (1256), the unemotional meter of dialogue. Her next statement is arranged in a tricolon, a highly effective rhetorical figure, the best known example of which is Caesar’s “veni, vidi, vici.” The asyndeton that characterizes a tricolon gives the impression of compactness, and the figure lifts Electra somewhat from her raving into a more rational state, since to use it, one must be thinking with some logic. On the other hand, her tricolon is semantically anacoluthic. The proper sequence is of course that Orestes came, then found those for whom he longed. The effect is a certain tension between the more relaxed meter and logical trope and the content of Electra’s words.

This tension dissipates when Orestes picks up her pedestrian iambic trimeter in his rational advice that she quiet down:

| Or. πάρεσμεν· ἀλλὰ σὺν ἐγώ σοι πρόσεμεν. (1236) |
| Or. Yes, I am here. But wait and keep silence. |

Up in arms, Electra demands to know why in a short bacchic, while Orestes, trying to soothe her, reminds her in his usual iambic trimeter that they are not safe and might be overheard:

| El. τί β’ ἔστιν; |
| Or. σιγάν δεμένου, μή τις εὐθείων κλίνῃ. (1237-1238) |
| Or. Why? |
| Or. It is better to be silent, lest someone inside hear us. |

Electra responds with a rebellious outburst of five lines composed in six different meters: molossus, cretic, doximia, double doximia, iambic dimeter catalectic, and double bacchic.

| Ήλ. ἀλλ’ οὐ τάν ἂν τεμίν | τάν δεί ἀφήσων |
| τοῦ μὲν οὐ ποτ’ ἀδίών πρέσα, | περίσσων ἄμυκος ἄνθον γυναικῶν δι’ αἰτέι. | (1239-1242) |

El. No, by Artemis!
Ever virgin untamed,
this I will never deem worth fearing.
The superfluous burden of women, remaining always within.

The agitation evident in the changing meter is also evident in her words. Much as she had pluralized her father’s body, she now blends Clytemnestra with an amorphous band of women inside the house. Her message is that only women - not men - are in the house now, and she will not fear women. Her words περίσσων ἄμυκος (περίσσων ἄμυκος - superfluous burden) are a play on Achilles’ famous ἀκόουσαν ἄμυκος (ἀκόουσαν ἄμυκος, Il. 18.104), when the hero sees himself as “a profitless burden” who let his friend Patroclus die.17 Her casting the women inside into an Achillean mode highlights her rash fearlessness.

Jebb and others believe that Electra’s exultation stems from her conviction that her brother has come to rescue her.17 Yet there is nothing in Orestes’ continued efforts to temper her exuberance that indicates that he sees himself as her savior. He tries to bring home the danger of her enthusiasm by reminding her of her own potential for aggression even though she is a woman.

| Or. ὃ τοὺς γε μὴ γυναικές ὡς Ἀργήν ἔνεστι’ εἶ δ’ ἐξορίζῃ περισσόθεν ποι. (1243-44) |
| Or. Yet see how Ares dwells in women, too. |
| You know it well since you are proof of this. |

Rather than restrain her, his words thrust her back to the time before his arrival, when she spent her days cursing and berating Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, and plunge her into an orgy of self-pity, once again in lyric meters, doximias and cretics:

| El. ὡττοτοι ὡττοτοι, | ἀνδρῶν ἑβάλας ὡς ποτ’ καταλύσωμεν, |
| οὐδὲ ποτ’ λαόσωμεν διμέτερον | οὔκεν κακόν. | (1245-50) |

16 See also Klaiber, Sophocles’ Electra, on the line. The expression is quite unusual. In fact, it appears nowhere else in Sophocles. It is in the Electra that the noun ἄμυκος (ἀκόουσαν) appears most in Sophocles, four times (cf. Phil. once, 1166, Ant. once, 1172) and always in Electra’s words, but never anywhere else with the adjective περίσσων (περίσσων).

17 Jebb on lines 1240 ff: "These words express her new exultation in the sense that she has a brother for her deliverance."
El. Alas! Alas!
You have brought it up unveiled, never to be
resolved, never forgotten, how
our misfortune began.

Weary of her lack of moderation, Orestes again tries to make her aware of the danger
they are in. In his usual iambic trimeters, he hints that delivery has not yet come. They
have not yet met Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus. The clear implication is that it will be
possible to rejoice only when the royal couple are dead.19 But the condensed, elliptical
quality of the warning and its failure to mention the royal couple explicitly shows that he
has not grasped how much in her own world and how cut off from reality his sister is.

Ορ. ἔξοδο καὶ παρονήσεις ἀλλ’ ἀτσιᾶ ἀνάριστον
φάλαινα τὸν ἔργων τόν ἐκακῶν μεθύσσει χρόνον. (1261-52)

Οξ. I know that too. But when the time tells us,
then it will be right to recall these deeds.

Failing to return to awareness and appreciate the danger of her situation, Electra
remains agitated and defiant. The start of the antistrophe repeats the movement from
iambic monometer to dochmion to iambic trimeter, as Electra says:

Ηλ. ὅ τις ἔμι,
ὅ τις ἐν πραπτοι παρών ἐνεπείν
τάδε δίκα χαίνος.
μόνις γάρ ἔχον νῦν ἐλεύθερον στόμα. (1253-56)

El. All time, for me,
all of it would be proper time
justly to announce these things.
For with difficulty did I hold my tongue which now is free.

There is some question on how to read line 1256. Does Electra proclaim that she is
restrained, as in Greene’s translation (“For hardly now are my lips free of restraint”) and
as Kells suggests, or that she has at last let her tongue loose after having had a hard time
holding it for so long?

In either case, it is clear that as far as Electra is concerned, she has already been
released from oppression even though the royal couple are still alive. She does not have
the faintest doubt that Orestes will eventually vanquish them and is oblivious to the
dangers that she and her brother still face.19 Orestes’ reply, in which he once again tries
to dampen her unrealistic enthusiasm, shows his awareness of her difficulty in holding
her tongue, whether in the past or present.

Ορ. ἐξίσωσιν κάθεις, τοιούτῳ σοὶ τόδε. (1267)

Οξ. I agree! Therefore assure it.20

In fact, Orestes continues to be quite sharp about his sister’s overly ready
expressiveness. To Electra’s sung question about what she should do to guard her
freedom of speech, Orestes responds clearly and shortly:

οὐ μὴς ὁ μαχαρὸν μὴ μακρὸν μεθύσσει νῦν 
λέγειν. (1259)

When it is not the proper time, avoid too much talk.

His forthrightness here contrasts with his earlier inexplicit hinting.

But talking sustained Electra in the fifteen years that she waited for him. Orestes
demands from her something she has never done before.

Ελ. τίς οὖν αὐτάξειν, ὅποιο
σοὶ γε τερεννύτος
μεταβάλλωσιν ὥστ’ ἄτοι κατὰ 
γάνα τάχος 
ἔτει σε νῦν ἄφροτας
δελτών τ’ ἐκείσεσον. (1260-63)

Εξ. Who, once you had appeared,
could thus adequately exchange
words for silence?
Since now I have seen you,
beyond expectation or hope.

19 Reading the word νῦν (nun) together with ἐξίσωσιν indicates that Electra believes that Orestes’ arrival is
equivalent to the accomplishment of the revenge. The iambic meter of line 1256, contrasting as it does with
her other meter, adds force to her assertion that she already possesses free speech, even though this
meter usually surfaces in this recognition scene only when reason operates. Her claim that she had a hard
time keeping quiet all these years also points to her loss of touch with reality.

20 The question raised by this response is what τάξις (taxis) - it refers to. Orestes does not mean “Go on
preserving this (conduct)” as Kells, Sophocles, Electra on line 125, maintains. There is nothing in the text to
indicate this interpretation. If Sophocles had meant something general like “this conduct,” it is unlikely that
he would have had Orestes use the neuter τάξις, which agrees with ἐξίσωσιν σοὶ τόδε in gender and
number. More likely, τάξις refers to his sister’s tongue which is free now and Electra is warning her to
learn it from her knowing how much about.
Although Electra listens well to Orestes' caution, it is impossible for her to keep quiet, she informs him. It is as if she believes it would be wrong for her to be quiet, now that Orestes has returned. She spoke up against the usurpers of the palace when she was on her own; she should certainly be able to speak now that she has her brother's protection.

Singing in passionate lyrics, she cannot get hold of herself. As she grows increasingly blind to the danger facing her and her brother, it becomes clear that Orestes' safe return means more to her than the revenge for which he came. When she sent him away at considerable risk to herself, she was probably more concerned with his safety than with any revenge he would wreak in the future. Now she is simply happy to see him alive.

Unmoved, Orestes responds acerbically in his eternal iambics, brushing away her mild complaint about his delay in returning: "You see me when the gods moved me to come" (1264). Instead of explaining the delay, he offers an indisputable observation which tells his sister that it would have been untimely for him and against the gods if he had come earlier. His reply extends for another iambic line, which has been lost.

Electra's response in the ode indicates that the missing line has not changed his message. Not taking offense at her brother's ineptly hanging his late return on the gods, she turns the delay into a propitious sign:

_HL._ ἔφρασας ύπερτέραν
τὰς τάρος ἐτι χόριτος, ε’ σε θεός ἐπόρισεν
ἐμέτερα πρὸς μέλαράς σαΐμύνιον
αὐτὸ τίθημ’ ἐγώ. (1265-70)

_EL._ You have told me
of a grace greater than the one before, if a god
has brought you to our house. I reckon
this a miracle.

Refusing to allow her brother to disappoint her, Electra, once again ignoring his prompt for spoken iambics and singing in dochmias and cretics, turns the lateness of his return into the work of heaven.

And yet once again Orestes answers in iambics, still refusing to succumb to his sister's emotionality, whether in words or meter. His answer this time is blunt and straightforward:

τὰ μὲν σ’ ἥκιν ἀνάροσοι συγγεθέν, τὰ δὲ
δέδοικα λίων ἄδικη νεκρεύψην. (1271-72)

_I shrink from checking your joy, but_
_I fear that you have been too much overcome by your pleasure._

Up to here, Electra's responses have been to the point and have fit Orestes' statements. Now she snaps. She launches into the same iambic monometer with which she had started her previous exchange of strophe and antistrophe, then moves to a double dochmias plus an iamb and a bacchic, and from there back to iambics:

_HL._ ἰὼ χρόνον
μοιράσας ἠλτάται ὄδειν ἐπαξίω’
σας ὄδει μοι φανήσαι,
μὴ τι μὲ, πολύτοιον ὄδ’ ἱδών
_Or. τὶ μὴ ποησώι_
_HL._ μὴ μ’ ἀποστερήσῃς
tῶν σῶν προσάτων δῶδον μεθέσθαι. (1273-78)

_EL._ O! When after such a long time
you have decided to make
this journey dearest to me, and to me thus appear,
do not, seeing me so miserable—

_Or._ What should I not do? _El._ Do not deprive me
of the pleasure of your face, to give it up.

Why she suddenly believes that Orestes will leave is unclear. She seems to misunderstand his warning that her joy is premature. Her iambics underscore the importance to her of the actual sight of her brother, which means more to her than his mission, and her illogical fear of losing sight of him. Once she senses real danger, she comes out of her lyrical trance, becomes less emotional and, with the exception of a short excited bacchic in 1278, moves to Orestes' iambic trimeter.

But then when she hears what Orestes has to say about her fear, she recedes into trochaics. The trochaic meter has not yet been heard in this play. Its debut in the final part of the last stanza of the recognition scene is contrived to gain the spectators' attention by introducing them to a new musical accompaniment:

_Or._ ἢ κάρστα κἀν ἄλλοις θυμολήν ἰδών.
_HL._ ξυμαίνεις; _Or._ τι μὴν ὦ;
_HL._ οὗ, ᾐκλυον ἐν ἐγὼ αὐθ’ ἐν ἄλτιοι αὐθάν.;
ἔσχον ἀργὰν ἄναλουν
οῦδε σὺν βοᾶ κλύσειν’ ἀ κλαίων.
νὸν δ’ ἔσχον σε’ προσάργησθε δὲ
φιλίτατον ἔχον πρόσωποιν,
δει ἐγὼ αὐθ’ ἐν ἐν κακοὶς λαθοίμαν. (1279-87)

_Or._ I would be angry indeed if I saw this in others.
_EL._ So you agree? _Or._ How not?
El.  O my dear! I have heard a voice I never hoped to hear.
When I heard, wretched me,
I kept my anger voiceless, without a cry.
But now I have you. You have come
with your dearest face,
which I never could forget even in my misfortunes.

Electra's last lines (1281-87) are the apogee of her delight at seeing her brother alive and in Argos. Sophocles underscores them with the new trochaic rhythm.

Her rapture is sharply contrasted with the emotional bluntness of Orestes' next speech, delivered of course in iambics. In this long speech, Orestes demands that Electra stop prattling about her joy and tell him how best to ambush the royal couple. He even warns her not to reveal her joy in her facial expression (1288-300). His speech can hardly be interpreted as polite or cordial:

τὸ υἱὸν περισσεύοντα τῶν λόγων ὑφες,
καὶ μήτη μήτη ώς κοιλὴ διβασκέ με
μήτη ὡς πυρρόν πτερόν Αἰγίδου ὑδατόν
ἀντεί, τὸ δ' ἐχεῖ, τὸ δ' διστασεῖρε μάτην
(1288-1291)

Give up these excesses of words,
do not instruct me how wicked my mother is,
nor how Agisthos is emptying our father's wealth
from the household, squandering or wasting it ....

Electra eventually regains her balance and cooperates with her brother. Moving into iambic trimeter (1301-21), she gives Orestes the information he needs and promises to keep her joy to herself.

Electra's meters in this scene indicate that she is in much the same state of heightened emotionality as she was at the very beginning of the play, when Orestes and the pedagogue overheard her passionate cry: ἴσαι μοι μιὸ δυστυχος, "O poor wretched me!" (77). Sophocles emphasizes the idea that only such emotionality could have enabled a relatively young woman to hold on to her hatred for so many years and to persist in expecting the unlikely return of her brother and his taking revenge on the wrongdoers. Most people would have given up the hope and probably the hatred as well.

The recognition scene again reveals Electra to be an utterly impractical, unrealistic person, who acts as if revenge had already been taken and there is no need for fear or caution. But only such a person, who ignores danger, could have acted as courageously as Electra did in saving her young brother, and as persistently as she did in waiting lonely and scorned for his return, with utter disregard for her personal comfort.

Orestes is Electra's total opposite. Reinhardt describes him as 'stripped of tragic weight.' Winnington-Ingram calls him: 'purposeful and efficient, given to military language, committed to an intrigue about which he feels (except in one particular) no scruple.' His refusal to partake in or even respond to his sister's lyrical passion in the pivotal, emotionally charged reunion and recognition scene emphasizes his cold, obdurate intent to regain the throne, whatever the bloodshed involved. The clear contrast between Electra's lyrical meters and Orestes' iambics conveys the moral and emotional gulf between her total impracticality and his calculated cold-bloodedness.21

The use of meter to contrast characters is special to this scene.22 The length to which Sophocles has gone here to use meter to differentiate between Electra and Orestes may be appreciated by contrasting this scene with the recognition scene between Electra and Paedagogus which soon follows (1354-1363). When the old servant to whom she has entrusted the baby Orestes comes on stage and scolds both brother and sister for putting off their revenge, Electra at first fails to recognize him. As soon as Orestes tells her who he is, however, she bursts out into another of her shrilly joyous greetings, embracing and hugging the old man. Indeed, Kells sees her caressing his hands and feet as almost grotesque (on lines 1357-58). The pedagogue's discomfort and impatience as he exclaims: ὅρταν δεικτε μει - "I think we've had enough of that!" (1354) resemble Orestes' in lines 1288 ff. Yet Sophocles does not contrive the interaction between Electra and the pedagogue through lyrics and iambics but lets both characters express their feelings in the conversational iambic trimeter. Since the pedagogue is a minor character who does not reappear, Sophocles has no need to sculpt these two figures further or to point up the differences in their personalities.  


22 The characterization of Electra and Orestes through their mentic difference may have served Sophocles in yet another way. Gellie, Sophocles: A Reading 122, has already noted that in his recognition scene, Sophocles uses none of the Aeschylean delays. There is no fumbling with recognition tokens, no putting of identities to the proof. When Orestes decides to reveal himself, he says he is Orestes in one line and proves it with a ring in the next; Electra is at once convinced. "The scene is stretched, however, through Electra's impatience to the immediate need to act. Thus Sophocles manages both to keep the recognition scene to its usual length and to create tension - if not about the success of the recognition itself, then in regard to its favorable outcome.

I would like to thank my friend Karen Gillum of Colby College for her wise advice.
Innovation vs. Tradition: 
The Roman Vault and the Flat Ceiling

Roger Ulrich
Dartmouth College

Much of what we learn and teach about Roman architecture is based upon those surviving remnants of a building that have survived for us to observe, measure, and photograph. This paper intends to consider briefly what we can no longer see, particularly the wooden structural and decorative elements of Roman architecture that have, in most contexts (and all the ones discussed here), completely disappeared.

In the following discussion the focus will be upon the roles played by wooden ceilings and roofs, because it was in these very applications that builders faced their greatest technical challenges and here that we can draw some initial conclusions about the coexistence and even the dialogue between the "innovative" and the "traditional" in Roman architecture.

The importance of wooden roofs and ceilings in Roman architecture is easy to overlook; no wooden roof from the Roman world survives.1 Conversely, there are stunning examples of ceilings constructed of concrete vaults or carved in stone; some of these remain virtually intact. The visual impact of extant stone and concrete vaults has understandably inspired some of the most enthusiastic and eloquent modern essays on Roman architecture. Compared to the soaring vaults of bath buildings or domed temples, wooden ceilings and roofs seem somehow old-fashioned and technically second-rate.

To begin to appreciate the importance of the timber ceiling and roof in Roman architecture, however, we need only consider this: the largest rooms of many of the most prestigious public structures of Rome were covered with timber roofs and flat coffered ceilings. In the Roman Forum, until the fourth century AD, all the public basilicas, the temples, and the Senate House were roofed with timber frames and coffered ceilings.

Another important point: when it came to covering immense spaces based upon a square or rectangular plan, and the intent was to create an interior unencumbered by supplementary supports, there was, surprisingly, no advantage in using a vault over a timber roof. That is, with the exception of the domed structure (which is of limited application as far as public or domestic building goes), Roman barrel and cross vaults never spanned greater spaces than the flat timber ceiling.

Indeed, if we attempt to list the ten largest and broadest rectangular spaces (in terms

1 Structural roofing timbers have been found in large numbers at Herculanenum, preserved by virtue of having been carbonized. A carbonized ceiling of plain boards is preserved intact from a portico in the House of the Mosaic Altar at Herculanenum.

of free-span) ever covered in the Roman world we discover the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument, location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Clear Span in Roman Feet</th>
<th>Type of Roof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odeum, Pompeii</td>
<td>80 B.C.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeum, Athens</td>
<td>15 B.C.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirèctorium, Rome</td>
<td>7 B.C.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeum, Augusta Praetoria</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aula Regia, Rome</td>
<td>92 A.D.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesario Iuvi, Rome</td>
<td>92 A.D.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilia Ulpia, Rome</td>
<td>115 A.D.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. of Venus and Roma, Rome</td>
<td>135 A.D.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Basilica,&quot; Trier</td>
<td>300 A.D.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilica Nova, Rome</td>
<td>312 A.D.</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>Truss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these ten only the last, the fourth century emperor Maxentius's Basilica Nova, is known to have been planned from the outset to be covered with a cross-vault (it is also the latest chronologically and the shortest of the spans). All the others: the covered theaters, the basilicas, the single temple, voting place (Dirèctorium) of Rome, and the palatial halls, were covered with timber roofs and flat wooden ceilings.2 All were high-status projects, built at great expense for public entertainment or governing. Six stood in the Capitol. All but two were built by Hadrianic times. From this list it is also evident that the greatest span the Roman architect dared to cross without the benefit of additional support was about 100 Roman feet, just under thirty meters.

These enormous spans were technically possible for two reasons. The first was the Roman adoption and exploitation of the tie-beam truss, a simple triangular configuration of two main rafters and a horizontal tie-beam, fastened together at each corner (fig. 1). Roman builders

fig.1: A reconstruction of the Roman tie-beam truss. The heavy timbers of the truss support a framework of purlins and light rafters which in turn carry the tiles of the roofing. In this reconstruction, the main truss is strengthened by a vertical king post.


3Structural roofing timbers have been found in large numbers at Herculanenum, preserved by virtue of having been carbonized. A carbonized ceiling of plain boards is preserved intact from a portico in the House of the Mosaic Altar at Herculanenum.
apparently did not understand the potential (if the existence) of the tie-beam truss much before the second century B.C., and its impact upon architecture was profound. We need only call to mind the basilica, a type of building essential to the western urban cityscape and one impossible to construct as we know it without the knowledge of the tie-beam truss.

The second reason it was possible to span such cavernous spaces with timber frames was the identification, harvesting, and transport of trees tall enough to produce timbers of sufficient length. The horizontal tie-beams were formed of single timbers, and lengths of between 80 and 100 feet of sufficient uniform thickness (1.5 to 2 Roman feet or 45 - 60 cm) were found in groves of silver fir in the high Apenines or cut from stands of larch in the Alps. A few mature groves of silver fir still survive in Italy, most notably those cared for over centuries by monks of Camaldoli who culled the occasional tree to repair the ceiling of a great Italian basilica, and who still distill the sap of these firs to make medicinal liqueurs.

There existed, then, a technical knowledge, however unscientific, to build the wooden frames necessary to support the largest roofs of Rome, as well as the raw materials and the infrastructure needed to process and supply those materials to the Capital. But, we have still not answered the question of why Roman patrons often preferred timber roofs, especially as new techniques and materials, particularly vaulting in concrete, were being developed at a rapid pace, and used in other high-profile applications, particularly during the first century. Moreover, timber roofs on tall buildings were notoriously vulnerable to lightning strikes and resulting devastating fires.

The desire to build immense buildings in Rome and roof them with timber may be best explained by the roles of a conservative tradition and allusion to famed structures both real and imaginary. We know, for example, that important structures – the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline is a famous example – were regularly repaired or completely rebuilt in a manner faithful to their original appearance and many aspects of construction. In these cases tradition prescribed the appearance of a consecutive series of a single building, cloned, as it were, over time. But this type of tradition does not explain the impetus to cover the great basilicas, audience halls, or large temples in Rome with timber trusses. Neither basilicas nor imperial audience halls had an established tradition, nor was the tie-beam truss a "traditional" method of construction. Indeed, the discovery of the truss in the second century B.C. corresponds to the same period when the vault was itself first used on a large scale in major Roman building projects.

The role of illusion is another matter. The issue here is not the presence of the tie-beam truss itself but the forms the truss makes possible. On the exterior of the structure the most important feature was the triangular pediment (fascias), normally built to crown the main facade of the building. On the interior of the structure it was the flat covered ceiling supported and framed by the horizontal tie beams that inspired awe and admiration (fig. 2). These were old architectural forms, but now, with the tie-beam truss, they could be built on a scale that was inconceivable to earlier builders. Both the pediment and the covered ceiling were, as we will see, connected with notions of eastern royalty and celestial magnificence. Neither feature was associated with the form of the vault.

Literary mentions of covered ceilings (lacunaria) and pediments (fascias) are plentiful in Latin, not only in technical passages like those found in Vitruvius’s De Architectura, but in a diverse range of sources. Here we will consider a few passages that shed light on covering in particular. Sources such as Cicero and Pliny make it clear that the most beautiful of covered ceilings were not only of carved wooden panels but that these panels were gilded (apparently a type of gold leafing, a technique Pliny attributes to a craftsman named Pausias who lived in the 4th cent. B.C.). With only one or two exceptions, literary references to covered ceilings refer to buildings covered with wooden roofs, not to vaults decorated with coffers.

By the late Republican Romans were well aware that many of the most prestigious structures of the eastern Mediterranean were decorated with beautifully-carved panelled ceilings of wood. Vitruvius, for example, associated the covered ceiling with Egyptian

---


9. Pliny discusses record-sized trees in Book 16 of the Natural History. For larch (larix), e.g., see Plin. HN 16.200.

10. The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus burned and rebuilt in 83 B.C., A.D. 69, and A.D. 80. For the importance of maintaining the original plan see Dion. Hal. 4.61.4.
reception halls and also a feature of the famed Temple of Artemis at Ephesus.7 The ceiling of Solomon’s temple in Jerusalem, razed by the Roman army in the first century, was said to have been paneled in fragrant cedar.8

Such real structures— and their I talic imitators— inspired Roman poets to associate the coffered ceiling with palaces of a remote and imagined past: Ennius imagined the beams of king Priam’s palace in Troy covered with panels of gold and ivory.9 Vergil portrayed Dido in such a setting.10 In Cleopatra’s palace, says Lucan, writing nearly a century after the Egyptian queen’s suicide, “the coffered ceiling exhibited wealth, and thick gold covered the beams.”11 Of particular interest is the association of the gilt coffered ceiling with heaven. A striking example is Manilius’s poetic comparison of the coffered ceiling of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus to the layout of the sky.12

Similarly Statius compares the coffered ceiling of the imperial triclinium (Cenatio Iovi) in Domitian’s palace (the Domus Flavia) to the “golden ceiling of the sky.”13

We can make a strong case, then, that the traditional flat coffered ceiling was associated by the ancient Roman not only with Hellenistic luxury but also with heaven itself. Would this not help to explain the preference for the timbered roof in sacred contexts? Or in Imperial halls? Yet as modern students of Roman architecture we are often tempted to describe the arcing reaches of the Roman vault as the Roman builder’s expression of a divine canopy. From there we may be tempted to restore vaults in places they were never intended to be. Ironically there is little in the ancient sources to create any association between the vaulted form and the celestial realm.

Now when the Roman vault borrowed the coffered form from wooden ceilings— as it did quite early in its development to embellish its curved surfaces14—the coffered decoration itself may have imbued the vault with the ambiance we have just described as characteristic of the great timbered ceilings of the Mediterranean. Thus it may be the treatment of the surface— not the volume or form, that created the associative meaning. Interestingly Karl Lehman, in his seminal article entitled the “Dome of Heaven” published 55 years ago, recognized the profound influence of surface decoration from pre-Christian contexts on Byzantine dome mosaics— but he considered neither the significance of the flat wooden ceiling nor the coffered surface itself.15

These observations naturally lead one to ponder about the physical form of the Roman vault and how (or what) it may also have evoked an aspect of the natural world. This issue falls beyond the scope of this essay. It is important to remember, however, that most Roman vaults were employed in applications where their superior load-bearing characteristics and buttressing capabilities were especially valued: in multi-tiered structures such as theaters or amphitheaters, or semi-subterranean bastions built to support sanctuaries or even villas. The connection between early Roman vaulted spaces and subterranean— or semi-subterranean— contexts is a topic worthy of future study. Latin words associated with vaulting: camera, cameralis, area, fornix, are also used to describe the features of caves and grottoes, both natural and artificial. Such spaces were esteemed features of country villas, and were themselves associated with a varied population of divine creatures.

---

1 Joseph. Antiq. 8. 67-68, mentions that both the roof and the coffering of the temple were of cedar.
2 Cic. Tert. 1.85. While speculating on Priam’s fate had he survived the sack of Troy, Cicero quotes Ennius: “His barbarous opulence intact / with ceilings carved and coffered ( ... ascissa ope barbarius / sectis calatis, lacustris).”
3 Verg. Aen. 1.726: “lighted lamps hang from golden coffers (dependent lychnis laqueantibus aureis).”
4 Lucan, Bellum Civil. Book 10.112-113: “ ... laquassaque tacta ferebant / divinitas cumaque tubas abscondavit aurum.”
5 Manilius associates the constellations with coffering in Astronomica 1.553: “These then are the constellations which decorate heaven with an even swath, coffering the sky with their tides in various designs. Higher than these there is nothing; they are the pediment of the world; the public domain of nature is told contained by them, embracing the sea and lands lying below.”
6 haec igne tenax asquili sidera tractu. igitur in variis caelo laqueantibus formas. alius his nihil est: haec sunt festivissi mundi publica naturae domus his contenta tenetur, 7 finibus, amplectente pontum terraque lacustis.”
8 in a subsequent passage (Astronomica 5.283-292) Manilius associates the coffered ceilings of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus with the sky: “And, because the ear of wheat is inhabited by grains artfully arranged and its layout is like a building, for it provides chambers and granaries for its own seeds, [Spina] will make a man who covers coffered ceilings (laquaria) for sacred temples, providing a new heaven (caelum) for the roofs of the Thunderer (i.e., Jupiter).”
9 stat. Silv. 4.2.31: Status is describing a state dinner in the imperial palace. The emphasis seems to be on the height of the triclinium: “the view travels far upward, the tilled vision scarcely reaches the summit, and you would think it was the golden coffering of the sky (longa supra speciosa; fines et culmen prima vestibus aureis cuneisque medius laqueantur.”
10 K. Lehman, “The Dome of Heaven,” Art Bulletin 27 (1945) 1-27. Lehman does comment on the significance of figural motifs that were painted or sculpted within stone coffers, such as that found in the Etruscan Tomb of the Masked (from Clusium, early 5th cent. B.C.).
Latin III's Dirty Little Secret – Why Johnny Can’t Read

Kenneth F. Kitchell, Jr.
University of Massachusetts

I The Problem We have all had the experience. The student who is ending Latin II knows his or her endings, does well on individual tests on specific points of grammar and usage, and can translate with some ease the made-up texts in the earlier parts of the textbook. But this same student will flounder when, near the end of the Latin or at the beginning of Latin III, real Latin is introduced. There is increasing difficulty in translating the sentences and once translated they make little sense. Why is this so? The basic skills have certainly not disappeared and neither has the essential intelligence level.

The reasons, of course, are many. One might be that the difficulty level jumps too rapidly, or it may be that early on the textbook offers little or nothing by way of continuous readings, confining itself for the most part to short sentences or sententiae chosen more for their grammar than their ability to impart translation skills.

Or if there are stories in the texts, they may be small, disjointed tales where unnamed farmers stand in incredibly dry fields looking for unrelated puelia to fetch them aquam as they laborant. Or, while the stories might be interesting in and of themselves, they might not effectively prepare the students for the longer and more complex periodic sentences of Roman prose or the tortuous and (to a student) seemingly whimsical word order of Roman poetry. This is a charge leveled at many of the more modern, “reading method” textbooks.

All of these problems interfere with the students in their quest to be able to read “real” Latin facilely and each of us has tried to solve such problems when we teach upper division Latin classes. But having read and pondered the material E.D. Hirsch offers concerning how we learn to read, I have come to the conclusion that a student’s relative unfamiliarity with ancient cultural schemata, what I call the issue of “classical literacy,” plays a great role in this problem.

II. Hirsch Background The year 1987 saw the publication of E.D. Hirsch Jr.’s Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. The book coined the term “cultural literacy” and created quite a stir in popular and scholarly journals alike. The main tenets of the book spoke to that ever debated question of “what is wrong with our nation’s classrooms” and its answers variously enthused, grated, and enraged educators. It will be prudent,

first, to go over what the book has to say, and move on from there to its possible ramifications for us in the upper division Latin classroom, for quite without intending to do so, Dr. Hirsch has put his finger on one of the greatest problems facing the Latin classroom today.

E.D. Hirsch, Jr. is a Professor of English at the University of Virginia. His research in the past had centered on the intriguing questions of how we read and how we remember what we have read — in short, how we learn. Such interests led him to the works of specialists in such allied fields as educational psychology and convinced him of the seemingly contradictory statement that knowledge of the content of a piece of writing is often needed for us to understand what it says. To understand texts properly, he claims, people must have “world knowledge” or, in his words, “cultural literacy... the background information, stored in their minds, that enables them to take up a newspaper and read it with an adequate level of comprehension, getting the point, grasping the implications, relating what they read to the unstated context which alone gives meaning to what they read.”

Hirsch is saying that often, in order “to grasp the words on a page we have to know a lot of information that isn’t set down on the page” and that this information can be either culture-specific or content-specific in nature. It is a basic concept, but one that at first sounds fairly radical to those of us who live our lives learning by reading. Yet its truth is demonstrated by trying to understand the following passages excerpted from a report on a recent important cricket match.

Zimbabwe booked their place in the final of the NaWest Triangular series after a comprehensive 70-run victory over the West Indies at rain-sodden Canterbury, maintaining their 100 percent record in the tournament after three matches.

Guy Whittall, Alistair Campbell and Neil Johnson struck half-centuries as Zimbabwe plundered 256 for 4, but a dramatic collapse - which saw skipper Jimmy Adams and Brian Lara dismissed in consecutive balls - saw the Windies meandering to 186-8 from their fifty overs.

Franklyn Rose offered some resistance with a belligerent 50 from 31 balls before he was trapped leg before.

Campbell sustained the tempo with another measured


2 Hirsch, (note 1) 3. The sentiment is reminiscent of one commonly propounded by the great scholar of all things Greek, Eugene Vanderpool, who was very fond of saying that Greek inscriptions, “You have to know what they say before you can read them.” Most lately related by (John Timm in the memorial lectures to Vanderpool, Annarositas (Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, NJ, 1989) 15.
innings of 77 not out as Zimbabwe reached 256 for 4 from their allotted overs.4

Clearly, all of us reading this piece are quite fluent in English, yet few could follow what actually happened during this game because we lack the requisite background information to understand it. In short, vocabulary, morphology, and grammar are not enough. Hirsch cites the work of Steffensen, Jong-Des, and Anderson wherein two letters describing weddings were read for comprehension and subsequently tested. Both letters were in English, but one described an American wedding and one in India. Each letter was of equal linguistic complexity and the groups were carefully balanced for such variables as age, sex, and ethnicity. But the unfamiliarity of the culturally-specific items (e.g. items of dress) and local customs rendered understanding and comprehension difficult for the readers of the opposite culture. The conclusion seems obvious, but, as I hope to demonstrate later, it is one most of us have been overlooking in our Latin classrooms. In order to understand a text, even at its most basic levels, you have to understand — be literate in — the culture which produced it.

A final example will demonstrate that not only national or ethnic information is involved in reading comprehension. The content itself, that is, the subject under discussion, can bring about similar results.

Second, the foregoing suggests that metacognitive abilities, that is, universal rather than cultural thought patterns may be essential to comprehension. Possibly classroom practice and reader protocols should assign value to any student perception of textual organizations that reflects the passage’s macro-relationships.

or

Data from L2 studies of vocabulary gains from reading longer texts...should be distinguished from vocabulary research on short texts...Such brevity necessarily relocates a reader's encoding concerns from apperception of macro- to micro-structures.6

It is highly ironic that this excellent article has as one of its aims a study of how we understand what we read, for language such as this is clearly aimed at those "in the know," at people who are "literate" to the jargon employed. We will return to this concept below, but it is well to repeat, before we return to outlining Hirsch's arguments, that basic understanding and comprehension often depend on a prior knowledge of the material being discussed, be it specific to the culture or the topic at hand.

Hirsch uses this insight to stress the fact that basic reading skills are not at issue here. Most readers could use phonics and an innate sense of the structure of our language to recite these passages. This is a basic form of reading — turning the printed symbols into culturally agreed upon sounds. But Hirsch is emphatic in saying that possessing mere acquisition of decoding or encoding skills does not equate to literacy, and he points an accusing finger at our schools with their tendency toward content-neutral readings and cafeteria style, non-core curricula. The result of such trends, he says, is that children emerge from their education lacking a common stock of shared cultural information which only a short time ago was naturally expected to exist in every person educated at the high school level.

Another book offers chilling confirmation for his beliefs. Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr. conducted extensive tests across America to see what level of competency our high school graduates were attaining in literature and history. They tested 7,812 eleventh graders carefully chosen to represent the entire population.6 The results were depressing. Only 32.2% could place the Civil War into its proper 50 year period on a multiple choice question. Only 56.2% could identify the god Mars and two in five could not name Midas as the king whose touch turned objects to gold. This is not the place to elaborate examples, however. It is their conclusions which are important, for they tie in with Hirsch's theory and with the point I hope to make in this article.

As the authors state (215), "the most disturbing finding of the literature assessment was...the cumulative impression that students do not know many of the common allusions, especially those drawn from the Bible and mythology, that regularly appear in serious literature."

Hirsch appreciates this trend and in his book makes a clear and strong case that we must address the problem of cultural literacy at a very early age. Basie's arguments heavily on the work of Jeanne Chall, he shows that before grade three, when reading skills are more mechanical than they are interpretive, United States students perform equally well with other countries. It is in the later grades when, he says, the readings increasingly presuppose basic, shared, cultural information, that our students fall far behind. Likewise, disadvantaged first graders in America perform equally well with middle class children in the mechanical processes of sounding out letters and simple words. According to Chall, it is at the fourth and fifth grade levels that the gap widens and disadvantaged students fall behind. Their handicap, Hirsch believes, is in their unfamiliarity with mainstream, shared, cultural information which enables readers to understand more complex texts.
Hirsch lays all this out in his first chapter. His second chapter is somewhat more difficult to follow, but is potentially very important for the way we teach our upper division Latin courses. Hirsch first discusses memory, focusing on the question of how we remember what we read. Our short term memory (54), it turns out, is a very weak vessel, being able to hold no more than about four to seven separate items. The mind quickly gives these disparate items a structure and files them away for future reference. In terms of language, 7 or 8 individual words will be grouped into a single idea or image and then stored. We do not, as a rule, file away long strings of information for verbatim recall at a later date. The mind rather processes incoming information in a general fashion. Thus, the basic sentence “The window is not closed” may not be stored verbatim, but the gist of the sentence, i.e. a picture or image of an open window, is retained. As Hirsch sums it up (37-39), “we have bad memory for words but good memory for meaning.” This basic insight, I think, can have a great impact on what we do in our classes.

Hirsch next demonstrates that the raw materials the mind uses for processing the incoming information are “mental models we have in our minds on the basis of prior knowledge and the words of the text as we read them” and adds (39-40) that “to make sense of what we read, we must use relevant prior knowledge to form a model of how sentence meanings hang together.” He adduces tests and studies to show that the most simple of passages can be unintelligible unless we have some idea of its context and can therefore bring our “mental models” into play to help interpret the words we are reading.

Read, for example, the following instructions:

The procedure is actually quite simple. First you arrange the items in different groups. Of course, one pile may be sufficient depending on how much there is to do. If you have to go somewhere else due to lack of facilities that is the next step; otherwise you are pretty well set.

The activity in question is “Washing Clothes” (40), and if you were to reread the passage now, it makes immediate sense. On this second reading, the “facilities” pop into your head. You have a picture of them. You know them. The sorted groups are even clear — some are dark, some white. Some need bleach, some can not have bleach. All this is obvious, but none of it is actually stated in the text. You are supplying the information from your “mental models” which psychologists have variously called prototypes, frames, theories, constructs, models, and scripts. Hirsch prefers to call them “schemata” (singular “schema”) following Anderson (51).

The foregoing example shows how meaning can be lost without appropriate schemata. A later example, which he uses for another purpose, can be used also to demonstrate the overtones and “environment” if you will of a text.

Read the following three simple sentences:

1. The baby kicked the ball and laughed.
2. The golfer kicked the ball and laughed.
3. The punter kicked the ball and laughed.

These are very simple sentences, and bear very little descriptive material. Yet you can easily answer these questions: “What shape is the ball in each case?”; “Which ball is the smallest?”; “Which of the kickers is the happiest?” (they all are laughing!); “Which is the angriest?”; “Who has the most people watching him kick?”; “Who has the fewest watching him kick?”

So it is easy to see how schemata let us “read between the lines.” We know why babies kick balls and why golfers do so. One is happy, the other angry. The punter is just doing a job and his laugh may be defiant or exultant. The author expects us to have these schemata, to know about babies, and the games of golf and football and their rules. All this in seven words each!

Yet think what the sentence would mean to a native of New Zealand who was trained in British English in a small school somewhere away from American television. He or she would have a sense of “ball” of course, but not of “punter” unless as a slightly derogatory word for a bettor; or as referring to someone who propels a boat with a pole. Even if he were told that one of the games were “football,” he would have entirely different culturally determined views (schemata) of what was going on since “football” to such a person is our “soccer.”

Finally, schemata can be national in character. A simple example might be the everyday phrase, “The meat was tough tonight.” To most Americans “meat” would instantly become “beef,” even in these cholesterol conscious days. A Greek would think mostly of lamb and a South Seas islander of roast pig, something of which a Near Easterner would never conceive. Other phrases are referential in nature and here I will part with Hirsch and call these simply “allusions” or “references.” Thus “Father of the Country” means one thing to an American, but another to a citizen of China and, of course, quite another to a Roman living ca. 5 A.D.

Chapters 5 and 4 deal with anticipating charges that the demand for a nationally accepted canon of cultural literacy is exclusionary and biased. Beginning with Chapter 5 Hirsch asks why our students do not possess the requisite store of common, shared knowledge which would allow each student to be truly literate. He places the blame on our schools, claiming that their curricula have been eroded of their traditional content by the progressive education movement to the extent that an author can no longer safely assume that his or her references will be noted by the reader or that author and reader share any appreciable common ground.
Of course, this ultimately leads Hirsch to the matter of curriculum reform and, inevitably, into deep and troubled waters in his final chapters. Believing as he does that it is after the fourth or fifth grade that students fall behind and that the needed ingredient to prevent this is the store of common information needed for comprehension, he proposes that our youngest students be given vast stores of this information in their formative years. They need not be given a scholar's depth of information, just enough to enable them to communicate with a given author on the level the author intended. Thus, they only need know that an "Achilles heel" means an unsuspected vulnerability and not every aspect of the mythology of Achilles or the Trojan War.

At the end of *Cultural Literacy* Hirsch collaborated with others to produce a 64 page list of material needed to insure cultural literacy. This was, he proclaimed, a preliminary list, and it was followed in 1988 by his *Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*, 546 pages of terms to be known. At reaction was immediate—and vehement. Amid the heat of battle, most of the theoretical groundwork Hirsch had so patiently laid was totally ignored. Hirsch was accused of promoting a white, elitist culture, although he had cleverly and forcefully (22f.) met the objections beforehand in the book itself. Others felt he was quantifying knowledge, setting us and our classes up as targets for more inane tests to be used as mindless guides to the success or lack of it in our individual schools or systems. He was called an assassin of imagination in that he stressed mindless memorization over learning in context. Mostly, his approach was seen by world-weary teachers as yet another quick cure for education; another quick fix which would have its day and pass the way of other fads and crazes. There is some truth in all of this, of course, but there is equally a large element of myopia and self-centered overreaction. The subsequent reviews, articles, and even entire volumes devoted to cultural literacy and the resultant rebuttals by Hirsch himself proved as informative as they were entertaining. Nor was all reaction negative. Hirsch found his defenders, of course, and his quick acceptance by scholars such as Diane Ravitch put in the heady company of educational reform writers like William Bennett and Alan Bloom. To this extent alone, as a weapon in the "back to basics" movement, Hirsch certainly must have had a positive effect on the study of classical antiquity, once the most basic "basic" of all.

III. Hirsch and "Classical Literacy" But it is in the most infrequently mentioned contributions of Hirsch, viz., his contributions to understanding how we read and how we remember, and in his basic insight that cultural matters affect how we understand what we read, that there is a gold mine of information which can help us teach our students Latin more effectively and with more lasting effect. It may even, I feel, help us with the perennial problem of upper division enrollment and the rate of dropouts which so sorely affects schools between Latin II and III.

The first step is to remember at all times that Latin is a language. I do not mean to be flippanent here, but too many of us forget this very basic fact and end up teaching the language as if it were a code composed of equal parts grammar, vocabulary, and syntax. As a language, Latin is subject to the constraints of every other language, even our own. It might be a dead language in that we do not speak it with anyone, but as soon as we read it, it comes alive and immediately is subject to the many problems associated with reading that enter into the reading of any language. In short, it is time to examine what Hirsch has to say about reading and retention and to apply his findings to how we teach our students to read the Latin language.

I will begin with a story. One of my first "jobs" in teaching Latin was tutoring a poor, lost child who was struggling manfully but vainly with one of the Catalanian speeches of Cicero. I took him under my underpaid graduate student wing and began where I felt he needed the most help. We reviewed forms, chanted declensions, drove in grammar rules designed to help him make his way through the morass of Ciceronian prose, and we patiently learned how best to attack a Ciceronian sentence. To my surprise, he was not all that had in his basics. He knew his endings, had pretty fair translation skills and had enough grammar to be doing better than he was. The key to his failure to read Cicero came one day when he suddenly asked me, "What is Cicero so angry about, anyway?"

He had no idea. "Who is this Catiline fellow?" I asked. He did not know. "What is the big deal if Catiline had a plot? What difference would it make?" None, to him. In short, he had no idea of what was going on in his text. He was aware off than those people mentioned above who read the text on the Indian wedding, because they at least got to read their selection in their own language. It is no wonder that he was floundering, and anyone reading this with more than one year's teaching experience knows what the odds are that he enrolled in Latin IV. We also know the odds that he encouraged his children (for this was so long ago that by now he surely has some) to take Latin in their schools.

This student, and scores like him in third year/semester Latin was, in the words of Hirsch (27), well versed in "elementary decoding skills," but was stymied by the cultural information which informs the text and without which it might make little or, sometimes, no sense. This, I propose, lies at the heart of much of the difficulty third year Latin students encounter when moving into the reading of Latin authors.

Elementary level readings demand few schemata or, in good text books, have them built in. It does not take, for example, a lot of background information to understand a mythological tale of Hercules or a generic tale such as "Lucius Filam Amittit" in which one only needs to know that boys play with balls and sometimes lose them.37 This is a
common (if uninspiring) human experience and nothing gets in the way of understanding the story and of learning the attendant grammar, in this instance personal pronouns and possessive adjectives. More recent text books such as the Cambridge Latin Course, The Oxford Latin Course, and Exa Romani, also rely on common experience in the early stages and it takes little explanation to grasp, e.g., who the family members are, what a cook does, or what school is generally like. Indeed, these textbooks are careful to weave directly into the story itself any other material which is less immediately “cross-cultural,” such as what a slave does or what a Roman banquet looks like. Here we must applaud the use of illustrations in the newer texts, for these provide immediate cultural context.

I could multiply the examples, but the fact is that a vast majority of our elementary Latin texts, whatever their other flaws, allow our beginning students to concentrate on vocabulary, syntax and grammar — Hirsch’s basic decoding devices. Our beginning Latin students remind me of Hirsch’s beginning reading students, that is, America’s 1st through 3rd or 4th graders. Their readers also require little by way of cultural background. It is only, I remind you, when they begin to move beyond the basal reader stage that there is a clear need for cultural information in order to understand the text.

This is exactly the case with our late Latin II or beginning Latin III students. When a student begins to read Cicero, Vergil or even Caesar, an author picked for his “easiness,” he or she is moving into a totally different situation. For Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil were writing for Romans. It is a fact too easy to forget, but as Hirsch points out over and over again, an author has essential schemata in mind in almost every line. And I may add that the more literary the author the more schemata he implies in his learned audience. Let me give three examples, basing them upon three commonly mentioned levels of reading — the literal, the interpretive, and the evaluative.

At the literal level, a missed schema might cloud understanding, but will generally not prevent it. An excellent example comes from Pliny the Younger’s commonly read description of the cloud his uncle saw coming from the cone of Mt. Vesuvius. Pliny says it resembled a pine tree, a reference which baffles modern students who would more readily call it a mushroom cloud. That is because their schemata are nuclear and Pliny’s was the umbrella pine, a tree which an average Roman saw every day of his or her life. Now such a reference does not block or preclude understanding in our students because they still have a schema of what a volcanic cloud looks like. A volcanic cloud is not culturally linked even if the plant used to describe it is.

This brings us to the next level of reading — the interpretive — where the reader goes beyond the merely literal as we did in our “kicked the ball” examples above. Most of us expose our students to Catullus 101, the farewell to his brother which begins “Multae per gentes et multa per aequora vectus.” The poem is readily understandable as read. It is a tale of brotherly love and devotion for which most of us have either a personal or a vicarious schema. Yet the student can never fully interpret the depth of the love Catullus is demonstrating unless he knows about ancient ships and the location of Bithynia. An ancient Roman immediately appreciated the length of the poet’s journey and the discomfort he had endured to come to this far off place. Likewise, the ancients knew from first hand experience the futility to be experienced as one addressed mute ashes (“et mutum requiescum allegerint literam”) without even today’s opportunity to view the body and say goodbye. Much of what Catullus is trying to convey is immediately dependant upon culturally specific material; material as alien to our culture as an American wedding ceremony is to a native of New Delhi.

And yet this is the least disturbing part of looking at advanced Latin texts through “Hirshian” eyes. For the Pliny description or the Catullus poem is still essentially comprehensible without such knowledge. It might be less appreciated, but the average student with sufficient elementary decoding skills can still tell what is going on.

There exist countless examples however, where this is not the case, and where lack of shared schemata between a Roman author and a late twentieth century young American audience can often spell disaster. This is sometimes true at the interpretative or even literal level, but is commonly true at the third level, the evaluative.

I will attempt to illustrate this fact by using examples from textbooks which students are using today. I mean no specific condemnation of any of these textbooks. Several examples, in fact, are taken from books which I admire. I am merely attempting to point out the manner in which the difficulty of the text can be measured by the number of culturally specific items it contains. But first I must make a request.

As you read through these texts, purge your mind of most of its acquired schemata. Throughout the years you have become expert in these matters. You have, as Hirsh would have it, become culturally literate in things Roman. Try to scrub your minds to the state of your third year students and to put yourself at their particular level of “classical literacy.”

Try, then, to look at this text with the “classical literacy” level of a 17 year old, remembering that, on average, only 49.8% of them know who Odysseus was and some 48.5% think that Prometheus was chained to a rock because he married a beautiful woman and then boasted about it. 13 Again, I am not attempting here to condemn either the students or their educational system. That is another battle. My only aim is to get us to see the difficulty of the text through their eyes. Whatever the cause, much of the text is wondrously strange to them and, in an educational climate where “across the country, even now, interest groups are pressuring local school boards to remove myths and fables and other imaginative literature from children’s readers and to inject the teaching of creationism into biology” it is hardly likely to get better very quickly. 14

Let us look first at one of the more commonly read passages from Ovid, the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha. This selection is from the third year Jenney text and would, conventionally, be laid before our 17 year olds. It describes Deucalion’s first landing on Mount Parnassus and comes from Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*:

*Separat Amis Oetaiae Phoos ex arvis\ terra ferox, dum terra fuit; sed tempore in illo\ pars maris et latum subitanum campus aquis.\ Mons ubi verticolus petit ordo ubi autus umbros\ nomine Parnassus, superantique cacuminus nubes.\ Hic ubi Deucalion, num cometa pecus seque\ cum convolute tarsa parva rate vertit albaeuis,\ Corycium nymphae et umbros montis abravit,\ fata iliacque Themis, quae tunc ostra teneshat.\ Non ille melior quisquam nec amans qui aequi\ vir fuit, aut illa metuentur ulla deorum.*

The text itself begins with a barrage of “culturally loaded” information. I offer a literal translation of the text:

Phoecis separates the Aeolians from the Oetaean fields — a harsh land, as long as it was land. But at that time part of it was sea and its flanks were an expanse of sudden waters. There, a lofty mountain, Parnassus by name, reaches to the stars with twin peaks and its spires overcome the clouds. This is where Deucalion made land, for water covered everything else, borne along with the consort of his couch on a small raft. They worship the Corycian nymphs and the spirits of the mountain as well as fate-speaking Themis, who then was in possession of the oracles.

The number of culturally linked references is staggering and viewing these 2,000 year old references with our newly found 17 year old eyes is a revelation. Nor are Jenney’s notes very useful. Does it really help today’s youth to tell them that the Aeolians were “Boeotians”? And what good is it to tell our students that Phoecis is “The section of Greece where Delphi is located”? Does the name alone have solid enough connections in their minds? Similarly, to attempt to help today’s students by pointing out that

“Corycium is a cave on Mt. Parnassus” is to offer no real help at all.

But note well that Ovid expected such references to strike resonances in our minds. They are not mere window dressing. The relatively obscure name for the Boeotians is chosen because Aon was a descendent of Neptune and since his descendants are currently failing their swimming test, the reference is ironically humorous. Similarly, Parnassus is chosen because it overlooks Delphi. Anyone “classically literate” has his or her ears prick up at this point. “Caveat lector!” says Ovid. Something significant and holy is about to happen. This is not just any mountain or any site, but one of the most sacred in the entire country. It is little wonder that this passage, so rich and so rewarding to us, is more prone to bring frowns of frustration to our upper division students.

This is why only the most diligent student can make his or her way through a passage such as this. It requires a first reading strictly as a grammatical code. What adjective goes with what noun? Which nouns with which verbs? And it requires that this be done without the normal crutches we have for our own language of contextual clues since the context lies hidden by “classical literacy.” Our tireless student then must read all the footnotes. Sometimes, as in the case of “Amis” the student must even go further (e.g. to an atlas to find Boeotia). Then this information must be remembered long enough to last through a re-reading of the text in which he or she attempts to wed grammar to cultural context. This is all simply to get full meaning out of the text. If we are to go to the third level of reading, the evaluative, then a further reading is surely called for in which the student analyzes why this or that allusion is used and what it has to tell us about how the author is constructing his text.

This is a lot to ask. Most of us, to be blunt, know that it is too much to ask. I do have some practical suggestions to offer concerning this problem, and will suggest ways in which we can combat it. But before I get to that I would like to look at one or two further examples.

For one I need no text whatever. I will simply give a snap quiz. Where are the Belgae located? The Haedui? What was special about the tenth legion? What exactly were the duties of a centurion? A legatus? How far can a soldier hurl a javelin? How heavy is infantry armor? Why is Caesar not in Italy, anyway? Why is he not in Rome trying to become emperor? I could adduce others, but you get the point. Such information was readily available to most of Caesar’s audience. They were attuned to the “cultural literacy” of the day which for us, and our students, has become “classical literacy.” And yet without such information at one’s fingertips, reading Caesar can be a dull event indeed.

I turn now to *Per Sculas*, a book which tells us it is specifically designed “to bridge the gap between the ‘made-up’ or ‘adapted’ Latin of the course book and the complete text of a Latin author appropriate to progress in reading at the next stage.”

---

15 Ravitch and Finn (note 6) 52, inform us that, given a multiple choice map question, only 65.6% of their audience located France properly. In fact 22.1% of them thought it was Spain.
that I am not out to malign any given text. My only aim is to show the difficulties involved with certain texts when we understand the principle of “classical literacy” and then to offer some possible guidelines to the selection and teaching of upper division Latin texts.

This passage in question need not be reproduced in Latin. It will be sufficient to translate the first few lines:

Augustus was born when M. Tullius Cicero and C. Antony were consul, 8 days before the Kalends of October, a little before sunrise, in the region of the Palatine, near the Ox-Heads, where he now has the shrine that was established a little after he died. As an infant the cognomen “Thurinus” was given in memory of the origin of his ancestors or because his father Octavius had successfully completed a campaign against runaway slaves in the region of Thurii. After this he took the cognomen of Gaius Caesar and then of Augustus. In his fourth year he lost his father.

The passage is a perfect example of the perils of “classical illiteracy.” Suetonius supposes that his readers will be quite familiar with historical figures, Roman dating systems, Roman naming systems, the geography and topography of Rome, the position of Thurii, and the reasons Octavius took various names throughout his career. This is for mere comprehension. For “resonance” or “subtext” we are supposed to remember that 63 BC, the year of Cicero’s and Antonius’ consulship, was the beginning of the Catilinarian problem, a revolt whose lessons were not lost on Augustus.

Or what are we realistically to make of Horace, Odor 2.14, found in textbooks throughout the years and now part of the AP curriculum?37 Rather than go through the poem line by line, I would ask you simply to look at the number of places a piece of cultural background is necessary for understanding two particularly difficult stanzas. I have indicated these places with bold print.

*Cocytos errant et Danai genus
infame Lemnusique longi
Sinephus Aeolides laboris.

Or call to mind the stunning array of allusions Vergil built into Dido’s doors, Aeneas’ armor, or his sightings in the Underworld. And if this is true of Horace and Vergil, what are we to make of the selections set out in textbooks from less traditional sources? What sort of background can we expect our students to have, for example, for Widukind’s history of the Saxon race or the murder of Thomas à Becket?38 How are they to relate to Boethius, Francis Bacon or a Latin life of Alessandro Volta?39 Even if the Latin be lucid, we can be sure comprehension will be muddied by culturally specific information.

IV. Practical Suggestions If we grant that it has been demonstrated that what I have called “classical literacy” is one of the factors, perhaps one of the main factors, hindering our students’ facile transition to the realm of translating authentic Latin texts, what can we do to overcome it?

There are really only two basic approaches to the problem. We can abandon the ideal of teaching authentic Latin texts as the main goal of learning Latin, or we can remove the hindrance. It is well to consider both seriously and then, as always, to compromise.

Should we, then, abandon the reading of classical authors as the goal of most basic Latin curricula? This has recently been suggested by Daniel Carpenter who favors restructuring our entire curricular focus. No less an authority than George Kennedy has forcefully suggested that while this goal should not be abandoned, it should definitely be relegated to second place behind a primary goal of serving as “an introduction to the nature of language, to concepts of grammar, to etymology, and to cultural concepts conveyed through words,” especially for the “average student.” Kennedy bases his argument on the nature of today’s students as well as the fact that “except for the very highly motivated and the linguistically gifted, it usually takes years of study to be able to read Latin with any facility” (15). As much as the words may jar, there is much of truth here and recent discussion on revamping the upper division courses shows that it is a “hot” issue.40

What of the second option of removing the hindrance? That, I submit, is not entirely possible. We can no longer expect the students coming to us to have the same sort of background knowledge which those of our parents generation obtained. There was a time when basic Greco-Roman mythology and a general knowledge of the plots of the great classics could be assumed. A bit further back in time, it could also be assumed that the average high school student had already studied world history in such a way that the major events from antiquity had been encountered in prior years. The work of Ravitch and Finn demonstrates clearly that this is no longer the case. We have no way to put all this information back in their heads if we are also to teach them Latin.

If, then, we cannot improve our students and cannot teach reading skills to most of our students in two years, what should be done? I certainly would not go so far as to rule out reading all ancient authors in our upper division, but I do have a series of suggestions which might ameliorate the situation.

Curiously, little has been written of a practical nature on how to apply Hirsch's findings on the problem of cultural literacy to actual foreign language classroom activity.12 Thus, many of my ideas are tentative. The recommendations are basic and fundamental. They seek both to keep the age-old goal of reading the past masters in the original13 and to eliminate some of the problems our current students face as a result of their "classical illiteracy." They will not compensate entirely for poor grammar or weak vocabulary, but will, I feel, go far toward making the upper division Latin experience a more pleasant one for teacher and student alike.

A. Choosing the Author and Passage All too often a class will complain that their cohorts in French or Spanish can read so much more than they as Latin students are able to read and will, as a result, feel inadequate. The sad truth is that this charge is true. But it is not so much a reflection on the abilities of the students as it is of the texts they read. A comparison with the textbooks used in contemporary modern language courses can be very enlightening here.

With the help of a colleague I recently scanned a variety of Spanish 5 and 4 textbooks. The readings are envious. They are primarily from modern authors and most often deal with 20th century problems or those of universal applicability. Pieces, prose or poetry, tend to be short and self contained, able to be finished in one or two lessons. Pictures and prereading activities help prepare the reader for the actions and settings of the story.

Our students are not so lucky. First of all, there are few texts of this description remaining to us. Not being "great literature," they did not survive the transition from antiquity to the present. Most of our remaining texts are long, or if short, like Horace, tend to demand an abnormally high level of classical literacy for understanding. Some authors who do tell straightforward, short tales are generally seen as "unworthy" of serious time since they do not meet the criterion of "high literature," the reading of which has been seen as the ultimate goal of reading Latin for centuries.

There is some active debate currently over what should form the basis of our third and fourth year courses. Is it fair, some ask, to read Cicero in the third year and Vergil in the fourth? Would we give Milton to fourth semester ESL students? This is a battle which I do not wish to join at this time. Recent reading, however, has afforded me no small pleasure as I have found that this debate was raging almost 100 years ago and that the basic arguments have changed but little.14

In any case, the question is somewhat moot. Advanced Placement courses are often all that keep an upper level Latin course in a school, and that curriculum is standardized. Let me offer, then, a few compromise suggestions about choosing the text.

The first step is to analyze the nature of the support notes. It is not enough to have a student read a 69 page introduction prior to reading Cicero's first Catilinarian.15 The material there is too dense, too complex, and is out of context. Compare, when you get a chance, this deluge of information with the terse but relevant information with which the Longman Cicero reader begins.16 Here the bare minimum of information is given. Enough to get the reader going, but not enough to bog him or her down. Relevant explanations and expansions can be made on the lines and phrases where they are required.

The next step is to determine the cultural literacy quotient. This is, of course, a made-up name, but it does reflect a valid working principle. When scanning a text for my upper level students, I run a proportion of the number of words or lines devoted to notes to the actual number of lines of text. There is no magic number to obey, but if the notes involved with clarifying culturally-dependent issues are as long as or longer than the text itself, the text will be difficult for your students. A recent Horace AP text offers an excellent example. Routinely, throughout, 10 to 15 lines of actual text are surrounded by one and one half pages of notes, many of which pertain to culturally


13 The ACLS own report of 1921-23 stated that "Latin should be learned in order to be read and understood." Quoted by Reinhold (note 22) 133. In 1982, the editors of Living Latin still list as the purpose of their book as being "to provide students with a tested linguistic approach which will enable them to read Latin writers readily and intelligently" Clara Ashley, Teacher's Manual and Key. Living Latin, A Contemporary Approach. Book Two. Chicago: University. 1982.


15 Jersey, Scudder, and Collins, (note 16) 1-69.

16 E.J. Barnes and John T. Ramsey, Cicero and Sallust: On the Conspiracy of Catiline (White Plains: Longman,
linked material. For example, Ovid 3.1.15-30 has notes explaining sorition, Damodes, Zephyrus, the Vale of Tempe, Arcturus, and the constellation Hades.3 This is a sign that the poem will be culturally challenging for our young readers.

As you run such a scan, be sure to include notes which should be present but which are not. Thus, if a text should have 15 notes but only has five, you are being sent a different message, but one with the same result — this will prove to be a difficult text for your students.

An excellent application of this technique is found in the Longman Vergil volume.39 It focuses first on the Dido and Aeneas story which, as a love story, is a sort of universal schema. It chooses its selections wisely and links them with lucid plot summaries in English. There is also an effort, I feel, to choose selections which further the plot and to eliminate those which are best understood by professors and Augustan Romans. Thus, the admittedly beautiful and surely important, but frighteningly referential section where the Trojans admire the art work on the doors of rising Carthage is omitted as being beyond the "classical literacy" level of most students.

The message — the bottom line, as it were — is "be judicious." Scan the text as carefully for "classical literacy" as you would for grammar or vocabulary. If the "Classical Literacy Quotient" is too high, either make accommodations or move on until it is not.

The next factor readily under a teacher's control is that of pacing. It is my firm belief that no student can feel successful by reading only 4 or 5 lines a day or by taking a year or semester to finish a single oration. Skipping and summarizing sections or gisting and paraphrasing can give a sense of accomplishment while at the same time covering most of the text in question. Likewise, having the student read significant portions of the author in question in English (see below) has much to recommend it. Of course, such an approach is not for all days and some might find it distasteful. But next time you read a book, pay attention to your speed patterns. Do you not run quickly over some passages and linger over others? Our students, if they are to become fluent in Latin, must be given the same option.

There is also much to be said for varying what is read in a 3rd or 4th year course. Some older texts do this in an effort to offer a survey of all Latin literature. I prefer, rather, to vary the readings based on difficulty of understanding, attempting in this way to vary the pace, to help the students' confidence, and to pique their interest. The Latin of Asteroe Gallus is excellent Plautine Latin, but its comic book format allows many pages to be read at a sitting and the presence of pictures encourages intelligent guessing and gisting. Likewise, the Latin of Tele Chorabette is excellent, but my Latin III students breeze through it; reading far more pages of it per class than they do of Cicero or Caesar.

One reason is that the schemata here are their own, not those of the Romans. I am not suggesting an entire year of such works. But as readily accessible texts, they have much to recommend them as counterweights to the standard canon of Latin greats.

When the great works are read, some of the more culturally dependent sections can be read in English with great profit. One teacher I know requires her students to read the entire Aeneid before they attempt any of it in Latin. This is an excellent ploy, for did not the average Roman know most of the story — certainly its main schemata — before he or she heard Vergil's version? Such an approach has been adopted by the Cambridge Latin Course to great effect.

An excellent example of this is to be found in the CLC's fourth book.30 The poem is Catullus 11, and is filled with allusions to classical geography. To appreciate the poem the student has to understand where Persia, Scythia, and Parthia (to name a few) are. He must know that the Parthians bear arrows and what Caesar did in the Alps. And he or she must have all this in mind while making his or her way through the Latin. The CLC noticed this and gives the first four stanzas in English. The last two, which deal specifically with Catullus' feelings for his love and which contain nothing requiring "classical literacy," are given in Latin. The effect justifies the approach. Since the poem turns on a bit of a joke — the message is dangerous not because of the journey, but because of Lesbia's temper; and the message is hardly the one we think it might be when we begin to read — proper understanding of the first four stanzas is crucial to understanding the last two. By reading the first four in English, the students are prepared to understand the punch line of the poem. Their efforts can be concentrated upon their Latin and upon understanding the poem as a whole, and not spent in a frustrating search among classical trivia. I would also point out that the Barnes and Ramsey textbook for the Catullinarian conspiracy (above, n. 27) does an excellent job of interspersing English and Latin, all the while keeping the story going.

B. Varied Methods of Testing Comprehension That there are numerous ways in which we learn language is a given. Why, then, are we in the Classics generally locked into the assignment-preparation-translation method of testing comprehension in Latin? It is a perfectly satisfactory method of testing comprehension, but it is not the only one. Neither does it reflect how we came to learn our native language or how we learn a foreign language.

The first technique is to encourage gisting. An example from my recent leisure reading will make this clear. An excellent little mystery story entitled The Middle Temple Murder has its British protagonist staring at a sealed box. We are told that "it reminded Spargo irresistibly of the locker in which, in his school days, he had kept his personal belongings and the jam tarts, sausage rolls, and hardbase smuggled in from the tuck-shop."31 The average American reader does not know exactly what a jam tart looks like.

39 1 S. Fletcher, The Middle Temple Murder (NY: Dover, 1980 reprint of 1919) 75.
and is not all that sure what hardback or a tuck-shop is. The overall sense of the passage — its gist — is totally clear and few of us would bother to stop our reading to look up these arcane words. Yet how many of us are guilty of asking just this level of diligence from our Latin students on matters of equal or even greater irrelevance? For when we learn a living language, be it our own or another people’s, we do not, as we use the language, have the leisure to look up every word, and a precise translation is often secondary to a sense of being able to understand the gist of what is going on. As a frustrated Timothy Long once said: “We are the only field in foreign languages... which forces a student to look up every word he doesn’t know in the dictionary. It is killing our discipline.”

Let me suggest some alternate methods of approaching a text, then, beginning with our oldest friend, formal translation. The truth of the matter is that most of us are in a rut. We assign a certain number of lines to be translated and the next day call on various people to go through the text, translating and explicating as they go. This is valid, and is indeed necessary. But it is not valid for all texts, and is a severe handicap if used all the time.

The benefits of prereading should be considered. It does no real harm to preread a text in class before you send the students home to work it out grammatically. This is especially true if it is a passage rife with culturally based references. Prereading is not the same as translating and is different from in-class translation practice. You do not aim to give them a word for word translation of the paragraph. You can summarize the action for the students, pointing out the lines or sections where main events take place, explaining the cultural background as you do so. In the case of the Ovid text we have been using, you could tell them at what point of the story they are entering, and might give the students the translation of the more difficult lines, but only roughly sketch out the lines they will translate at home. It need take no more than a portion of actual class room time, but may save the student literally hours at home.

The teacher can lead the class in general, culturally relevant discussions prior to assigning translation. If the subject matter is Catullus 101, the teacher could initiate discussion, prior to assigning the poem, on how the students would feel if they lost a brother or sister. What if their favorite sibling died many miles away? How strongly would we, in the 20th century, feel about paying respects at the grave? How would we get there and what would we do there? This sort of activity engages them in the material before they attempt to read it. It simultaneously transcends cultural differences and gives the student a better chance of reading the text as a Roman did.

For the same poem, one student could prepare a brief cultural report (prior to reading the actual poem) on Roman burial practices and another about Roman beliefs in an afterlife. Also, as the students prepare the assignment for the next day, they could be required to keep a journal or diary of the terms, phrases, or references which they did not understand. The next day the teacher could answer some, or classroom time could be devoted to allowing the students to use in-class reference works such as The Oxford Companion to Classical Studies or The Oxford Classical Dictionary to answer their own questions. The completed journals would then be passed in. The student has learned a few things and the teacher has a student-generated list of the obscure material in this given passage which he or she can then use for a future class.

Comprehension can be fostered, and, indeed tested, if need be, by the simple expedient of rereading. It is very useful to begin each session with a quick — and I stress quick — rereading of the assignment due the previous class. It need not be translated. A summary will serve both to give context and to reorient the students to the context of the story.

If a paragraph is extremely complex and filled with classical allusions, perhaps it can merely be summarized in class by the student. This approach, designed to raise horror in those for whom Latin is more a code to be cracked than a language to be learned, is, in fact, not a new idea. It is refreshing to read that the Greek subcommittee of the 1895 report mentioned above believed that as additional practice a student should be allowed to give merely the substance of a passage and stated that “the reading of the text should precede any attempt at translation, and it would have a clear distinction made between the determination of the meaning of a passage and its translation.”

If in-class summarizing is not acceptable, or if a different approach is sought for variety, I suggest passing out comprehension questions to be answered as the student attempts to make sense out of the passage. Many admirable texts have such questions, but they invariably seem to follow the text. I submit that they might have more use before the text. Thus, to use the Ovid example from above, the students would go home with the assignment, not of translating, but of filling out the following sheet which allows them to “gist” the passages demanding the most “classical literacy” and to translate those least impeded by such issues.

---

28 Prof. Long was advocating vocabulary facing the text, but his words are equally apt. He was quoted by Martha C Taylor and Gilbert Lavall, "American Philological Association: Greek and Latin Textbook Survey," CD (May/June, 1994) 108.

29 Elliot et al. (note 22) 83-4. Cf. the Latin subcommittee's encouraging "understanding at sight" (70-71) and "skimming" (72).
This is not an onerous task for the teacher, but it does have several positive aspects to it. It first frees the student from the morale-crushing experience of slogging through a set of lines where it is not the amount of Latin he or she knows that is slowing him or her down, but rather a lack of "cultural literacy." Secondly, it lets the class cover larger sections of text, yielding a sense of greater accomplishment.

**Conclusion** There are many more ideas one could offer along these lines,

but perhaps it is enough to have raised some questions which may cause us all to think about the issue of "classical literacy" as it affects the issue of why our Latin III classes seem so difficult these days. It is certainly not the panacea for what ails our upper division enrollments, but it is, I think a large, and generally overlooked, element of the problem.

---

**FROM THE EDITOR**

**Scholarship**

Scholarship is a broad term that embraces a number of different activities. One knows this, but perhaps we might reflect a bit more on the fact, since universities and colleges, though they seem to value scholarship, do not undertake to define it. Often — and this is a cynical but at least partially correct view — scholarship is equated simply with production of articles and books that are published in a given profession weighted in terms of the assumed importance of the publishing journal. Hence universities pass on the responsibility for evaluation of scholarship (research) to other agencies and people, substituting peer review for university oversight. Piles of paper or dollars received in grant money equal scholarship and result in promotion and financial reward. Excellence in teaching, the spoken word, often at least seems to take a second place to stacks of processed dead trees.

I have no serious problem with the system of evaluation of scholarship because I can think of none better, but I am interested in it and in the broader issues of how one spends one's time. There are (at least) two kinds of scholarly investigation, both of them — one hopes — requiring a firm knowledge base combined with intellectual effort: scholarship should not be equated with the venting of opinions. The first I would label objective, the second subjective, without wishing to imply that these two terms are (a) exclusive or (b) value-laden. In fact one knows that there is a subjective component in even the most objective investigations; and that even the most subjective interpretations must rely on an objective basis in fact.

Objective or empirical research deals with facts, and should in principle yield unequivocal and unassailable results. Such facts might include the correct location of an ancient monument; or the finding of a new manuscript or papyrus. Of course much research is not so certain as this, both because the data do not speak unanimously, and new data may cause changes in earlier definitive results. It used to be held that Aeschylus' *Suppliantes* was the earliest of his dramas because of the extensive participation of the chorus. Later a papyrus fragment was found that conclusively places that play after 468, four years after *the Persians*. In this case an empirical datum has caused the abandonment of a previously widely held view: an objective fact has replaced a subjective judgment. A new subjective debate must, however, thereby arise: why did Aeschylus treat the chorus in this way in *Suppliantes*? And/or: is our view of the development of Greek tragedy from chorus to drama correct?

Other empirical conclusions involve dating of things, location of buildings and the like. The *Stoa Poikile* in Athens had been located notionally in various places, but American excavations in the Athenian Agora have now definitively placed the structure. Other identifications have proved less certain. We know, for instance, that there is a

---

mid-fifth century Doric temple on the hill overlooking the Athenian Agora. We do not, however, know to whom it was dedicated. Certainly not to Theseus, and probably not to Hephaestus. Here we combine certainty on the one hand with ignorance on the other. Speculation as to the temple’s identification is just that.

Likewise with the Parthenon’s Ionic frieze. We know it was there, and either that it represents the Pan-Athenian procession or that it does not. In this instance as in many others, I recommend a percentage system to replace the right-wrong system to which we are used. It used to be held that the frieze represents the Pan-Athenian procession, but that conclusion has repeatedly been called in doubt. My guess is that in percentage terms we might weight arguments 30% in favor of the old identification, 70% against. And we probably should rate any alternative proposals for an identification roughly 10% for and 90% against. However unpalatable it may seem, this conclusion means that the chances (70% - 90%) are that we do not know the intention of the Parthenon frieze — beyond that of celebrating Athena and Athens.

This last leads us to what I have called value-laden or subjective scholarship, though perhaps “interpretive” would be a better term. These sorts of investigation require the former empirical scholarship as a prerequisite, but go into the question of the meaning of an artefact, be it literary, historical, philosophical, architectural. We all, for instance, know how the Aeneid ends. To many the death of Turnus has unsatisfactory for one of a number of reasons, and scholars have been diligent and eager to interpret the ending both in literary terms and also historical. Is the ending a critique of the Aenean — read Augustan — program; or is there a higher justification for Aeneas’ action at this point? We cannot know, and arguments on both sides have proved both fruitful and unconvincing to the opposition.

One recalls Homer’s words (in Achilles’ mouth) upon the death of Hector: “we have won us great glory; we have slain noble Hector” (Iliad 22.335). Clearly Virgil did not wish to imitate Homer with a similar expression. He found himself unable to have Aeneas rejoice in the same way Achilles had. Rather he developed the thought of the previous Iliad lines in which Achilles recalls his dead friend Patroclus. Why did Virgil not have Aeneas rejoice? Why did he choose to end his poem on an elegiac note? We cannot know, but I incline to the pessimistic camp of scholars.

On the other hand — and here there is a third kind of scholarship, the celebratory — we can feel Achilles’ exhilaration at his great success; and we can mourn with Aeneas at the necessity of — vainly — avenging his friend by the killing of a valiant but hated enemy. The more we ponder these two passages and urge our students to ponder them the better and more humane will be our scholarship — whether objective or subjective.
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