

New England Classical Journal

Volume 49
Issue 1 *Special Issue In Honor of Jacqui Carlon*

Pages -

8-12-2022

Full Issue

Follow this and additional works at: <https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2022) "Full Issue," *New England Classical Journal*: Vol. 49 : Iss. 1 , .
<https://doi.org/10.52284/NECJ/49.1>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Classical Journal by an authorized editor of CrossWorks.

New England Classical Journal

Special Issue
In Honor of Jacqui Carlon



Volume 49.1 ♦ Spring 2022

Aaron M. Seider, *Editor*
Peter Barrios-Lech, *Guest Co-Editor*
Anne Mahoney, *Guest Co-Editor*
Ruth Breindel, *Managing Editor*
Francesca Bellei, *Book Review Editor*
Andrew Buck, *Editorial Assistant*
Anastasia Kaliabakos, *Editorial Assistant*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Nancy Antonellis, *Brockton High School*
Antony Augoustakis, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*
Hanne Eisenfeld, *Boston College*
Harriet Fertik, *The Ohio State University*
Thomas J. Howell, *Northampton High School*
Stephanie Lindeborg, *Boston Latin Academy*

AIMS & SCOPE

New England Classical Journal is a biannual, peer-reviewed journal that publishes articles, notes, and reviews on all aspects of classical antiquity. The journal welcomes contributions from those residing in any geographical area, and it aims to foster a process of peer-review that is timely and constructive.

New England Classical Journal

49.1 — Spring 2022

<https://doi.org/10.52284/NECJ/49.1>

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- PETER BARRIOS-LECH**
Introduction to *Schola Viuida* 1
- Part One: Ancient Epistolography
- THOMAS J. KEELINE**
“Adams’ Law” and the Placement of *esse* in Pliny the Younger 12
- PETER BARRIOS-LECH**
Putting on a Fronto:
Persona and Patterns of Language in Fronto’s Correspondence 27
- Part Two: Latin Pedagogy
- RONNIE ANCONA**
Introducing a Bit of Active Latin into Your Current Advanced Latin Classroom:
Usus loquendi et audiendi de Terentio Catulloque 55
- JORGE TÁRREGA GARRIDO**
De Sallustio Latine Praelegendo:
Causae, Rationes, Consilia Docendi 66
- Part Three: Latin Readers
- JOHN GRUBER-MILLER AND BRET MULLIGAN**
Latin Vocabulary Knowledge and the Readability of Latin Texts:
A Preliminary Study 80
- TERESA RAMSBY**
The Utility and Representational Opportunity of Latin Novellas 102
- Appendix
- JORGE TÁRREGA GARRIDO (TRANS. PETER BARRIOS-LECH)**
On Teaching Sallust in Latin:
The Why and the How 112
- KATZ CONTEST WINNER
- BENJAMIN CLAESSENS**
Horace’s Use of the Myth of Icarus in the *Odes* 126
- CANE STUDENT WRITING CONTEST WINNER
- MIA SCHENENGA**
A Perspective on Pandora’s Box 130

BOOK REVIEWS

DANIELLE FREEDMAN

Andreas Karkavitsas. Translated by Johanna Hanink.

The Archeologist and Selected Sea Stories

133

LINDA McNULTY PEREZ

Luis Alfaro. Rosa Andújar, ed. *The Greek Trilogy of Luis Alfaro:*

Electricidad; Oedipus El Rey; Mojada

136

MAURO PUDDU

Kim Bowes, ed. *The Roman Peasant Project 2009–2014:*

Excavating the Roman Rural Poor

139

NEHA RAHMAN

Shadi Bartsch, translator. *The Aeneid*

142

HANNELORE SEGERS

Brian P. Sowers. *In Her Own Words:*

The Life and Poetry of Aelia Eudocia

147

ADVERTISEMENTS

Suburani

150

National Latin Exam

151

Articles

Introduction to *Schola Viuida*

PETER BARRIOS-LECH

Abstract: An overview of Professor Jacqueline Carlon’s scholarship and career, in the context of a brief historical overview of the “Communicative” or “Active Latin” movement.

Keywords: Active Latin, Communicative Latin, Spoken Latin, SLA, Latin Pedagogy

Adnotasse videor facta dictaque uirorum feminarumque alia clariora esse alia maiora (Plin. Ep. 3.16.1-2)

I think I’ve noted before that people are often known for words or actions that are not, in fact, their most outstanding accomplishments.

Jacqui Carlon has worn many hats in her long and distinguished career: computer technician, scholar of Classical Latin and Ancient Language Pedagogy, distinguished educator at the high-school and university level.¹ She is internationally known, having spoken at conferences and been cited by scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.

Schola Viuida acknowledges Jacqui’s scholarly contributions (*clariora*) to the fields of Silver Latin, Imperial Roman Culture, ancient epistolography, and Instructed Ancient Languages. The *maiora* – even more important accomplishments, however, – could pass unnoticed. This volume seems the right place to mention them. Jacqui co-founded the *Conuenticulum Bostoniense*; helped create what is still the only program granting a Masters with Teaching License in Latin that emphasizes Second Language Acquisition Theory (SLA) and Latin pedagogy; she created a viable and more rewarding alternative to the AP, a dual enrollment program allowing teachers and students to explore Latin texts of their choosing while students earn college credit; she has led, as its president, the New England region’s Classical Association, CANE (Classical Association of New England); she has mentored (and continues to mentor) countless students and junior colleagues. Although Jacqui leaves behind her day-to-day work at UMass Boston, we eagerly look forward to reading further work from her on Latin pedagogy, Pliny, Latin literature generally; and learning from her lectures and demonstrations.

Jacqui Carlon’s Career

The story of Jacqui’s career as a classicist begins in 1986, when she was hired as a Latin Teacher and computer operator for Notre Dame Academy on the South Shore in Massachusetts. Computers – not Latin – had gotten Jacqui the job. Later in her career at Notre Dame, she was the foreign language department chair. In that capacity she began informally training foreign language (FL) teachers. Her experiences observing and training FL teachers gave Jacqui practical knowledge of what worked and didn’t in the language classroom.

In the late nineties, Jacqui left Notre Dame Academy. After reflection and discussion with her close circle, she decided to continue her study of the ancient world, earning an MA in Classics from Tufts in 1997. From Tufts, Jacqui went on to Boston University, where she earned the doctorate in Classical Philology with her dissertation on Pliny’s letters, later published

¹ Her excellence as an educator was recognized four years ago with the Society of Classical Studies’ prestigious *Collegiate Teaching Award*. The citation is at <https://classicalstudies.org/awards-and-fellowships/2016/collegiate-teaching-award-jacqueline-carlon>, accessed April 2, 2021.

in a revised version by Cambridge University Press as *Pliny's Women* (2009). The book has become a highly cited and valued contribution to Plinian studies, and to the study of gender in Ancient Rome generally.

The Pliny Scholar

Pliny's Women is a study of the women in the letters, drawing on prosopography, epigraphy, traditional philological analysis, and sensitive close readings of a selection of Pliny's letters. Jacqui aims to show how, through these epistles, Pliny advertises his relation to key women to construct his own persona and secure his own *aeternitas* and *gloria*. "Pliny's women" also emerge from Jacqui's readings as conduits of a rich oral history and as possessing formidable power.

Pliny had few surviving relatives: his father, adoptive father (Pliny the Elder), sister, and mother had all died before the letters were assembled for publication. As Jacqui writes, "this dearth of kin is made even more acute for Pliny by his lack of children. Pliny the son, Pliny the brother, Pliny the father are all roles difficult to define in a script missing so many players." Pliny fills these otherwise unoccupied roles in the letters, advertising himself as a kind of surrogate relative to the women he writes about or to in his letters (Carlon 2009: 5).

For example, Jacqui shows how Pliny, by advertising his connection to their female relatives, presents himself as an avenger for members of the so-called "Stoic Opposition," senators who advocated for greater power and more freedom of speech particularly under the Flavians. (Though it appears he did nothing at the time to stop their persecution.) Women play a key role in Pliny's self-presentation as "the associate of opponents to Domitian's excesses". In one letter, for instance, we find Pliny lamenting the death of two young women who died in childbirth (*utraque a partu...decessit*, 4.21.1). Their father, Helvidius Priscus (II) had been executed under Domitian in 93. Pliny centers the grief for the deceased women – repeatedly and quite strikingly – on himself, "I grieve also for my own sake," he says, concluding tricolon with *angor etiam meo nomine* (4.21.3). By placing this letter against the backdrop of the other consolatory or "obituary" letters in the corpus, Jacqui sets into sharp relief Pliny's surprising focus on his *own* grief. She argues, convincingly, that with that focus on his own grief for the loss of the two women, Pliny "draws himself into the inner circle of bereaved family members as substitute parent" (2009: 50). He thus can showcase his role as a quasi-father, not missing, at the same time, a great opportunity to highlight his own connection with Helvidius Priscus, outspoken against imperial excesses: "I love their [sc. the deceased women's] father assiduously, as testified by my defense of him and the speeches published afterwards (*nam patrem illarum defunctum quoque perseverantissime diligo ut actione mea et libris testatum est*, 4.21.3).

After his mother died, Pliny's only family are women related to him through one of his marriages (he was married at least twice, possibly three times). These women were his mother-in-law and an *adfinis* named Calvina (both from previous marriages); his wife, and his wife's aunt. It is through his depiction of his relation and interaction with these women that Pliny can put on display his private persona, and reinforce the consistency between it and his public one. For example, in a letter to Calvina (Plin. *Ep.* 2.4; Carlon 2009: 123-125), Pliny advertises his pay-off of the debt inherited from Calvina's now-deceased father. Jacqui shows how Pliny subtly contrasts, with the deceased father's profligacy, his own (Pliny's) prudent fiscal behavior, relying on traditional Roman virtues of *frugalitas* and that traditional source of income, farming. Jacqui elucidates the concluding rhetorical antithesis, as Pliny's *frugalitas* affords his *liberalitas*, generosity, with his parsimony serving as wellspring for his liberal donations. Pliny's judicious management of his finances allows him to relieve the debt his *adfinis* inherited, and he thus fills a vacuum in her life as a father-figure.

These thumbnail sketches will give an impression of a book that has been widely and positively reviewed. An article on Pliny's hometown of Comum (Carlon 2018) followed. Here, Jacqui reads letters Pliny writes to residents of Comum, specifically, friends and family. The letters, in Jacqui's analysis, showcase Pliny's ongoing concern for the town. Through

epistles, he maintains relations with Comum's residents; advertises his benefactions to the town, both simple and more elaborate; and constructs Comum as a *locus amoenus*, a place and a community he envisages as an ideal *secessus* from the pressures and peril of Rome.

Jacqui Carlon: The Bridge between SLA Theory and Latin Pedagogy

While writing her dissertation, Jacqui returned to Tufts to teach. Here she continued the mentoring role she had assumed at Notre Dame; this time, by preparing graduate students to teach at the high-school level. By the time she earned her PhD in 2002, Jacqui had acquired skills few doctorates in our field have: philological expertise, a firm sense of the challenges of teaching Latin, and of effective pedagogical approaches to meet those challenges.

An open position at UMass Boston seemed custom made to Jacqui's emerging scholarly persona and professional skills: it required a consummate Latinist with hard-earned knowledge of effective Latin-teaching practice, both at high-school and university levels. The rest, as they say, is history: Jacqui would go on to direct the MA program in Latin and Classical Humanities, one of whose tracks leads to teaching licensure.² That program would establish itself in the vanguard, by providing students with theoretical foundations – Second Language Acquisition theory – on which to build informed Latin pedagogy; while allowing students to engage in the acquisition of a second (or third) language (Latin!) by hiring skilled speakers and establishing New England's first Spoken Latin event, the *Conventiculum Bostoniense* (CB).

Jacqui co-directed the *Conuenticulum Bostoniense*, from its inception in 2006.³ The CB drew inspiration from the *Conventiculum Lexintoniense* and the *Rusticatio*, but quickly established a distinct identity as a laboratory for communicative teaching techniques; a commitment to helping teachers; and as a venue for graduate-level courses. It is still the only convention of its kind from which a student can gain both Professional Development Points and graduate credit. One of the graduate courses introduces students to SLA theory, with focus on Latin pedagogy. The other invites participants to engage with texts not commonly read: the *Austrias* of Juan Latino (black African poet and Latin professor, and the first poet from Sub-Saharan Africa to publish a book of poems in a European language);⁴ Hrosvitha of Gandersheim (10th C. German nun, and playwright); Johannes Kepler's *Somnium* (considered to be the first work of Science Fiction); or the Guatemalan poet Landivar's *Rusticatio Mexicana*, to give some examples.

The CB's philosophy is founded on three bedrock beliefs. The CB programming offers participants the theory, and techniques underpinned by that theory, as 'tools' to add to the pedagogical toolkit. One bedrock belief, then, is that teachers who teach from research-backed principles, who control a range of techniques and approaches, and are willing to constantly experiment and learn, will better be able to reach out to and honor diverse learning styles. A second foundational principle is the ecumenical embrace of the millennia-long tradition of Latin letters, produced by writers from across the world, both women and men. CB programming emphasizes non-canonical readings (examples of which were listed above), and promotes the use of novellas (see Ramsby, this volume). The model is very much inspired by classrooms (as documented by e.g. Stringer 2019 and Ribeiro Leite 2021), where teachers draw from the long tradition of Latin letters, including neo-Latin, to select readings that will speak to students and connect to their experiences. A third conviction concerns what the texts are and are not. The texts are not monuments deserving veneration, means of acquiring necessary cultural capital, nor fountains successive generations of readers draw from to renew western culture. Instead they are sites for exploration of the human – and especially one's own! – experience, a means to discover the *Weltanschauung* of people in other times

² There are two other tracks, one in Applied Linguistics and the other in Greek and Latin. In both the Licensure Track and the Applied Linguistics Track students learn SLA theory and its application in the Latin classroom.

³ Carlon 2011 provides a brief overview of the inception of this program.

⁴ There is some debate about where Juan Latino was born, but Africa is most likely, though precisely where is not known: see Gates and Wolff (1998: 16-21 for brief biography, and esp. p. 16 for debates on birthplace).

and places, opportunities to reflect critically on their (the texts') previous appropriation, and departure points for creative self-expression.⁵

As she directed the CB, Jacqui observed many engaging, pedagogically sound and (frankly) fun Latin classes led by passionate, experienced instructors teaching a text they chose, often an "off-the-beaten-track" author, in a communicative classroom. Thus arose another initiative: dual enrollment, a welcome alternative to the AP course.⁶ The dual enrollment program is now offered in over ten high schools across New England (the number increases yearly) and regularly introduces high-school juniors and seniors to (non-)canonical Latin in an engaging and pedagogically sound way, including Communicative Latin techniques.

The term "Communicative Latin" means Latin taught in ways other than Grammar-Translation (GT). Some prefer "Active" Latin, without, of course, implying that other approaches are somehow *not* active.⁷ Neither label should be, but is often, confused with "Conversational Latin", a term which conjures images of people talking about the weather, what pizza toppings to order, or birthday presents received. It is the aim of this Introduction and the entire issue to demonstrate that "Communicative Latin" (we use this label henceforth) is not small talk in Latin in circles of enthusiasts, but a serious business: a suite of pedagogical techniques, backed by research, and increasingly employed in high schools and universities (below we approximate how many high schools and universities offer classes featuring Communicative Latin).

But Communicative Latin is not a supermethod (Saffire 2006; Keeline 2019). To revisit the truism: students learn optimally, each in his or her own way. Students also have learning *preferences*, as each "find[s] different ways of enjoying studying. Spoken Latin, for instance, is very popular with some, whereas other students find great pleasure in translating difficult texts with the help of grammars and dictionaries" (Pettersson and Rosengren 2021: 196). Given the range of learning styles and preferences, it makes sense to offer a range of resources and teach using those methods that best reach the students who are with us. As Jacqui herself has said, "truly good teaching is customized both for its teacher and its students".

Jacqui Carlon, Bridge between SLA and the Latin Classrooms

As Jacqui lead the CB, a bustling laboratory for Communicative Latin techniques, she was also conducting research, applying enduring SLA findings to address long-standing problems in Latin pedagogy. Jacqui best summarizes her own research, some of the first done in a field (as yet to be named) dedicated to the application of SLA theory to ancient language learning:

the body of [SLA] research is vast, sometimes contradictory, and often jargon-filled. Teachers are perfectly capable of undertaking a multi-faceted pedagogy, once definitive research is shared in an accessible way, and I think that there are some clear implications for the Latin classroom to be drawn from SLA research...as well as some outstanding questions and several areas of frustration, not the least of which is the lack of research that focuses on Latin learners (2016: 119).

⁵ Examples: a Chicano adaptation of Plautus' *Casina* which glances at Mexican machismo and patriarchy, a young queer man's poetic recasting of the Orpheus and Eurydice story, focalizing, in a poem, Eurydice, who mistakes the heat of the underworld for the warmth of Orpheus' body, or Walcott's *Omeros*, an epic on Walcott's native Saint Lucia, in part a meditation on European colonialism. See further on critical reception of the Classics Hanink (2017): <https://eidolon.pub/its-time-to-embrace-critical-classical-reception-d3491a40ecc3>, accessed August 16, 2021, with further bibliography.

⁶ The Latin AP does a disservice to Latin teachers and their students. Despite the AP course's professed goal that students be able to read and comprehend, the AP itself is no measure of reading comprehension; for this, students and teachers are much better served by the ALIRA. For the "oft-broken promise" of AP credit, see Stringer (2019: 86 with n.36).

⁷ For definitions, see Slocum Bailey (2019: 94).

Jacqui's articles, accessibly conveying the "definitive research of SLA" arose out of the conviction that the communicative classroom would engage a more diverse set of learners; and in so doing, boost enrollments, secure retention, banish the chimera that Latin is an intractably hard language, and eliminate its reputation as an elitist subject (Carlson 2011).⁸

Later research would bear out this conviction, which was nevertheless, already in 2011, supported by ample anecdotal evidence. That anecdotal evidence came in the form of student journals written during the CB, journals which Jacqui collected and analyzed for trends. Participants in the CB over the course of four years consistently attested to the following four positive effects of the summer program: (1.) "growth in...speaking abilities," was the most obvious and immediate payoff. Second, (2.) more strikingly, many participants observed "that their Latin reading ability drastically change[d] over the course of the week... with less need to 'decode' the text". Third (3.): teacher empathy towards students increased. After struggling for a week to understand and be understood *in Latin*, the CB participant better understood his or her own students' struggles with the language. Finally (4.), because participants had directly experienced the communicative methods' effectiveness, they were now eager to apply them in their own classrooms (2011: 13).

In 2013, Jacqui published the fruit of her thinking on applications of SLA to Latin, now considered a milestone in research on Latin pedagogy. Before its publication, Classicists had only recently begun to apply insights from SLA to the study and teaching of Latin and Greek; and such applications of SLA to ancient language pedagogy were few and far between, nor had John Gruber-Miller's excellent volume of collected essays, *When Dead Tongues Speak* (2006) triggered the flood of research he and the contributing authors had hoped for.⁹ Of course, by this time, people had been speaking Latin and Greek for millennia, though the number dwindled by the 20th C.¹⁰ There had also been a long history of using communicative approaches in the classroom, and in particular Renaissance and early Modern Latin instructors anticipated what SLA research shows to work (Musumeci 1997; Tárrega, this volume; van den Arend 2018). But at the turn of the 20th-21st C., communicative classrooms were rare to find, until recently.¹¹

Jacqui's "Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy" came just as more and more students and teachers were discovering the power of the communicative method; though still very few knew about, let alone applied, SLA to the communicative classroom. The article launched her career as a bridge between SLA and the Classics, alongside just a few others, notably Justin Slocum Bailey (2016, 2017a, 2017b, and 2019) founder of *Indwelling*

⁸ There is enough research and anecdotal evidence to now suggest that Grammar-Translation methods alone will not be sufficient. Deagon (2006: 33) cites evidence suggesting that a traditional grammar-translation approach might only reach 10% of learners.

⁹ Deagon 1991 is the earliest entry I can find, which adumbrates the advantages of communicative Latin and Greek. In 1997, the *Standards for Classical Language Learning* (Gascoyne 1997) called for students to "use orally, listen to, and write Latin or Greek as part of the language learning process." In order to meet this standard, Gruber-Miller 2005, and especially Gruber-Miller 2006, adapt SLA findings to Latin and Greek instruction. These are important, especially the latter edited volume in which see especially the chapters by Deagon (2006), Gruber-Miller (2006), McCaffrey (2006), Morrell (2006) and Saffire (2006). After Gruber Miller 2006, there were still few people writing on applications of SLA to ancient languages, but see notably Anderson and Beckwith 2010 and MacDonald 2011.

¹⁰ Nancy Llewelyn numbers those who can speak Latin fluently at 3,000 in an article (probably) written in 2013, although now almost two decades later, that number has certainly increased; by how much, it is hard to know. See Llewelyn (2013?) at <http://www.latin.org/resources/Why%20Speak%20Latin.pdf>, esp. n. 3.

¹¹ Although sometimes opposed to each other as "new" (Active Latin) versus "traditional" (G-T), or "intuitive" (Active Latin) vs "logical-rational" (Waquet 1998: 181-182), both methods have a pedigree extending at least as far back as the Renaissance. Since then, they have always existed side by side (Musumeci 1997: 113-116). See (Waquet 1998: 54-55; 177) for the growing predominance of grammar translation approaches heading into the mid 20th C. Prior to and in the early days of SLA applications to Latin pedagogy, speakers of the ancient languages adduced anecdotal evidence for the efficacy of the communicative approach; they appealed to common sense (listening and speaking is how we learn our first language); and to the 'fun' of the whole enterprise; as well as Latin letters' promotion of a "general human flourishing" (Wills 1998, Coffee 2012, Llewelyn 2013).

Language and Nancy Llewelyn, founder of *SALVI*. In her landmark 2013 article, Jacqui identified the areas that needed to change for Latin to survive the 21st C:

- A) **Language teachers at all levels must familiarize themselves with important findings in SLA and stay current with recent developments** (Carlson 2013: 112).¹² Instructors at all levels can no longer ignore SLA findings, nor can one stop with Krashen (Jacqui's article appears in an issue of *Teaching Classical Languages* titled precisely, "After Krashen"), After all, the field of SLA has now well and thoroughly moved past his ideas, which themselves have been modified; while new theories have been elaborated and are being tested.¹³
- B) **Ancient Language Pedagogy must be constituted as a scholarly discipline.** Jacqui candidly observed, back then, how little we still know about how *Latin* is learned. In the hopes of remedying this ignorance, she poses nearly a dozen research questions (2013: 112-113): what are the "orders of acquisition" – that is, what elements of grammar are learned earlier and later on?¹⁴ A related question: what elements of the language are easily acquired (we may find some surprises here)? What is the impact of *Spoken Latin* on *reading* speed and the accuracy of understanding?

To take these points in order. First, the task of becoming conversant with SLA theory is not so daunting as it may first appear, certainly not for Classics teachers, who are used to acquiring much of their knowledge autodidactically! This volume is a good place to start, as is the now-classic *How Languages are Learned* (2013). Also useful is regular perusal of journals which focus on ancient language pedagogy: the *New England Classical Journal*; *Teaching Classical Languages*; *Classical Outlook*; the *Paedagogus* section of *Classical World*, the *Forum* section of *Classical Journal*, and *The Journal of Classics Teaching*. There are of course debates online. The underlying point is this: one has a choice in how one teaches the ancient language, but the choice must be informed by what we know about how people learn languages, and what is in the best interests of our students; that is, what students want from the course (Carlson 2013: 112). Nor, crucially, is there just "one best way"; we need not throw out – and indeed cannot throw out – traditional methods which include explicit grammar instruction (Keeline 2019; Aguilar Garcia 2020: 336-339).

As for the second point above, scholars have by now heeded Jacqui's clarion call to form a discipline, whose goal is to inform teaching practice "based on data-driven evidence in the interests of our students" (Stringer 2019: 88). Research since the publication of her article has shown that communicative classrooms lead to increased enrollments, student retention from one year to the next, and a more diverse population of Latin learners (Patrick 2015; Stringer 2019). Teachers have shared their own experience on transitioning to or teaching a communicative classroom and experimenting with texts outside the canon. Without sacrificing rigor, both teacher and students experience more joy and more progress towards the goal of reading (Shirley 2019, Stringer 2019, Tárrega and Ancona, this volume). Leni Ribeiro Leite, a Latin professor in Brazil, writes about her transformation of a Latin classroom whose aim is to "explore texts that [are] relevant to undergraduates' own cultural heritage [like a Spanish Jesuit's letter on an armadillo; or poems on college education in 16th C Portugal] and also to encourage use of Latin as a means of communication" (2021: 92).

Studies, some empirical, are multiplying: on reading practices of Latin learners (Boyd 2018), the value of cloze exercises over against translation to get students to "notice" or

¹² Foreman, A.Z. 2019 restates this now increasingly accepted point: <https://blogicarian.blogspot.com/2019/03/argumentum-ad-ignorantiam.html?m=1&fbclid=IwAR07JwH0tK59-zlXN2mlPi8zUx2bshXAcIE8OQNlcZKMcMZ-iMVyR3hMaLA> accessed March 17 2021.

¹³ Anderson 2019 provides an entry point for more recent developments in SLA; see now also Lloyd and Hunt (2021).

¹⁴ See MacDonald 2011 and Patrick 2015 for the suggestion that acquisition of case-endings come (much?) later in the process of acquiring the language.

“focus on forms” (Sarkissian and Behney, 2018), the need for explicit vocabulary instruction (Carlson 2016), and more: Adema (2019) now attempts to delimit this burgeoning field, trace its history, and identify areas which still need research. A recent volume *Communicative Approaches for Ancient Languages* also includes reports on teachers’ experimentation with the communicative approach (e.g. Ribeiro Leite 2021; Letchford 2021).

The proliferation of communicative Latin *classrooms* at the high school and middle school has been documented. By one conservative estimate, that number now stands at 130.¹⁵ Change is especially needed at the university level, where teaching practices remain conservative, in no small part due to a common attitude towards language pedagogy, that it is a “lesser” pursuit, to be handed off, whenever possible, to adjuncts or graduate students. But even in the academy, attitudes are changing, as attested by the sheer number of programs which feature communicative ancient languages: Justin Slocum Bailey reports at least 17 such programs two years ago, in 2019; that number probably did not capture all higher-education institutions with communicative ancient language, and it has in any case undoubtedly increased three years later.¹⁶

The motive for introducing communicative classrooms at UMass Boston is not from a nostalgia for the past, or to recreate a republic of letters where Latin becomes a universal scholarly language: this is an outcome neither realistic or desirable for the simple reason that learning to speak Latin with a high degree of fluency requires a serious commitment of time and effort, which most people either cannot or do not wish to devote.¹⁷ One good reason to cultivate the spoken language is if research and our own experience shows that speaking the language helps students learn it. And any one can speak Latin fluently enough for their students; furthermore, all the evidence shows that students appreciate the effort (Stringer 2019, Shirley 2019, Tárrega and Ancona, this volume). One can teach students to read Cicero well without speaking like Cicero.

Again, a reasonably good level of fluency can be achieved, and students will benefit from listening to you, the teacher, however much input you decide to include, even if it is not always correct. As Keeline (this volume) puts it:

Latin is not some pristine marble statue placed high on an untouchable pedestal, something that we will befoul if we handle it with our grubby little paws: as students and teachers we do not need to be afraid to make mistakes, particularly in the classroom and in everyday conversations.

To readers ambivalent about whether to incorporate speaking: we encourage you to set your own goals for spoken Latin, however modest or ambitious. You can decide to script interactions, and include plenty of level-appropriate Latin (for recommendations, see Gruber-Miller and Mulligan, this volume), and if you make mistakes, worry not. Students will benefit “’cause,” ultimately, to quote the rapper Rakim, “[their] ears never lie”.

Content of this Volume

Schola Viuida honors Jacqui’s impact in the areas of Plinian studies and Latin pedagogy. It falls into three parts. In the first, two chapters pay tribute to her research on Pliny and Latin epistolography (Keeline, Barrios-Lech). The second part contains two chapters, each of which offer classroom-tested Communicative Latin techniques and exercises (Ancona, Tárrega). Finally, part three addresses Latin texts for beginning and intermediate students (Gruber-Miller, Ramsby).

¹⁵ <http://todallycomprehensibletlatin.blogspot.com/p/ci-latin-teacher-database.html>; I consulted this database in the summer of 2020, when it recorded over 150 instructors who teach Latin actively: 128 teach at the middle and/or high school level; 12 at the elementary; 14 identify as teacher-trainers or supervisors; and 2 as university professors.

¹⁶ See now Slocum Bailey (2019: 98n.99) for universities with communicative Latin; Mair and Lloyd (2021) document change at a number of universities, including Brazil, the UK, and Poland.

¹⁷ See Waquet (1998) 189-190; and 315-318 for (failed) attempts to achieve this goal.

Part One

In **Chapter 1, “‘Adams’ Law’ and the Placement of *esse* in Pliny the Younger”**, Tom Keeline focuses specifically on Pliny’s letters. He begins by introducing readers to what he calls Adams’ Law, namely that the verb *esse* can act as a focus particle, by coming after the focused element, that is, the new or salient piece of information in the sentence: compare *caeruleum est caelum* (the sky is *blue*) with *caelum est caeruleum* (It’s the *sky* that’s blue). Adams had shown that this tendency held for at least some authors of the first century BCE and early first century CE, but was not certain whether it was in force after that period. Through a careful and thorough analysis of all forms of *esse* in Books 1 and 10 of Pliny’s letter collection, Keeline argues convincingly, both with quantitative and qualitative analysis, that Adams’ Law persisted at least until ca. 100 CE. Those interested in philosophical questions concerning communicative Latin, or those already teaching using such methods themselves, will want to pay special attention to Tom’s remarks in his epilogue, where he ties these findings to SLA research and contemporary concerns in Latin pedagogy, urging that we try to model in our own “output,” as best we can on the language of the authors whom we seek to understand.

In **Chapter 2, “Putting on a Fronto: Persona and Patterns of Language in Fronto’s Correspondence”**, Peter Barrios-Lech analyzes the language of letters exchanged between Fronto and correspondents, in order to show by what verbal means Fronto and his epistolary correspondents construct a persona and maintain and negotiate relationships. Analysis of the frequency of (Latin to Greek) code-switches, the diversity, or range of unique, address-terms, letter openings and closings used, and the type and frequency of requests show how Fronto’s relationship with Marcus Aurelius changes over time; and offer us one way to measure differences in Fronto’s epistolary relationship with the other correspondents.

Part Two

As Ancona puts it (this volume), “time spent ‘in the language’ helps us to acquire language”: that is, the input and output generated in a communicative language classroom are crucial. And as she reminds us, the importance of ‘time spent in the language’ has been acknowledged in the recent (2017: 6-7) *Standards for Classical Language Learning* which calls on learners to transmit and receive messages in Latin or Greek in order facilitate learning of the language. In **Chapter 3, “Introducing a Bit of Active Latin into Your Current Advanced Latin Classroom”**, Ancona addresses college instructors specifically. She observes that while teachers at this level may – without even recognizing it – use active Latin in beginning classrooms, often students in advanced Latin classes hear very little of the language, much less get to speak it. Ancona, therefore, offers college level teachers some suggestions for introducing “a bit” of spoken Latin in the advanced-level classroom. After being inspired by high-school active Latin classrooms as well as by some active Latin workshops she observed, Ancona introduced a bit of active Latin in her advanced classes. Her experiences teaching Terence’s *Eunuch* actively, as reported in her chapter, and the lesson plan she offers for teaching Catullus 1 communicatively show just how easy it will be for any college-level Latin teacher to incorporate communicative Latin in an advanced Latin class.

Jorge Tárrega, in **Chapter 4, “De Sallustio Latine Praelegendo: Causae, Rationes, Consilia Docendi”**, gives a snapshot of an advanced Latin class conducted in entirely in Latin, this time on Sallust’s *Bellum Jugurthae*. As did the student feedback from Ancona’s class, so did that gathered by Tárrega demonstrate, overwhelmingly, that students enjoyed and found useful the communicative approach. For those with no experience in Spoken Latin, Tárrega still has something to offer: a host of exercises “which...can help students as subsidiary activities even in a class using traditional approaches.” (The article is written in Latin, with an English translation by Barrios-Lech in the Appendix).

Part Three

In **Chapter 5**, “**Latin Vocabulary Knowledge and the Readability of Latin Texts**”, John Gruber-Miller and Brett Mulligan here present, for the first time, a new measure of lexical readability: *Mulligan’s LexR*, which is based on various measures, including average word length and frequency, Lexical Variation (the ratio of unique words to the total number of tokens in the text), and others. *LexR* “offers a reproducible method that can be applied to any lemmatized Latin text.” Gruber-Miller and Mulligan then apply it to fifteen well-known texts, ranging from beginning to advanced: readers of the article will likely be surprised to find out which texts Mulligan’s *LexR* classes as easier and which harder in lexical readability.

In **Chapter 6**, “**The Utility and Representational Opportunity of Latin Novellas**”, Teresa Ramsby provides a number of justifications for using the Latin novella in the K-12 Latin classroom, citing the value that exists in providing students with narratives that are designed for their level of Latin reading proficiency and that are compelling to read. Moreover, as the number of Latin novellas has increased exponentially over the last few years, so has the diversity of characters represented in these novellas, thereby allowing students to read something they find interesting and to meet characters with whom they might more easily identify. By way of example, Ramsby provides an analysis of one of the earliest Latin novellas, Ellie Arnold’s *Cloelia*, to showcase the potential this genre holds for introducing students to sophisticated concepts regarding ancient culture and society.¹⁸

University of Massachusetts, Boston
Peter.Lech@umb.edu

¹⁸ I would like to thank Anne Mahoney and the contributors to this volume for their helpful suggestions and corrections; opinions and any errors are mine.

Works Cited

- Adema, Suzanne. 2019. "Latin Learning and instruction as a research field." *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 18.1-2: 35-59. <https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2019-0001>.
- Aguilar Garcia, Maria Luisa. 2020. "De Rationibus ac Principiis Quibus Constat *Comparatio Aliarum Linguarum (SLA) ad Linguam Latinam Tralatis ac Conversis*. *Classical World* 113.3.: 335-356. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2020.0027>.
- Anderson, Peter and Mark Beckwith. 2010. "Form-focused Teaching for the Intermediate Latin Student" *Teaching Classical Languages* 2.1: 31-52.
- Anderson, Peter. 2019. "Comprehensible Output, Form-Focused Recasts, and the New Standards." *The Classical Outlook*. 94.2: 72-80.
- Bailey, Justin Slocum. 2016. "Teaching Latin to Humans." *Eidolon*.
- . 2017a. "The Persistent Perks of Speaking Latin" *Eidolon*.
- . 2017b. "How Harrius Potter Helped Me Read More Latin." *Eidolon*.
- . 2019 "Toward a Collegial, Post-Method Latin Pedagogy." *The Classical Outlook* 94.2, 94-101.
- Boyd, Rebecca M. 2018. "Latin students' bottom-up and top-down strategies for reading Latin literature and the impact of cross-linguistic influence." *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 17.2: 301-332. <https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2018-0014>.
- Carlson, Jacqueline. 2009. *Pliny's Women*. Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511581229>.
- . 2011. "Educating the Educators." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 22, 13-14.
- . 2013. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Instruction and Securing its Place in the Curricula." *Teaching Classical Languages* 4.2 (Spring 2013): 106-112.
- . 2015. "Rethinking the Latin Classroom: Changing the Role of Translation in Assessment." *The Classical Outlook* 90.4 (Summer 2015): 138-140.
- . 2016. "*Quomodo dicitur?* The Importance of Memory in Language Learning." *Teaching Classical Languages*, 7.2: 109-135.
- . 2018. "You Can Go Home Again: Pliny the Younger Writes to Comum" *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 61.2: 56-65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-5370.12082>.
- Deagon, Andrea W. 1991. "Learning Process and Exercise Sequencing in Latin Instruction." *The Classical Journal* 87.1: 59-70.
- Elifrits, Kathy; Mary English, and Sherwin Little, et al. 2017. *2017 Standards for Classical Language Learning*. American Classical League.
- Foreman, A.Z. 2019. "Latin as She is Spoke: How Classicists Tricked Themselves, and the Real Issue with Mary Beard's Latin."
- Gascoyne, Richard et al. 1997. *The Standards for Classical Language Learning*. Oxford, Ohio.
- Gates, Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Maria Wolff. 1998. "An Overview of Sources on the Life and Work of Juan Latino, the 'Ethiopian Humanist'" *Research in African Literatures* 29.4: 14-51.
- Gruber-Miller, John. 2005. "Developing Listening and Speaking Skills: Practical Ways to Implement the Standards with the 'Oxford Latin Course'." *The Classical Journal* 101.1: 87-98.
- Gruber-Miller John. 2006. *When Dead Tongues Speak: Teaching Beginning Greek and Latin*. Oxford.
- Hanink, Johanna 2017. "It's Time to Embrace Critical Classical Reception" *Eidolon* May 1, 2017.
- Keeline, Tom. 2019. "Aut Latine aut nihil? A Middle Way" *The Classical Outlook* 94.2, 57-65.
- Letchford, Clive. "Communicative Latin for All in a UK University." In *Communicative Approaches for Ancient Languages*, edited by Mair E. Lloyd and Steven Hunt, 81-89.
- Lightbown, Patsy M. and Nina Spada. 2013. *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford.

- Llewelyn, Nancy. 2013. "Why Speak Latin?" *The North American Institute for Living Latin Studies*.
- Lloyd, Mair and Steven Hunt. 2021. *Communicative Approaches for Ancient Languages*. London. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350157378>.
- Macdonald, Seumas. 2011. "Krashen and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Theory - a re-evaluation of how to teach classical languages" *Journal of Classics Teaching* 22, 3-5.
- Musumeci, Diane. 1997. *Breaking Tradition: An Exploration of the Historical Relationship between Theory and Practice in Second Language Learning*. New York.
- Patrick, Robert. 2015. "Making Sense of Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom." *Teaching Classical Languages* 6.1, 108-36.
- Pettersson Daniel and Amelie Rosengren. 2021. "The *Latinitium* Project." In *Communicative Approaches for Ancient Languages*, edited by Mair E. Lloyd and Steven Hunt, 195-202. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350157378.ch-019>.
- Riberio Leite, Leni. 2021. "Active Latin in the Tropics: an Experience with Neo-Latin in Brazil." In *Communicative Approaches for Ancient Languages*, edited by Mair E. Lloyd and Steven Hunt, 91-100. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350157378.ch-009>.
- Stringer, Gregory. 2019. "What Can Active Latin Accomplish? Well Let Me Just Show You" *Classical Outlook* 94.2: 81-93.
- Saffire, Paula. 2006. "Ancient Greek in Classroom Conversation." In *When Dead Tongues Speak: Teaching Beginning Greek and Latin*, edited by John Gruber-Miller, 158-189.
- Sarkissian, John and Jennifer Behney. 2018. "Salience of Noun-Adjective Agreement in L2 Latin." In *Salience in Second Language Acquisition* edited by Susan M. Gass, Alison Mackey, Susan M. Gass, Patti Spinner, Jennifer Behney, 223-243. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315399027-12>.
- Shirley, Skye. 2019. "A Day in the Life of an Active Latin Teacher." *The Classical Outlook* 94.2: 66-71.
- van den Arend, Alan 2018. "Something Old, Something New: Marrying Early Modern Pedagogy and Second Language Acquisition Theory." *Teaching Classical Languages* 10.1: 1-32.
- Waquet, Françoise. 1998. *Le Latin ou L'Empire d'un Signe: XVIème - XXème Siècle*. Paris.
- Wills, Jeffrey. 1998. "Speaking Latin in Schools and Colleges." 92.1: 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4352180>.

“Adams’ Law” and the Placement of *esse* in Pliny the Younger

THOMAS J. KEELINE

Abstract: J. N. Adams showed that in Latin of the first century BCE, the verb *esse* does *not* necessarily gravitate to “second position” within a phrase; i.e., its placement is not in line with Jacob Wackernagel’s “law of enclitics.” Instead, *esse* tends to cliticize on—immediately follow—the focus of the phrase. By examining all instances of forms of *esse* in Plin. *Ep.* 1 and 10, I show that Adams’ observation still holds true ca. 100 CE. In a pedagogical epilogue, I offer some thoughts on the implications of such subtleties for the teaching and learning of Latin today.

Keywords: Adams’ Law; Wackernagel’s Law; Pliny the Younger; *esse*; word order; clitics; pedagogy

In 1994 J. N. Adams published a slender book with large implications. Entitled *Wackernagel’s Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin*, the book showed that the verb *esse* did *not* necessarily gravitate to “second position” within a phrase, that is to say, its placement was not in line with Jacob Wackernagel’s “law of enclitics.”¹ Instead, Adams neatly demonstrated that *esse* tended to cliticize on, i.e. immediately follow, the focus of the phrase: *nauigatio perdifficilis fuit* (“sailing was very difficult”); *nauigatio fuit perdifficilis* (“sailing was very difficult [sc. e.g. but not travel by land]”); *fuit nauigatio perdifficilis* (“sailing was, I grant you, very difficult” et sim.).² This remarkable insight, recovering by philological scrutiny a phenomenon once intuitively felt by native speakers of Latin, has the deepest implications for our understanding of what is going in even very simple Latin sentences.³

Adams limited his investigation to “classical Latin” prose, and his examples are drawn mainly from Cato the Elder, Cicero, and Caesar, with occasional excursions into Livy and Celsus. At some point, however, the tendencies that he observed cease to operate. Adams wondered whether the clitic character of *esse* was already weakening in Livy and Celsus.⁴ But by examining the placement of *esse* in Pliny the Younger, I will show that, so far from breaking down already in the Augustan period, Adams’ observations still seem to hold true ca. 100 CE. Such an investigation seems like a fitting tribute to Jacqui Carlon, who combines interests in Pliny the Younger and linguistics and Second Language Acquisition Theory. After demonstrating that “Adams’ Law,” as I will call it, was still valid for Pliny the Younger, I will

¹ Wackernagel’s Law, first formulated in Wackernagel 1892, “is a generalization referring to the tendency of certain enclitics and postpositives to occur second within their clause or sentence” in Indo-European languages (Goldstein 2013). Examples of such postpositive enclitics in Latin include e.g. *autem* and *enim*, and many scholars in the twentieth century thought that unemphatic personal pronouns (*mihi* etc.) and forms of the verb *esse* fit the same pattern. Adams 1994a showed that Wackernagel’s Law did not hold for forms of *esse*, and Adams 1994b showed that it did not hold for unstressed pronouns in Latin either. For more on Wackernagel’s Law in Classical Greek, where it seems much more compelling in its explanatory force, see Goldstein 2017.

² Example from Adams 1994a: 84. Adams in fact argued that *esse* focused the word it leaned on. It seems much more likely that *esse* attaches to a focused word because of some property (prosodic or otherwise) of the focus or the larger clause. But this amounts only to a reframing of Adams’ argument.

³ Adams’ book does not appear to be as widely known as it should be; its only review in a Classics journal was Clackson 1996, and a trawl through citations of Adams 1994a and 1994b on GoogleScholar suggests that they are much more regularly read by linguists than classicists. But that is perhaps changing; see e.g. Pezzini 2015, 246–47 (and elsewhere) and now, above all, Pinkster 2021, 984–93, enshrining these theories in what may become the twenty-first century’s reference grammar for Latin. (For a different approach, at least partially compatible with Adams’ work, see Devine and Stephens 2006, 145–224; cf. further Spevak 2006, 261–72.)

⁴ Adams 1994a, 56–58. By the time of the Romance languages, there is obviously a rule that the copula is simply placed before the predicate (“the sky is blue”: *el cielo es azul, il cielo è blu, le ciel est bleu*).

close with some reflections on the implications of these results for active Latin and language pedagogy: a major goal of language instruction is to create an accurate mental representation of the target language—and yet almost no one speaking or writing Latin today manages to feel or replicate such subtleties.

Methodology

I have cataloged every instance of forms of *esse* in books 1 and 10 of Pliny's *Epistles*. Book 1 consists of Pliny's polished private letters, while book 10 represents the unpolished collected correspondence between Pliny and Trajan.⁵ In book 1 of the *Epistles* I count 188 instances of *esse*; in Book 10 I consider 300 occurrences (Pliny: 194, Trajan: 106).⁶ This corpus is large and diverse enough to allow us to check the status of Adams' Law in some detail in the practice of one author writing a century and a half after Adams' main evidence ends (Pliny), and to compare it with a sort of control (Trajan).

In a sentence with an expressed subject, form of *esse*, and predicate, there are six possible word orders:

1. subject *esse* predicate (*caelum est caeruleum* ["the sky is blue"])
2. subject predicate *esse* (*caelum caeruleum est*)
3. predicate *esse* subject (*caeruleum est caelum*)
4. predicate subject *esse* (*caeruleum caelum est*)
5. *esse* subject predicate (*est caelum caeruleum*)
6. *esse* predicate subject (*est caeruleum caelum*)

Not all sentences involving *esse* can be slotted into one of these categories. Sometimes the subject is omitted (*est caeruleum* or *caeruleum est*), sometimes the predicate is (*quid est caeruleum?* *caelum est* or, less likely, *est caelum*), and sometimes both (*estne caelum caeruleum? est*). Furthermore, some uses of *esse* are either certainly or arguably not copulative; for example, there is the existential use of *esse*, and it is not always straightforward to judge what falls into this category (e.g., should *Ep. 1.22.1 nihil est enim illo grauius sanctius doctius* be understood as "there is nothing weightier or wiser or more venerable than he?"). Trickier still are verbal forms: in the clause *quorum* [sc. *orationes*] *sane plurimae sunt circumcisae et breues* (*Ep. 1.20.4*), because of the parallelism between *circumcisae* and *breues* we can be relatively certain that *circumcisae* is functioning primarily as an adjective ("most of whose [speeches] are of course concise and brief"). On the other hand, in the phrase *ab alio dictum est quod ipse praeuidit* (*Ep. 1.20.13*), it might be more natural to consider *dictum est* as a grammaticalized passive form of the verb *dicere* ("what he himself has seen in advance has been said by someone else"). Betwixt and between are gerundives: what adjectival or verbal force did a Roman perceive in a sentence like *sollicitius custodiendus est honor, in quo etiam beneficium amici tuendum est* ("an honorable office must be diligently looked after when in it the good deed of a friend is likewise to be tended," *Ep. 1.19.4*)?

No typology can be perfect. I have decided simply to include all instances of *esse* in my data set, and to collect the following information for each instance:

1. Citation (e.g. *Plin. Ep. 1.2.3*; Pliny is cited by Roger Mynors' Oxford Classical Text)
2. Latin text (*si modo is sum ego qui excitari possim*, "if in fact I'm the sort of person who can be stirred")
3. Position of *esse* within the phrase: first position, "relative first," second position, last position, or elsewhere. These data on position should be taken as approximate at best, because "second position" resists easy definition.⁷ (Note that I have created a

⁵ I agree with the long-standing *communis opinio* that Pliny did not revise and publish book 10 of his *Epistles* himself, but I should acknowledge that the hypothesis that he did in fact do so is now in vogue. Cf. Gibson and Morello 2012, 259–64 and Woolf 2015 with further references.

⁶ Occurrences of *esse* in quotations in *Ep. 10.58.7–10* have been excluded.

⁷ In the first instance it can be hard to define colon boundaries, and studies tend to indicate that Latin cola are often quite short and rarely longer than 15 or 20 syllables (cf. Fraenkel 1968, Habinek 1985, Nisbet 1990). Even within a colon it is hard to pin down what constitutes "second position"; see in detail Goldstein 2016 on canonical and non-

special category, “relative first,” to describe phrases like *quorum est aemulus* [“whose rival he is,” *Ep.* 1.16.3]: *est* stands first within the relative clause, but might also be counted as “second” following *quorum*.)

4. Order of subject, *esse*, and predicate (or however many elements are present)
5. If relevant, notation of whether *esse* is existential, verbal, or used with a gerund(ive)
6. Miscellaneous notes

All these data have been compiled into a spreadsheet for easy manipulation. It is thus easy to exclude from consideration existential *esse* or verbal forms or the like, and we can also see at a glance certain data about the position of *esse* within a sentence.

The Data

The headline results are pretty clear, and pretty clearly in line with Adams’ observations for Latin in the first century BCE. So, for instance, *esse* does not seem especially attracted to “second position”:

	Pos. 1	Rel. 1	Pos. 2	Misc.	Last	Total
<i>Ep.</i> 1	31	17	42	38	60	188
<i>Ep.</i> 10: Plin.	31	37	33	29	64	194
<i>Ep.</i> 10: Traj.	2	2	6	29	67	106

While “second position” is common, *esse* is in fact most commonly found last in its phrase, and overwhelmingly so in Trajan’s letters.⁸ Indeed, although “second position” is second-most common in Pliny, both first position and other placements are found frequently too. Admittedly these numbers tell only part of the story: for example, when *esse* is found first in its clause, it almost never includes both an expressed subject and an expressed predicate (a sentence like *Ep.* 1.13.5 *erant sane plerique amici*, “of course most of them were my friends,” is rare). And yet these data give us good prima facie reason to reject the hypothesis that the position of *esse* in a sentence is determined by Wackernagel’s Law: this would be a “law” that holds true at most one-third of the time in Pliny’s letters.⁹

Adams found that “subject + predicate + *esse*” was Latin’s most common (and least marked) word order. He provides the following table to report some of his data:¹⁰

canonical second position in Greek. Consider also the case of German, where verbs in main clauses typically come in “second position,” but second position can mean something quite other than “second word”: so the first sentence of the headline article of *Spiegel* online for 12 December 2018: “An dem Blumenladen Au Nom de la rose in der Rue du 22 Novembre gehen an anderen Tagen viele Menschen achtlos vorbei.” So too in German some elements can occupy a “position 0,” like “aber” or “ja”: “Sie war auch im Kino, aber ich habe sie nicht gesehen.” I have considered Latin coordinating conjunctions (e.g. *et*, *nam*, *nec*, *sed*) as occupying position 0, so in the sentence *nec est quod putes me . . . ueniam petere* (*Ep.* 1.2.5), *est* is in first position.

⁸ Admittedly there can be overlap between these two categories in short clauses. In *Ep.* 1 there are no obviously ambiguous instances, but some do occur in *Ep.* 10, where I have tried to deal with them as logically and consistently as possible (so in e.g. *Ep.* 10.39.4 *incompositum enim et sparsum est*, I have counted *est* as in last position because it ends the sentence and seems indisputably final).

⁹ And that is counting all instances of “relative first position” as second position: $(17 + 42 + 37 + 33) / (188 + 194) = 33.77\%$. If we discard “relative first position” entirely, the proportion is even lower: $(42 + 33) / ((188 - 17) + (194 - 37)) = 22.87\%$. Admittedly one might counter that Wackernagel’s Law is not concerned with cases of, say, existential *esse* in first position, but these account for only a very small fraction of the data.

¹⁰ Adams 1994a, 14.

	Cato Agr. 1–50	Cic. <i>S. Rosc.</i> 1–60	Cic. <i>Inv.</i> 1.1–20
S pred. <i>est</i>	68	39	26
S <i>est</i> pred.	5	11	41
pred. S <i>est</i>	10	3	1
pred. <i>est</i> S	2	5	10
<i>est</i> S pred.	1	1	—
<i>est</i> pred. S	—	—	—

	Cic. <i>Red. sen.</i>	Cic. <i>De orat.</i> 3.1–100	Celsus 4.1–10
S pred. <i>est</i>	15	38	52
S <i>est</i> pred.	7	23	4
pred. S <i>est</i>	3	4	9
pred. <i>est</i> S	3	14	12
<i>est</i> S pred.	1	10	—
<i>est</i> pred. S	—	2	—

Adams' results can be compared with the data that I have collected for Plin. *Ep.* 1 and 10, which look like this:

	S pred. <i>est</i>	S <i>est</i> pred.	Pred. S <i>est</i>	Pred. <i>est</i> S	<i>est</i> S Pred.	Pred. <i>est</i> S
<i>Ep.</i> 1	37	26	6	28	10	4
<i>Ep.</i> 10: Plin.	40	24	2	33	15	10
<i>Ep.</i> 10: Traj.	42	6	6	13	2	0

Note in the first instance that Pliny is broadly consistent in his practice in books 1 and 10. A chi-square test comparing Pliny's distribution of these six patterns in *Ep.* 1 and 10 yields $\chi^2 = 5.476$, which, with five degrees of freedom, produces a p-value of about .36058. This is not a statistically significant difference; i.e., it is reasonable to ascribe any observed difference in Pliny's practice in books 1 and 10 to random chance.¹¹

Pooling Pliny's data in *Ep.* 1 and 10, we can also test Pliny's practice against the tendencies of Cicero in *De orat.* 3.1–100 (taken from Adams' data above):

	S pred. <i>est</i>	S <i>est</i> pred.	Pred. S <i>est</i>	Pred. <i>est</i> S	<i>est</i> S Pred.	<i>est</i> Pred. S
Plin. <i>Ep.</i> 1 and 10	77	50	8	61	25	14
Cic. <i>De orat.</i> 3.1–100	38	23	4	14	10	2

¹¹ A discussion of the details of the chi-square test is beyond the scope of this paper. For a brief explanation and an online calculator, see Preacher 2001 (= <<https://www.quantpsy.org/chisq/chisq.htm>>).

Again a chi-square test shows no statistically significant difference ($p \approx .20402$) between Cicero and Pliny.

These data do, however, appear to present at least one Plinian peculiarity. The orders “Pred. *est* S” and “*est* Pred. S” are much more common in Pliny than in any author surveyed by Adams. I cannot immediately explain this except to observe that some of the variation may stem from how I have classified examples. So, for instance, I have considered a sentence like *mirum est ut animus agitatione motuque corporis excitetur* (“it’s amazing how the intellect is stimulated by vigorous action of the body,” *Ep.* 1.6.2) as an example of Pred. (*mirum*) *est* S (*ut animus agitatione motuque corporis excitetur*). Similarly I have counted *nec erit difficile custodire tam paucos* (“nor will it be difficult to watch over such a small number of people,” *Ep.* 10.33.3) as *est* (*erit*) Pred. (*difficile*) S (*custodire tam paucos*). These categorizations might be felt artificial, and with such cases excluded, the total in these columns declines considerably.¹² Nevertheless these instances generally, as we will see in the next section, obey the tendencies that Adams has observed in Pliny’s predecessors. And so, to look just at the numbers, we can say that Adams’ observations hold for Pliny the Younger.

Observations on the Data

But of course we cannot just look at the numbers, and I will now consider these data more closely, choosing my examples primarily from *Ep.* 1. Adams argued that forms of the verb *esse* gravitate to the focus of the sentence, i.e., that their “host”—the immediately preceding word—is focused. The “focus” of a sentence is a new or unexpected or contrasting or somehow important piece of information. Adams offers a useful practical test to identify it, at least in English: “the identification of the focus of an utterance in English may be made from the intonation of that utterance: ‘a focussed constituent contains an intonational center, in German and English, generically a falling pitch accent.’”¹³ So, for example, “I’m painting the living room BLUE” provides a typical case of English “end focus,” but compare also “I AM painting the living room blue” (in response to a “surely you’re not?” question) or “I’m painting the LIVing room blue” (as opposed to the bathroom).¹⁴

Adams’ hypothesis seems to map onto our data quite well. Consider the four instances of the aforementioned Pred. *est* S construction in *Ep.* 1.20:

1. *testes sunt multae multorum orationes et Ciceronis pro Murena pro Vareno* (“the witnesses are many speeches of many orators, especially those of Cicero on behalf of Murena and Varenus,” 1.20.7).
2. *at aliud est actio bona, aliud oratio* (“but it’s one thing to deliver a speech well, another to produce a good written version,” 1.20.9).
3. *uaria sunt hominum iudicia, uariae uoluntates* (“people’s judgments vary; people’s temperaments vary,” 1.20.12).
4. *neque enim minus imperspicua incerta fallacia sunt iudicium ingenia quam tempestatum terrarumque* (“no less obscure and uncertain and deceptive is the character of the jurors than the nature of storms and the soil,” 1.20.17).

In all of these instances, the predicate is strongly focused.¹⁵ In two cases we see contrasting rhetorical terms serve as hosts (*uaria sunt . . . uariae; aliud est . . . aliud*): “It’s ONE THING to deliver a speech well, ANOTHER to produce a good written version.” Such order is completely typical; indeed, *aliud est . . . aliud* has almost fossilized into a fixed phrase.¹⁶ Other examples of this contrastive focus are constantly found in *Ep.* 1, e.g.

5. *quae siue uxoris sunt ut adfirmat, siue ipsius ut negat* (“whether they are his wife’s, as he maintains, or his own, which he denies,” 1.16.6)

¹² I do not know how Adams classified such instances.

¹³ Adams 1994a, 18, quoting von Stechow and Wunderlich 1991, 804. On the focus of a Latin sentence, see further Pinkster 2021, 839–49.

¹⁴ Examples from Adams 1994a, 18–19.

¹⁵ Book 10 offers similar cases, e.g. *confirmat necessarios esse milites sex* (*Ep.* 10.27.1).

¹⁶ On this position of *esse* in rhetorical antitheses see Adams 1994a, 15–18.

Here *siue uxoris . . . siue ipsius* provides provides the contrast. In the other two cases quoted above, the predicate is focused for other purposes, in the first to emphasize the witnesses that Pliny is relying on to make his claim, and in the fourth to point up just how very hard it is to grasp the minds of men.

Many of Adams' specific observations can be paralleled. Deictic or intensifying pronouns, for example, are often focused. Here are some Plinian examples:

6. *tu modo enitere ut tibi ipse sis tanti, quanti uideberis aliis si tibi fueris* ("strive to be of as much value in your own eyes as you will seem to others, if you will be such for yourself," 1.3.5).
7. *hoc sit negotium tuum hoc otium* (with further antithetical repetition) ("let this be the occupation of your business, let this be the occupation of your leisure," 1.3.3)
8. *illum enim esse huius consilii ducem, me comitem decet* (again with antithetical repetition) ("since for him it's right and proper to be the leader of this plan, for me it's right and proper to be the follower," 1.5.10)
9. *haec est adhuc sententia mea* ("this is my opinion thus far," 1.20.24)

Such pronouns often are either focused or have an element of contrast (or both). Sometimes, of course, other factors come into play as well:

10. *interim, <in> iis qui ad me tamquam Christiani deferebantur, hunc sum secutus modum* ("meanwhile, in the case of those who have been reported to me as being Christians, I've followed this procedure," 10.96.2)

Here *hunc* is focused, as Pliny will go on to describe in detail his procedure for dealing with reported Christians. But the word order also neatly yields a double cretic clausula (*hunc sūm sēcūtūs mōdūm*), and at some level prose rhythm too doubtless influenced Pliny's *dispositio*.

Other adjectives also regularly act as hosts for *esse*, especially adjectives of size and quantity and superlatives, which often serve as a phrase's focus. So, for example:

11. *uitae mortisque consilium uel suscipere uel ponere ingentis est animi* (1.22.10)
"To accept or reject the notion of living or dying is the mark of a TRULY GREAT soul."
The verb *est* has intruded right into the middle of the phrase *ingentis animi*, throwing the strongest possible focus on *ingentis*. Similarly:

12. *cum alioqui magna sit expectatio* ("since moreover great is the anticipation," 10.81.8)
13. *adfirmabatur mihi in omni ciuitate plurimos esse buleutas ex aliis ciuitatibus* ("I am told that in every city very many are the senators with foreign citizenship," 10.114.3)
14. *quorum [sc. orationes] sane plurimae sunt circumcisae et breues* ("most of whose [speeches] are of course concise and brief," 1.22.4)

While such an order is not a fixed law, when it does *not* occur, it is at least tempting to wonder whether other reasons have supervened. Consider, for example:

15. *magna, domine, et ad totam prouinciam pertinens quaestio est de condicione et alimentis eorum, quos uocant θρεπτούς* ("it's a big problem, sir, and one that affects the whole province, this issue concerning the status and maintenance of those known as 'foundlings,'" 10.65.1)

It is actually quite hard to rewrite this sentence with *est* leaning on *magna*. As it stands, there is a poised balance of the two qualifying phrases joined by *et*, with the second carrying more stress both because of sense (not just a "big problem" but "a problem affecting the whole province"!) and rhetorical arrangement (it follows the "law of increasing members" ¹⁷). If Pliny instead had begun *magna est*, he could not easily have written *domine* straightaway, and so he would have been forced into: *magna est quaestio, domine, et ad totam prouinciam pertinens*. This would be a fine response to, say, "What sort of *quaestio* is it?" But it will not do when followed by *de condicione* etc. I am not suggesting that Pliny would have

¹⁷ On "das Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder," see Hofmann and Szantyr 1965, 722–26.

consciously thought through any of these considerations; he doubtless simply placed the words in their most natural positions.

Other factors may account for:

16. *nam et in agris magna copia est hominum et maxima in ciuitate* (“for both in the fields is there a great number of men, and in the city there is the greatest number,” 10.41.2)

There is a lot going on here. We have coordinate *et . . . et* joining logically parallel phrases in chiasmic arrangement (*in agris magna . . . maxima in ciuitate*), with a single verb, *est*, shared ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in both. Nothing would seem to stand in the way of writing *magna est copia*, which also might appear to conform to the tendency of using *esse* to focus contrasting members. But Pliny does still insert *est* in a “disruptive” way, interrupting the unit *magna copia hominum*. Perhaps he did not want to focus *magna*, given that he will continue with the more pointed *maxima*, and so he instead chose to focus *copia* more particularly—it is itself a word denoting quantity—which will then be amplified from *magna* to *maxima*.

Our sample also yields other instances that seem connected to the tendency of *esse* to attach to adjectives of size or quantity, like the phrase *nihil est*. To this can be added the more general observation that *non est* is almost always the standard word order (i.e., *non est factum* or *factum non est*, not *non factum est*).¹⁸ Such negatives naturally carry the focus of the sentence, and they might be thought of as a special case of words of quantity or size—namely, the case where the quantity or size is precisely zero.

Adams likewise makes observations about where *esse* is placed as an auxiliary verb: it is often separated from a participle for the same reasons as we have already seen, namely to focus some other element in the sentence.¹⁹ So e.g.:

17. *quibus [sc. aduocationibus] alioqui numquam eram promiscue functus* (“which [court cases] moreover I had never taken on indiscriminately,” 10.3a.1)

In line with the discussion about negatives above, here the focus is squarely on *numquam* (“never”). Likewise:

18. *quo magis scires, quantum esset ille mihi ego tibi debiturus* (“so that you’d know how great would be the debt that he would owe to me, and I would owe to you,” 1.24.4)

Stress is laid on “how large” the debt will be.

A related phenomenon is seen in:

19. *omissis iocis credo decentes esse seruos, qui sunt empti mihi ex consilio tuo* (“but joking aside, I believe that the slaves who were bought for me on your advice look good,” 1.21.2)

First note that *esse* shows that *decentes* is focused, “I believe that the slaves look good”; there is an implied contrast with what follows, namely “it remains to be seen whether they are honest” (*superest ut frugi sint*). But in the phrase *qui sunt empti*, we see two tendencies coalesce: first, *qui* is focused as referring to these particular slaves, but second, relative pronouns in general are almost invariably focused to some degree and so tend to attract *esse*.²⁰ Consider the following Plinian examples:

20. *pleraque quae sunt agenda rei necessaria, eadem peracta nec utilitatem parem nec gratiam retinent* (“many things which are necessary for accomplishing a task have much less usefulness or pleasantness once the task is done,” 1.8.7)
21. *quae sint inculcanda infigenda repetenda* (“which must be inculcated and fixed and repeated,” 1.20.2)
22. *non posse non bonam actionem esse quae sit bona oratio* (“that a delivered speech can’t be bad if it’s a good written speech,” 1.20.9)

¹⁸ Cf. Adams 1994a, 9–13.

¹⁹ Adams 1994a, 34–43.

²⁰ Adams 1994a, 44–53. As a side note, Greek relative pronouns also often—but not always—serve as hosts for enclitics (Goldstein 2016, 87–88), and so this just might be a feature of the Indo-European proto-language.

23. *tu omnia quae sunt in causa putas exsequenda* (“you think you should follow up on everything which is relevant to a case,” 1.20.14)
24. *effinge aliquid et excude, quod sit perpetuo tuum* (“create and produce something which will always be your own,” 1.3.4)

It is simply very common for *esse* to gravitate toward the relative pronoun as host; our Plinian corpus provides at least 34 examples.

Adams noted this phenomenon and well remarked that it is particularly striking because verb-final position is in general much more common in relative clauses than in main clauses; in other words, the coherence of *esse* with relative pronouns bucks the prevailing trend.²¹ Adams confined his observations primarily to relative pronouns, but the Plinian data suggest that other subordinators may play a similar role. A particularly clear case is that of words introducing (indirect) questions, where the question word naturally carries the focus:

25. *cum quaerem, num esset aliqua lex dicta templo* (“when I inquired whether there was some law pertaining to the temple,” 10.49.2)
26. *interrogavi ipsos an essent Christiani* (“I asked them themselves whether they were Christians,” 10.96.3)
27. *itaque teorum uehementer addubitem an sit potius id tempus, quo εισήλασαν, intuendum* (“therefore I’m altogether inclined to think that we should look rather to the date when they entered the city as victors,” 10.118.1)

Further investigation might clarify whether other words introducing subordinate clauses play a similar role.

In all of the foregoing cases, *esse* has been an enclitic, “leaning on” a host word which was the focus of the phrase. But as we have seen in our initial tables, *esse* frequently occurs in first position in a clause too, where it necessarily is itself the focus of an utterance. This often occurs in the phrase *est enim*. So, for example, Pliny writes

28. *est enim plane aliquid edendum* (“For of course I MUST publish something!”) (1.2.6)
29. *“est enim” inquam “mihi cum Cicerone aemulatio”* (“I DO,” I say, “have a rivalry with Cicero.”) (1.5.12)
30. *est enim locuples factiosus* (“he IS [indeed] rich and powerful”) (1.5.15)
31. *quamquam huius cunctationis meae causae non tam in scriptis quam in ipsa materiae genere consistunt: est enim paulo quasi gloriosius et elatius* (“although the causes of my hesitation aren’t so much in the writing as in the nature of the material: it IS [admittedly] somewhat boastful and grand”) (1.8.5)
32. *hoc mihi sufficit; est enim maximum* (“that’s enough for me: it IS the most important thing [after all]”) (1.11.2)
33. *decessit Corellius Rufus et quidem sponte, quod dolorem meum exulcerat. est enim luctuosissimum genus mortis* (“Corellius Rufus has died, and died voluntarily, which sharpens my pain: that is the kind of death that causes the most sorrow,” 1.12.1)

These uses vary slightly among themselves. In 29, Regulus had accused Pliny of wanting to rival Cicero. In response, Pliny proudly asserts that Regulus’ accusation is true. This is what Adams terms the “veridical” or “assertive” use of *esse*.²³ Similarly in 28, after he had been talking in the previous sentence about planning to publish a speech, Pliny asserts that he simply MUST publish something. In 31, by contrast, initial *esse* marks a concession: “it is, I grant you, somewhat boastful and grand [sc. to sing one’s own praises].”²⁴ In all of these cases, initial *est* looks back to the preceding statement (as you would expect, given the explanatory *enim*).

There are other cases, however, where *esse* does not look back at all. So, for example, in

²¹ Adams 1994a, 45.

²² The textual corruption is not relevant to the point under discussion, but proposed remedies for *itaque eorum* include e.g. *ita ut* or *ita tamen ut*.

²³ Adams 1994a, 69–81.

²⁴ For concessive *esse* in first position, see Adams 1994a, 77–80.

34. *erant sane plerique amici* (“most of them were of course my friends,” 1.13.5) Pliny refers to the many people who had invited him to literary recitations, which he dutifully attended: “most of them WERE of course [I grant you] my friends.” Fronted *esse* here again marks a concession.

Furthermore, when used existentially, *esse* quite regularly stands first. This is reasonably well known,²⁵ and it seems to apply equally well to datives of possession, which might be thought of as a subspecies of existential *esse* (“there is to me a . . .”):

35. *est illi facies liberalis, multo sanguine multo rubore suffusa, est ingenua totius corporis pulchritudo et quidam senatorius decor* (here with rhetorical repetition) (“he has a noble countenance, ruddy and full-blooded; he has a natural beauty throughout his body and a sort of senatorial bearing,” 1.14.8)

36. *est adhuc curae hominibus fides et officium, sunt qui defunctorum quoque amicos agant* (“people still care about duty and honor; there are those who act the part of friends even for those who have died,” 1.17.1)

Note in the latter example that the phrase *sunt qui* etc. also well exemplifies the typical placement of existential *esse* in first position: “there are those who . . .”

Of course this can all start to look a bit too easy, as if this one key can unlock every door. It cannot. Latin word order is a complex phenomenon, and it is governed by a variety of factors. Consider the following sentence featuring both a dative of possession and a sort of numerical adjective:

37. *frequens mihi disputatio est cum quodam docto homine et perito* (1.20.1)

“I am CONSTANTLY debating with a certain skilled and learned man.” From the foregoing discussion about datives of possession, one might have expected *est* in first position; from the foregoing discussion about numerical adjectives, one might have expected *frequens est*—and we get neither. In fact Adams has also shown that Latin unstressed personal pronouns likewise tend to cliticize on the focus of a phrase,²⁶ and so *mihi* here has attached to the focused *frequens*, which has been fronted to the beginning of the sentence. Perhaps *est* shows that there is some additional stress on *disputatio*, a notion which might be absent if *est* had itself been focused at the front of the sentence. But it is clear that these are not simply mechanical “rules” to be applied without question or exception.

Similarly complicated cases are not uncommon. So e.g.:

38. *est enim sane alia ratio tua, alia mea fuit* (“of course your situation is one thing, mine was something different,” 1.18.6)

Here, with contrasting *alia . . . alia*, one might have expected *est* to attach to that word. But Pliny is in fact making a concession of the type that we saw earlier. His correspondent, Suetonius, had recounted to Pliny a disturbing dream about an upcoming court case. Pliny counters with a pre-trial dream of his own, one that presaged success, and urges Suetonius to find a positive interpretation of his dream too. But towards the end of the letter he says, “I must grant, of course, that your present situation is rather different from what mine was,” hence *est* in its concessive use moves to first position (and is joined, as often, with *sane*; cf. e.g. *Ep.* 1.13.5, quoted above, or 5.6.2). The final *fuit* may show that *mea* is focused, or may be placed in a sort of rhetorical ring composition of “to be” verbs.

I have devoted most of my attention in this paper to analyzing some of the more surprising effects of the placement of *esse*, but I would be remiss not to at least note that *esse* is frequently found in fairly ordinary constructions. And yet even here the sort of analysis we have been doing thus far usually makes sense:

39. *nitebamur nos in parte causae sententia Metti Modesti optimi uiri: is tunc in exilio erat, a Domitiano relegatus* (“in part of our case we were reliant on the opinion of Mettius Modestus, a great man: he was in exile at that time, banished by Domitian,” 1.5.5)

²⁵ See Hoffman and Szantyr 1965, 405; Pinkster 2015, 200; Pinkster 2021: 1015. Cf. existential Gk. ἔστω (as opposed to εἴστω), about which there is admittedly some dispute: see the discussion with references in Probert 2003, 144–46, to which can be added the philosophically inclined Kahn 2009.

²⁶ Adams 1994b.

“He was in exile at that time”: relatively unmarked subject + predicate + *esse*, but Modestus’ exile really is the focus of the sentence, as the appendage *a Domitiano relegatus* helps make clear. Or:

40. *quamquam hoc quoque multum est* (1.21.1)

“Although this too is a lot”: again, subject + predicate + *esse*, but here *esse* furthermore follows, as so often, an adjective of size or quantity. Pliny is joking with his correspondent Paternus about his (Paternus’) good taste: “I have a high opinion of your judgment, not because it’s so great (don’t flatter yourself!) but because you know as much as I do—although this too is a lot”! Pliny’s placement of *est* thus contributes, in an almost imperceptible way, to the joke that he is making.

That “almost imperceptible” is an important qualification. While we can try to recover these effects today by close philological study, and an analysis of the type that I have carried out here can be continued on almost every example in the corpus, Pliny never needed to sit down to think this out consciously. He was a native speaker of Latin, effortlessly deploying the full resources of the language to communicate his desired meaning to an audience of fellow native speakers. He perhaps could not have told you why *ingentis est animi* just felt right, any more than a native speaker of American English today can tell you why we say “CHINESE food” rather than “Chinese FOOD.” Of course it is not “wrong” to say “Chinese FOOD,” but it is unidiomatic in contemporary American English.²⁷ If you are a native speaker of English, can you explain why you might conceivably say fan-FREAKING-tastic but not *fanta-FREAKING-stic? San Di-FREAKING-ego? (Admittedly you might not say “freaking.”) It is a subtle thing, and yet we feel it and form such words “correctly.”²⁸ So too in Latin as spoken by the Romans, the placement of *esse* within a sentence was governed by certain complex but intuitively felt idiomatic considerations.²⁹

Epilogue

Pliny still felt these considerations, but as we have seen, at some point speakers stopped feeling them. You might have noticed that I have said almost nothing about Trajan so far. This is because, as far as I can see, he or his chancery secretaries ignored Adams’ Law and instead preferred the fixed pattern S Pred. *est*, with *esse* tending to come last in the sentence (roughly 63% of the time, or almost double the proportion in Pliny). Did Trajan then have no feel for Adams’ Law? I think this is unlikely. Because Pliny so clearly felt it, contemporary native speakers of Latin—like Trajan—doubtless did too.³⁰ I imagine instead that Trajan’s bland word order is yet another feature of his bureaucratic style, in fact a deliberately (if perversely) cultivated “feature.”³¹

²⁷ Although it was the default American pronunciation in the early 1970s, when Chinese food was still a relative novelty in America: see McWhorter 2016, 185–86. For an accessible introduction to the “backshift,” see McWhorter 2016, 178–93; for a detailed investigation into compound stress assignment in English, see Plag et al. 2008. Note that clitic placement in Latin also must have influenced the prosodic contour of the sentence, but such effects are very difficult to recover today.

²⁸ The explanation appears very complex indeed: see e.g. McCarthy 1982.

²⁹ And in this paper I have of course only begun to talk about such considerations: throughout I have made almost no mention of prose rhythm, for example, although rhythmic considerations played a huge role in determining Pliny’s preferred word orders. So the cretic-trochaic clausula probably has something to do with the word order of *Ep.* 10.65.3 *neque putavi posse me in eo, quod auctoritatem tuam posceret, exemplis esse contentum*. For Plinian prose rhythm see Hofacker 1903; Whitton 2013, 28–32 and Index s.v. “rhythm”; and Keeline and Kirby 2019.

³⁰ It is much less likely that Trajan’s word order represents typical Latin at the time, while Pliny’s is a deliberately cultivated and artificial feature: this is not the kind of thing that you can easily and consistently “fake.”

³¹ There are occasional cracks in the facade, but they are rare, e.g.: *Ep.* 10.34.1 *meminerimus provinciam istam et praecipue eas civitates eius modi factionibus esse vexatas* (for the cretic-trochaic clausula? so too 10.48.2 *esse facturum*), 10.50.1 *potes . . . si loci positio uideatur hoc desiderare, aedem Matris Deum transferre in eam quae est accommodatior* (coherence with relative pronoun), 10.78.3 *fiduciam <eam> diligentiae < tuae > habeo, ut credam te omni ratione id acturum, ne sint obnoxii iniuriis* (coherence with *ne*; cf. *Plin.* 10.104.1 *uereor enim, ne sit immodicum pro omnibus pariter inuocare indulgentiam tuam*). But such instances, the norm in Pliny, are vanishingly rare in Trajan. For Trajan’s bureaucratic style more generally, see Coleman 2012.

So when did Latin speakers simply stop feeling the force of Adams' Law? "Further research is needed." What is abundantly clear is that once speakers stopped feeling these tendencies—whenever that happened—knowledge of them simply disappeared. It was only in 1994 that Adams rediscovered a law that had been in operation for hundreds of years of Latin, and one for which the evidence had always been staring us in the face. Even today, knowing what we know, most of us probably still have a hard time feeling these effects intuitively. For those of us who are interested in language pedagogy and *recentiores auctores* and spoken Latin, this is a relatively small example of a frequently occurring problem. A major goal of language instruction is to create an accurate mental representation of the target language. When people speak Latin today, attention to details like word order is often largely or entirely neglected—and understandably so—in favor of accurate vocabulary and syntax. The same is true for many contemporary Latin novellas and at least some textbooks currently used in Latin classrooms, but even the leading lights of Renaissance Latin suffered from these difficulties. If this is the Latin that our students are hearing and reading, it will shape much of their understanding of the structure of the language. And so, if we want our students (and ourselves) to develop the ability to read Latin with ease and deep understanding both, do we need to pay more attention to subtleties like word order? If so, what should we do?

The answer to the first question is, I think, "yes." There is a large literature on learners' errors in second language acquisition, and the modern tendency has been to see such errors as not only a natural and necessary but sometimes even a positive part of the language learning process.³² But such a view, it seems to me, rests on the idea that students' language usage becomes ever more "correct" as they continue to learn: in brief, that they figure out that they are making mistakes and stop making them; that they come ever closer to a correct mental representation of the language in question. This doubtless holds true for much of Latin language acquisition too: *ille est laborans*, an initially laudable attempt at using the resources of the language with a "transfer error," is replaced by *ille laborat* as a student's understanding grows. But when it comes to subtleties like word order, it is not clear to me that students will ever intuit their way to something like Adams' Law. Scholars, after all, who were working very hard to find such things, could not do so for more than a millennium. Indeed, they even came up with an inaccurate description of the placement of *esse* in the form of Wackernagel's Law—which itself had gone undiscovered, or at any rate unformulated, for millennia.

Today there is no community of native speakers of Latin whose intuitions we can rely on to correct linguistic misapprehensions. And we have a devil of a time trying to figure out Rumsfeldian "unknown unknowns." While a student at Cambridge in the late eighteenth century, the young Richard Porson sent up a prize-winning poem in Greek iambs in which he thrice violated Porson's Law—which of course he had not yet discovered, but that is precisely the point.³³ You are not very likely to discover a metrical law by verse composition, or a law about the placement of *esse* by speaking Latin.³⁴ It must either become unconsciously ingrained in your linguistic competence through a sufficient quantity of correctly formed comprehensible input, or be explicitly pointed out to you and then reinforced through sufficient practice so that it becomes unconscious and "natural."

³² Much of this literature focuses on the question of whether or not it is useful for teachers to correct learners' natural and inevitable mistakes, and if so, how best to do it: see e.g. the fundamental Krashen 1982, 116–19. The issue is far from settled, as documented by Karim and Nassaji 2019 (written corrective feedback) and Ellis 2017 (oral corrective feedback). To see why errors can sometimes be a good thing, consider young children who had been saying "went" but start saying "goed" instead: this shows that they have internalized the English rule for forming past tenses in -ed, which in fact represents progress, even if they have overgeneralized the rule.

³³ He was competing for the Craven University Scholarship, which he won. His seventeen verses were also devoid of accents. For the story, see e.g. Jebb 1896, 155.

³⁴ Sensible remarks in Brink 1985, 127–28, including a quotation from A. E. Housman's Cambridge Inaugural: "you are not likely to discover laws of metre by composing verses in which you occasionally break those laws because you have not yet discovered them" (Housman 1969, 18). Indeed, composition and speaking will only reinforce existing patterns and habits, which is all the more reason to try to make sure that they are correct!

Perhaps such subtleties are of little consequence. They certainly are not the most important part of language acquisition. But they do make a difference if we want to come as close as we can to reading and understanding ancient Latin literature the way the Romans themselves might have. Here is one last example: as I have mentioned, Adams also showed that unemphatic pronouns in Latin tend to cliticize on focused elements.³⁵ In that light, consider Cicero writing to Atticus on the brink of civil war (*Att.* 7.3.10):

sed quoniam grammaticus es, si hoc mihi ζήτημα persolueris, magna me molestia liberaris.

But since you are a grammarian [sc. these days], if you resolve THIS difficulty for me, you will relieve me of a GREAT annoyance.

Cicero had just reported how Atticus had upbraided him for a specimen of errant Latinity, hence the reference to a *grammaticus* and the joke about a ζήτημα (a literary “problem” to be solved), but Cicero’s present difficulty is no joke. Caesar and his agent Balbus are trying hard to win him for the Caesarian faction, and although Cicero wants to resist, he is in their debt and does not know whether he can. The unstressed pronoun *mihi* thus cliticizes on focused *hoc*: “if you can solve THIS difficulty [sc. as opposed to that grammatical triviality that we had been discussing].” Similarly, in *magna me molestia*, *me* naturally cliticizes on a focused adjective of size. If readers miss these usages, they really are missing something: if they think that Wackernagel’s Law has just dropped pronouns into “second position,” then they know just enough to get themselves into trouble; if they think the word order is completely arbitrary, then they will be left wondering why in the world Cicero split up his adjectives and nouns with a random pronoun. They might come away with the pernicious belief that Latin word order is capricious and a completely unfathomable mystery. They will certainly get only a fraction of the linguistic information that Cicero is communicating.

Now we do not want our students tearing their hair out about Latin word order when they are just learning how to express themselves and taking baby steps towards reading. What we want instead is to provide good models for them that will help form an accurate mental representation of the language. Latin is not some pristine marble statue placed high on an untouchable pedestal, something that we will befoul if we handle it with our grubby little paws: as students and teachers we do not need to be afraid to make mistakes, particularly in the classroom and in everyday conversations. But anyone who puts out a podcast or writes a Latin novella or textbook becomes, like it or not, a model to anyone who listens and reads. People read textbooks again and again and again. And so I suggest that those of us who have the temerity to do such things—*de me nunc loquor!*—try to give real attention to as many of these issues as possible.³⁶

We do not want to be like the unfortunate Pedro Carolino, who in 1855 published *The New Guide of the Conversation, in Portuguese and English*, often known by the title it was reprinted under in England, *English As She Is Spoke*. The book is remembered today only as a source of unintentional humor: the author’s entire knowledge of the English language appears to have been derived from books and dictionaries, leading him to write such dialogic masterpieces as the following (“The fishing”):

A: That pond it seems me many multiplied of fishes. Let us amuse rather to the fishing.

B: I do like it too much.

A: Here, there is a wand and some hooks.

B: Silence! there is a superb perch! Give me quick the rod, Ah! there is, it is a lamprey.

³⁵ Adams 1994b, not including this example.

³⁶ And some certainly do: Daniel Pettersson and Amelie Rosengren, for example, put enormous energy into the Latinity of *Pugio Bruti*, their recent novella.

A: You mistake you, it is a frog! dip again it in the water.

B: Perhaps i will do best to fish with the leap.

A: Try it! I desire that you may be more happy and more skilful who ascertain fisher, what have fished all day without to can take nothing.³⁷

You may well laugh, but we are non-native speakers of Latin who have learned the language from books and dictionaries. I think we probably do better than Carolino, but his accidental satire can hit pretty close to home for contemporary Latinists. Even very skilled speakers and writers of Latin today say things that would have raised eyebrows and smiles in antiquity: how often do you hear or read *quoque* placed before the word it emphasizes in contemporary Latin? How many of us routinely say *bene* where in English we use “well” as a transition or a pragmatic marker? (A: “He got here in less than 10 minutes!” B: “Well, he’s a fast runner.”) So the word is used in modern Italian, but it seems much harder to find examples in classical Latin. This is a list that could be extended *sine fine*. The point here is not to carp or to harp on small inconcinities (glass houses, stones, etc.): the point is that if these add up, we are writing *Latin As She is Spoke*, and this should give us pause.

Now we will never be perfect, and we labor under peculiar disadvantages relative to every language with a population of native speakers. Furthermore, somewhere down this road madness lies: few of us would want to be the Renaissance Ciceronians mocked with such scathing brilliance by Erasmus, who not only restrict themselves to words found in Cicero, but perhaps even to forms of words found in his extant corpus—“oh, Cicero never uses such and such a verb in the second-person plural”!³⁸ Perfect is clearly the enemy of good here, and there must be some kind of *aurea mediocritas*. But if for centuries the tendency was to censure even the slightest deviation from “pure” and “classical” usage, I wonder whether the reactionary pendulum has now swung too far in the other direction.

Regardless, those of us who put ourselves forward as models of Latinity—whether intentionally or unintentionally—should be aware of these kinds of issues and do our best to grapple with them. And we all should remember that the only real models for classical Latin are the ancient authors themselves. Just as Alessandro Manzoni, author of the nineteenth-century Italian novel *I Promessi Sposi*, betook himself to Florence “a sciacquare i panni in Arno”—i.e., to purify his language and make sure it conformed to Tuscan literary standards—we too must constantly return to the wellsprings of Latinity, to texts written by native speakers of Latin. We ourselves cannot ever become native speakers, but we can inch ever closer, improving both our own abilities and allowing us to be better models for those whom we teach. If a primary goal of learning Latin is to read ancient texts with greater ease, pleasure, and understanding, then we should try as hard as we can to model accurate Latin for ourselves and our students, including the “little” details: they matter.³⁹

Washington University in St. Louis
tkceline@wustl.edu

³⁷ Carolino 1855, 120. Everything *sic*.

³⁸ See Erasmus, *Dialogus Ciceronianus*, esp. pp. 607–16 in Mesnard 1971. So e.g. p. 610: “*Amo, amas, amat, sit enim hoc exempli causa dictum, apud Ciceronem inuenio: amamus et amatis fortasse non inuenio. Item amabam inuenio, amabatis non inuenio. Rursus amaueras inuenio, amaras non inuenio. Contra amasti reperio, amauisti ne quaquam . . .*”

³⁹ I thank the editors, Peter Barrios-Lech and Anne Mahoney, for piloting this volume from idea to completion and for helpful comments on my paper; I am also grateful to the anonymous reader for further helpful comments. Ever since we met at the Conuenticulum Bostoniense, Jacqui Carlon has taught me much about teaching and about navigating the academic world. She has given unstintingly of her time and wisdom, and I am happy to finally give her something in return—although I have to admit that a paper on clitic position in Latin is a pretty poor repayment for her generosity.

Works Cited

- Adams, J. N. 1994a. *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- . 1994b. "Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of Unstressed Pronouns in Classical Latin." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92: 103–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.1994.tb00430.x>.
- Brink, C. O. 1985. *English Classical Scholarship: Historical Reflections on Bentley, Porson and Housman*. Cambridge: J. Clark.
- Carolino, P. 1855. *O Novo Guia da Conversação, em Português e Inglês, em Duas Partes. The New Guide of the Conversation, in Portuguese and English, in Two Parts*. Paris: V^a J.-P. Aillaud, Monlon e C^a.
- Clackson, J. 1996. Rev. of Adams 1994a. *Classical Review* 46: 378.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/46.2.378>.
- Coleman, K. M. 2012. "Bureaucratic Language in the Correspondence between Pliny and Trajan." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142: 189–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/apa.2012.0013>.
- Devine, A. M., and L. D. Stephens. 2006. *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195181685.001.0001>.
- Ellis, R. 2017. "Oral Corrective Feedback in L2 Classrooms: What We Know so Far." In *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning: Research, Theory, Applications, Implications*, edited by H. Nassaji and E. Kartchava, 3–18. Milton: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432-2>.
- Fraenkel, E. 1968. *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Gibson, R. K., and R. Morello. 2012. *Reading the Letters of Pliny the Younger: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139024747>.
- Goldstein, D. M. 2013. "Wackernagel's Law I." In *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, edited by G. K. Giannakis. Leiden: Brill.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000375
- . 2016. "Variation versus Change: Clausal Clitics between Homer and Herodotus." *Indo-European Linguistics* 4: 53–97.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/22125892-00401006>.
- . 2017. *Classical Greek Syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Habinek, T. 1985. *The Colometry of Latin Prose*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hofacker, C. 1903. *De clausulis C. Caecili Plini Secundi*. Bonn: K. George.
- Hofmann, J. B. and A. Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik*. Munich: C. Beck.
- Housman, A. E. (edited by J. Carter). 1969. *The Confines of Criticism: The Cambridge Inaugural, 1911*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jebb, R. C. 1896. "Porson, Richard (1759–1808)." In *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 46., edited by S. Lee, 154–63. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.
- Kahn, C. H. 2009. *Essays on Being*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karim, K., and H. Nassaji. 2019. "The Effects of Written Corrective Feedback: A Critical Synthesis of Past and Present Research." *Instructed Second Language Acquisition* 3: 28–52. <https://doi.org/10.1558/isla.37949>.
- Keeline, T. J., and J. T. Kirby. 2019. "Auceps syllabarum: A Digital Analysis of Latin Prose Rhythm." *Journal of Roman Studies* 109: 161–204.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435819000881>.
- Krashen, S. D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- McCarthy, J. J. 1982. "Prosodic Structure and Expletive Infixation." *Language* 58: 574–90.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/413849>.

- McWhorter, J. 2016. *Words on the Move*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Mesnard, P. 1971. *Erasmus: Dialogus Ciceronianus*. In *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami ordinis primi tomus secundus*, edited by J. H. Waszink, L.-E. Halkin, C. Reedijk, and C. M. Bruhl, 581–710. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. 1990. “Cola and Clausulae in Cicero’s Speeches.” In *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, edited by E. M. Craik, 349–59. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Reprinted in R. G. M. Nisbet (S. J. Harrison, ed.), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, edited by S. J. Harrison, 312–24. Oxford: Oxford University Press.)
- Pezzini, G. 2015. *Terence and the Verb ‘To Be’ in Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198736240.001.0001>.
- Pinkster, H. 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax: Volume 1. The Simple Clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199283613.003.0001>.
- . 2021. *The Oxford Latin Syntax: Volume 2. The Complex Sentence and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199230563.001.0001>
- Plag, I., G. Kunter, S. Lappe, and M. Braun. 2008. “The Role of Semantics, Argument Structure, and Lexicalization in Compound Stress Assignment in English,” *Language* 84: 760–94. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0072>.
- Preacher, K. J. 2001. “Calculation for the Chi-Square Test: An Interactive Calculation Tool for Chi-Square Tests of Goodness of Fit and Independence.”
- Probert, P. 2003. *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Spevak, O. 2006. “Les enclitiques en latin.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111: 249–74. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110186505.249>.
- von Stechow, A., and D. Wunderlich. 1991. *Semantik: ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110126969>.
- Wackernagel, J. 1892. “Über ein Gesetz der indo-germanischen Wortstellung.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333–436. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110242430.333>.
- Whitton, C. 2013. *Pliny: Epistles Book II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woolf, G. 2015. “Pliny/Trajan and the Poetics of Empire.” *Classical Philology* 110: 132–51. <https://doi.org/10.1086/680669>.

Putting on a Fronto: Persona and Patterns of Language in Fronto's Correspondence

PETER BARRIOS-LECH

Abstract: The subject of this chapter is the language of letters exchanged between Fronto and correspondents, specifically those linguistic means by which Fronto and his epistolary correspondents construct a persona and maintain and negotiate relationships. Analysis of the frequency of (Latin to Greek) code-switches, the diversity, or range of unique, address-terms, letter openings and closings used, and the type and frequency of requests show how Fronto's relationship with Marcus Aurelius changes over time; and offer us one way to measure differences in Fronto's epistolary relationship with the other correspondents.

Keywords: Marcus Cornelius Fronto, Marcus Aurelius, Politeness, Latin and Greek Politeness, Code-Switching; Historical Sociolinguistics

Introduction: Fronto's Letters and The Social Function of Language

Marcus Cornelius Fronto (c. 95-c.166 CE) was sole Latin tutor (*rhetor*) for Marcus Aurelius (emperor from 161-180). We are fortunate to have their correspondence. It attests to literary culture in elite circles of the mid-2nd century imperial Rome (Champlin 1980); discloses an evolving relationship between tutor and pupil (Richlin 2006a and 2006b); displays early examples of distance learning; and documents how, in the apogée of Roman power, Latin-users manipulated language to forge, enact, and negotiate social bonds (Hall 2009; Elder and Mullen 2019).¹ Epistolary language is the closest of literary genres to a live conversation – Cicero calls it *amicorum colloquia absentium* (*Phil.* 2.7.12; Poccetti 2010: 106). Correspondence showcases language's social functions: letter-writers recommend, instruct, advise, request, teach; long absences force them to perform verbally their relationship to the addressee (Elder and Mullen 2019: 3).

This paper examines certain elements of epistolary language with which Fronto and his correspondents co-construct and negotiate a relationship. The elements fall under five categories: commands and requests; terms of address; letter-openings; letter-closings; and switches to Greek, so-called "code-switching." Expressions falling under these categories demonstrate that "language has *imperium*: the power to resolve problems, to negotiate relationships, and to construct characters and even Roman culture itself" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 3).

As a study on the social dimensions of Fronto's epistolary language, the current work belongs to the scholarship dealing with the *rhetor* and his relationships with each of his correspondents. Scholars exploring the social aspects of the letters employ close readings of relevant passages and prosopography. In this paper I employ close readings, informed by ideas from sociolinguistics, and data analysis. Through this analysis, I seek to isolate patterns which will, hopefully, show diachronic changes in a correspondent's epistolary language. I also want to distinguish the language of each subcorpus; in other words, to demonstrate how Fronto accommodates his impressive linguistic resources to each addressee; and how, in turn, each correspondent suits his language to Fronto. For instance, we could expect the 45-year-old Fronto to use different language with his rough contemporary, but social superior, Antoninus Pius *imperator*, than he would with Marcus Aurelius, his 20-something student.

¹ The text is in a bad state. For details see van den Hout (1988: vii-lxxx, esp. viii-xv; xx-xxiii; lxxviii-lxxix); Haines (1919): xi-xvii; Champlin (1980) 3-4. In general, modern literary critics do not hold Fronto's work in high regard: see Brock (1911) 3-5; Champlin (1980) 2; van den Hout (1999): viii; Richlin (2006b) is an effort to bring this work to a wider audience.

Thus, while the paper’s subject is not new, its methodology is relatively so, since it constitutes one of only two studies that use quantitative analysis to analyze Fronto. The other is that of Mullen and Elder (2019), on code-switching to Greek in the great Latin epistolary *corpora* (Cicero, Pliny, Fronto).

The Fronto Corpus

To compile each set of data, I have read Fronto’s correspondence, and entered the relevant items into a spreadsheet, which I make available online, in the hope that others will use it to build on this work. My text – the corpus of data – is Michael Van den Hout’s 1988 Teubner edition. In this corpus, Fronto’s correspondents are: Antoninus Pius, emperor from 138-161 and stepfather to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Marcus Aurelius as Caesar (or emperor-designate, from 138-161 CE); the same Marcus Aurelius as emperor (161-180); Lucius Verus (co-emperor with Aurelius from 161-166 CE); Domitia Lucilla, Marcus Aurelius’ mother; and, finally, a number of Fronto’s friends. The letters are written mostly in Latin, although we find six items in Greek (VdH 16-17; 21-24; 32-33; 171; 242-248; 250-255).²

Even a cursory glance at **Table 1** reveals that the correspondence between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius predominates, consisting as it does of 120 letters out of the total 217 (about 55%).

Correspondents	Total Letters	Directives	Vocatives	Opening Phrases	Closing Phrases	Code-Switches
Fronto and M. Caesar	120	216	133	100	110	85
Fronto and Augustus	34	115	42	24	20	41
Fronto and L. Verus	14	37	16	8	4	7
Fronto and A. Pius	8	4	10	6	2	0
Fronto to Friends	41	59	14	26	1	10
	217	431	215	164	137	143

Table 1: Data Gathered from Exchanges between Fronto and Correspondents.

Scanning across the top row, the reader will see the categories of data collected: **directives** – basically, commands and requests— like “see to it that you remember and consider carefully” (*fac memineries et cum animo cogites*, VdH 224.13); **vocatives** like “my dear Pompeianus” (*mi Pompeiane*, VdH 180.15) or “excellency” (*domine optime*, VdH 74.2); **opening phrases**, like “Fronto sends greetings to his dear Caesar” (CAESARI SVO FRONTO [SALVTEM DICIT], VdH 2.18); **closing phrases** like *vale*; and **code-switching to Greek**, for instance (in Caesar’s request for a subject on which to write): “send me rich material, please, please, I beg and beseech and entreat” (*uberem mi materiam mitte, oro et rogo* και αντιβολῶ και δέομαι και <ί>κετεύω, VdH 77.10-11).

Some Concepts from Sociolinguistics and a Foreshadowing

To analyze this data, I make use of two ideas from sociolinguistics: facework and politeness. I also foreshadow in this section two important conclusions revealed by the data.

Facework and Politeness

² Citations of Fronto will be made according to the standard format of page in (1988) van den Hout edition and line number(s) of that page, thus, **VdH 94** means “page 94 of the Van den Hout 1988 edition”; and **VdH 164.10** means “page 164, line 10 of the Van den Hout 1988 edition.” Translations are my own.

“ce mépris, qui n’en est que plus piquant, parce qu’on voit que la politesse s’impose le devoir de le cacher.” Stendhal, *Le Rouge et Le Noir*, p. 298 (“this disdain, which is all the more stinging, because one sees that [normally] politeness obliges you to conceal it.”)

Politeness, for moderns, means words and acts demonstrating consideration for another. Politeness, evidenced in greetings and words like “please” and “thank you” is the “grease that lubricates the tracks” of conversation and social interaction generally. But polite phrases and actions may serve as a false veneer of friendliness and respect put on to advance the speaker’s personal agenda, or to conveniently hide true feelings. Sociolinguists have in the past forty years been attempting to put verbal politeness on theoretical footing. One popular Politeness theory deploys the concept of “face”. This is the theory we will use to explicate Fronto’s epistolary interactions.

A concept drawn from sociology, and given its definitive analysis by Erving Goffman, “face” means one’s positive self-image; in other words, “what the person protects and defends and invests his feelings in”; “an idea about himself” (Goffman 1967: 43). The upkeep of this positive self-image is the responsibility of both self and other, who cooperate in supporting each other’s face during the course of any interaction, because it is mutually advantageous to do so. If I do injury to your face, I risk reprisal in kind, with damaging consequences to the social bond. “Facework” is the cumbersome term that embraces the various words and actions that self and other take to mutually support the other’s face (Goffman 1967: 12). The idea is relevant to Roman society, as Kaster has shown (Kaster 2005: 162 n. 18). When interacting, Roman élites sought to maintain their own and take into consideration the other’s *dignitas* – the esteem in which they were held according to their societal position – *existimatio* – reputation – and *auctoritas* – “clout” as vouchsafed by prior deeds, social connections, and previous political positions held.³ I would argue that a Roman’s “face” involved all of three of these concepts, as all three contributed to the Roman (particularly male) self’s public image.⁴

We can observe how Aurelius, still a prince, engages in facework, showing due regard to Fronto, in a letter from the 150’s. In it, Aurelius alludes to a legal battle pitting Fronto against the Athenian rhetor Herodes Atticus (VdH 36-39; Champlin 1980: 63-64; 104-105). Both men are Aurelius’ tutors; the Caesar claims to love both (VdH 36.19-20). Fronto is an advocate for the defense; Herodes, the prosecution. Marcus Aurelius wants to avoid a verbal slanging match between two people very closely connected to him. Indeed, an ugly confrontation between two of Aurelius’ rhetors could prove embarrassing for the emperor-to-be. So Marcus asks Fronto to proceed with restraint and not be the first to lash out verbally.

1. Aurelius asks Fronto not to initiate verbal attacks on a legal rival.
Adeo sive tu me temerarium consultorem sive audacem puerulum sive adversario tuo benivolentiorum esse existimabis, non propterea quod rectius esse arbitror, pedetemptius tibi consulam. Sed quid dixi 'consulam'? qui id a te postulo et magnopere postulo et me, si inpetro, obligari tibi repromitto. Et dices: 'Quid! si lacessitus fuero, non eum simili dicto remunerabo?' At ex eo tibi maiorem laudem quaeris, si nec lacessitus quicquam responderis. Verum si prior fecerit, respondentem tibi utcumque poterit ignosci: ut autem non inciperet postulavi ab eo et impetrasse me credo (VdH 36.11-18).

³ Kaster (2005) 144 for the definition of *dignitas* and 56 for *existimatio* as a kind of “positive face” the positive regard that one wants the other to have for one’s self. Galinsky (2012) 9 for *auctoritas* as “clout,” which “[was] not a given but had to be constantly validated – thus living up to its derivation from *augēre*, which means to increase.”

⁴ Hall (2009) 12-13, by contrast, suggests that *dignitas* could be equivalent to the notion of “face” as outlined above. Unceta-Gómez (2018) offers the state-of-the question on studies in Latin politeness.

Whether you consider me a rash adviser, a brash boy, or kinder to your adversary, I will not be more cautious in counseling you, just because I think that to be more proper. But why did I say, “counsel?” I’m requesting something from you, and that vehemently. And if I obtain my request, I promise in turn that I will be obliged to you. You’ll say, “What if I was attacked first, won’t I return the attack?” On the contrary: you seek greater praise if, even though injured, you do not counter-attack. But if he started, one could forgive you for responding in whatever way. But I asked him not to, and I think I’ve obtained what I asked.

Marcus Aurelius employs at least two strategies here to soften the “blow”, that is, his request (or even order) that Fronto moderate his language in court. First, Marcus employs the strategy of self-humbling: for him to suggest to his *rhetor* what to do in court – that would be the act of “a rash advisor (*temerarius consulator*); a brash boy (*audax puerulus*); or – what was worse – a friend *not* to Fronto but to his *adversary* (Herodes) (*adversario tuo benivolentior*)”.⁵ Second, the future emperor verbally performs his friendship drawing attention to his frank speech. Specifically, Aurelius goes on record with his demand, not trying to sugarcoat it: his is not advice but a *request*, in his own interest (“but why did I say “counsel/advise you, since I am demanding, and that vehemently?” *sed quid dixi ‘consulam’? qui id a te postulo et magnopere postulo*). Aurelius confesses circumspection was called for, but instead insists on frank talk: “I will *not* be more cautious in counseling you, just because I think it [sc. more circumspect talk] to be more proper.” Aurelius concludes his verbal performance of friendship by pointing out that direct talk befits true friends: “I’ll end up having written with less wisdom, but I do that in preference to remaining silent, conduct unbefitting a friend,” *ego certe minus sapienter magis scripsero, quam minus amice tacuero* (VdH 36.24-25). With these utterances, Aurelius enacts one of the principal requirements of a friend, to be honest, even if it might hurt the other’s feelings (Cic. *Am.* 44; *Off.* 1.58).⁶

These two strategies – self-humbling and verbal performance of his friendship – are the epistolary means by which Aurelius supports Fronto’s “face” as a respected advocate, rhetor, and friend. They counterbalance the potentially face-threatening request, that Fronto tone down his attack on an adversary. Aurelius engages, then, in “facework” of a particular kind, which, in the literature is labelled as “**positively polite**”, or what Hall calls “**affiliative politeness**”, language which seeks to reduce the sense of distance between the interlocutors, with expressions of regard and affection being typical of such positive or affiliative politeness (Hall 2009: 12-14; Brown and Levinson 1987: 62-3). By contrast, language that acknowledges social distance has been termed “**negative politeness**”, or by Hall, “**politeness of respect/distance**” (Hall 2009: 7-14). Marcus’ self-humbling – he is a brash boy; a reckless *consigliere* – cleverly bows to Fronto’s *autoritas* as renowned rhetor.

Polite Expressions

These concepts – of positive and negative politeness – can be appreciated especially when a person realizes a command, request, suggestion, or other directive (Brown and Levinson 1987; Brown and Gilman 1989). In a letter advising Marcus on proper diction, Fronto frames his suggestions with the 1st person subjunctive form *dixerim*: “I would more properly say the dagger is besmeared with poison, but the rod is covered with birdlime”, *mucronem veneno <praelitum>, radium visco ‘inlitum’ rectius dixerim* (VdH 58.16-17).⁷ Thus, Fronto advises Marcus on how to use these verbs compounded of prefix+*lino*, but in doing so avoids addressing his superior directly.

⁵ The strategy of self-humbling as a means to soften a potentially offensive speech act, like requesting, is documented in modern languages: Brown and Levinson (1987: 185-186).

⁶ See Fleury (2006: 24) on frank declarations in the letter exchanges as expressions of friendship.

⁷ *Praelitum* is van den Hout’s suggestion for *oblitum*, which had already been mentioned earlier. It would seem odd for Fronto to use the same word twice in a passage highlighting the fine distinctions in *lino* and its various compounds.

In order to mitigate their commands and requests, Latin speakers also added polite words or phrases. In Fronto's time, people probably softened requests with *rogo*, like English "please" (Dickey 2015: 28). But since Fronto and his correspondents sought an archaizing style, they avoid what is common, instead turning to Terentian *sodes*, Ciceronian *obsecro* but, yes, also to contemporary (for Fronto and friends) *peto* (Dickey 2015: 26-28). Add to these options, the various polite clauses: comparative clauses like "do x, *ut facis*, "as you are doing [anyway]." Such expressions say, "I'm asking you to do something, but acknowledge that I am in no position to be ordering you around." They are "negatively polite," achieving a respectful distance, whether that social distance be measured horizontally or vertically (Hall 2009: 14-15; Barrios-Lech 2016: 34-35).

Or consider conditional clauses like *si me amas*, [*fac*]. This expression, "do x, if you love me" implies that friendship or some other intimate bond exists between speaker and hearer, and that the hearer can prove his love anew by doing a favor. With the expression (*si me amas*, [*fac*]), a speaker foregrounds the friendship precisely when he needs to request something. Thus, the phrase is a piece of "positive" or "affiliative" politeness. In principle, it would be absurd to ask a stranger to "do me a favor, if you love me," as strangers or mere acquaintances don't love each other with that peculiar Roman love (*amor*) that binds friends. At any rate, in our correspondence, only friends use *si (quid) me amas* and the like: Marcus Aurelius when writing to Fronto (VdH 60.20; 77.9, 86.22); Fronto when writing to Aurelius (VdH 69.41); and Fronto when writing to Arrius Antoninus, a former student and beloved friend (VdH 189.5).

Do Fronto and friends employ predominately positively polite expressions to extend and demonstrate *amor* to each other? Do correspondents who know each other less well employ "politeness of distance/respect"? Does the Fronto use such politeness of distance when writing to the emperor – Pius before 161 and Aurelius after 161?

An Asymmetric Relationship That Becomes More So

ego, si tu volueris, ero aliquid, "If you so desire it, I will be something"
(VdH 50.20, letter from Marcus Aurelius to Fronto dated to the early 140's)

Quid quaeris? Hanc ipsam epistulam paululum me porgere non sinunt instantes curae, quarum vacatio noctis demum aliqua parte contigit "To be brief: pressing concerns won't allow me to continue this letter even a little bit, concerns from which I am getting a respite finally during part of the night."
(VdH 103.21-23, letter from Aurelius the emperor to Fronto dated to between 161-167).

For clarity's sake, I anticipate here two key aspects of this paper concerning the relationship between Fronto and Aurelius. These were already noticed by others, but now stand out clearly revealed by patterns in our data.

First, the intensity of the affectionate language – sometimes frankly erotic – diminishes, particularly after Fronto's term as tutor finishes and Aurelius, in turn, has assumed duties of ruling as emperor in 161; it is commonly assumed that Aurelius' interests in philosophy and the assumption of rule distanced him from his former tutor (Richlin 2006a: 111-112; Richlin 2006b: 5-6; Elder and Mullen 2019: 205-209). The linguistic patterns we illuminate below underpin the relationship's "general contours...formed by modern readers using a fragmentary set of letters" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 206).

Second, the evidence will show that Aurelius recurs more frequently – often much more frequently – than does Fronto to positive politeness. Fronto does the opposite: his favored form of politeness is that conveying distance and respect. In other words, while

Aurelius recurrently hits the accelerator, rapidly closing distance down, Fronto likes to apply the brakes, cautiously widening the gap between himself and Aurelius. The question then is, why?

Common sense would dictate that a subject to the emperor would use the politeness of distance and respect, and this Fronto demonstrably does, when writing his superiors. But why does Aurelius, who has the upper hand, employ “affiliative politeness” with his subordinate? Sociolinguists of modern languages have noted this asymmetry in usage of politeness, with inferiors verbally demonstrating distance and respect and superiors expressing affection and esteem. More specifically, scholars observe that in certain hierarchical settings, it is considered inappropriate for the inferior to presume intimacy with a higher-status addressee; though the converse is acceptable. The reason for the differential in politeness usage is that positive politeness is more “venturesome”: to claim intimacy with another can be an unwelcome imposition (Morand 1996: 547-8). While the rights for use of positive politeness are not distributed equally between the interlocutors of unequal status, both high- and low-status speakers freely draw on negative politeness (Morand 1996: 549; Rees-Miller 2000). We will see, time and again, Aurelius presume intimacy with his social inferior, while Fronto cannot do the same – *at any point in their relationship*.

Data Analysis

I now start with directives, then continue analysis in the order presented above (address-terms, opening phrases, closing phrases, and code-switches to Greek). Once I finish the discussions on each category of data, I bring the individual results together in a conclusion.

Directives

As Fronto himself says, in a letter addressed to Aurelius’ co-regent, Verus (dated 163 CE), “*imperium* is not just a word for power, it belongs to discourse” (*imperium autem non potestatis tantummodo vocabulum, sed etiam orationis est*, VdH 123.16-18). Latin **commands and requests** are typically framed in the imperative, *modus imperativus*. The *imperativus* constitutes one way a language user can wield *imperium* over another. It is an attempt, realized through language, to get the addressee to do something. The relatives of the command are the request, the piece of advice, the instruction, the permission, the entreaty. All of these – from the peremptory command to a humble entreaty – can be subsumed under the term *directive*, that is any utterance (and it is usually an utterance) *directing* someone to do something (Searle 1976: 11-12). This technical term I employ for convenience’s sake. Here are some examples, drawn from the correspondence.

2. In an early letter, Aurelius asks Fronto to come visit him.

Tu modo perendie veni, et fiat quod volt (VdH 35.1-2).

Just come the day after tomorrow, and let what wants to happen, happen.

3. Fronto says that Aurelius heeds the *populus* when deciding whether to manumit a gladiator or pardon a criminal in the amphitheater. Likewise, Aurelius should take his audience into account when reciting an oration.

igitur ut populo gratum erit, ita facies atque ita dices (VdH 18.9-10)

So however it will please the people, so do and say.

4. Fronto asks Antoninus Pius to forgive an insult to a close confidant of the emperor’s (Champlin 1980: 100-101).

Tuae clementiae est, imp(erator), unicam hominis verborum culpam cum ceteris eius recte factis ponderare (163.15-17).

It is within the powers of your mercy, Emperor, to weigh the single fault of a man's words against his good deeds.

The utterances in passages (2.) through (4.) are directives because they constitute an attempt to get the addressee to do something. But they are not all alike. In passage (2.), Aurelius wants to see his tutor, and simply requests he come: *veni* "come," using the present imperative. In the passage (3.), Fronto steps into his role as tutor and advises Marcus Aurelius to take his audience's pleasure into account when delivering a speech. For this, he uses the 2nd person future indicative (*ita facies atque ita dices*). Finally, Fronto treads carefully in (4.), a passage directed to the emperor Antoninus Pius. Fronto had accepted property bequeathed to him by a man who, in turn, had gravely insulted Pius' confidant of twenty years. By accepting this legacy, Fronto appears to side against the *imperator*. But now the rhetor circumspectly asks Pius to consider that – apart from one bad episode – the now-deceased testator deserves the emperor's esteem (passage 4, above, and 163.17-22).

Fronto carefully words this request, using three strategies to mitigate it ("it is characteristic of your mercy, Emperor, to weigh the single fault of a man's words, against his good deeds", *tuae clementiae est, imp(erator), unicam hominis verborum culpam cum ceteris eius recte factis ponderare*, 163.15-17). First, Fronto addresses Pius as *imperator*, acknowledging thereby that his addressee does not have to comply: he is after all the commander-in-chief (Dickey 2002: 100). Second, Fronto does *not* use a second person pronoun like *tu* or *te*, which might be taken as more confrontational. Instead, he lodges his request impersonally: "it is characteristic" not of *you*, but of "*your clemency*" (sc. "to take a more holistic view of a person's character"). In summary, Fronto's strategy is one of impersonalizing and distancing, two linguistic means, documented across many modern languages, of showing negative politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987: 182-185; 190-194).⁸

Clearly, the relationship between the interlocutors plays a role in how speakers frame requests. Marcus as emperor-designate bluntly directs his subject to come visit. But in passage (4), Fronto, subject of the emperor, must lodge his request in a more submissive way. In passage (3), Fronto is expected to teach the Caesar. Advice-giving suits his role as tutor.

As mentioned above, commanding, requesting, advising, instructing, permitting, beseeching, and praying are all attempts (however realized) to get the hearer to do something; they are all "directives". The criteria I use to label a directive as a "command," "request," or any one of the other possible subtypes are drawn from previous work (Risselada 1993: 45-49; Denizot 2011: 23-24). One important distinction is who stands to benefit. If the speaker directs addressee to do something to the *speaker's* benefit, I consider the directive either a command or a request. Distinguishing between the two – command or request – requires the reader to take into account several factors. What is the weight of the request? Is the speaker asking the addressee to scribble a couple of lines in response to a letter or to forget a serious injury (cf. passage 4, above)? In addition, the modern reader should also consider the quality of the relationship between speaker and addressee. (Scholars agree, for instance, that Fronto and Marcus, as prince, are closer than Fronto and the same man when emperor.)

To demonstrate how I categorize directives, I submit the following sample analysis:

5. Caesar has completed an exercise Fronto sent him; he asks Fronto to send him another. Ego adeo perscripsi (tu **mitte** aliud quod scribam), sed librarius meus non praesto fuit, qui transcriberet. Scripsi autem non ex mea sententia, nam et festinavi et tua ista valetudo aliquantulum detrivit mihi. Sed veniam cras petam, cum mittam. Vale

⁸ It must be conceded that Latin has few terms of address like our "sir" to show appropriate distance and respect to strangers: see Dickey (2002: 255-256). We will discuss Fronto's use of terms like *domine* and *imperator* below.

mi dulcissime magister. Domina mea mater salutem tibi dicit. Nomen tribuni plebis, cui inposuit <no>tam Acilius censor, quem scripsi, **mitte** mihi (VdH 76.13-19).

I've finished writing it – send me another to do – but my copyist wasn't at hand to transcribe it. It wasn't to my liking; I rushed, and then your bad health has been distressing me. But let me ask forgiveness from you tomorrow, when I send it. Good bye, sweet teacher. My mother sends her greetings. Send me the name of the tribune of the plebs, on whose name Acilius the censor set the mark of censure.

Mitte, if it were a command, would not accord with the friendly concern expressed in the body of the letter (“your bad health has been distressing me”); and Aurelius’ self-humbling stance (“let me ask forgiveness from you tomorrow, when I send it”). I therefore interpret the imperatives (*mitte aliud...mitte mihi*) as requests.

Directives in the hearer's interest, advice (“you have a headache: take an aspirin”), permissions (“you want an ice-cream?” go ahead.”), and instruction, from which a pupil stands to benefit, feature often in the correspondence, unsurprising since the letters are a vehicle for Fronto's instruction and advice to the emperor. Consider the following passage.

6. Fronto instructs Aurelius on proper Latin usage.

Nolim igitur te ignorare syllabae unius discrimen quantum referat. Os 'colluere' dicam, pavimento autem in balneis 'pelluere', non colluere; lacrimis vero genas 'lavere' dicam, non pelluere neque colluere (VdH 58.5-8).

I wouldn't want you to ignore the difference even one syllable makes. I'd say “wash” (*colluere*) the face; but “clean” (*pelluere*) the floor in the baths; not “wash” (*colluere*) them. I'd say bathe (*lavere*) one's cheeks in tears, not clean (*pelluere*) or wash (*colluere*).

Fronto gives instruction on Latin diction – an act expected of him – but indirectly, with polite first person subjunctives: “I'd not like you to,” (*nolim*); “I would say,” (*dicam*) and later on in the passage “I would more properly say” (*rectius dixerim*, VdH 58.17). I have classified these three instances as instructions, albeit couched in a circumspect way.

Making minute distinctions – whether some utterance constitutes a piece of advice or an instruction, for instance – remains subjective. More straightforward is determining a particular utterance's membership to a *family* of directive, say “command-request” (where the speaker stands to benefit) or “advice-suggestion-instruction” (where the addressee stands to benefit). The analysis offered below, then, is based on my own interpretation of the data.

Of Commands, Requests, Suggestions, and Permissions

The following general points can be made about the directives exchanged between Fronto and Aurelius. First, the particular kind of directive used flows from the role played. Thus, Fronto, as befits a *rhetor*, frequently advises and instructs Caesar, his pupil. Of all directives employed by Fronto, more than one third (36.2%) are advice or instruction. This instruction ranges from advice on style (see passage 6, above) to morality, two of the main tasks of the language teacher in antiquity (Kaster 1988: 12-14).⁹ If the reader compares the two tables below, he or she sees that Fronto never fully abandons his role as teacher, even when Marcus becomes *imperator*.

⁹ For instance, “you will win friends for yourself if you take care to remove this one vice: let them not feel envy or hate you,” *quod [amicos tibi conciliaveris] si unum illud vitium...extirpandum...curaveris, ne liveant neve invident invicem amici tui*, VdH 54.5-7).

	<i>Advice</i>	<i>Instruction</i>	<i>Permission</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Request</i>
Fronto	10.4%	23.6%	2.1%	3.5%	60.4%
Caesar	3.1%	0.0%	4.7%	3.1%	87.5%

Table 2: Some Functions of Directives in the correspondence *ad M. Caesarem*.

Even after his active period as tutor ends in 161, Fronto continues to advise and instruct Aurelius, now emperor, about forty six percent (46%) of the time (see Table 3).

	<i>Advice</i>	<i>Instruction</i>	<i>Permission</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Request</i>
Fronto	31.3%	14.5%	4.8%	< 1.0%	42.2%
Aurelius as Aug.	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	92.3%

Table 3: Some Functions of Directives in the correspondence *ad M. Aurelium Imp.*

Proposals like *meliora, quaeso, fabulemur* (VdH 54.4) are the so-called 1st person plural hortatory subjunctives “let us do x.” In Greek and Latin new comedy, these appear almost always between equals, because it might have been untoward for an inferior to invite a superior to participate in a collaborative act (Barrios-Lech 2014; Kreiter-Spiro 1997: 228). Proposals cast in the 1st person plural hortatory subjunctive (like *meliora...fabulemur*) appear not infrequently in the earlier correspondence (between Fronto and Caesar), only to all but disappear when Marcus becomes *imperator*. This is but one sign of an increased relational distance between the two correspondents, especially after Marcus leaves the formal instruction (in 145) and becomes emperor.

Expressing Directives Politely

In the early correspondence (between 138-161), however, Marcus’ tone is markedly self-humbling, and effusively affectionate (VdH 2.6-7; VdH 25.23-26; VdH 49.20-23; VdH 51.15-16; VdH 55.10-14; VdH 249.6-7; 250.3). He displays his affection through “affiliatively polite” directive-softeners, like *ama et* “love me and do x” and *fave mi et* “show favor to me and do x.”

Marcus uses the positively polite softeners strikingly more often than does Fronto – five times as often as his *rheto*r. In a striking contrast, Fronto employs negatively polite softeners about 4 times as often as his charge (see Table 4).

	<i>Positively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>P.P. Softeners per 100 Directives</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners per 100 Directives</i>
Caesar to Fronto (64 directives)	14	22/100	1	1.6/100
Fronto to Caesar (144 directives)	6	4.2/100	12	8.3/100

Table 4: Politeness Softeners in the Correspondence between Caesar and Fronto

We see the same pattern in the correspondence between Fronto and Aurelius after 161: Fronto’s distancing – through polite markers of distance/respect – contrasts with Caesar’s (continued) verbally-demonstrated affection (see Table 5).

	<i>Positively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>P.P. Softeners per 100 Directives</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners</i>	<i>Negatively Polite Softeners per 100 Directives</i>
<i>Augustus to Fronto</i> (26 directives)	5	19/100	1	3.8/100
<i>Fronto to Augustus</i> (83 directives)	1	1.2/100	5	6.0/100

Table 5: Politeness Softeners in the Correspondence between Augustus and Fronto

Yet there are clear differences. First, the near absence of positively polite softeners in Fronto's correspondence with Aurelius after 161 (Table 5) is striking. Second, in the early correspondence, Fronto's politeness words actually convey politeness; after 161, however, they serve only an emphatic function.¹⁰

This change in Fronto's usage of softeners post 161, constitutes a further sign of a cooling-down in the relationship's intensity. Even so, *at no point* in his long friendship does Fronto ever presume an affectionate stance with his superior, at least when issuing directives.

The letter collections addressed to the two other main correspondents – Verus and Antoninus Pius – turn up few requests. From these, however, it seems that Fronto relies almost exclusively on politeness of distancing and respect when issuing directives to these other imperial addressees.¹¹

Address Terms

As Dickey (2002: 2-3) points out, the Romans were very aware of what address-terms were called for in a particular context, just as Spanish-speakers know when to use the informal *usted* or informal *tú*; the French when to say formal *vous* or informal *tu*; and English speakers when to say Mrs. Carlon, Jacqueline Carlon, Professor Carlon, or Jacqui.¹² Address terms can create respectful distance, for instance, Fronto's *imperator* (passage 4) directed to Antoninus Pius; they also forge intimacy, as Fronto's *mi Naucelle* (VdH 183.11), when the rhetor advises Marcus Julius Naucellus to take care of his health. Dickey's (2002) foundational work on Latin address terms will help us to understand what was meant by such addresses as we explore the patterns in the letter-corpora, proceeding chronologically.

Address Terms in the Correspondence between Fronto and Caesar

The following points of contrast between Fronto's and Caesar's address usage will emerge from the following: first, Caesar's usage of address terms is more affectionate than his tutor's, and Caesar exercises a broader palette of linguistic options.

¹⁰ There is a striking difference in usage of softeners pre- and post-161. In the correspondence before 161, *obsecro* typically conveys (affiliative) politeness (VdH 36.28; VdH 77.16), and *quaeso* appears bound to a subjunctive (VdH 5.12; 54.13). After 161, the same words appear as strengtheners emphasizing a question: *obsecro (dic, obsecro, mihi: de dialecticis istis equid tenes?* VdH 144.2); *oro (dic, oro te, Marce, idcircone Alsium petisti...? 238.17); and dic sodes hoc mihi: utrumne...recipi iubes?* (VdH 134.18). *Quaeso* appears simply to emphasize a request in the addressee's favor (VdH 92.23 bis; 93.18).

¹¹ Fronto relies exclusively on the politeness of distance and respect with Pius (152.15-17; 168.24-26) – we don't have any requests from Pius in the corpus. With Verus, he uses polite markers three times: two are negatively polite (*ut voles atque ut animus tuus feret*, 118.4; *si videbitur*, VdH 118.6). The positively polite request is in fact an impassioned plea that Verus cease carousing, for which he was notorious: *fac, oro te et obsecro, domine, quod tuo egregio ingenio decet, temperes et reparcas et modifieris desideriis omnibus* (vDH 110.3-4). The letters from Verus turn up little indeed on which to base conclusions.

¹² Cf. Dickey (2002: 49): "[t]he average English speaker is...likely to be addressed by name in two or at most four different ways."

To begin, we consider how each normally addressed the other. A standard address for Marcus employs the vocative *magister*, which appears in 60 of the total 79 addresses (76.0%), in combination, *meus* or *mi magister*, or with an adjective conveying friendship or affection, even if the superlative had lost most of its force by this time: *iucundissime*, *dulcissime*, *carissime*, or *suavissime*.¹³

Fronto's standard address in these exchanges is *domine* (42 of the 54 total contain *domine*, or 77.8% of the addresses). The form *domine* in Fronto's time was polite, but not servile in tone (Dickey 2002: 88-91).¹⁴ The accompanying adjectives which Fronto uses likewise convey a friendly bond (though, again, the superlative force had diminished by his time): *dulcissime*, the term used between valued male friends (Dickey 2002: 322-323), *desiderantissime*, a very rare term of affection used between male friends (Dickey 2002: 132; 319), and *optime*, "a term of respect and affection" (Dickey 2002: 346).

Aurelius' addresses time and again express outright affection: Caesar employs the endearing address, *mi+vocative*, in 60 of his 79 addresses, so 76.0% of his addresses.¹⁵ Aurelius' addresses verge on, or are frankly, erotic. Six times Aurelius addresses Fronto with the terms of endearment, *anima*, *animus*, or *spiritus*, the latter two definitely erotic.¹⁶ Four times, we find vocative strings with amatory forms of address, like the following: *mi magister dulcissime*, *homo honestissime et rarissime*, *suavitas et caritas et voluptas mea* (VdH 34.14-15). Similar are:

mellitissime, *meus amor*, *mea voluptas* (VdH 63.10-11);
meum desiderium, *mea voluptas* (VdH 63.20-21);
mi, *omnia mea*, *magister*, *amo me* (VdH 72.4-5).

The first in this list, *mellitissime*, *meus amor*, *mea voluptas* (VdH 63.10-11) contains two explicitly erotic address terms, *mellitissime* and *mea voluptas*, with *mellitissime* appearing only once elsewhere, in an erotic scene from Apuleius' novel *Metamorphoses*.¹⁷

In yet another striking contrast, Fronto very rarely employs the affectionate address: *mi+vocative* occurs in his letters 7 times of 54 total addresses, or 12.9% (Aurelius employs *mi+vocative* in 76.0% of his total addresses). Also striking is the *absence*, from Fronto's letters, of erotic or amatory address terms.¹⁸ Fronto allows himself just three times the endearing *mi domine dulcissime* (VdH 76.10; 77.27; 81.26). The remaining four endearing addresses feature abstract nouns, all devoid of erotic content.¹⁹

¹³ *iucundissime*, a "[t]erm of affection used by men to valued male friends" (Dickey 2002: 315), is Aurelius' favorite, appearing 19 times. *Dulcissime*, a "[t]erm of affection for family, lovers, and friends" (Dickey 2002: 322-3) comes a close second at 18 times. At a distant third and fourth, follow *carissime*, a "[g]eneral term of mild affection, esp[ecially] for friends or acquaintances of equal or lower status" (Dickey 2002: 335) employed 9 times; and *suavissime*, a "[t]erm of sincere affection for family and friends" (Dickey 2002: 360). In Fronto's time, these adjectives had lost most of their superlative force (Dickey 2002: 97).

¹⁴ On the use of *domine* as an address form directed to emperors see Dickey (2002: 96-97), who identifies it in informal contexts like letters as "subliterary, generalized *domine*."

¹⁵ On the endearing address, see Adams (1984: 68-73) and for modern data Brown and Levinson (1987) 123-124.

¹⁶ For *anima* and *animus* as terms of endearment, the latter used by women towards lovers, see Dickey (2002: 311); for *anima* used by women with each other or by a man toward a women, see Adams (1995: 120). *Spiritus* occurs in a frankly erotic context: *vale spiritus meus. Ego non ardeam tuo amore, qui mihi hoc scriperis?* (VdH 42.20).

¹⁷ See Dickey (2002: 365) for *voluptas* with *mea* as a "term of endearment, normally for lovers." Dickey (2002: 341) identifies *mellite* as a "term of strong affection for lovers". The only other attestation of the superlative is in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, in an erotic scene featuring Lucius and the slave girl Photis (*Met.* 2.10.3).

¹⁸ The only probable instance in my data appears in one of Fronto's letters to Caesar, where Fronto claims that Caesar is more important than his own *anima*, "life": *domine, anima mea potior* (VdH 77.20). But I do not find any erotic connotation here.

¹⁹ *mea gloria*, *meum gaudium*, *mea securitas*, *mea hilaritas* (VdH 70.6; 9.15; 21.10); *causa optima vitae meae* (VdH 81.7). To these four citations, I would add *decus patriae et Romani nominis* (VdH 31.23), which, though not an endearing form of address appears with *dominum meum* (accusative) in the following: *te, dominum meum, decus morum, solacium mali* (VdH 5.17), the following, *decus morum, solacium mali*, may be accusatives in apposition but they could equally well be vocatives.

We have, then, evidence from each man's address system to show that Aurelius can presume intimacy with his tutor; but Fronto cannot.

Aurelius' address system displays a much broader lexical palette than Fronto's. Caesar employs twenty (20) unique adjectives drawn from both Latin and Greek (*amantissime, amicissime, amplissime, benignissime, carissime, desiderantissime, disertissime, doctissime, dulcissime, gratissime, honestissime, iucundissime, optatissime, optime, μέγα, maxime, mellitissime, praecipue, rarissime, suavissime*). But Fronto uses just four unique Latin adjectives (*desiderantissime, dulcissime, immortalis, optime*), and only one of these – *immortalis*, entirely suited to a Roman emperor-to-be – does not already appear in Aurelius' letters.

We have, then, seen both in Aurelius directive- and address-usage, an intimacy and affection, even *eroticism* that Fronto never assumes when addressing his pupil. We have also seen that more unique adjectives can be attributed to Aurelius than to Fronto. We will return to the question why this is so in the concluding discussion. For now, let us compare Fronto's address system with the one he used when Marcus was *emperor*.

Address Terms in the Correspondence between Fronto and Augustus

Fronto's address system, as it appears in his correspondence with the emperor, changes markedly from the earlier period. Several facts strike us immediately. First, although he had most frequently employed *domine* when addressing Caesar, now *domine* all but disappears. *Domine* appears just once (VdH 89.25), in a letter where Fronto more often addresses the emperor with his cognomen, *Antonine* (three times, VdH 86.2, 12, 88.6).

7. Fronto expresses his pride in both emperors' – Marcus' and Verus' – rhetorical attainments, and compares himself to a proud parent:

Fieri etiam vos [sc. Verus and Aurelius] cotidie facundiores video et exulto quasi adhuc magister. Nam quom omnis virtutes vestras diligam et amplectar, fateor tamen praecipuum me et proprium gaudium ex eloquentia vestra capere. Itidem ut parentes, cum in voltu liberum oris sui lineamenta dinoscunt, ita ego cum in orationibus vestris vestigia nostra<e> sectae animadverto, γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λήτω: meis enim verbis exprimere vim gaudi mei nequeo.

I see you [sc. Verus and Aurelius] becoming more eloquent daily and I rejoice as if I were still your teacher. Now, although I do love and embrace all your virtues, I confess I take a special joy, peculiar to me, in seeing your eloquence. Just like parents rejoice, when they recognize their features in the faces of their children, so, too, do I, when I notice the traces of our school in your orations: γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λήτω (and Leto rejoiced in her heart) (Hom. *Od.* 6.106). [I say it in Greek] since I can't express the degree of my joy in my own words (VdH 87.17-23).

What does Fronto convey by calling his addressee with the cognomen *Antoninus*? Addresses by cognomen are the most frequent of all addresses by name and were probably standard in Fronto's time (Dickey 2002: 56-63, esp. 60). So Fronto may be using an unmarked, standard form of address. The cognomen *Antoninus*, however, was special; for Marcus, on assuming the role of emperor, had taken this cognomen; while his co-ruler adopted Verus (Birley 2012: 155). Was Fronto giving honor to his addressee, then, by calling him *Antonine*?

We get a sense of the connotations of *Antonine* from two clues, one in a letter addressed to Verus, another in a letter from the emperor Aurelius. In a letter to Verus, Fronto praises the eloquence of Verus' dispatch to the senate. The former tutor imagines a dialogue in which he adopts a familiar tone to exhort Marcus to match Verus' oratory: "what is

this, Antoninus? I see that you have to accept the title [sc. of orator] you had rejected and withdraw from your [previous] opinion [sc. about the value of literary studies]. What can my literary studies do? What can your philosophers accomplish?" (*quid hoc rei est, Antonine? Nam tibi video nomen quod recusaveras accipiendum esse et de sententia decedendum. Quid nunc meae, quid philosophorum litterae agunt?* VdH 132.4-6). In another letter, the emperor Aurelius exhorts Fronto not to trouble himself about coming to the family's estate in Lorium to celebrate the emperor's daughter's birthday. He tells Fronto to do this "for your Antoninus," *hoc Antonino tuo da sollicitate et vere petenti* (VdH 86.23-24). In both passages, where *Antoninus* appears (either in address or referential usage), the speaker assumes a friendly, intimate tone with the addressee. I take, then, the address with cognomen *Antoninus* to convey a familiar intimacy. It would thus be entirely suited to the passage quoted above (7.), where Fronto likens himself to Marcus Aurelius' proud parent.

There is yet another striking departure from Fronto's early correspondence. For, now, Fronto calls the emperor Aurelius *Marce*, using the praenomen in six out of the eleven (11) total addresses.²⁰ Yet earlier, during the period of instruction, he had only *once* used called Aurelius *Marce*: *ain quid iudicas Marce?* (VdH 20.8, in a letter dating to 142).

Address by praenomen is rare and typically reserved for family members (Dickey 2002: 64-7). That Fronto now more frequently calls the emperor by his *praenomen* suggests that he indeed felt, or was trying to portray himself as, a family member. Many of the contexts of use have Fronto chiding the emperor as if he were still a young pupil. In one passage Fronto reproaches the emperor for incorrect diction (VdH 159.3-4); in another, he exhorts him to find time for literary study; in yet another, to get more sleep (233.16).²¹ In two more contexts, Fronto addresses the emperor with *Marce* when sharing personal information about his health or thanking the emperor for reading his, Fronto's, speeches (240.15-16: *Marce...mi Marce carissime*; 105.21).

But Aurelius did not reciprocate the intimate language, nor does he display as much affection towards Fronto anymore, after 161. Of the 30 addresses used by Aurelius, in 28, the emperor Aurelius employs the affectionate *mi magister*, with or without an adjective. That had been Aurelius' standard address to Fronto, during the period of instruction, and he continues to use it. That Aurelius refused to set aside the more formal relationship and verbally express more intimacy to his former teacher must have disappointed Fronto. We get a sense of Fronto's disappointment from the following words in response to Aurelius' solicitude for Fronto's health: "his [sc. my, Fronto's,] health...everything is good for this old man, and – as you address him – "your teacher"" , *seni huic, et, ut tu appellas, magistro tuo, bona salus...res omnis bona* (VdH 86.26-27).

The greater distance that Aurelius maintains is also measured by several other facts in his – Aurelius' – address system, post-161. First the erotic addresses disappear after 161: gone are addresses even remotely similar to *mea voluptas* or *mellitissime*. Second, the emperor has severely pruned down the range of adjectives he uses to accompany his address-terms, down to just four choices: *iucundissime* (5 times), *dulcissime* (2 times), *optime* (2 times); *bone* (1 time). Recall that, when Caesar, he had picked from 20 different adjectives to modify the address term.

Speaking of adjectives, Aurelius, in the earlier correspondence, had used the adjective *carissime* nine (9) times; five instances of *carissime* had modified the cognomen, Fronto (VdH 36.25, 38.12, 38.22, 54.20, 55.28). But after being made emperor, Aurelius addresses his former teacher neither as *Fronto* nor with *carissime*.

Fronto, conversely, addresses the emperor as *mi Marce carissime* (240.16), an adjective he *never* applied to Marcus in the letters from the early period of formal instruction.

²⁰ Seven out of 12 total, if we include a fragment, appearing in the grammarian Charisius (p. 267.6-8 Barwick), where Charisius points out that *male* can serve as an intensifying adverb like *valde*. Here we see Fronto addressing the (perhaps, now) emperor as *Marce*: '*male me, Marce, praeteritae vitae meae paenitet.*'

²¹ Recall the imagined rebuke to Anoninus, telling him to turn away from philosophy: *quid hoc rei est, Antonine?* (VdH 132.4).

The shift in each correspondent's address system after 161 cannot but strike us. Aurelius has abandoned any hint of eroticism in his addresses to Fronto; he continues to call his former tutor *mi magister*; but he creates distance by abandoning the more familiar forms of address he had used, for instance, not using the cognomen with *mi* and/or *carissime* (e.g. not using the addresses *Fronto carissime* 55.28; *mi Fronto* 50.25). Fronto, conversely, seeks, and affects, a greater intimacy with the emperor, something he had not done in the early period.

Emperors could be called *Caesar* or *imperator* or *domine*, with formality decreasing in this order (Dickey 2002: 100-102). It is not surprising then, that in Fronto's correspondence with the three emperors, Aurelius, Verus, and Pius, all three appear. The most informal – *domine* – of the set appears most often in Fronto's early letters to Marcus, 78% of the time; *domine* appears 44% of the time with Verus (four out of nine addresses), and with Pius, never.

Fronto always addresses Antoninus Pius with either *Caesar* or *imperator* (sometimes modified, with either *domine* or *sanctissime*). Three times, Fronto employs a title with Verus, Marcus' co-emperor: either *Caesar* (once) or *imperator* (twice), one-third of the total addresses (three out of nine addresses used by Fronto with Verus). Two further times, he addresses Verus with the praenomen, *Luci* (VdH 119.7; 132.16).²² But the tutor never uses *imperator* and very rarely *Caesar* with Marcus Aurelius at any point in their correspondence.²³ And in the later correspondence, when Aurelius is emperor, Fronto uses mostly cognomen and praenomen, and, as we saw, almost completely drops *domine* from the address system, in striking contrast to his earlier practice.²⁴

If Fronto keeps a respectful distance from Verus and Pius, the latter two convey intimacy in their addresses. Recall that with *carissime*, Fronto conveys intimacy with Aurelius the emperor, and the latter, when Caesar, had indeed used the same adjective with Fronto during the emotionally intense early period. Verus six times addresses Fronto in the correspondence, of which four have the adjective *carissime* with *magister* (*mi magister, Vero tuo dulcissime et carissime*: 114.16; 115.6; 109.11; 113.19).²⁵ The pattern matches what we find in the correspondence between Pius and Fronto. Fronto always uses the title with Pius, but Pius always uses *mi Fronto carissime* (VdH 162.2; 165.3).

Thus, in all these exchanges, positive, or affiliative politeness is normally directed down, from emperor to subject. Fronto's address system discloses that he, on the other hand, as a subject, does not express affection towards his imperial superiors Pius or Verus. The address system Fronto uses towards Aurelius the emperor, then, markedly deviates from this norm, as Fronto *does* express affection towards his former pupil, now *imperator*, in the later correspondence.

²² The first of these passages is in a badly damaged part of the text; in the second passage, Fronto is effusively praising Lucius' eloquence

²³ *Caesar* as an address term used by Fronto in just four out of 133 vocatives in the earlier correspondence (all dating before the 150s: VdH 2.19; 13.18; 25.20; 38.3), and once out of 42 address terms in the later correspondence, when Aurelius was emperor (VdH 148.15)

²⁴ It is worth noting here that with his close friends, Fronto uses the cognomen in an endearing address (*mi Naucelli carissime* 174.22; *mi Naucelli* 183.11). Thus the addresses to his friends approximate Fronto's post 161 addresses to the emperor Aurelius. Arrius Antoninus, a pupil of Fronto's is addressed as *mi fili* (190.14) or *mi domine fili carissime* (189.10), "perhaps betraying here a paternal intimacy in one without sons of his own" (Champlin 1980: 46). Another close friend, Aufidius Victorinus, is addressed once as *domine* (176.10), an address that was polite but considered 'subliterary' in the 2nd C.; Fronto uses it to his friends (in the passages just cited and at VdH 174.4, 13; *domine frater* 185.14). See Dickey (2002: 90-91) on the subliterary but polite nature of *domine*, and Fronto's usage of it to friends; combinations with kinship terms like *frater* (cf. VdH 185.14, *domine frater*) are typical of documentary texts, first appearing there in c. 100 CE and "becomes very common later," according, again, to Dickey.

²⁵ Perhaps Verus wanted a closer relationship with Fronto, as suggested in a letter from the Aurelius the emperor to Fronto: "I ask that you keep up the correspondence (*peto scriptites*) with my brother (sc. Verus). He really wants me to secure this request. His wishes are making me ungovernable and unreasonable" (*domino meo fratri peto scriptites. Valde volt ut hoc a te impetrem; desideria autem illius intemperantem me et violentum faciunt* VdH 92.8-9). This could explain Verus' intimate addresses, too.

Letter Openings and Closings

Greetings and valedictions, or, letter-openings and closings function as the *zeremonielle klammern* “ritual bracketing elements,” not only for face-to-face, but also for epistolary exchanges. Together, salutations and closings serve as a frame demarcating the limits and boundaries of the enclosed exchange (Müller 1997: 17). One particular letter-opening discloses the complex relationship between Fronto and his charge. “Marcus Aurelius Caesar sends greetings to his consul and teacher” (M. AURELIUS CAESAR CONSULI SUO ET MAGISTRO SALUTEM VdH 31.14-15). Aurelius is Caesar (M. AURELIUS CAESAR) to Fronto, who was consul (CONSULI) at the time of writing (in 142 CE). But whenever pedagogy is at issue, Fronto has a (limited) claim to superiority, as Aurelius’ teacher (MAGISTRO). Indeed, in a passage above (1.) we witnessed Aurelius’ deference towards Fronto, but also a performance of friendship. This *amicitia* is suggested by the possessive adjective SUO “his (Aurelius) very own”.²⁶

Opening Phrases

Private letters are “conceived of as a distant dialogue, in that [they] expect a reply and perform an interaction across space and time” (Pocetti 2010: 106). Salutations in conversations (*salve, have*), are supposed to begin the dialogue; so, too, do letter openings initiate a written exchange. Unlike salutations, however, letter openings are expected to be more elaborate (Pocetti 2010: 105).

Letter Openings in the Early Correspondence: Fronto and Caesar

Accordingly, we would expect Fronto, the accomplished stylist, to produce elegantly polished letter openings. But the opposite is true. Let us consider first opening phrases used in the early correspondence, exchanged between tutor and prince, Fronto and Aurelius Caesar. More than three quarters (79.2%) of Fronto’s letter openings to Caesar are simply *DOMINO MEO*, thirty-eight (38) of a total 48 letter openings preserved; thirty-nine (39) if we add *DOMINO MEO FRONTO* (VdH 56.5).²⁷

Fronto rarely diverges from this pattern. Only one extremely elaborate opening stands in this early letter corpus. Written when Fronto was consul, we see that the rhetor, in high dudgeon, begins, sustains, and concludes the letter in high-flown style. He introduces it with *CAESARI AURELIO DOMINO MEO CONSUL TUUS FRONTO SAL(UTEM)* (VdH 17.16). In the body, Fronto’s tone is ebullient, advising Caesar with the aid of various metaphors, from gladiator fights, to cloth and weaving, to horse-riding (VdH 18-19), and praising his rhetorical skill highly (VdH 19.15-20.5). Finally, Fronto closes the letter with an elaborate valediction, drawing from Plautine diction: *vale meum gaudium, mea securitas, hilaritas, gloria. Vale et me obscuro omni modo ames, qua ioco, qua serio* (VdH 21.10-11).²⁸

By contrast, only once does Fronto introduce a letter in a conversational way, with a vocative: *HAVE DOMINE* (VdH 38.4). But this letter is really a post-script, an afterthought dashed off “when I closed and sealed the last letter” and right then “something came to mind”: *clausa iam et obsignata priore epistula venit mihi in mentem [aliquid]* (VdH 38.6-7). The context – a brief message, fired off quickly – explains this, the only verbal sign of a looser style in Fronto’s letter openings.

²⁶ A search in Cicero’s *ad Familiares* (using the Perseus text) shows that Cicero writes to *Tironi suo* and *Terentiae suae*, also once to *Dolabellae suo*; Vatinius uses it to Cicero, as does Curio once. Cicero doesn’t use it to other correspondents. It therefore seems that *suo*+dative marks a close friendship in Cicero’s letters, and probably Latin epistles generally. I thank my co-editor Anne Mahoney for performing this research for me.

²⁷ Interestingly, all the letter openings with *suo* date from the first four years of the relationship, for instance: *M. CAESARI DOMINO SUO FRONTO* (VdH 8.8), from 139 CE; and *CAESARI SUO CONSUL* (VdH 31.20), again, from Fronto’s consulship of 142 CE. In any case, the default opening is *DOMINO MEO*.

²⁸ *qua...qua... for et...et... qua maris qua feminas* (Pl. *Mil.* 1113) and elaborate greetings: *o mea commoditas, o mea opportunitas, salve* (Pl. *Men.* 137-138).

A quick contrast with the letter openings from Fronto to friends shows the formal distance that Fronto maintains with Marcus. For only once does he use the pupil's first name, Marcus, in a letter opening, and one which dates from the beginning of the instruction, when Marcus was eighteen, and Fronto, about forty (139 CE): M. CAESARI DOMINO SUO FRONTO (VdH 8.8). With friends, however, Fronto always opens letters with the name, typically *gentilicium* and *cognomen*, for instance, to his close friend Arrius Antoninus, Fronto begins ARRIO ANTONINO (VdH 189.9).

For Aurelius' letter openings, three points can be made. First, Aurelius much more frequently employs a more colloquial tone; second, his openings are more affectionate and finally they are more stylistically varied, from the colloquial, to something neutral, MAGISTRO MEO (31 of his total 51 letter openings, or 61%), to stylistically elaborated, like the introduction to a letter that dates somewhere in this earlier period: M. CAESAR M. FRONTONI MAGISTRO SUO SALUTEM (VdH 60.1).

Let us take each of these points in detail. First, Aurelius begins his letters conversationally at an incidence of once for every five beginnings, simply by beginning the letter with a term of address eleven (11) times out of 51 of his opening phrases.²⁹ These are frequently affectionate: of the total 11 vocative opening-phrases, seven (7) feature the endearing address, *mi*+vocative ("my dear..."), for example HAVE MI FRONTO CARISSIME (VdH 38.11).

The default for Aurelius' letter openings, as we saw, is MAGISTRO MEO, almost two-thirds of his letter openings. But Aurelius' most elaborate letter openings date from the year when Fronto held a consulship, 142 (Eck 1998). In these five letter openings, the elevated style matches the augmented status of the addressee; for instance: M. AURELIUS CAESAR CONSULI SUO ET MAGISTRO SALUTEM (VdH 30.15; cf. 25.22, 29.10, 32.15, 10.1).

We now compare the two correspondents' usage in regard to letter openings, Caesar's and Fronto's. Aurelius, with a more frequent use of address terms as letter openings, initiates his written correspondence as if it were a face-to-face conversation with a good friend. Fronto is consistently more formal than Aurelius, using only one vocative phrase to introduce a letter; Aurelius uses eleven. Aurelius uses endearing forms of address – which are positively polite – in his letter openings; Fronto does not. Aurelius draws from a broader palette of letter openings, from informal, to neutral, to quite formal. Fronto mostly remains in the neutral register when choosing letter openings. Are there any changes once Aurelius becomes emperor?

Letter Openings in the Later Correspondence: Fronto and Augustus

We have few letters surviving from the period after 161 (see Table 1), and even fewer surviving letter openings. From the openings extant or recoverable, Marcus Aurelius, now *Augustus*, departs markedly from how he had introduced letters in his earlier correspondence. For now, without fail, Augustus uses MAGISTRO MEO, with or without SAL(UTEM).³⁰ Gone are elaborate letter openings; gone are vocatives, that Aurelius *Caesar* had employed, like HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME (VdH 63.12).

By contrast, Fronto departs little from the distant stance disclosed by letter openings he chose to use in the early period. If anything, Fronto further distances himself, preferring, nine times out of thirteen, to use the last half of the emperor's formal title, for instance: ANTONINO AUGUSTO DOMINO MEO (VdH 92.11).³¹ If we compare his letter

²⁹ CARISSIME (VdH 54.17); HAVE MI FRONTO CARISSIME (VdH 38.11); HAVE MI FRONTO MERITO CARISSIME (50.8); HAVE MI MAGISTER OPTIME (VdH 249.1, 85.3, 42.4, 43.1); HAVE MIHI MAGISTER CARISSIME (61.5); HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME (VdH 62.8); HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME (63.12); MI <FRONTO CONSUL> AMPLISSIME (25.22).

³⁰ Once he allows himself to insert Fronto's name in the dative case: MA<GI>STR<O FRONTONI> SA<L> (VdH 239.17), in a heartfelt condolence letter mourning the death of Fronto's grandson. Note, however, that this is an editorial supplement.

³¹ The emperor, after 161 was styled *Imperator Caesar M. Aurelius Antoninus Augustus*: Kovács (2012: 78). Fronto's infrequent alternative was DOMINO MEO (four times: VdH 102.8; 102.22; 104.4; 104.15).

openings with emperors with whom he did not have as close ties, Verus and Pius, we can appreciate the gap that has opened up in the relations between the men. For Fronto uses only the title when heading letters to Verus, with whom his relationship was “mercurial” (Champlin 1980: 110-116).³² He similarly only employs titles to introduce letters to Pius, with whom Fronto probably did not have any “real intimacy” (Champlin 1980: 97-102).³³

Letter Closings

Like letter openings, valedictions are highly scripted moments in any letter exchange. At least in the earlier correspondence, neither Caesar (64 total valedictions) nor Fronto (42 total) are ever content with simple valedictions, such as were presumably found in conversation and amply attested to in Roman comedy, like *vale*, *bene vale* or *valeas*. The most basic valediction in our corpus is *vale* followed by one or more vocatives (*vale, Caesar, decus patriae et Romani nominis; vale, domine* VdH 31.23-24). To such a valediction, Fronto will often attach a request that Caesar pass on a salutation to his (Caesar’s) mother, thus: *vale, domine, patri placeto, matri dic salutem, me desiderato* (VdH 51.26-27). Half of Fronto’s valedictions are like this. Aurelius reciprocates with the corresponding *vale+vocative; domina mea* (or *mater mea*) *te salutat* (or *salutat te*) in about a third of his valedictions.

These recurrent formulae, Fronto’s *dominam tuam saluta* and Aurelius’ *domina mea te salutat*, point to Domitilla Lucilla – Aurelius’ mother – as another connection between the two men. For Fronto’s wife, Cratia, was Domitilla’s *clienta*, and the two women were friends (Champlin 1980: 108-109). Cratia, however, “is a shadow next to Cicero’s Terentia or Pliny’s Calpurnia”: Fronto’s interests in the correspondence are elsewhere (Champlin 1980: 26-27); and so are Aurelius’, who never asks Fronto to pass on greetings to his wife, Cratia, in the closings.

We witnessed Aurelius’ stylistic variation in his address-system and letter openings; he also varies his letter closings, employing at least 6 unique valedictions, not found in Fronto; while the prince’s tutor uses three unique valedictions.

The stylistic variety may result from his desire to impress his teacher. On one occasion, Aurelius playfully elaborates a rather plain letter-closing, saying that, given his addressee, he should conclude his letter in a more structured way (*me dispositius dicere oportet*):

8.

Vale mihi Fronto iucundissime, quamquam ita me dispositius dicere oportet (nam tu quidem postulas talia): O qui ubique estis di boni, valeat, oro, meus Fronto iucundissimus atque carissimus mihi, valeat semper integro inlibato incolumi corpore, valeat et mecum esse possit. Homo suavissime, vale (VdH 2.13-17).

Farewell, my delightful Fronto, though I should say it in a more structured way (after all, such is what you demand): O, you good gods, whosoever you are, I pray that my Fronto be well, most pleasant and dear to me, well always in body, intact, unimpaired, whole; may he be well and [I pray that he] can always be with me. Most charming man, farewell.

Indeed, the closing is *dispositius dictum*. Aurelius voices a prayer arranged in descending tricolon with triple repetition of *valeat*, and assonance and alliteration in the second member (*integro inlibato incolumi corpore*). All of this is inserted between two valedictions, chiasmically arranged (*vale mihi Fronto iucundissime...homo suavissime, vale*). There is nothing this elaborate in Fronto’s letters, perhaps because Fronto doesn’t need to

³² Fronto always addresses Aurelius’ co-ruler, Verus as Augustus, for instance: DOMINO AURELIO VERO AUGUSTO (VdH 113.1).

³³ He always addresses Pius with the title, for instance: ANTONINO PIO AUGUSTO FRONTO (VdH 166.19).

impress Aurelius with his Latin, since his reputation as a master Latinist recommended him to Aurelius' family in the first place.³⁴

Aurelius also explores the opposite pole of the stylistic register, choosing a loose syntax – specifically *aposiopesis*, to close another letter (*vale meum...quid dicam?* VdH 63.20). Again, I find nothing like this in Fronto. Another way in which Aurelius' valedictions closely mimic a more relaxed register is in the use of *valebis*, found in Cicero's letters *ad Familiares* and *ad Atticum* (Fronto does not employ it); and *valeas*, frequently recurring in Roman comedy, and in the just-cited letter collections of Cicero. It may have belonged to the colloquial register. At any rate, Fronto does not employ it in any of his extant letters from this period.

Valedictions in correspondence between Fronto and Augustus

In striking contrast to the earlier correspondence, when Fronto permitted himself more ample closings, we now find just three: two are simply *vale*; one is only slight more elaborate (*vale* (VdH 101.19; *vale mi domine dulcissime; dominam et filiolos saluta; fratri interea orationes mittito*, 102.20-21; *vale*, 160.12).³⁵

When closing letters, Aurelius restricts the stylistic variety of his earlier correspondence for a more parsimonious *vale*+vocative; for instance: *vale mi iucundissime magister* (104.1).³⁶ New in this period are requests that the emperor's greetings be passed on to Fronto's grandson, in five of the thirteen total valedictions (86.16; 92.10; 101.24; 102.7; 103.15-16), for instance: *vale mi dulcissime magister; nepotem saluta* (102.7). Fronto's grandsons were born around the time Aurelius became emperor, so the emperor's requests (*nepotem saluta*) concluding these letters was to be expected.

Again, comparison with the other letter corpora is revealing.³⁷ Nowhere in Aurelius' correspondence – pre- or post-accession – does he say to Fronto *uxorem tuam saluta*. But we have one such valediction in the correspondence from the co-emperor Verus *vale, mi magister; Vero tuo carissime; Cratiam saluta* (VdH 114.13). Here we have yet another attempt by Verus to convey an intimacy with Fronto which the latter did not apparently feel.³⁸

Code Switches

Switches from Latin to Greek – **code-switches** – recur with some frequency in the major literary epistolary corpora. In fact, there is a broad community of practice, with Cicero (in *ad Familiares*), Pliny (in the first nine books of his letters) and Fronto code-switching about twice for every one Loeb page (Elder and Mullen 2019: 192-193).³⁹ It is fair to say that from Cicero's time, code-switching to Greek was one of the several defining features of Latin literary epistles.

But it is not always easy to determine whether the author has indeed switched to Greek. Loan-words like *strofa* ("I get that clever trick of yours," *intellego istam tuam argutissimam strofam*, VdH 50.9), by origin Greek but firmly part of the Latin lexicon by the author's time, are not always straightforward to identify (Elder and Mullen 2019: 18-19). Similarly hard to assess are words with Greek roots but Latin inflectional endings.

³⁴ The conclusion to a letter dated to Fronto's consulship comes close: *vale meum gaudium, mea securitas, hilaritas, gloria. vale et me obsecro, omni modo ames, qua ioco qua serio* (VdH 21.10-11).

³⁵ Thus only three valedictions conclude three letters out of a total twelve (12) whose endings are not damaged (with 22 total letters in this later correspondence from Fronto).

³⁶ We have twelve (12) letters from the emperor to his tutor. All but one contain a valediction; in two letters, the emperor signs off twice (86.15-19; 104.4-3).

³⁷ There is only one valediction in the correspondence with friends (173.26).

³⁸ See above, n. 25.

³⁹ For statistics on Cicero's code-switching over time, see Adams (2013: 372-374) with further elaboration in Elder and Mullen (2019: 136-9): he appears to use less Greek in times of crisis, but in fact, could turn to it during the fraught year of 49 to escape or to engage in serious deliberation.

For instance, Fronto, in a letter to Aurelius, chides the emperor for not relaxing more during his vacation, *perhaps* switching to Greek mid-way: “you should have had a party with all sorts of shell fish...rich dishes, fruits” (*convivium deinde regium agitates conchis omnium generum...matteis, pomis* (VdH 227.18-228.2). *Matteis* transliterates the Greek ματτή, “a rich, highly flavored dish” (LSJ s.v. ματτή) but carries the Latin -is ending. Elder and Mullen might have considered the word as a “word-internal code-switch” (2019: 80), but they do not include it in their database of code-switches.⁴⁰

Probably more difficult is finding the *reason* for a code-switch; in some cases, it is simply a matter of interpretation (Elder and Mullen 2019: 18-19; 195-196). It will not surprise, then, that my own and Elder and Mullen’s databases – compiled independently (and roughly at the same time, although neither knew about the other’s efforts!) – differ. So, too, the statistics in each of our works differs slightly.⁴¹ Drawing on previous work for my classificatory apparatus, in particular that of Adams (2003: 308-346) and Elder and Mullen (2019: 24-30), I offer here the most frequently recurring reasons for Fronto and friends’ switches to Greek.

First, because the discourse surrounding certain disciplines had been sustained in Greek for centuries, a technical vocabulary became associated with each of them, for instance, rhetoric, medicine, architecture, or cuisine. The author chooses the Greek technical term because it is *le mot juste*, more readily to hand, and more economical than a Latin version (Adams 2003: 337-40; Elder and Mullen 2019: 26, 92).

Second, quotations are relatively frequent in the correspondence. Along with switches motivated by the Greek discipline under discussion, quotations (of any kind, a proverb, from a work of literature, self- or other-quotation) figure among the top two most frequent motivations for switches to Greek in Fronto (Elder and Mullen 2019: 85). Understanding why the author employs the quotation is often more difficult: Cicero may make use of quotations during periods of crisis to “sum up and help him reflect on the problems [he] faced” (Elder and Mullen 2019: 139). But sometimes authors introduce quotations to highlight a shared identity with the addressee.

9. Fronto recommends a certain Volumnius to a beloved former pupil, Arrius Antoninus.

Demonstratus est mihi a doctis et multum mihi familiaribus viris, quorum apud me voluntas ipsorum merito valet plurimum. Igitur, si me amas, tantum Volumnio tribue honoris facultatisque amicitiae tuae complectendae; οἱ γὰρ φίλτατοι ἄνδρες conciliaverunt eum mihi. Igitur tam comi amicitia accipias velim quam ille Me<no>et<iadi> volebat, ζωρότερον δὲ κέραιρε quom imperabat (VdH 189.2-8).

He was pointed out to me by cultured men, who are very close to me, and whose good-will in my eyes – deservedly – means a great deal. So, please, give to Volumnius as much esteem [sc. as I do] and the opportunity to embrace your friendship. οἱ γὰρ φίλτατοι ἄνδρες [“for dear friends,” Hom. *Il.* 9.204] have

⁴⁰ <https://csrl.classics.cam.ac.uk/index.php>. For points where I disagree with the categorization of a particular code-switch, see my data, available on my website: https://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/peter_barrios_lech.

⁴¹ I submit a few code-switches eliminated from, on various grounds, Elder and Mullen’s database, but which I include: (1.) VdH 178.1 *tropos* (transliterated τρόπος; a correction by Mai of topos in MS A); (2.) καὶ παίζειν ἀναγκαῖον, VdH 183.2 (no MSS variation here); (3.) I would admit the playful *epistolicotata* and *rhetoricotata* VdH 188.4-5, even though they are nowhere else attested; cf. Mullen and Elder (2019: 80) who insightfully suggest that these are ‘word-internal code-switches’; (4.) *paronomasia* (transliterated παρονομασία) VdH 97.1; (5.) *epanaphoris* (transliterated ἐπαναφορά although the Matrix Language, Latin, governs the case ending, *is*), VdH 97.4; (6.) *matteis* (transliterated ματτή, “a rich, highly flavored dish”, LSJ s.v. ματτή), with the Matrix Language case-ending, *is*.

secured my favor towards him [sc. Volumnius]. So I want you to accept him with as warm a friendship as that one [sc. Achilles] wanted Menoetiades to [accept Ajax, Phoenix, and Odysseus]; when he ordered [Patroclus] to ζωρότερον δὲ κέραριε [mix the pure wine into the jug].

Arrius, the addressee, was a judge with jurisdiction in Cisalpine Gaul, precisely where Volumnius, the recommendee, had been a municipal senator for the town of Concordia. Volumnius, however, suffered exile. In another letter (not given here), Fronto will ask Arrius, in his capacity as *judex*, to restore Volumnius to the municipal senate (VdH 190-197; Champlin 1980: 69-70).

This was probably the context for our passage (9), where Fronto vouches for Volumnius' character: "he was pointed out to me by cultured men, who are very close to me, and whose good-will in my eyes – deservedly – means a great deal" (*demonstratus est mihi a doctis et multum mihi familiaribus viris, quorum apud me voluntas ipsorum merito valet plurimum* VdH 189.2-3). Fronto immediately points to a commonality all men share: literary culture. That shared culture provides the context for the switches to Greek.

With just a couple of citations from the famous embassy of the *Iliad*, Fronto evokes an entire scene – Achilles' tent – where the Greek hero swept aside existing tensions, and warmly welcomed Odysseus, Phoenix and Ajax. Several times, in their hearing, Achilles says these guests are "dearest to him" (Hom. *Il.* 9.198; 204). To demonstrate his fellow-feeling, Achilles has Patroclus mix wine (ζωρότερον δὲ κέραριε) and pour cups for everyone.

Fronto's brief allusions pay Arrius a two-fold compliment. First, he pays tribute to his learning, counting on Arrius to be able to evoke the scene for himself. Second, Arrius can be an Achilles, forgetting politics for a while to extend friendship to Volumnius. Alternatively, if Arrius so chooses, he can be Patroclus, heeding his revered teacher's advice. On display here, then, is one motivation for code-switching: to remind the addressee that both he and the writer form part of a learned in-group (Adams 2003: 316-317).

Code Switches in the Early Correspondence between Fronto and Marcus

Most of the tutor's code-switches draw, predictably, from the domain of Greek rhetoric (87.0%, or 27 of the 31 total code-switches from the period of instruction), as Fronto instructs his charge in the *ars rhetorica*. Otherwise, the Latin tutor but rarely (only four other times) switches to Greek for other reasons.⁴² Fronto's switches to Greek for didactic purposes recur ten times in a letter where he illustrates the effective comparison (the εἰκῶν). He begins by depicting the island of Ischia which "receives and repels" the waves, any naval force, pirates, etc.; within that island, he goes on, is a lake, which itself contains an island, "safe from dangers and difficulty" (VdH 40.17-18). So does the emperor Pius "endure the perils" of rule while protecting Marcus "in his [sc. Pius'] tranquil bosom" (VdH 40.22-41.23). The remainder of the letter is taken up in teaching Marcus the effective use of such comparisons, and Fronto switches to Greek always out of a need to express a rhetorical concept.⁴³ Indeed,

⁴² Twice to quote (VdH 21.9-10, a Greek proverb; VdH 8.20, quoting Marcus Aurelius), once to request (VdH 50.5). The fourth instance deserves special comment. In a letter perhaps dating after the period of instruction, Fronto employs the philosophers to show that even they use *obliqua* – indirect means – of stating their points. Does Socrates, he asks chide his interlocutors *per iurgium an per πολιτίαν*? "by rebuking them or politely/urbanely" (VdH 48.14) Elder and Mullen give as a reason for this code-switch that Fronto draws from the Greek discourses surrounding politics and law ("Greek Culture Sphere: Politics/Law"). But given the context, I think it more likely that Fronto introduces a loan-translation for *urbanitas*, πολιτίαν, English "politeness." Elder and Mullen give Fronto 27 code-switches in this early period, before the mid-forties. I include in this early period four code-switches which cannot be securely dated within the period 139-161: VdH 45.19, 46.11, 48.12 and 48.14. For the early period, Elder and Mullen have 81% of Fronto's code-switching drawing from the Greek cultural domain of Literature/Rhetoric/Grammar. Obviously, the difference between our figures should not obscure the overarching agreement on Fronto's recurrent use of Greek to explicate ideas in the *ars rhetorica*.

⁴³ For a sustained reading of this letter, with careful attention to the code-switching, see Elder and Mullen (2019: 198-202).

as Elder and Mullen remind us, Fronto's reaching for *le mot juste* follows "no doubt his own training probably from several Greek teachers, of whom three, Aridelus, Athenodotus and Dionysius are mentioned in the letters" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 196).

By contrast, Marcus Aurelius employs 16 Greek rhetoric terms or about 30% (16 out of 54 total switches to Greek in his earlier letters).⁴⁴ Slightly more often, Marcus will insert quotations in his letters (19 times out of his 54 switches to Greek, representing a proportion of about 35%). Of these, fifteen (15) appear in a well-constructed letter which constitutes an *accusatio somni*, an accusation of sleep. Here Marcus sets up Odysseus and Agamemnon as examples of the perils of ill-timed naps and deceptive dreams, and draws liberally on the passages from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.⁴⁵

Code-Switches in the Later Correspondence between Fronto and Aurelius the Emperor

We have fewer code-switches for Aurelius the emperor (10), than we do for Fronto (31), but this is no doubt due to the fact that Fronto writes more frequently to the emperor, whose letters in turn, tend to be curt, in striking contrast with the earlier correspondence.⁴⁶

Once Aurelius becomes emperor, Fronto continues to teach him through epistles. This explains the high proportion – 55% (17 out of 31 total code-switches) – of Greek words or phrases which draw from the Greek discipline of rhetoric. But Fronto quotes from Greek sources much more often now than he did in the earlier correspondence, 29% (9 of the total 31 code-switches). Elder and Mullen, noting that these figures approach *Marcus'* style in the earlier correspondence, explain: "perhaps [Fronto] is, consciously or subconsciously, aping Marcus' earlier practice from their more intimate period of association."

I am in agreement with Elder and Mullen: the reason for Fronto's latter code-switching practice must be that he wants to accommodate to his addressee's well-known tastes for Greek culture, especially literature and philosophy. Fronto, therefore, now draws much more liberally on terminology from other cultural spheres traditionally associated with the Greeks – fine dining, philosophy and medicine (5 out of 31, or 16.1%). But in the early correspondence, Fronto had *exclusively* employed Greek rhetorical technical terms.⁴⁷ Now the former teacher inclines to drawing from Greek authors to illustrate rhetorical principles, and now expresses his emotions in Greek, two things he had not done in the earlier correspondence. Thus, when he illustrates the construction of a *prooemium* in oratory, he quotes liberally from the first four verses of the Apollonius' *Argonautika* (VdH 155.19-22). He twice turns to Greek to express his great pride in seeing Aurelius' successes, first, when praising Aurelius the emperor for carefully constructing a tricky phrase: "you've made me happy, really happy, so help me" (εὐφρανας, ὑπερέφρανας, σῶξέο μοι VdH 146.9-10) and, second, quoting Homer "Leto rejoiced in her heart", γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λήτω (Od. 6.106) because "I'm unable to express my joy in my own words" at the emperors' rhetorical prowess (*meis enim verbis exprimere vim gaudi mei nequeo* VdH 87.22-23).

We have ten code-switches in Aurelius the emperor's correspondence. Half of these have a referential function, that is, to use Elder and Mullen's definition, they "advance the meaning of the text, but [do] not explicitly comment on or describe anything in the other language" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 29).⁴⁸ The other half, or five, draw from the traditional

⁴⁴ Elder and Mullen (2019: 209-210) count 52 switches for Marcus Aurelius, of which 38% are drawn from the cultural sphere of Literature, Rhetoric and Grammar and 29% are quotations. See above, and n.42, for the reason for differences between theirs and my own numbers.

⁴⁵ Fronto, indeed, praises Marcus for the carefully thought out letter (VdH 8.20-9.3): see, further, Elder and Mullen (2019: 210-211).

⁴⁶ We have twenty two (22) more or less complete letters from Fronto; against just 12 from Aurelius; and Fronto's are typically lengthier, like the letters *de Eloquentia* and the letter *de Orationibus*.

⁴⁷ Two of these from VdH 151.22-23 count both as quotations and phrases used in Greek philosophical discourse, that is they are imagined quotations, utterances one would probably hear in a Greek philosophical school.

⁴⁸ In practice, I found it difficult to distinguish the referential function from that of description, the latter a "function...assigned when the primary purpose of the code-switch is description" (Elder and Mullen 2019: 25). I found myself often notating "referential/description" for cases where the Greek advanced the meaning of the text,

Greek cultural spheres, with rhetoric predominating (VdH 105.17-18 *ter*). We have many fewer code-switches in this later correspondence, so it is impossible to analyze changes from Aurelius, earlier and later practice.⁴⁹

Code-Switching in the other Subcorpora

Here, too, comparison with code-switching practice in the other subcorpora will be instructive. Greek has an intimate as well as distancing function – it is useful to speak euphemistically about uncomfortable topics (Adams 2003: 335; Elder and Mullen 2019: 205). Also, as noted above, Greek can forge intimacy, pointing to a shared literary culture and used to express deep emotion.

Pius never, and Verus once (to cite a title, πεντηκονταετίαν Θουκυδίδης VdH 108.27) switches to Greek when writing to Fronto. This may result from the many fewer letters that we have from these men (see Table 1), but also from the quality of Fronto's relationship with them, which was certainly more distant than it was with Marcus. Fronto does code-switch to Verus, six times, but of these six, three are the Greek term φιλόστοργος and its cognates, used to describe Fronto's relationship not with Verus, but with a former pupil and close friend, Gavius Clarus (VdH 111.17, 18, 19). The term, he says elsewhere, does not exist in Roman, so he is forced to use the Greek here.⁵⁰ In another letter, we find Fronto defending himself for – after a four month absence from Rome – *not* greeting the new emperor Verus. To testify that he had intended to greet Verus, he quotes from a Greek letter written to the imperial *cubicularius* asking if “today would be good day to come” (VdH 116.16-18).

Fronto switches to Greek two more times in the correspondence, but on neither occasion does the code-switch have the function of forging intimacy with Verus. Once, the Greek code-switch occurs in praise for *both* Marcus Aurelius and Verus.⁵¹ In another code-switch, with a purely referential function, Fronto assaults emperors non trained in rhetoric who use speech-writers: they speak another's words, just like those whom an alien disease, “phrenitis[,] has taken hold of” (*qualis phrenitis morbus quibus implicitus est, aliena eloquentes imperitabant*, VdH 123.15-16).

In correspondence with his friends, however, Fronto's code-switching does forge intimacy. There are four quotations from Greek authors or thinkers highlighting Fronto's shared culture with the addressee, a close friend in all cases. We noted in passage (9), above, how Fronto switches to Greek in order to highlight the love for Greek literature he and his friend Arrius share. With another special intimate, Claudius Julianus, Fronto twice quotes from a *grammaticus* Valerianus, urging Julianus to treat a certain case with a light touch (VdH 182.19; 183.2; Champlin 1980: 34-36).

Fronto forges intimacy by complaining about medical ailments. This he does in Greek with another close friend, Aufidius Victorinus.⁵² We see Fronto more relaxed and playful in this correspondence. To the same Aufidius he commends a certain Aquila in

referring to some extralinguistic reality without commenting on a particular use of language or something mentioned in the letter.

⁴⁹ Elder and Mullen (2019: 210) similarly note three code-switches motivated by Aurelius need to express a rhetorical concept and otherwise observe that “his code-switching is more varied.” For this particular set of correspondence, I differ from Elder and Mullen on interpretation in many cases, hence our different conclusions. Elder and Mullen's remarks bear quoting here: “any analysis of this kind [sc. assigning a function to a code-switch] is subjective: we are constantly reminded of the inadequacies of our appreciation of the cultural context and question interpretations which are based on incomplete texts.”

⁵⁰ See n. 55 below.

⁵¹ In praising Varus' and Marcus' oratory, Fronto says that he is better equipped than “the torch runners at Eleusis, kings carrying scepters, the *quindecimveri* consulting their tomes” (*amplior mihi et ornatior videbar daduchis Eleusine faces gestantibus et regibus scepra tenentibus et quindecimviris libros adeuntibus*, VdH 132.17-19).

⁵² He complains about lower back pain, supplying the Latin translation of the term (*internatium Graeci hieron oston*, Suetonius... ‘*spinam sacram*’ appellanti) and adds “I would have preferred to be ignorant of the Latin and Greek term for any body part, as long as I could live without *this* pain” (VdH 179.6-9).

Greek, playing on the eagle's (*aquila*) excellence among birds in complementing *Aquila* as ῥητόρων ἄριστος (VdH 176.17). In another letter we find playful coinages, *epistolicotata* and *rhetoricotata*, to praise the writing of one Volumnius Quadratus. These, I believe, constitute code-switches to Greek (VdH 188.5).⁵³

Of the 10 total code-switches, then, four are quotations in letters to close friends, and another four create intimacy or indicate a light, playful tone. On the remaining two occasions where Fronto switches to Greek, he draws on terminology from spheres traditionally associated with the Greeks, rhetoric and deeply emotional relationships.⁵⁴ The near absence of rhetorical terminology in this set of correspondence, of course indicates that its concerns lie elsewhere: for instance commendation, requests, expressions of friendly concern.

The high proportion of quotations and the more frequent recourse to Greek terminology in cultural spheres *other than rhetoric* aligns this correspondence with Fronto's letters to Aurelius the emperor, where, as we saw, Fronto tries to accommodate to the emperor's interests in Greek.

It is now time to conclude by bringing together the paper's five strands – (1) commands and requests; (2) address terms (3) openings and (4) closings; (5.) code-switching.

Conclusion

Two main conclusions can be drawn about the early correspondence, between Fronto and Aurelius. First, Fronto consistently maintains relational distance, while Aurelius insists on closing that distance. We see this striking contrast – Fronto circumspect, Aurelius frankly intimate – in the following areas: Fronto (1.) uses polite markers of distance and respect, like *si videtur* “if it seems alright to you, [do it]”; Marcus Aurelius inclines much more to affiliatively/positively polite markers like *si me amas*, “if you love me, [sc. then do x for me]”; (2.) In his address system, Fronto generally avoids the affectionate address-form *mi+vocative* and never uses erotic language. Marcus Aurelius, however, *liberally* employs affectionate and erotic address terms. (3.) In letter openings, Fronto almost always uses the courteous, but brief DOMINO MEO. Marcus Aurelius, however, employs endearing address forms in the vocative to open letters, like HAVE MI FRONTO CARISSIME (VdH 38.11). These intimate addresses used to begin an epistle find no counterpart in Fronto's letters. Only several times does Fronto depart from his usual, distant letter opening, and this in a very early letter, M. CAESARI DOMINO SUO FRONTO, whose wording better characterizes Fronto's letter openings to his friends.

Second, Marcus Aurelius' style is more varied, adventurous, and colloquial than Fronto's. Marcus Aurelius address-system draws from an ample and various lexical palette, with more than 20 unique adjectives at his disposal. (Fronto's address system contains just four unique adjectives.) Marcus' letter openings are more colloquial, and more stylistically varied than Fronto's; and Marcus' letter closings show a similar variety against Fronto's more restricted set of closings. Finally, Fronto's code-switching in this early period reflects his role as a rhetoric instructor: most (87.0%) of the time, the *rhetor* switches to Greek to express a rhetorical concept. Marcus Aurelius' code-switching is more varied than is Fronto's. Although Marcus the rhetoric student expresses rhetorical concepts with the appropriate Greek term (30%), even more of his switches to Greek are quotations (35%). Marcus also uses the relevant Greek word to convey the relevant amatory, medical or philosophical idea. Sometimes he simply refers to or describes an extralinguistic reality in Greek, something Fronto never does.

Several questions remain. First, what accounts for the striking difference in the

⁵³ Mullen and Elder write memorably of this passage, “his letter is much more informal and relaxed in tone and we can imagine that a light-hearted discussion of styles of writing might trigger the desire for a Hellenic frisson” (2019: 80).

⁵⁴ Once Fronto again uses the Greek *philostorgus* (transliterated) to describe someone dear to him; this is a term, he says, that “doesn't appear in Latin” (*philostorgum... eius rei nomen apud Romanos nullum est*, VdH 173.15-16). Only once in this correspondence does he draw from Greek rhetorical terminology (VdH 181.3), for the focus of this set of letters is elsewhere.

stylistic mannerism between Fronto and Aurelius? Second, Fronto, in his directive and address system, and in his opening phrases, avoids affectionate displays towards the princeps. But how to reconcile this with the *content* of Fronto's letters themselves, which is at times strikingly affectionate?

Others have noted that Marcus' exuberant style contrasted with Fronto's cautious, and restrained usage, befitting a rhetoric teacher whose charge is to exemplify *Romanitas*.⁵⁵ We now have the data to underpin this claim. The emotions underlying Marcus' exuberant language (and Fronto's cautious reciprocation) were probably genuinely felt, especially since these letters were probably not meant for broader distribution (Champlin 1980: 3; Elder and Mullen 2019: 208).

The two letters which probably initiated the relationship set the tone. In 139 CE, when he was 45 and Aurelius 18, Fronto wrote a letter of introduction in Greek. This is Fronto's invention, an additional speech for Plato's *Phaedrus*. Throughout this letter, the tutor-to-be insists that, not blinded by desire, he can keep Aurelius' interests in mind better than could any lover, drunk with *ἔρωσ*: "As far as I'm concerned, you'll be called *καλός* (beautiful), but not beloved" (*καλός γάρ, οὐχί ὁ ἐρώμενος, τό γε κατ' ἐμὲ ὀνομασθήσει addit*. VdH 251.26). There is no consensus on Fronto's purpose in writing the letter. Interpretations have ranged from "jeu d'esprit" to "veiled seduction attempt".⁵⁶

We do better to focus on Marcus' response. If Fronto invokes Greek pedagogical practice, with its erotic bond between *ἐραστής* and *ἐρώμενος*, the Marcus turns this relationship on its head. He sees right through Fronto's diffidence (much as Socrates, or Phaedrus himself, saw through Lysias' in the *Phaedrus*): "you'll never drive away your lover (*erasten tuum*) – me, I mean" (*numquam tu tamen erasten tuum, me dico, depuleris*, VdH 249.2). At the conclusion of the same letter, Marcus says that he burns with as much love for Fronto as Socrates does for Phaedrus (VdH 250.1-3). Pupil, then, becomes teacher; beloved becomes lover, as Aurelius inverts the traditional relationship. His letter is also suffused with erotic language, drawn from Greek and Roman love poetry and New Comedy.⁵⁷

This initial exchange sets the tone for what is to come, with Marcus exaggeratedly passionate, and Fronto restrained. For in the early period, before 145 CE, Marcus' language continues to be overtly erotic. For instance, in a letter from the early 140's, Aurelius says his desire "swells" (*gliscit*), like a leek, quoting the mime writer Laberius:

10.

et quod ait Laberius de amore... "amor tuus tam cito crescit quam porrus, tam firme quam palma," hoc igitur ego ad desiderium verto, quod ille de amore ait (VdH 30.19-22).

'My love for you grows as quickly as a leek, as firmly as a palm tree': what he [sc. Laberius] says about love, I say about my desire for you.'

It is hard to ignore the sexual undertones here, and this is just one of Caesar's several frankly

⁵⁵ "The future emperor...is exuberant, slangy, sometimes impudent, and...bubbling over with love for Fronto; the eminent orator responds cautiously but, in the end, with a tragic sense of desertion and betrayal" (Richlin 2006b: 5-6).

⁵⁶ It constitutes a *jeu d'esprit*: Van den Hout (1999: 560). No, it is a seduction attempt, says Richlin: for in his *erotikos logos*, Fronto hides safely behind the mask of a character in the *Phaedrus* (Lysias') in order to flirt without appearing to do so (2006a: 113; 117). Maybe the two, so Davenport and Manley, invoke the context of Greek pedagogical practice, in an age devoted to reviving 5th C. Athenian literary culture. They therefore employ the language of the *ἐραστής* and *ἐρώμενος* "to show off their own literary and rhetorical prowess" (2014: 10). Pascale Fleury denies that this is a seduction attempt or a *bagatelle*; no, it is Fronto's veiled attack on philosophy (2006: 305-306: 321-323).

⁵⁷ Aurelius perishes from love for Fronto, *te ita amore depereo* (VdH 249.7): this is language used by *adulescentes amantes* in comedy (Pl. *Am.* 517; *Bac.* 747, *Ep.* 219). Marcus burns with desire (*arsisse*, *addit*. VdH 250.3); the language of burning frequent in amatory poetry (e.g. Vergil *Ec.* 2.1) and Roman comedy (Ter. *Eu.* 84-85).

erotic declarations.⁵⁸

These declarations apparently overwhelm Fronto, who is struck by their ardent nature (VdH 15.4-10); declares himself unable to match Caesar's love (VdH 3.14-19; VdH 13.18-14.6) or demurely declines to match the frequency of his charge's more-than-daily letters (VdH 46.3-25).

If Caesar "wears the trousers" in the relationship, as Swain (2004: 20) has put it, then Fronto willingly plays the passive role:⁵⁹

11. When Caesar wrote daily, Fronto was like Hero to Marcus' Leander:

simile patiebar quod amator patitur, qui delicias suas videt currere ad se per iter asperum et periculosum...nam ego potius te caruero, tametsi amore tuo ardeo, potius quam 'te ad hoc noctis natate tantum profundi patiar' [70 R³] (VdH 46.26-47.2)

I suffered like the lover does, who sees her boyfriend rush to her though the way is harsh and perilous...I will rather be without you, even though I burn with love for you, than suffer 'you to swim at this time of night across such a deep vasty sea.'

Thus, Fronto's persona in the letters is that of a 'passive lover', happy to let himself be seduced by the overwhelming erotic force of Aurelius' declarations. The patterns we discovered support Fronto's persona, for he rarely – in his polite request softeners, address system, and letter openings – ventures to express intimacy or strong affection in as stark terms.

In fact, Marcus' affection and Fronto's restraint finds a parallel in the other sets of correspondence, maintained by Fronto with Verus and Pius. For the latter two, when emperors, take the liberty of addressing Fronto affectionately with *carissime*, their adjective of choice. But Fronto never let himself forget the hierarchical nature of the relationship with *any* of his imperial addressees, and modern studies bear out that positive politeness is rarely "directed up." The difference between Marcus on the one hand, and Pius and Verus on the other, is that Marcus' language *also* contains an erotic element absent from Pius' and Verus' letters.

Striking changes emerge in the language patterns from the later correspondence between Fronto, and the (now) emperor Aurelius. For if in the earlier correspondence, Fronto maintains his distance, now the tables are turned. The former tutor closes down the relational distance, while Aurelius distances himself. Gone is Aurelius the emperor's former stylistic exuberance, which, now, Fronto seeks to imitate.

We see this inversion of roles most starkly in the address systems. Aurelius the emperor opens up distance between himself and his former tutor; while Fronto tries (desperately) to close it down. For now Aurelius the emperor no longer employs erotic address terms, no longer avails himself of the impressively wide range of vocative adjectives (instead restricting himself to just four unique adjectives); no longer do his letter openings or closings exhibit the stylistic range of the earlier correspondence; nor does the emperor anymore address his former teacher with the cognomen *Fronto*. One continuity in usage bridges early and later correspondence: Aurelius the emperor continues to rely on his standard address, *mi magister*, when writing Fronto. For Marcus Aurelius still viewed the relationship as a formal teacher-student arrangement, which disappointed Fronto.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ [*animus*] *qui nunc torretur ardentissimo desiderio tuo* (VdH 51.16), from a letter dated to the 140s. *imploro* [sc. *deos*], *uti...neque ego tam saepe tam saevo desiderio fatiger* (VdH 43.14-15), dated in the period between 139-161; *quom videbis in dolio mustum fervere, in mentem tibi veniat mihi sic pectore tuum desiderium scateret et abundare et spumas facere* (VdH 61.2-4), dated between 139-161.

⁵⁹ Swain (2004: 20) comments specifically on the erotically charged address *mi semper anima dulcissima* (VdH 30.13).

⁶⁰ Cf. Elder and Mullen (2019: 177): "Fronto barely veiled his disappointment at being sidelined"; and Richlin

Fronto, however, attempts to accommodate to the emperor's earlier, more affiliative style. For the first time in his correspondence, the tutor avoids *domine*, commonly used to imperial addressees. Instead the former tutor employs *predominantly* the emperor's *praenomen*, which he had ventured only once in more voluminous early correspondence, as an early, timid attempt to accommodate to the emperor's more colloquial and intimate style. Now, however, address by *praenomen* constitutes over *half* of Fronto's total address-terms. Reserved for family members, Fronto's frequent usage of the *praenomen* constitutes his bid to rekindle the intimacy, now lost, between the two. Moreover, Fronto twice uses the phrase *Marce carissime*, completely absent in his earlier correspondence.⁶¹

In fact, in letters directed to Aurelius the emperor, Fronto's address system – affecting intimacy and informality – approximates Fronto's address system in epistolary exchanges with his friends, where addresses by cognomen and with *carissime* are found.

Fronto's practice in code-switching also changes in the later correspondence. Greek rhetorical terms still constitute the majority (55%) of Fronto's code-switches, for he continues to teach Aurelius the emperor, whose code-switching continues to be varied in this later period, with a little under a third (three out of ten) of his switches to Greek motivated by a need to express a rhetorical concept. Fronto now accommodates to Aurelius' more varied use of Greek: the former tutor quotes from Greek markedly more often than he had done earlier, and he draws on Greek terms from spheres *other than rhetoric* more frequently as well. There is a clear desire to forge intimacy through this code-switching. Although Fronto does switch to Greek with Verus, he never does so to close down relational distance. Indeed, Fronto's code-switching practice with Aurelius the emperor aligns quite closely with his switches to Greek in correspondence with his friends.

At the beginning of his *Meditations*, Aurelius lists what he has learned from his family members and teachers. He has just a few words for Fronto, who, he says taught him to see beneath the dissimulation and subtlety of rulers and helps him recognize “that those who are called aristocrats somehow lack warmth” (καὶ ὅτι ὡς ἐπίπαν οἱ καλούμενοι οὗτοι παρ' ἡμῖν εὐπατρίδαι ἀστοργότεροί πως εἰσίν, 1.11). Fronto's letters disclose that the teacher's warm affection towards Marcus Aurelius did not change (in fact, it may have increased); while Marcus Aurelius' youthful passion, as revealed by the correspondence, would soon come to be replaced by the all-consuming duty of running an empire.⁶²

University of Massachusetts, Boston
Peter.Lech@umb.edu

(2006b: 6), on Fronto's feeling of being betrayed. These claims may appear subjective, and based on individual reading of certain passages, but the data bears them out.

⁶¹ In that earlier correspondence, by contrast, only Marcus had used *carissime*; and Pius and Verus use it with Fronto, but he never uses it with them. Here is a further indication that, in the later correspondence, Fronto is trying hard to forge intimacy with Aurelius the emperor – a verbally demonstrated intimacy which Aurelius does not reciprocate.

⁶² I would like to thank Anne Mahoney and the anonymous reader for *NECJ* for reading through an earlier draft and providing helpful comments; my thanks also to Luis Unceta Gómez and to Alex Mullen. Any errors or infelicities are to be attributed to me alone.

Works Cited

- Adams, J.N. 1984. "Female Speech in Latin Comedy." *Antichthon* 18: 43-77.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400003142>.
- . 1995. "The Language of the Vindolanda Writing Tablets: An Interim Report." *JRS* 85: 86–134. <https://doi.org/10.2307/301059>.
- . 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- Barrios-Lech, P. 2014. "The 1st Person Plural 'Hortatory' Subjunctive in Plautus and Terence" *Rheinisches Museum* 157.3-4, 272-277.
- Barrios-Lech, P. 2016. *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316416983>.
- Birley, A. 2012. "Marcus' Life as Emperor." In Marcel van Ackeren (ed.) *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*, Malden MA. 155-170.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118219836.ch9>.
- Brock, M. Dorothy. 1911. *Studies in Fronto and His Age*. Cambridge.
- Brown, Penelope and S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1989. "Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies." *Language in Society* 18: 159–212.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500013464>.
- Conte, G.B. (J.B. Solodow, trans.; D. Fowler and G.W. Most, rev.) 1994. *Latin Literature: a History*. Baltimore.
- Champlin, E. 1980. *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. Cambridge, MA.
<https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674331785>.
- Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des ordres en grec ancien: étude linguistique des formes tion. Cahiers de l'ERJAC, n°3 – Fonctionnements linguistiques*. Mont-Saint-Aignan.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford.
- . 2015. "How to say 'please' in post-Classical Latin: Fronto and the importance of Archaism." *Journal of Latin Linguistics*. 14.1: 17—31.
- Eck, W. 1998. "M. Cornelius Fronto, Lehrer Marc Aurels, Consul Suffectus im j. 142." *RhM* 141-2, 193-196.
- Elder, Olivia and Alex Mullen. 2019. *The Language of Roman Letters: Bilingual Epistolography from Cicero to Fronto*. Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108647649>.
- Fleury, Pascale. 2006. *Lectures de Fronto: Un Rheteur Latin A L'Epoque de La Seconde Sophistique*. Paris.
- Galinsky, K. 2012. *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*. Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139045575>.
- Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York.
- Haines, C.R. 1928. *Fronto Correspondence*. Cambridge MA. 2 vols.
- Hall, J. 2009. *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*. Oxford.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195329063.001.0001>.
- Kaster, R. 1988. *Guardians of Language*. Berkeley CA.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520342767>.
- Kaster, R. 2005. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Cary, NC.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195140781.001.0001>.
- Kovács, P. "Epigraphic Records". In Marcel van Ackeren (ed.) *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*, Malden MA. 77-91. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118219836.ch5>.
- Krieter-Spiro, Martha. 1997. *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären: Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander. Stellung, Rolle, Komik und Sprache*. Stuttgart.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110968453>.
- Laes, C. 2009. "What Could Marcus Aurelius Feel for Fronto?" *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 10.A.3. <https://doi.org/10.12697/sht.2009.10.A.3>.

- Morand, D. A. 1996. "Dominance, Deference, and Egalitarianism in Organizational Interaction: a Sociolinguistics Analysis of Power and Politeness." *Organization Science* 7.5: 544-556. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.5.544>.
- Müller, R. 1997. *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg.
- Rees-Miller, Janie. 2000. "Power, Severity, and Context in Disagreement." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1087-1111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00088-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00088-0).
- Pocetti, P. 2010. "Greeting and Farewell Expressions as Evidence for Colloquial Language: Between Literary and Epigraphical Texts." In E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge, 100-126. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511763267.008>.
- Richlin, Amy. 2006a. "Fronto + Marcus: Love, Friendship, Letters." in *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, edited by M. Kuefler, 111-129. Chicago.
- Richlin, Amy (ed. and trans.) 2006b. "Marcus Aurelius in Love: Marcus Aurelius and Cornelius Fronto." Chicago.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1993. 1993. *The Imperative and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004408975>.
- Swain, S. 2004. "Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius," in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius* edited by L.H. Strevens and A. Vardi, 3-40. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199264827.003.0001>.
- Timpanaro, S. 1987. "Il 'ius osculi' e Frontone." *Maia* 39: 201-211.
- Unceta Gómez, L., 2018. 'Gli studi sulla (s)cortesia linguistica in latino. Possibilità di analisi e proposte per il futuro', *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 56(2), 9-37.
- . 1999. *A Commentary on the Letters of Marcus Cornelius Fronto*. Leiden.
- Valette, Emanuelle 2014. "Le vêtement bigarré des danseurs de pyrrhique": pratiques du bilinguisme dans la correspondance de Fronto et Marc Aurèle" in F. Mestre and P. Gómez (eds.), *Three Centuries of Greek Culture Under the Roman Empire: homo Romanus Graeca oratione*: 101-123.
- Williams C. 2012. *Reading Roman Friendship*. Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511777134>.

Introducing a Bit of Active Latin into Your Current Advanced Latin Classroom: *Usus loquendi et audiendi de Terentio Catulloque*

RONNIE ANCONA

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to show how easily and profitably one can introduce a small portion of active Latin into an upper-level Latin classroom through select questioning and response that draws directly from and reinforces grammatical structures and forms, as well as key vocabulary, from the students' advanced Latin texts under study. Use of active Latin supports SLA (Second Language Acquisition) research about the value of spending time "in the language" in the classroom. The current *Standards for Classical Language Learning* recognizes this value as well.

Keywords: standards, SLA, active Latin, classroom, Latin, teaching, listening, speaking

This paper is devoted to methods for introducing a bit (and I mean a bit) of active Latin into a "traditional" advanced Latin classroom.¹ Second language acquisition research has taught us that time spent "in the language" helps us to acquire language.² A welcome and timely acknowledgement of this fact can be found in the new *Standards for Classical Language Learning*.³ The purpose of this paper is to show how easily and profitably one can introduce a small portion of active Latin into an upper-level Latin classroom through select questioning and response that draws directly from and reinforces grammatical structures and forms, as well as key vocabulary, from the students' advanced Latin texts under study.

Spending time "in the language" is certainly not a brand-new concept in Latin pedagogy. Classrooms over the centuries have included Latin-to-Latin work. For example, most teachers have intuitively done substitution drills for years without consciously thinking that they were "staying in the language." (Such drills involve the substitution of appropriate Latin for Latin in the original, such as "Me videt." "Te videt," and so forth, answering "Quem vel quid videt?") I certainly used such drills as a beginning Latin teacher without any conscious pedagogical reason for doing so. That said, there has certainly been revived interest in the use of active Latin, and so it may be profitable to revisit some of these techniques and to see their usefulness, especially in light of the new *Standards* with their recognition of the value of active Latin (and Greek).⁴

Let me summarize before I move on to discuss my own experience. Since there is increasing scholarly support for the value of time spent "in the [target] language" in our Latin classrooms, it is incumbent upon all of us as Latin teachers to consider how we might address that finding in our own classrooms. While the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) acknowledges that classical language learning has somewhat different priorities, one cannot overlook their general recommendation "that learning take place through the target language for 90% or more of classroom time except in immersion

1 I use the term "a bit" to emphasize how a little of something new can be beneficial and also how small my experiment was.

2 See Carlon 2013. The references in this article are useful, as well. In Ancona 2018, I address why college teachers should be aware of the new *Standards* and call attention to the document's noteworthy nod to active Latin.

3 Elifrits, English, Little et al. 2017.

4 The topic of the 2019 American Classical League SCS affiliated group panel, which I co-organized with Justin Slocum Bailey, at the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Society for Classical Studies in San Diego was "What Can 'Active' Latin Accomplish?" Discussions about this topic in the Classics profession are numerous and ongoing. The four papers from the panel and the Response by Justin Slocum Bailey appeared in *The Classical Outlook* 94.2 (2019).

program models where the target language is used exclusively.” Their additional note makes clear that the learning of Latin, too, benefits from the use of the target language: “In Classical Languages, the instructional focus is on the interpretive mode; however, interpersonal conversations and presentational writing tasks develop fluency in looking for the “gist” and thinking in “chunks” rather than reading or writing one word at a time.”⁵ Thus, the use or practice of speaking and hearing Latin (the “usus” of my title) should be a priority for us. How can we and our students spend more time in the target language in order to facilitate language acquisition? While some teachers may choose to make radical changes in their teaching, there are smaller ways in which teachers can effectively modify their approaches, too. In what follows, I explore some of those smaller ways.

I turn now to explain my experience introducing some active Latin into my own advanced-level college classroom (a course on Roman Comedy), the reasons for doing so, the students’ reactions, and my own evaluation of the experience. Sample Latin questioning used in that course, based on Terence’s *Eunuch*, will be included. Then I will provide materials for introducing some active Latin into the advanced Latin classroom using Catullus Poem 1. The Latin questioning used in this article could be used “as is” when teaching these texts or as a model for teachers designing their own “bit of Latin” in an advanced Latin classroom.⁶ I intersperse the questions with explanations of why I created the specific Latin questions to be asked. In fact, explanations are longer than examples so that my pedagogical reasoning is clear. The pairing of a less-known text (*Eunuch*) with a very widely read text (Catullus Poem 1) will show that despite the differences in genre, vocabulary, grammar, and other features, both Latin texts provide ample opportunity for a bit of active Latin.

Teachers at the advanced levels of Latin in programs that do not depend on active Latin as their main teaching method may hesitate to bring just a bit of active Latin into the classroom. This article will hopefully convince these teachers that the payoffs of including a bit of spoken Latin are considerable. The material I present here could work equally well in a program that had little-to-no active Latin at the earlier levels and in a Comprehensible Input-based program where students will have had a lot of prior experience with active Latin at those levels. I hope to show that giving some Latin-to-Latin questioning a try is well worth the effort and that students and teachers alike will find it a rewarding and refreshing way to interact with their Latin texts. While the use of active Latin in the classroom is sometimes seen as an “all or nothing” proposition, I do not think it needs to be, nor do I think such an approach the most useful one for the profession.⁷ There should be room for many approaches to the learning of language and to the study of literature. Different pedagogical goals can drive different and varied methodologies. One’s desired learning outcomes in a first-year Latin class may differ from those in an advanced Latin class. That difference, in turn, may impact what methods one employs in various circumstances.

While I have used bits of active Latin in my Latin classes over many years, the recent impetus to do more had a specific origin, or at least a specific source of additional encouragement. From 2013-2016 I had a Leadership Grant from the Classical Association of the Atlantic States to visit fifteen secondary school Latin programs for an entire school day in each of the regions of CAAS, which includes Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The purpose of the grant was to partner with teachers for a day so that I could lend support to their programs and so that I could learn from them, as well, as someone in a leadership position in CAAS at the time. I taught at the secondary school level for five years at The Bush School in Seattle, Washington, before returning to school to study for a PhD, an experience which also entailed a switch to college teaching. Nevertheless, my interest in secondary school teaching has always continued, including during my time as head of the Latin MA program at Hunter College, which

⁵ ACTFL no date.

⁶ On Latin questioning, see Bailey 2016.

⁷ See Keeline 2019. Kuhner 2018 is useful as well.

trains individuals to teach Latin at the secondary school level and leads to New York State certification to teach Latin in grades 7-12.

During this grant I chose to visit the widest range of schools I could – public, independent, charter, coed, single sex, boarding, not boarding, religiously affiliated, not religiously affiliated, urban, suburban, and rural.⁸ I intentionally visited schools that used a wide range of pedagogical techniques. Since Comprehensible Input / active Latin techniques have become a central issue of discussion in the field of Latin pedagogy, I made a point of including two schools in my schedule that would give me full-day exposure to programs that have embraced such methods. I had the pleasure of spending a day each with Dawn Mitchell at Dulaney High School in Timonium, Maryland, outside of Baltimore, and with Elizabeth (Hestand) Szytlejko at Central High School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Because of the increasing presence in the profession of active Latin, especially at the secondary school level, I chose to visit these programs so that I would continue to be current in my own knowledge about the field of Latin pedagogy, generally, and so that I could learn myself as a Latin teacher and Latinist. I was enormously impressed by these two visits, in particular, because of their welcome exposure to methodologies less familiar to me. I returned home after the second visit eager to introduce some active Latin activities into my advanced Latin class to see how they might work. I have used bits and pieces of active Latin, particularly when teaching beginning Latin, instinctively over many years. My most recent experience teaching beginning Latin has been while using *Latin for the New Millennium*.⁹ Its “fusion” approach is not only conducive to active Latin activities, but it supports and encourages them. The content questions and answers in Latin, exercises changing Latin sentences, and the short Latin dialogues at the chapter ends all encourage one to stay “in the language,” more than is the case in most other commonly used beginning Latin textbooks, except for Hans H. Ørberg’s *Lingua Latina per se Illustrata*.¹⁰ Nevertheless, my advanced college level classes have rarely included the active use of Latin, except to the extent that reading a Latin text aloud can be considered active.

The biggest takeaway I had from my two visits to schools employing active Latin techniques was learning how much the instructor’s voice was heard in the classroom and how much the students listened. Further, I learned how much the speaking done by the students was dependent on what they had heard. This certainly should not have been a surprise to me, considering the importance of lots of aural input at the early stages of second language acquisition. It would take a lot of training and practice for me to speak at length during a class in Latin and that is not likely a task I will take on at this time, for a variety of reasons. I returned from my visits, though, inspired and wanting to do a bit of experimenting with my advanced Latin class, which was studying Roman Comedy. They had read some brief selections from Plautus and then had plunged into reading Terence’s *Eunuch* in its entirety. We met once a week for almost two hours. One week I spent about an hour doing some active Latin with them. The next week I spent perhaps a bit under an hour. My purpose was to see what someone like me could do with a bit of active Latin at this level. I am a long-term Latin teacher, but a relative novice with active Latin. At the time I was teaching the Comedy class (spring 2017), my active Latin background was minimal.¹¹

⁸ I provide here a link to the teachers and schools I visited. I thank each of the teachers and their schools for their generosity in hosting me. <http://caas-cw.org/wp/leadership-initiative-grants/caas-leadership-initiative-partners/>

⁹ Tunberg and Minkova 2017.

¹⁰ The series (and ancillaries) are currently available from Hackett Publishing. It teaches Latin through Latin, as its title indicates.

¹¹ At the time I was teaching the Roman Comedy class, I had attended only a couple of active Latin workshops. I owe thanks to both the Society for Classical Studies and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States for financial support to attend these programs. Since I began writing this article, both my involvement with and competence in active Latin have expanded greatly, largely through my participation in Lupercal’s “Cozy in the Wolves’ Cave” sessions in which we discuss in Latin selections from Boccaccio’s *De Mulieribus Claris (On Famous Women)*. I have benefitted tremendously from the supportive and encouraging Lupercal community. As a participant and as an

For my active Latin mini-session, I developed some very controlled exercises that would continue to develop my students' reading and comprehension skills, especially of the Terence text we were reading. I sought to focus on vocabulary, grammar, and syntax that were common in our readings or that the students had had trouble with, as well as any linguistic features that would enable us ask questions and give answers in Latin about the text under study. Below I will give you some samples of what I asked the students in Latin and some possible answers they could have given, but I want to jump ahead for a moment to my evaluation of this mini-experiment.

1. The students were silent and paying close attention the minute I switched into Latin, not that they are normally inattentive. These are small classes populated largely with majors who really want to study Latin literature. But they were extra attentive because they had to listen carefully to hear and understand the Latin questions in order to be ready to provide possible answers. One can tune in and out a bit in one's native language and still follow things. It is not easy to do that with a second language.
2. Students became comfortable speaking aloud the vocabulary, grammar, and syntax that was incorporated into their Latin answers. When I asked the same question of several students in a row, the later respondents, having heard the earlier answers, spoke far more fluently. This kind of repetition is something I have used for years in beginning Latin classes, but I had not thought to use in an advanced class before. I should add that the students were a mixed bag in terms of their prior Latin study. A few had attended active Latin workshops and there was one for whom saying aloud even individual Latin words correctly was still a struggle. Nevertheless, after hearing me and others, this student's pronunciation and comfort with speaking improved dramatically. There are still some Latin classrooms where there is little, if no, opportunity to even hear Latin pronounced.
3. The very few forms, words, and structures I employed with them in the sentences did seem, after this brief experiment, to be more comfortable and automatic to them. We often don't think to "drill" our advanced students, but such activities can often be profitable.
4. The students after the first day of this exercise asked if we could do more, which we did. Thus, clearly at the level of student interest, the experiment was a success.
5. It is likely I will employ some of these exercises again.

Here is a sample of what I did with the students. I introduced the exercises in the following way:

"Hodie volo vobiscum lingua Latina loqui de Eunuchō Terentii paulum tempus."
"Intellegitisne?" "Ita an minime?"

We practiced a bit with:

"Ita intellego." "Minime, non intellego."

"Ego rogabo quasdam rogationes; vos respondebitis singuli Latine, non uno verbo, sed plena sententia. Responsa vestra erunt Latine et brevia, sed non uno verbo. Si vultis respondere, tollite manus."

I used a mix of asking for volunteers and going around the room and asking everyone to respond. I thought the approach of taking volunteers would be a good way to begin so as to let some students just listen initially.

For those not familiar with Terence's *Eunuch*, here is a little background. I should say that it is a fascinating play to teach (in Latin or in English), despite or perhaps because of some of the difficult subject matter: its central episode is a rape. It abounds in issues to

occasional session leader, both my aural and oral Latin skills have grown. In fall 2021, with some trepidation, but also with a lot of enthusiasm, I incorporated a significant amount of active Latin (more than the "bit" of this article's title) into my upper level Latin class, building upon the pedagogical work that I describe here. Doing so confirmed my sense that the use of some active Latin can have an important place in our upper level Latin classes.

discuss regarding gender, class, citizenship, economics, and power.¹² I include here an English translation of the 2nd century CE synopsis of the play from the frequently used Penguin translation by Betty Radice.¹³ Much of the translation is fine, but some parts gloss over (or sanitize) its central episode of rape. (I have italicized some words below.)

A girl was wrongly said to be the sister of Thais; unaware of this, the soldier Thraso brought her with him as a present for Thais. In fact, she was a freeborn Athenian. Thais's lover, Phaedria, gives orders for a eunuch he has bought to be given to her, is persuaded to yield his place to Thraso for two days, and departs for the country. Phaedria's young brother *is desperately in love with* the girl given to Thais; on Parmeno's suggestion he dresses up as the eunuch, gains admission to the house, and *seduces* the girl. But an Athenian citizen is found to be her brother and gives her in marriage to her *seducer*. Thraso persuades Phaedria to come to terms. (Radice 162)

"Cum deperiret"¹⁴ is the Latin of the original for "is desperately in love with." It should be noted, though, that the character has only just seen her in the street and now desires her. (One can discuss in a class whether this constitutes "love.") The Latin synopsis (versus this translation) rightly states "introit, uitiat uirginem" (he entered [the house], he violates / rapes the girl") and uses the term "uitiatam" again in what follows, "Sed Atticus cuius repertus frater eius conlocat uitiatam epebo." (The brother of the one "raped" would be an accurate translation.) The character Pythias states in line 654: uirginem quam erae dono dederat miles uitiauit. "Vitio"¹⁵ is standard Latin vocabulary for "sexually violate."¹⁶ I mention this word and its mistranslation above to show how an issue central to the play can be evaded in English translation and also why it is one of the words I chose to have students practice with below. It is not a word they would all know, even in an advanced Latin class.

We began our Latin with a very simple question that has a right / wrong answer. "Estne Terentius poeta?"

My reasoning here was to merely initiate the Latin questioning and answering with little thought required other than knowing how to turn a question into a statement. While of course this is a question so simple that it could be asked in a beginning Latin class, my interest was in easing the students into a use of active Latin with which many would not be familiar. I was content having them start by merely understanding aurally and responding orally.

Next, I varied the question very slightly, but the small change required more thinking to produce a Latin answer. "Esne tu poeta?"

Of course, such a question quickly shows students that they can answer however they please "content-wise"! The point is to engage them for a moment saying something about themselves (true or false!). "Sum poeta," "Non sum poeta," "Minime, non sum poeta," "Ita, sum poeta." Anything along these lines would be fine for a response. Sometimes humor comes to the surface when hearing these answers, especially if they are in the affirmative.

The next question I asked was the following:

"Estne Terentius poeta Romanus an Graecus?"

(In retrospect, given our lack of detailed knowledge about Terence's actual biography, "Latinus" might have been a better choice here, focusing on language. Terence's full name, Publius Terentius Afer, could also suggest "Afer.") For grammatical purposes I provided this question as an example of a question that has disjunctive alternatives (*-ne...an*). In addition,

¹² Rape is only one of many difficult topics that appear in classical texts that we teach. The literature on how to approach the teaching of such topics is growing. One source that teachers may find useful to consult is Rabinowitz, Sorkin and McHardy 2014.

¹³ Radice 1976.

¹⁴ I take the Latin quotes of the synopsis from Barsby 1999.

¹⁵ Barsby uses u for both consonant and vowel. I distinguish the two here.

¹⁶ See Barsby 1999, 210, on line 654: "uitiauit 'has raped'. Uitiare (lit. spoil) is the technical word for 'rape' esp. in the sense of deflowering a virgin; it is commonly joined with *uirginem*, as here (704, 857-8: *OLD* 3)."

since Roman comedy is so dependent on Greek new comedy, and since the Prologue of the *Eunuch* discusses the Greek playwright Menander, I wanted to get the students thinking in terms of who writes in Greek and who writes in Latin and how those answers relate in terms of the genre of Roman comedy. It also provides practice with a masculine first declension noun and its masculine modifiers, an example of agreement that is sometimes difficult for students to remember.

Keeping the names of characters straight in a Roman comedy can be challenging. I even find when I teach this play, which I have taught many times, I have to remind myself each time which brother is called what. The following question was a test of the students' knowledge of one of the characters at the very basic level of whether she was male or female. (It was also a disjunctive question, like the previous one.)

"Estne Thais mulier an vir?"

The reason for this specific choice of alternatives ("mulier an vir") was to call attention, more broadly, to language having to do with gender in the play. Since the play involves a eunuch, who is impersonated by a young man (Chaerea) so that he can gain access to Pamphila, the girl whom he rapes, gender and sexual issues are complicated and ever-present in the play. Also, the play has male characters whose names end in "a," (e.g., Chaerea and Phaedria) and often students get confused and assume such characters are female. Thus, a question calling attention to gender seems useful for many reasons.

The following questions, at a very basic level of content knowledge, are significant because the audience knows the answer is Chaerea, but part of the plot of the play depends on this seeming impossibility, since it was supposed to be the eunuch who was in the house, not Chaerea, dressed as the eunuch. I also thought it important for the students to know well this verb whose meaning is central to the play, as mentioned above, and not to confuse it with the verbs "vivo, vivere" or "vito, vitare" with which they would be more familiar.

"Quis vitiavit Pamphilam?"

"A quo vitiata est Pamphila? a Chaerea? ab eunuchō?"

"Pergin" for "pergisne" (a common change in comedy) had tripped up the students, so we practiced with that. "Pergo" (proceed, continue) is not a verb all the students would have known. (For "pergin," cf., e.g., line 817, "pergin, sceleste, mecum perplexe loqui?")¹⁷

"Pergin ambulare?" "Ita, pergo ambulare."

"Pergin dicere?"

"Pergin linguae Latinae studere?"

This kind of substitution drill, in which the main verb remains the same ("pergin") and the infinitive changes, can be excellent practice, even at the advanced level, with the use of complementary infinitives. (One can always add another feature for practice, such as the fact that "studere" in the last example takes a dative.) In addition, the repetition of the form that had tripped them up in question after question gave them a chance to become comfortable with its use.

"Pergin legere fabulam Eunuchum?"

The word "fabula" in the sense of a play was not very familiar to the students. This question gave them practice with that meaning of the word. In addition, recognizing words in apposition can still be tricky at the advanced level, especially when the words have different endings. (Students may forget that apposition is not the same as agreement.) Having students repeat the feminine singular accusative "fabulam" with the masculine accusative "Eunuchum" provided practice with this.

The play has a lot of indirect questions, something not surprising in a genre that involves conversation. The act of hearing and repeating subjunctive forms in subordinate clauses reinforces this use of the subjunctive in a natural, non-analytical way. It is one thing to learn a rule about this use of the subjunctive; it is another thing to hear and say it easily and

¹⁷ On the "pergin?" Latin question request and its "peremptory" or "rude" sense, see Barrios-Lech 2016, 86.

comfortably. Such activity makes students realize the subjunctive is just as “normal” a verb form as the indicative.

“Scisne cur pergas?” “Ita, scio cur pergam.”

The use of “similis, e” with the genitive instead of the dative appeared in the play, so we practiced with that, as well. In the sentence below, the students did not manipulate that part of the sentence; the point was to practice hearing it and saying it. The following question builds in practice with indirect statement, as well. Just as is the case with the subjunctive, students sometimes think indirect statement is something tricky or special. It really isn’t, and once one hears a lot of accusative infinitive constructions, they sound as “normal” as anything else in Latin. Repeating to students that the subject of the infinitive will be in the accusative is fine. Giving students some handy examples in Latin to keep in their heads (memorization of some Latin examples can be far more useful than reverting to grammatical rules) often works better than or helps to support the grammatical explanation. Here was the question used:

“Putatne Chaerea se esse similem dei Iovis an non?”

Having shared some bits of active Latin I used with my Roman Comedy class (and why) using a Latin text that is likely not necessarily familiar to all teachers, I share now some ways one can use a very popular text, Catullus Poem 1, in the same fashion. The questions I use here are not based on my having used them with a specific class, but they are rather written in light of having taught Catullus at the advanced college level for many years and also having introduced frequently snippets of Catullus into beginning college Latin classes. How better to pre-teach the subjunctive than to share “Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus!” (Catullus 5.1)? I also bring to this activity experience as a Catullus textbook author.¹⁸

I have selected some places that I think can use practice, based on my experience teaching the poem. Some of the same things that need reinforcement at the early reading stage need reinforcement in advanced courses, as well.

Here is the text of Catullus Poem 1¹⁹:

Cui dono lepidum novum libellum
arida modo pumice expoliturum?
Corneli, tibi: namque tu solebas
meas esse aliquid putare nugas
iam tum, cum ausus es unus Italorum 5
omne aevum tribus explicare cartis
doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis.
quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli,
qualecumque, quod, <o> patrona virgo,
plus uno maneat perenne saeculo. 10

To whom do I present (my) new little book just now polished with dry pumice? To you, Cornelius, for you were accustomed to consider my worthless stuff something even then when you alone of (the) Italians dared to unfold all of history in three rolls, learned, Jupiter, and full of work. Therefore have for yourself whatever this is of a book, which, of whatever sort (it is), O patron virgin, may it endure lasting more than one generation.)²⁰

“Cui donat poeta lepidum novum libellum?”

I pose the question above for a variety of reasons. “Lepidum novum libellum” is Catullus’ language exactly. Through placement of this in the question to be asked and answered,

¹⁸ Ancona 2013a; Ancona 2013b.

¹⁹ I use here the text of Poem 1 as it appears in Thomson 1997. The matter of different readings for line 9 will not be addressed here.

²⁰ Translation from Ancona 2014, 65.

students get practice repeating important Catullan vocabulary. “Lepidus” may be a completely new word to them. “Libellus” likely will be, too. In addition, whether conscious of it or not, they will get practice repeating the end of a hendecasyllabic line (short-short-long-short-long-short-long-x). All the student must do to have the whole hendecasyllabic line is tack on the first three syllables to the answer, “lepidum novum libellum,” so this sentence is a good start. I have often found it is more effective when teaching Latin meter to have students listen and repeat before trying to memorize rules. (I have found the same thing to be true when teaching which syllable gets the stress accent in Latin. Why not teach that several weeks into a beginning Latin class when students will already have numerous examples of correct accentuation in their heads from having heard the instructor speak and from having imitated, rather than on day one?)

Students don’t have trouble guessing the meaning of “dono, donare,” if it is new to them, but it is important not to confuse it (in terms of forms or exact meaning) with the very common “do, dare.” Since Catullus is concerned in many poems with notions of giving, receiving, exchange, and value, it is useful for students to know the specific vocabulary that pertains to these themes. Changing Catullus’ “dono” to “donat” allows students to get practice with hearing this particular verb in other forms. (I should add that these same themes happen to be central to the *Eunuch*, discussed above.)

Finally, students will gain practice with producing dative singular forms in response to “cui.” Of course, part of the fun of asking this question is that there is no single answer, despite the role of Cornelius Nepos in the poem as addressee. Catullus wrote for a larger readership than one person and Poem 1 line 1 is a good place to point that out. One can also discuss the ambiguity of what it means to “give” a book. Can only one person “have” it? Book production, readership, authorship, and transmission of texts are all things one can profitably discuss in relation to Catullus Poem 1.²¹

For purposes of answering in class, this question functions as a substitution drill with students replacing the interrogative pronoun “cui” with a singular noun in the dative. Some possible answers are given below. All of these can be justified in terms of sense. We are receiving it, as is Cornelius, Catullus’ friend.

“Cornelio / amico / mihi / tibi / donat poeta lepidum novum libellum.”

Of course, for additional practice, one can change up the tense of “donat.”

“Quid modo fecisti?”

If one requires the answer to the question above to only include verbs that appear in Poem 1, this provides practice with the poem’s verbs as well as with the adverb “modo,” which is often confused by students with the dative or ablative of “modus, modi.” The second “o” is generally, although not always, scanned as short for the adverb, as here, thus distinguishing it from the forms of the noun spelled the same way.

“Modo expolii, modo ausa sum, modo explicavi, modo mansi, modo habui, modo putavi, modo solebam...”

All of these might be possible answers. Some call out for complementary infinitives or other constructions, so those could be added as well by the teacher. For example:

“Modo solebam libellum meum habere, sed nunc non habeo.”

That response is longer than I would want from a student during a substitution drill, where simpler is better, but it could be fun for purposes of discussing what happened to the “libellus”!

“Quo expolitus est libellus?”

This question provides practice with the ablative of means and also reinforces matters of book production. In addition to “Pumice expolitus est libellus,” one might elicit “digitis” or “manibus.” Students often can use practice with distinguishing the ablative of means from the ablative of personal agent. A useful follow-up question could be:

“A quo / a quibus expolitus est libellus?”

²¹ See my introductory paragraph to Poem 1 in Ancona 2013a, 3.

“A poeta / a Catullo / a multis hominibus / a me / ab Italis” could all be accurate and/or fun answers.

I have found that students can find “Corneli, tibi” in the poem a bit tricky form-wise. The two words refer to the same person and sit right next to each other. Nevertheless, one is vocative and the other dative. One can set up a substitution drill that keeps the dative, but calls for vocative substitutions, starting with “Corneli, tibi dono libellum” by asking students to “call upon” someone other than Cornelius. If students in the class have Latin names, each student could call upon the next person addressing that person in the vocative, e.g.,

“Marce, tibi dono libellum.”

Alternatively, one could stick to vocabulary from the poem:

“Iuppiter, tibi dono libellum / Catulle, tibi dono libellum / Patrona virgo, tibi dono libellum...”

Students sometimes find the following Latin from the poem tricky: “namque tu solebas / meas esse aliquid putare nugas.” The two infinitives, one complementary (“putare”) and the other part of indirect statement (“esse”), and the two accusatives, one accusative phrase part of the indirect statement (“meas...nugas”) and the other accusative (“aliquid”) a predicate accusative after “esse” pile up. And the wide separation of the possessive adjective (“meas”) from its noun (“nugas”), while poetically quite effective, stretching out the “nugas” phrase to make it even more of an “aliquid,” requires the ear or eye to hang in there for completion of the thought begun by “meas.” One can ask:

“Quid tuum tu solebas esse aliquid putare?”

Possible answers could be:

“Ego solebam meum esse aliquid putare libellum.”

“Ego solebam meum esse aliquid putare corpus.”

“Ego solebam meam esse aliquid putare familiam.”

“Ego solebam meam esse aliquid putare vitam.”

“Ego solebam meos esse aliquid putare amicos.”

This provides practice with the grammatical constructions mentioned above, the wide separation of adjective and noun, and adjective-noun agreement. It can also provide additional practice with the fact that a plural (“meas...nugas”) can be a something singular (“aliquid”).

Additional practice with “soleo” and a complementary infinitive could be provided by asking:

“Tune solebas putare? Ita vel minime?”

“Tune solebas scribere?”

Students would respond with answers like “Minime, ego non solebam scribere.” Still further, additional practice with complementary infinitives could be based on the verb “audeo.”

“Quid ausus / ausa es explicare?”

Here the practice comes from repetition, as the answers will all keep the infinitive and the main verb, but they will change the direct object.

“Ego ausus / ausa sum explicare multa / bona / libellum / nugas / aevum.”

Conversational Latin also provides a good opportunity to make sure the feminine forms of the participle, such as “ausa” in “ausa sum” are utilized, and not just the “default” masculine ones.

Repetition of the partitive genitive and practice with reflexive pronouns could be gained from the following question:

“Habesne tibi quidquid hoc libelli?”

Sample answer: “Ita, habeo mihi quidquid hoc libelli.” One could complicate things a bit by continuing with the following: “Habetne ille sibi quidquid hoc libelli?”

“Quid debet manere plus uno saeclo?”

Students can be asked to answer this question and then to follow it with a wish (in the subjunctive.) “Libellus debet manere plus uno saeclo. Maneat!”

In teaching Terence or Catullus or any other Latin author at the advanced level, there are many ways we can reinforce students’ Latin skills, generally, as well as their

comprehension of the specific text(s) being studied. One effective use of some class time can be to use a bit of active Latin. (Many teachers may want to use a lot more!) Select questioning and response in the Latin language utilizes the aural and oral modes of language learning that are often completely neglected in Latin classrooms, especially after the beginning stage of instruction. If utilizing those can strengthen our students' Latin reading comprehension skills, our Latin instruction overall will benefit. In many advanced Latin classes, even less Latin may be heard than at earlier stages of instruction. Whether we are reinforcing vocabulary, forms, constructions, or content, "staying in the language" provides an opportunity for our advanced Latin students, as many of our beginning students do routinely, to hear Latin and to respond to it in Latin themselves.

As I mentioned above, what I am describing here contains elements of pedagogy I was using with my Latin students unconsciously and intuitively when I was a brand-new Latin teacher with no background in pedagogy. Other pieces come directly from the privilege I had to visit two exciting classrooms that make extensive use of active Latin. Another motivator was my interest in enacting some active Latin at a level I had not before because of my newer awareness of recent second language acquisition work and its implications for how our students learn. My use of the word "bit" in the title of this contribution was intentional. I wanted to show both how tiny a bit of active Latin this might represent for a given class, but also how that tiny bit might activate a kind of Latin pedagogy largely absent from advanced Latin classrooms. My favorite teaching schedule has always involved teaching a lower level Latin class along with an advanced Latin class because the two create a kind of synergy for me. I often bring snippets of the advanced class into the beginner class, as I might when teaching the authors above, but it also can motivate me to bring some "beginning Latin" issues back into the advanced class. For example, if I have just taught the ablative absolute in a beginning class, I am much more sensitized to its appearance in an advanced class. As far as active Latin is concerned, I think most of us think in terms of whether or not such techniques are being used at the foundational stages of a Latin program. I hope I have shown here that regardless of whether one's introductory program is based on active Latin or not, an advanced Latin class can easily be introduced to a bit of "staying in the Latin language" that may increase student comprehension of the Latin language, generally, and also their comprehension of the original texts they are studying. It may, as well, engage them as students and you as teacher in new ways.²²

Hunter College and CUNY Graduate Center
rancona@hunter.cuny.edu

²² I thank the audience at my workshop on this topic at the 2018 Annual Meeting of CAMWS in Albuquerque, NM. It was their positive response that encouraged me to turn this into a publication, when approached by Peter Barrios-Lech and Anne Mahoney to contribute something to this volume.

I would also like to thank the University of Massachusetts - Boston Classics and Religious Studies Department for their hospitality when I served as one of the two outside evaluators for their program. It was through that experience that I had a chance to meet Professor Carlon, whom I knew only through her publications before, and to see first-hand how her ideas about active Latin pedagogy were being enacted in the Classics program at UMass-Boston.

Works Cited

- ACTFL. "Guiding Principles for Language Learning."
- Ancona, Ronnie. 2013a. *Writing Passion: A Catullus Reader*. 2nd edition. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.
- _____. 2013b. *Writing Passion Plus: A Catullus Reader Supplement*. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.
- _____. 2014. *Writing Passion: A Catullus Reader*. 2nd edition. *Teacher's Guide*. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.
- _____. 2018. "College Professors and the New Standards for Classical Language Learning." *Teaching Classical Languages* 9.1: 64-73.
- _____, ed. 2019. *The Classical Outlook* 94.2.
- Bailey, Justin Slocum. 2016. "The Ars of Latin Questioning: Circling, Personalization, and Beyond." *The Classical Outlook* 91.1: 1-5.
- Barrios-Lech, Peter. 2016. *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316416983>
- Barsby, John. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carlson, Jacqueline M. 2013. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Latin Instruction and Securing its Place in Curricula." *Teaching Classical Languages* 4.2: 106-22.
- Elifrits, English, Little et al. 2017. Draft, *Standards for Classical Language Learning*. https://www.aclclassics.org/Portals/0/Site%20Documents/Publications/Standards_for_Classical_Language_Learning_2017%20FINAL.pdf
- Keeline, Tom. 2019. "'Aut Latine aut nihil'? A Middle Way." *The Classical Outlook* 94.2: 57-64.
- Kuhner, John Byron. 2018, Dec.1. "The Via Media: Is There a Middle Ground Between Grammar/Translation and Active Latin?" *In Medias Res*.
- Ørberg, Hans H. 2011, and following. *Lingua Latina per se Illustrata*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.
- Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin and Fiona McHardy, eds. 2014. *From Abortion to Pederasty: Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Radice, Betty. Trans. and Intro. 1976. *Terence: The Comedies*. London: Penguin Books.
- Shirley, Skye. <https://www.skyeshirley.com/lupercal>
- Thomson, D.F.S. 1997. *Catullus*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442672789>.
- Tunberg, Terence and Milena Minkova. 2017. *Latin for the New Millennium*, Levels 1 and 2. 2nd edition. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.

De Sallustio Latine Praelegendo: Causae, Rationes et Consilia Docendi

JORGE TÁRREGA GARRIDO

Summa: Multae sunt viae, multi modi quibus utentes possumus auctores rimari eosque discipulis nostris in scholis monstrare et aperire. Describuntur hac in symbola rationes Sallustii in Vniversitatibus studiorum praelegendi, subsidia didascalica ac exercitia varia, quae omnia sunt usu et tractatione coram discipulis a nobis probata. Praeterea significantur causae cur multum iuuet linguam Latinam *per loquelam ipsam Latinam* docere, et quae beneficia ex his rationibus capiant discipuli qui sermonis rudimenta iamdudum perdidicerunt atque se auctoribus legendis et excutiendis dederunt. Referuntur postremo et exempla probationum et summa percontationis, ad quam, cursu academico peracto, harum rationum non amplius expertes discipuli responderunt.

Claves: Rationes docendi, Sallustius, Vniversitas studiorum, linguae Latinae usus.

Tantummodo incepto opus est, cetera res expedit (Sall. Cat. 20)

Plures in dies cum adhibeantur in totius orbis terrarum lyceis et academiis rationes docendi quibus omnes facultates linguae foventur atque exercentur, cumque plures reperiantur in annos symbolae et commentarii¹, in quibus homines docti et eruditi rationes linguae Latinae docendae quaerunt vividiores, efficaciores, cum studio aliarum linguarum hodiernarum coniunctiores, haud abs re nobis iam olim visum est illa consilia ad usum adducere et scholis nostris Vniversitariis accommodare. Quippe attulerat XVIII abhinc annos Professor VON ALBRECHT (2002: 7-13) multas causas cur lingua Latina adhibenda esset in Philologia Latina, ex quibus praestant *argumentum ex rerum memoria*, quod multis saeculis nonnisi Latine de Philologia scriptum sit; *argumentum ex analogia*, quod aliis Philologiae provinciis eadem lingua periti utantur quam pervestigant et odorantur: sic enim Philologia Anglica Anglice traditur, Germanica Germanice; *argumentum commoditatis*, ut studiosi totius orbis terrarum in unam linguam communem animos quam maxime intendant; *argumentum ex rerum natura*: quae Latina sint, Latine tradantur; *argumentum ex re sive ex apto*, quod multo facilius sit Latine de rebus Latinis docere, Latine de vita Romanorum, Latine de verbis Latinis; et *argumentum utilitatis*, quod qui Latine scribit, ad scriptores intellegendos explicandosque eximie paratus sit.

Monstrabimus igitur proximis lineolis consilia quae diu perpendimus quibusque in Vniversitate studiorum Valentina, in Hispania sita, usi sumus. Ad exempla propria descendemus unius scriptoris, Sallustii nempe historici, qui quidem in Vniversitate studiorum Valentina anno secundo academico praelegitur. Voluimus iam imprimis, quamquam constitutae sunt ibi res a moderatibus et argumenta in scholis tractanda, his modis uti eosque experiri. Neque defuerunt in primordiis difficultates, nam his nostris temporibus plerique discipuli, qui studia superiora ingrediuntur, nondum linguam Latinam *audiverunt* neque umquam impulsus sunt ut scripta *legerent*, potius ut verbum pro verbo *redderent* ex lingua Latina in sermonem patrium. Qua de causa viam munivimus eamque Latinam qua possint discipuli res percipere, cognoscere ac in peritia linguae Latinae progredi.

Nihilominus, sumus bene conscii, non omnes collegas in Facultate uti in scholis suis iis rationibus, quibus lingua *per usum* discatur, id est, loquendo, audiendo, scribendo, legendo, quin immo in tralaticias, quae dicuntur, methodos et vias iamdudum incumbunt. Vtut est, putamus his, quae inferius monstrantur, **exercitiis** discipulos multum progredi posse etiam in scholis tralaticiiis rationibus dispositis: etiamsi ante scholas nostras discipuli alii

¹ Vide, exempli gratia, AGUILAR GARCÍA 2020 & 2019, AREND 2018, LLOYD 2017, OWENS 2016, CARLON 2016 & 2013, PATRICK 2015, MINKOVA 2014, RICUCCI 2014 & 2013, COFFEE 2012.

rationibus linguam didicerunt iisdemque post nostrum exemplum pergunt discere, tamen censemur exercitia hic proposita magno fore auditoribus emolumento. Planum simul est nostrum consilium et multiplex iam inde ab initio: ut exemplis et vero usu lingua fiat discipulis germanum communicandi instrumentum, non obscurum et inusitatum machinamentum²; ut res a Sallustio tractatae intellegantur eiusque genus scribendi examinetur; ut quaestiones, quae ad rem publicam administrandam et ad homines pertinent, penitus penetremus.

De locis selectis

Haec, de qua loquimur, disciplina in tres menses est constituta. Complectitur in summa quinquaginta fere horas, quae binas in scholas binarum horarum singulis hebdomadibus distribuuntur. Quae cum ita sint, nobis videtur amplitudo et numerus locorum, quos eligamus, ad horarum copiam esse accommodandus, ne sit sententiarum vel paragraphorum inanis congregatio et causa potius praetexta ut regulas grammaticas explicemus. Quem ad finem initium excerpimus *Belli Iugurthini*, in cuius prioribus capitulis fundamenta narrationis iacit Sallustius atque belli origines adumbrat: quae scilicet producuntur ex capitulo V usque ad capitulum XVI illius operis. Hos, qui sequuntur, titulos singulis paragraphis imposuimus quo facilius discipuli primo obtutu teneant de qua re agatur:

V: Quid sit Sallustius scripturus. Post bellum Punicum secundum quid acciderit. Masinissa. Micipsa regnum obtinuit.
VI: Iugurthae virtus. Micipsa anxietate tenebatur propter Iugurtham.
VII: Iugurtha praefectus est Numidis in Hispania. Bellum Numantinum.
VIII: Novi atque nobiles Romani Iugurtham accendebant. Scipio monet Iugurtham.
IX: Litterae Scipionis Micipsae redditae.
IX-X: Micipsa Iugurtham beneficiis vincere aggreditur. Quid Micipsa ante mortem dixerit.
XI: Micipsa mortuo, disceptatio de regno.
XII: Hiempsal necatur. Nex Hiempsalis.
XIII: Alii Numidae Adherbalem secuntur, alii Iugurtham. Adherbal se Romam confert; etiam legati Iugurthae.
XIV. Loquitur Adherbal in senatu.
XV. Iugurthae legati respondent in senatu.
XV-XVI: Senatus consulitur.

² Vide CARLON 2013, 106: "It [Latin] is frequently viewed as an artifact, a leftover from an elitist and antiquated educational system". PORRO (112): "We must avoid at all costs teaching grammar without context, as if it were an artifact all on its own, disconnected from the language that defines it".

De singulis scholis

Singulae scholae quaternas in partes dividuntur:

1. Prolegomena: quid praeteritis scholis dictum sit. Locutionum repetitio. Res tractatae.
2. Lectio: lente dum legimus, plurima exempla praebemus, ut puta verba idem vel contrarium significantia, exempla ex rerum adiunctis, paraphrases. Discipulos identidem Latine exhortamur ut Latine respondere audeant³, quod sane non semper, sed saepenumero faciunt.
3. Exercitia (quae paulo inferius subiciuntur).
4. Denique paragraphum modo tractatam legimus atque, scrupulis iam solutis, gustamus. Neque enim agitur tantum de verbis et locutionibus explorandis, sed etiam de delectatione, teste Cicerone⁴, in litteris habenda.

Quod ad usum linguae attinet, stat nobis scholas Latine tradere iam inde a primo die. Quid sit cur haec omnia Latine tractemus atque hunc usum loquendi putemus discipulos ad bonam frugem perducendum, causis a professore von Albrecht iam supra allatis, paucissimis absolvemus idque experimentis nostris: primum quod diuturna consuetudine discipuli aures paulatim assuefaciunt linguae propiusque ad eam accedunt; dein quod, cum eadem lingua utantur quam conantur perdiscere, eam a se ipsis abstractam et seiunctam nullo modo esse arbitrantur; tertium, quod structuris grammaticis, quas apud Sallustium legimus, semel ac saepius se exercent; postremo quod plurima vocabula memoriae mandant.

Exercitia

Ne exercitia innumera huc afferamus, ecce nonnulla selegimus exempla ad singula capitula aptata, ex quorum aspectu et specie plurima alia, si placuerit ratio, generari possint:

Exercitia ad capitulum V excogitata

A) Responde ad interrogata:

- Quale fuit bellum inter populum Romanum et Iugurtham?
- Quid finem fecit studiis civilibus?
- Quid sibi vult Sallustius antequam explanat belli initium? Quem ad finem talia dicit?
- Quis opes Italiae maxime attriverat?
- Fuitne Masinissa amicus Romanorum?
- Qua de causa fuit Scipioni cognomen "Africanus"?
- Quid fecerat bello Punico secundo Masinissa?

B) Responde ad interrogata:

Quaere in capitulo V verba idem significantia:

³ MINKOVA (2014: 298) multa praebet exempla, quibus utitur Caesarem in Academia sua praelegens. Multum enim iuvat, ut ipsa fatetur, discipulos interrogare, paraphrases exquirere ac summarium loci exarare. His adde utilissimam rationem exercitorum concinnandorum a CARLON 2016 & 2015, PATRICK 2015. HARRISON 2010 prolatam.

⁴ Cic. *Epist.* VI, 12: "Est unum perfrugium doctrina ac litterae, quibus semper uti sumus, quae secundis rebus delectationem modo habere videbantur, nunc vero etiam salutem".

arrogantia		patientia
dirum		absolveret
diversa		explano
postea		pugna
quod		solitudo
altero		egregia
facultates (divitias)		facta

C) De morphologia:

Quaere in loco praeterita plusquamperfecta eorumque verborum enuntiatum indica.

D) De re

Quae erat contentio in Re Publica Romana, de qua Sallustius in capitulo V loquitur?

Exercitia ad capitulum VI excogitata

A) Iunge A cum B singulariter

A	B
Plurimum facere	ferire
Pleraque tempora in venando	anteire
Leonem atque feras	minimum de se loqui
Omnes gloriā	certare
Cursu cum aequalibus	agere

B) Sententias Latinas compone his vocabulis fretus:

- dedit- luxu- neque - ubi - corrumperem - se - non - inertiae - adolevit - qui - primum
- Iugurthae - fore - regno - virtutem - existumabat - gloriae - suo - Micipsa
- eo - permotus - cum - tametsi - negotio - fuerat - multa - animo - initio - volvebat - laetus - vehementer - suo

C) Responde ad interrogata:

1. Indica sex artes quibus Iugurtha adulescens se exercebat
2. Quid terrebat Micipsam?
3. Quid saepe conturbat homines modestos apud Sallustium?
4. Erantne Numidae irati Iugurthae?
5. Quid forsitan accidisset, si Iugurtha dolis necatus esset?
6. Quid tu censes? Decetne hominem multum de se ipso loqui? Estne virtutis "minimum de se loqui"?

D) Quaere verba idem significantia in capitulo VI *Belli Iugurthini* (ex “Qui ubi” ad “de se loqui”):

vultu		potens	
praestaret		pugnare	
cum primum		bestias	
vulnerare		robustus	
consuetudo			

E) Quaere in capitulo VI *Belli Iugurthini* (ex “Quibus rebus” ad “anxius erat”):

- Accusativum cum infinitivo:
- Ablativum absolutum:
- Participium coniunctum:
- Sententiam concessivam:
- Gerundivum:
- Plusquamperfectum:
- Ablativum causae:
- Ablativum instrumenti:
- Duas proprietates Sallustii generis scribendi:

Exercitia in capitulum VII excogitata

A) Quid congruit?

Iugurtha volebat parēre	Romanos/Romanis/Romanas
Micipsa praefecit Iu- gurth..... Numid.....	Iugurtham-Numidis/ Iugurthae Numidas/ Iugurthis-Numidam
Misit auxilia	equis/equitum/equitatum
Saepe obviam ibat	pericula/periculos/periculis
Neque eius in- ceptum frustra erat!	ullum/nullum/nemo

B) Quaere verba idem significantia in capitulo VII *Belli Iugurthini*:

fraudibus		decevit	
difficiles		periclitari	
cupidus		monstrando	
putaverat		accidit	
sagacitas		acuto	

C) Quaere verba contrarium significantia in capitulo VII *Belli Iugurthini*:

clementia		fugiendo	
eodem modo		odiosus	
negligentia		amori	
maximā superbā		ignavo	
raro		disiunxerat	

D) Dic aliis verbis:

1. Virtus eius regni tui gloriam amplificabit
2. Numantinos terrebat Iugurtha
3. Micipsa sic periclitatus est
4. Nostri maxime amabant Iugurtham
5. Maxime cupiebat gloriam militarem

E) Responde ad interrogata:

1. Cur nolebat Micipsa interficere Iugurtham?
2. Quomodo sperabat Micipsa Iugurtham necatum iri?
3. Quibus adiectivis describit Iugurtham Sallustius in capitulo VII?
4. Quid fecit Iugurtha ad animos Publii Scipionis alliciendos?
5. Terrebatne Iugurtha Numantinos?
6. Quid fit, Sallustio teste, si nimis utimur prudentiā? Quid fit, si nimis audaciter agimus?
7. Num deficiebat saepe in inceptis suis Iugurtha?
8. Quos sibi amicitia comparaverat Iugurtha? Quibus rebus?

F) GRAMMATICA: Quaere in capitulo VII *Belli Iugurthini*:

- Duos Accusativos cum infinitivo:
- Gerundium:
- Vt consecutivum:
- Ablativum qualitatis:
- Cum narrativum:

G) De genere scribendi Sallustiano. Suntne in capitulo VII...?

- Variationes:
- Medii, qui dicuntur, soni:
- Chiasmi:
- Infinitivi historici:
- Accusativi plurales tertiae decl. in -is exeuntes:
- Numquid plura?

Exercitia ad capitulum XIII excogitata

A) Quaere verba idem significantia in capitulo XIII *Belli Iugurthini*:

factum			perfectis	
adicit			operam dabant	
confisus			iubet	
proelium			haesitent	
discessit			nece	

B) Responde ad interrogata:

1. Qui Numidae Iugurtham secuntur?
2. Suntne sponte secuti omnes Numidae Iugurtham?
3. Num Iugurtha devictus est ab Adherbale? Quid accidit post proelium?
4. Quibus rebus fretus volebat Iugurtha iram mitigare Romanorum?
5. Suntne irā accensi Romani propter Iugurthae largitudinem?

C) Sententias Latinas compone his vocabulis fretus:

- itineribus contendit Galliam Quam maximis in ulteriorem
- potest generum maximas parat copias omnium quam potest
- totius sperant sese potiri Galliae posse
- eo volvebat negotio multa suo vehementer permotus animo cum
- legatum Marius iubet Manlium proficisci
- iubet erumpere milites Marius tollere atque portis clamorem
- imperat Cicero deprehendant Allobrogum comitatus (*IV declinatio!*) praetoribus ut
- ne Omnes transeant ope decet summā vitam homines niti silentio

D) De proprietatibus generis scribendi Sallustiani. Suntne in capitulo XIII...?

- Variationes:
- Medii, qui dicuntur, soni:
- Infinitivi historici:
- Accusativi plurales tertiae declinationis in -is exeuntes:
- Numquid plura?

De argumento, de re

Verba, quibus Sallustius opus aspersit, non sunt obiter neque velut in transitu tractanda, quin immo, simul atque de structuris grammaticis et vocabulis disserimus, simul atque locutiones et exempla plurima ad linguam ipsam pertinentia proferimus, haud raro consistendum est et in sententiis incidendum in quibus Sallustius consulto nos, dum de Roma verba facit, alloquitur: de re publica administranda, de parvis et magnis corruptelis, de honoribus. Neque hic est locus ut totam aperiāmus mentem Sallustii, quam multi alii in litteris veteratores interpretati sunt⁵, quin immo ut de colloquio gravi et docto moneamus coram discipulis de opinionibus Sallustianis instituendo, quo habito multum proficient auditores *multaque*, ut Quintilianus ait,

⁵ Non mediocri operum affluentia cum abundant studia Sallustiana, satis est huc referre unum atque alterum commentarium, ex quibus commentariis perfectis venient discipuli, si libuerit, ad maiora: KRAUS & WOODMAN 1997; VON ALBRECHT 1989 & 1997; MCGUSHIN 1977; CIRUELO 1973; LA PENNA 1968; SYME 1964. Etiam Latine: D'ELIA 1964, VALLAURIUS 1860, BURNOUF 1821 & VALPY 1820.

*secum referent*⁶. Suademus igitur ut praefationes *Belli Iugurthini* et *Belli Catilinaris* imprimis legant atque animo volvant, dein ad haec respondeant:

1. Scribe summarium praefationum Sallustii in *Bellum Catilinarium* et *Bellum Iugurthinum*.
2. Quem ad finem scripsit Sallustius *Bellum Iugurthinum*?
3. Saepe disserit de ambitione et corruptelis populi Romani. Quid tu sentis de rerum descriptione, qua utitur? Distatne multum vita Sallustii a consiliis, quibus opera sua aspersit?

Ad quas quaestiones cum domi in pagellis responderint, quae mox ad magistrum erunt tradendae, fient in scholis colloquia, disputabunt inter eos viva voce atque de omni re, quaecumque in disceptationem quaestionemque vocabitur, suas aperient opiniones iisque aliorum adversabuntur, etiam profecto illis Sallustianis, sic ut fateantur, Horatio auctore (*ep. I, 14-15*): “nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri, / quo me cumque rapit tempestas, deferor hospes”.

En concinnas acutasque Sallustii sententias collegimus, de quibus discipuli si *vel in utramque partem* disputabunt, multos capient fructus:

1. Cum omnis gloriā anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse (cap. VI) / gloriā invidiam vicisti (cap. X)
2. Plurimum facere, minimum ipse de se loqui (cap. VI)
3. Proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio, quorum alterum ex providentiā timorem, alterum ex audaciā temeritatem afferre plerumque solet (cap. VII)
4. Romae omnia venalia esse (cap. VIII)
5. En habes virum dignum te atque avo suo Massinissa (cap. IX)
6. Non exercitus neque thesauri praesidia regni sunt, verum amici, quos neque armis cogere neque auro parare queas: officio et fide pariuntur (cap. X)
7. Nam concordia parvae res crescunt, discordia maximae dilabuntur (cap. X)
8. In omni certamine qui opulentior est, etiam si accipit iniuriam, tamen, quia plus potest, facere videtur (cap. X)

De discipulis periclitandis

Veniendum est ad discipulos periclitandos et existimandos, quem ad finem nostras species interrogatorum non inducemus quin partim rationes addamus, ut legibus constitutum est, tralaticias. Duabus illis rationibus si utimur in periculo ultimo discipulis subeundo, et leges Facultatis Philologiae observamus, et efficimus ut agendi modi, quos in scholis adhibuimus, quoque in periculo significantur. Duas igitur partes proponemus discipulis, quarum altera continebit res et paragraphos in scholis tractatas, altera alios locos ex opera Sallustiana depromptos. Hic autem est notandum apud Hispanos quintam partem totius iudicii pertinere ad pensa et opera a discipulis suscepta et magistro reddita. Itaque, omnia in summa sic existimantur: *pars prima* (40) + *pars altera* (40) + *Pensa* (20) = 100.

Ecce harum duarum partium exempla discipulis periclitandis:

⁶ *Inst. II 2, 8*: “Ipse [*i.e. praeceptor*] aliquid, immo multa cotidie dicat quae secum auditores referant. Licet enim satis exemplorum ad imitandum ex lectione suppeditet, tamen viva illa, ut dicitur, vox alit plenius”.

PARS PRIMA

1. Sesquihora ad respondendum, nullo lexico adhibito
2. Nihil convertendum est nisi pars significata.
3. Ratio huius partis: 40p

Lege locum ex Sallustii *Bello Iugurthino* depromptum:

Numida mandata brevi conficit atque, uti doctus erat, noctu Iugurthae milites introducit. Qui postquam in aedis irrupere, divorsi regem quaerere, dormientis alios, alios occursantis interficere, scrutari loca abdita, clausa effringere, strepitu et tumultu omnia miscere, quom interim Hiempsal reperitur occultans se tugurio mulieris ancillae, quo initio pavidus et ignarus loci perfugerat. Numidae caput eius, uti iussi erant, ad Iugurtham referunt. Ceterum fama tanti facinoris per omnem Africam brevi divulgatur. Adherbalem omnisque, qui sub imperio Micipsae fuerant, metus invadit. In duas partis discedunt Numidae: plures Adherbalem secuntur, sed illum alterum bello meliores.

A) Responde ad interrogata (10p):

- a) De quo Numidā hic loquitur Sallustius?
- b) Quem interficiunt Iugurthae milites intrantes?
- c) Vbi repertus est Hiempsal? Cur se ibi occultavit?
- d) Terrenturne fautores Adherbalis? Cur?
- e) Qui homines Iugurthae favent?

B) Quaere in loco (8p):

verba idem significantia		verba contrarium significantia	
patrat		vigilantis	
repugnantis		egressi sunt	
tradunt		manifesta	
invenitur		audax	
sceleris		postremo	

- C) Converte in sermonem vulgarem partem loci adnotatam: a “Qui postquam...” ad “perfugerat” (10p.)
- D) Quaere in loco VI proprietates, quae saepe a Sallustio in scribendo adhibentur (12p.)

PARS ALTERA

1. Sesquihora ad respondendum. Lexico uti lice
2. Nihil convertendum est nisi pars significata.
3. Ratio huius partis: 40p.

Lege locum ex Sallustii *Bello Iugurthino* depromptum:

Postquam diviso regno legati Africā decessere et Iugurtha contra timorem animi praemia sceleris adeptum sese videt, certum esse ratus, quod ex amicis apud Numantiam acceperat, omnia Romae venalia esse, simul et illorum pollicitationibus adensus, quos paulo ante muneribus expleverat, in regnum Adherbalis animum intendit. Ipse acer, bellicosus; at is quem petebat quietus, inbellis, placido ingenio, opportunus iniuriae, metuens magis quam metuendus. Igitur ex inproviso finis eius cum magnā manu invadit, multos mortalis cum pecore atque alia praeda capit, aedificia incendit, pleraque loca hostiliter cum equitatu adcedit.

A) Responde ad interrogata (10p):

- a) Quando legati Romani ex Africā discessere?
- b) Quid certissime Iugurtha sciebat?
- c) Cur nullo timore Iugurtha tetendit in regnum Adherbalis?
- d) Quibus verbis depingitur Adherbal?
- e) Cuius finibus potitus est Iugurtha?

B) Convertite in sermonem vulgarem partem loci adnotatam: a “Postquam...” ad “intendit” (10p).

C) Quaere in loco IV proprietates, quae saepe a Sallustio in scribendo adhibentur (4p)

D) De syntaxi: quid congruit? (16p)

In tantam claritudinem brevi pervenerat, ut _____ vehementer carus, _____ maximo terrori esset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nostris-Numantinis 2. Nostri-Numantini 3. Nostros-Numantinos
Existumabat virtutem Iugurthae regn_____ su_____ glori_____ fore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regno suo-gloriae 2. Regni sui-gloriam 3. Regna sua-gloriis
Natura praiceps ad explend_____ animi cupidin_____	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. explendam-cupidinem 2. explendae-cupidinis 3. explendum-cupinidinis
Ne _____ seditio aut bellum oriretur, anxius erat.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qua 2. Aliqua 3. Quo
Videt neque per vim neque insidiis _____ posse hominem tam acceptum popularibus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. opprimi 2. opprimendi 3. opprimendos

Non se luxu neque inertiae _____ dedit	1. corrumpere 2. corrumpendam 3. corrumpendum
En habes virum dignum _____	1. tibi atque avi tui 2. te atque avum tuum 3. te atque avo suo
Morb _____ atque aetat _____ confectus	1. Morbo-aetate 2. Morbi-aetatis 3. Morbos-aetates
Amici, quos neque armis cogere neque auro parare queas, officio et fide _____	1. parentur 2. pariuntur 3. parant
_____, Iugurtha, decet providere	1. Tibi 2. Te 3. Tui
Tempus ad utramque rem decernitur, sed maturius ad pecuniam distribue _____	1. distribuere 2. distribuendam 3. distribuendi
Iugurtha omn _____ Numidi _____ imperare parat	1. omni Numidiae 2. omni Numidia 3. omnem Numidiam
Nolite pati _____ nepotem Masinissae frustra a _____ auxilium petere	1. ego-vos 2. mihi-vobis 3. me-vobis
Aut quisquam _____ misereri potest?	1. nostros 2. nostri 3. nos
Rex finem _____ fecit	1. loquendi 2. loquendum 3. loquendo
Pauci, quibus bonum et aequom divitiis carius erat, _____ Adherbali et Hiempsalis mortem severe _____ censebant	1. subvenire-vindicare 2. subventum-vindicatum 3. subveniendum-vindicandam

Epilogus: de discipulis percontandis

Fuit nobis in animo hic rationes exponere quibus in Vniversitate studiorum Valentina nuperrimis annis usi sumus quaeque, ut putamus, ad maiorem peritiam linguae Latinae discipulos contulerunt maioremque notitiam auctorum provexerunt. Causae, quae nos imprimis ad has rationes adhibendas impulerunt, sunt cotidianis scholis, cotidianis exercitiis, cotidianis periculis pedetemptim confirmatae; quin etiam discipuli ipsi, in percontationibus

interrogati de his inceptis quid sentirent, cursus beneficia patefecerunt eiusque utilitates magni aestimaverunt: placuit enim, cursu academico peracto, discipulos percontari de rationibus a nobis usurpatis. Omnes igitur, qui scholae ultimae interfuerunt, numero ad XXVIII, ad haec interrogata libero animo responderunt:

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quid censes de scholis omnino Latine tradendis? 2. Putasne has docendi rationes tibi emolumento fuisse? 3. Maluisses scholas potius Hispanice (non Latine) traditas esse? |
|--|

Alii discipuli singulatim, alii generatim ad interrogata responderunt, hac una condicione servata: nomen ut celarent neque id in pagella significarent. Ex responsis facile colligitur **omnibus discipulis** placuisse scholis Latine habitis interesse; neminem maluisses scholas sermone vernaculo audire; omnes putare has rationes sibi fuisse magno emolumento. Ceterum singulas inferius referimus opiniones, quae hic illic sparsae sunt:

Discipulorum responsa	Numerus discipulorum qui haec responsa reddiderunt
- Multa vocabula didici audiendo et legendo	9
- Linguam Latinam prorsus didici	8
- Magno nobis fuit gaudio	8
- Melius intelleximus mentem Sallustii	6
- Magnum studium, ne totius scholae filum perdamus, flagitatur	5
- Esset discipulis magno beneficio plures disciplinas Latine tradi	4
- Cogimur ut Latine cogitemus et mentem Latinam fingamus	3
- Lingua Latina hisce rationibus viva est, non mortua	2

Percontationis indicia	
Copia discipulorum	XXVIII discipuli
Cursus academicus	Secundus annus academicus Philologiae Classicae
Sedes	Facultas Philologiae, Vniversitas Studiorum Valentina in Hispania
Dies percontationis	a.d. XV Kal. Iun. ann. MMXVII
Ratio	Responsa in pagellis, nullo nomine prolato, manu scripta ⁷

University of Massachusetts, Boston
jorge.tarregagarrido@umb.edu

⁷ Velim imprimis gratias agere huius symbolae attentissimo iudici, mihi quidem ignoto, cuius utilibus consiliis et annotationibus fretus opusculum lima polivi et perfeci, necnon Professori Barrios Lech, quippe qui exemplum Latinum susceperit Anglice reddendum.

Index Bibliographicus⁸

De rebus didascaliciis

- Aguilar García, María Luisa. 2020. "De rationibus ac principiis quibus constat *Comparatio aliarum linguarum* (SLA) ad linguam Latinam tralatis ac conversis", *Classical World* 113.3: 335-356. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2020.0027>
- Aguilar García, María Luisa. 2019. "Usus adversus doctrinam? Grammatica in schola alterius linguae. Grammatica Latine tradita", *Thamyris* 10: 237-264.
- Albrecht, Michael von. 2002. "De lingua Latina in Philologia Latina adhibenda", *Estudios Clásicos* 122: 5-16.
- Arend, Alan van den. 2018. "Something Old, Something New: Marrying Early Modern Latin Pedagogy and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Theory", *Teaching Classical Languages* 10.1: 1-32.
- Carlson, Jacqueline. 2016. "Quomodo Dicitur? The Importance of Memory in Language Learning", *Teaching Classical Languages* 7.2: 109-135.
- Carlson, Jacqueline. 2015. "Rethinking the Latin classroom: changing the role of translation in assessment", *The Classical Outlook* 90.4: 138-140.
- Carlson, Jacqueline M. 2013. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Latin Instruction and Securing its Place in Curricula", *Teaching Classical Languages* 4.2: 106-122.
- Coffee, Neil. 2012. "Active Latin. Quo tendimus?", *Classical World* 105.2: 255-269. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2012.0007>
- Harrison, Rebecca. 2010. "Exercises for Developing Prediction Skills in Reading Latin Sentences", *Teaching Classical Languages* 2.1: 1-30.
- Lloyd, Mair Elizabeth. 2017. *Living Latin: Exploring a Communicative Approach to Latin Teaching Through a Sociocultural Perspective on Language Learning*, PhD Thesis, The Open University. <https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0000bef6>
- Minkova, Milena. 2014. "De Caesare in scholis Latinis provectioribus destinatis modo activo proponendo", *Nordlit* 33: 297-309. <https://doi.org/10.7557/13.3168>
- Owens, Patrick. 2016. "Barbarisms at the Gate: An Analysis of Some Perils in Active Latin Pedagogy", *Classical World* 109.4: 507-523. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2016.0047>
- Patrick, Robert. 2015. "Making Sense of Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom", *Teaching Classical Languages* 6.1: 108-136.
- Ricucci, Marco. 2014. "Oltre i confini di Babele; riflessioni per una didattica della grammatica latina con il metodo neocomparativo", *Euphrosyne* 42: 225-43. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.EUPHR.5.125454>
- Ricucci, Marco. 2013. "Al cospetto di Theuth. Understanding reading tra note teoriche e tecniche didattiche", *Thamyris* 4: 11-32.

De litteris Latinis

- Albrecht, Michael von. 1997. *Historia de la literatura romana*, Barcelona.
- Albrecht, Michael von. 1989 (=1971). *Masters of Roman Prose, From Cato to Apuleius*, Anglice redditum a Neil Adkin.
- D'Elia, Antonio. 1964. *Latinarum litterarum historia*, Neapoli.
- Kraus, Christina S. & Woodman, Anthony J. 1997, *Latin Historians*, Oxford.
- Vallaurius, Thomas. 1860. *Historia critica litterarum latinarum*, Augustae Taurinorum.

De Sallustio

- Burnouf, Jean Louis. 1821. *Caius Crispus Sallustius ad codices Parisinos recensitus cum varietate lectionum et novis commentariis*, Parisiis.
- Ciruelo, José Ignacio. 1973. *Salustio: política e historiografía*, Barcelona.

⁸ Omnia ligamina quae hic monstrantur sunt idibus Augustis ann. MMXX recognita et examinata.

- La Penna, Antonio. 1968. *Sallustio e la "rivoluzione" romana*, Milano.
- McGushin, Patrick. 1977. *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae. A Commentary*, Lugduni Batavorum. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004327627>
- Syme, Ronald. 1964. *Sallust*, Berkeley. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520929104>
- Valpy, Abraham John. 1820. *Caii Crispi Sallustii opera omnia ex editione Gottlieb Cortii cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini, variis lectionibus, notis variorum, notitia literaria, recensu editionum et codicum et indicibus locupletissimis accurate recensita*, Londini.

Latin Vocabulary Knowledge and the Readability of Latin Texts: A Preliminary Study

JOHN GRUBER-MILLER
BRET MULLIGAN

Abstract: Studies have found a strong correlation between vocabulary knowledge and L2 reading comprehension. This preliminary study of the readability of Latin texts considers how common measures of lexical complexity (word length, word frequency, lexical sophistication, lexical density, and lexical variation) can inform instructors about what texts have the least (and most) lexical complexity. By defining several key measurements of Latin lexical complexity, we establish a provisional account of the lexical difficulty of some familiar Latin texts that are frequently taught in elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels, and propose *LexR*, a single, informative, integrated score that provides a sense of the comparative lexical complexity of Latin texts.

Keywords: lexical complexity, readability, Latin, word length, word frequency, lexical sophistication, lexical density, lexical variation

1. Introduction

For students of Latin, acquiring a vocabulary large enough to read texts assigned in class poses a significant — and often intimidating — challenge. Imagine these all-too-familiar scenarios. In the first scenario, students, who may have been expected to learn 450–1000 words in their first year(s) of studying Latin, are tasked to read with fluency a historical Latin text. These texts contain many words they cannot recall in the new context and many hundreds of additional words they have never before encountered.¹ In the second, instructors use Latin novellas with “sheltered” vocabulary, in which the number of vocabulary words is limited, to attempt to align class readings with the lexical knowledge of their students. But they then find themselves at odds with their institution’s curriculum, which prioritizes historical Latin texts. They may also regret that they are not offering their students the experience of reading the authors who inspired them to learn Latin. Intrepid Latin instructors who recognize these difficulties still confront a double bind: we remain uncertain about how unknown vocabulary affects our students’ ability to read and we lack fundamental tools that would help us assess how well texts, whether historical or contemporary, align with their students’ level of reading proficiency.²

A confluence of developments in different disciplines over the past decade makes this an opportune moment to assay the role that vocabulary knowledge exerts on the readability of Latin texts. Readability studies have matured and are now beginning to be applied not just to corpora of English texts for first and second language learners, but also to foreign languages (Xia, Kochmar, and Briscoe, 2016). Computer analysis of texts has progressed so that it is no longer necessary to analyze texts by hand. Curated datasets — such as those of *The Bridge* (Mulligan), the *Ancient Greek and Latin Dependency Treebank* (AGLDT),

¹ The typical number of core vocabulary words in an introduction sequence was calculated from a survey of the required vocabulary in 18 elementary Latin textbooks, which ranged from 433 words in *De Romanis* to 1468 words in *Latin for Americans*; the mean of the sample was 947 words.

² Digital projects to help instructors discover readable texts are on the horizon: e.g., *Bridge/Oracle* identifies texts and passages that contain the highest percentage of user-defined vocabulary (Mulligan, bridge.haverford.edu/oracle); (*Meletē*)/*ToPān* (Koentges, github.com/ThomasK81/ToPan) facilitates topic modeling of ancient texts, allowing instructors to identify passages that are thematically (and so likely lexically) similar.

and *Opera Latina* by the Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes (LASLA) — can expedite the statistical analysis of Latin texts.³ Meanwhile, recent trends in Latin pedagogy have refocused attention on the role of vocabulary acquisition in language learning. Instructors who employ an Active Latin approach have begun to publish Latin novellas, fictional texts that intentionally limit the amount of new vocabulary in a text without necessarily limiting grammatical structures (Piazza 2017, Venditti 2021; cf. Ramsby, this volume). Moreover, many Latin teachers are developing “embedded” texts for classical authors. These simplified versions of Latin authors (or textbook readings) embed the main ideas and many of the words and structures of the original, but substitute more frequent and familiar Latin vocabulary for uncommon words and simplify longer, more complex sentences.⁴ These developments reveal an interest in assessing the readability of Latin texts and a newfound capacity to do so.

Yet measuring the readability of a text is a complex task. Since reading is an interactive process that combines author-driven, reader-driven, and text-driven factors (cf. Shrum and Glisan 172–88), textual features alone are insufficient to measure fully the readability of a text. According to Turk and Kirkman, the writer affects readability by “careful selection of the material, by organization, signposting and variation of emphasis” (1989). Likewise, certain reader-driven factors cannot be measured easily in text readability scores, such as motivation, working memory, and general linguistic proficiency, along with bottom-up (e.g., recognizing words and endings) and top-down processes (e.g., background knowledge, topic familiarity, and cultural knowledge). These significant factors in the readability of a text are highly subjective or exceedingly difficult to assay. Even limiting analysis to a full account of text-driven factors would require a formidable set of data. DuBay (2004), for example, identifies four textual features critical for readability: (1) *content* (propositions, organization, coherence); (2) *style* (semantic and syntactical features); (3) *design* (layout, typography, and illustrations); (4) and *discourse structure* (genre, chapters, headings, and navigation). The factors that affect the reading task, therefore, are complex and can be difficult to quantify. Yet, despite the complexity of fully describing the reading task, two text-driven factors have proven to be good predictors of text readability in English: lexical content and syntactic complexity (DuBay 2004). This preliminary study of readability in Latin texts explores the first and most important of these text-driven factors: lexical content. We consider how five common measures of lexical complexity (word length, word frequency, lexical sophistication, lexical density, and lexical variation) can inform instructors about what texts have the least (and most) lexical complexity. By defining several key measurements of Latin lexical complexity, we will establish a provisional account of the lexical difficulty of some familiar Latin texts that are frequently taught in elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels, and establish whether statistical measures of lexical complexity match the perceived difficulty of texts at different levels.

2. Vocabulary Knowledge and Reading Comprehension

Vocabulary knowledge has been recognized as a crucial component of language proficiency and as the best predictor of reading comprehension. How often has a student expressed frustration that they had to look up dozens of words in order to begin to understand a brief Latin text? Frequent consultation of the dictionary or on-line parsers is sure to demoralize even the most assiduous student. According to Chall, vocabulary difficulty explains as much as 80% of the total variability of readability scores for traditional print texts, with sentence

³ *The Bridge* (bridge.haverford.edu) is a free web tool that allows users to generate customized vocabulary lists from a human-curated database of Greek and Latin lists, textbooks, and texts; the AGLDT is part of the Perseus Digital library (https://perseusdl.github.io/treebank_data/); LASLA's *Opera Latina* enables the analysis of lexical, morphological, and stylistic data (web.philo.ulg.ac.be/lasla/opera-latina/).

⁴ For example, *Project Arkhaia* has produced sets of “AP Tiered Readings” that provide passages of Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* and Vergil's *Aeneid* rewritten at several levels of complexity (<http://lapis.practomime.com/index.php/operation-caesar-reading-list>).

structure possessing a small additional amount of predictive power (Chall 1958, 156–58). Studies have found a strong correlation between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension in one’s first language (Grabe and Stoller 2011) and even more so for reading in a second language (Laufer 1992, 1997; Qian 1999, 2002). In fact, vocabulary knowledge emerges as the strongest predictor of reading ability. A recent study by Staehr, which found that vocabulary knowledge predicted up to 72% of variance in reading comprehension, supports Chall’s findings (Staehr 2008).⁵

To fully comprehend a text, the reader must know a high percentage of the words in that text. Indeed, the current consensus holds that full comprehension requires that a reader must know between 95–98% of the words in that text.⁶ For example, Hu and Nation (2000) divided readers into four groups, in which students receiving a text composed from a list of the 2000 most frequent words in English. The text for each group was differentially modified by replacing none, 5%, 10%, or 20% of the words in the passage with nonsense words. No students could make sense of the passage comprising 80% known vocabulary, and only a few the passage in which one word out of ten words was unknown (90%). At 95% coverage (one word out of twenty unknown), fewer than half (35–41%) of the readers could adequately comprehend the passage. As a result, they conclude that 98% coverage (one word out of 50 unknown) was necessary to insure comprehension.

There has been some debate about the number of words needed to comprehend a typical text in English. Most estimates range from 2000–3000 word families (or 5000 individual words) to 8000–9000 word families.⁷ The need to acquire such a high level of vocabulary knowledge is daunting for a second language learner.⁸ Recent studies have suggested that a solid knowledge of high frequency vocabulary might be a reasonable goal for intermediate language learners. In examining English reading comprehension by Dutch high school students, Staehr (2008) found that knowing the most frequent 2000 word families was an important threshold and led to above average reading comprehension scores. Nation (2006) found that the 2000 highest-frequency word families provides 85% lexical coverage in English. Since the vocabulary of Latin is more limited than that of English, it is reasonable to assume that a shorter Latin list would provide analogous lexical coverage and preliminary work supports this postulate: e.g., Diederich’s finding that 1471 words provided 83.6% coverage of a wide selection of Latin texts.⁹

3. Measures of Lexical Complexity

Lexical complexity or lexical richness is a multidimensional construct that must be measured in different ways. Researchers have been exploring how to measure lexical complexity in English for over a century (Zamanian and Heydari 2012). In early readability studies it was

⁵ In statistics these correlations are typically expressed using Pearson’s *r* on a scale from -1 (variables are negatively correlated) to 1 (variables are linearly correlated), with 0 indicating that there is no correlation between the variables; the further Pearson’s *r* is from 0, the greater the correlation; these studies found a positive correlation between a student’s vocabulary knowledge and reading ability: Schoonen, Hulstijn, and Bossers 1998: $r = .60 - .76$; Pike 1979: $r = .88 - .94$; Qian 1999: $r = .78 - .82$; Qian 2002: $r = .73 - .77$,

⁶ Hu and Nation 2000; Laufer and Ravenhorst–Kalovsky 2010; Schmitt, Jiang, and Grabe 2011; cf. Schmitt, Cobb, Horst, and Schmitt 2015.

⁷ Since a word family “consists of a base word and all its derived and inflected forms that can be understood by a learner without having to learn each form separately” (Bauer and Nation 1993, 253), the size of a word family for a particular word will grow as the learner’s proficiency in the language increases.

⁸ 2000–3000 word families: Laufer 1992, Van Zeeland and Schmitt 2012; 5000 individual words: Hirsh and Nation 1992, Laufer 1989; 8000–9000 word families: Nation 2006; Schmitt et al. 2011.

⁹ Diederich 1939; see below for a fuller discussion of Diederich’s list and dataset. It is impossible to provide an exact accounting of a language’s total vocabulary; but comparison of the 171,476 words in current use words in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd ed., 1989) with the 39,589 words in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968) suggests the different scales of English and Latin vocabulary.

measured with two basic tests: word length and word frequency. More recent research has identified additional lexical features that can make a text easier or harder to comprehend. In addition to word length and word frequency, John Read identifies three other commonly used measures of lexical complexity: lexical sophistication, lexical density, and lexical variation (2000). Thus, the five most common measures of lexical complexity in recent studies are: (1) **word length**; (2) **word frequency**, or the percentage of high frequency words in a text; (3) **lexical sophistication**, or the percentage of low frequency words that provide more precise and more nuanced meanings; (4) **lexical density**, or the ratio of content words to function words; and (5) **lexical variation**, or the variety of different words used in the text.

3.1 Word length. Since English words of greater length are generally considered more difficult to process than words of short (one syllable) or medium (two syllables) length, it has been hypothesized that shorter words are easier to comprehend. Thus, many popular readability measures — such as the *Flesch Reading Ease Test*, the *Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Test*, and the *Gunning Fog formula* — assess texts by analyzing word length and the number of syllables per word. There have to date been no studies about the effect of word length on comprehension in inflected historical languages.

3.2 Word frequency. Vocabulary frequency is the second most common vocabulary measure in readability studies. The more frequently a word appears, it is reasoned, the more likely that the reader will see it and learn it, as learners are more likely to acquire more frequently seen words than those less frequently seen. In English, West's *General Service List of English Words* and the *British National Corpus* of high-, mid-, and low-frequency words are examples of attempts to characterize word frequency. In Latin, two lists from the first half of the twentieth century, those by Lodge and Diederich, have had significant impact (Muccigrosso 2004). In 1907, Gonzales Lodge compiled a list based on the most commonly read portions of Caesar (*Gallic Wars*, Books 1–5), Cicero (*Catilinarians*, *On Pompey's Command*, and *For Archias*), and Vergil (*Aeneid*, Books 1–6). His list of the most frequent 2000 words was based primarily on words that appeared five or more times in his data. In 1939, Paul Diederich sampled texts of more than two hundred authors “from Ennius to Erasmus” for his dissertation, *The Frequency of Latin Words and their Endings*. From this corpus he produced two core lists that are more representative of Latin literature through the ages than that of Lodge: the *Diederich 300* and the *Diederich 1500*.¹⁰ The *Diederich 300* comprises the 307 words that occur 100 times or more within his sample corpus, representing 58% of all the words in his data. For the longer list, the *Diederich 1500*, he began with the 1556 words that occur twenty times or more in his sample but then removed 85 words that are “important chiefly in medieval Latin.” The resulting list of 1471 words account for 83.6% of the vocabulary in his corpus. In 2013, a team at Dickinson College led by Christopher Francese build on the work of Lodge and Diederich to create a core list of almost 1000 words for the *Dickinson College Commentaries* series; this list represents approximately 70% of the words in a typical Latin text. Unlike the two older lists, the DCC team took advantage of the digitized database of Latin words from the *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et index inverse de la langue latine*. This database, compiled by the team at the *Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes (LASLA)*, is nearly four times larger than that used by Diederich, which in turn is approximately two and a half times larger than that of Lodge (Francese 2018; Muccigrosso 2004). Thus, the *Diederich 300* and *DCC Latin Core Vocabulary* provide sufficient proxies for high frequency words across a range of Latin texts and genres. Texts that contain a high percentage of words in these lists can reasonably be considered more likely to be accessible than lower scoring texts.

¹⁰ To create his sample, Diederich used the texts that appeared in *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse* (1912), Avery's *Latin Prose Literature* (1931), and Beeson's *Primer of Medieval Latin* (1925).

3.3 Lexical sophistication. While the frequency of commonly occurring words is a standard measure of text difficulty, researchers also endeavor to find other ways to measure lexical sophistication and the effect that the number of unusual or advanced words has on the readability of a text (Kyle and Crossley 2015). In ESL lexical studies, sophisticated words might be defined as words introduced in Grade 9 or later (Linnarud 1986). Another approach is to rely on the *Academic Word List* (Coxhead 2000). Yet another approach defines lexical sophistication as words that are above a certain frequency threshold, such as words “beyond the basic 2000” (Laufer and Nation 1995; Lu 2012). Similarly, the Dale-Chall formula computes the number of words that do not appear in the 3000 easy words understood by 80% of fourth graders. It is argued that these rarer words reveal more precision and sensitivity to register and tone and therefore are more difficult to understand. In studies measuring L2 learners’ lexical sophistication in their writing, researchers define this as the percentage of advanced words in a text divided by the total number of words. Since there are no academic word lists for Latin, this study will consider words not in the *Diederich 1500* as words that are rarer and hence more sophisticated.

3.4 Lexical density. Lexical density can be defined as the number of lexical or content words divided by the total number of words in a text (Ure 1971; Read 2000). Lexical words — nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs — are the primary carriers of meaning and provide readers with more content than do function words such as pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections. For example, a sentence such as “The quick brown fox jumped swiftly over the lazy dog” contains seven (underlined) content words out of ten total words for a 70% lexical density score. In contrast, a sentence such as “She told him that she loved him” yields only two content words out of seven total for a lexical density score of 29%. In general, a text with a lower lexical density is easier to understand, and spoken discourse tends to have a lower lexical density than written texts (Belinda 2007; Halliday 1985; Johansson 2008; Yu 2010). Ure (1971) found that the lexical density of written texts was usually more than 40% while the lexical density of spoken texts was generally below 40%. Although function words may be high frequency words, in L1 studies, children acquire function words more slowly than content words, perhaps because function words provide redundant information (Goodman et al. 2008).

3.5 Lexical variation. How often individual words are repeated within a text can also contribute to its lexical complexity of a text. The traditional way to measure lexical variation is to find the Type-Token Ratio (TTR), which is the ratio of the number of unique words (referred to as types) to the total number of words (or tokens) in a text. Traditional TTR, however, exhibits a bias against shorter texts. In general, the longer a text at the same level becomes, the lower its traditional TTR value will fall, since it is often necessary to re-use a number of function words before using a new lexical word. For example, in comparing the lexical richness of *Moby Dick* and *Sense and Sensibility*, Matthew Jockers determined that *Moby Dick*, with 16,872 unique words (types), exhibited more than 2.6 times as much lexical variation as *Sense and Sensibility*, which has 6325 unique words. But once the different lengths of the texts were taken into consideration, Melville’s adjusted TTR (29%) surpassed Austen’s (19%), by only a factor of 1.5. Three common variants on TTR attempt to compensate for this bias in traditional TTR: Root TTR (Guiraud 1960), Log TTR (Herdan 1964), and Corrected TTR (Carroll 1964).¹¹ With this bias in mind, we selected for analysis texts there were at least 2,000 words long and, for those texts that were considerably longer (e.g., the *Gospel of John* at 14,058 words or *Petronius* at 30,958), we analyzed excerpts of comparable length.

¹¹ Lu (2012: 205) reports that “among the seven TTR measures applied to the total vocabulary, the three transformations of the original TTR, namely, CTTR, RTTR, and the D measure, performed the best.” We chose not to use the D measure (Malvern et al. 2004) for this study because analysis has shown that D is most effective for shorter texts of 100–400 word tokens (McCarthy and Jarvis 2007); the shortest text in our sample was 2149 tokens (Catullus 69–116).

4. Textual Corpus

For this preliminary study, we deemed it reasonable to choose a few works that are commonly taught either in the first year of learning the language, at the intermediate stage, and finally at the more advanced level. To facilitate this study, we included in our sample mostly texts that had previously been lemmatized — i.e., the texts had been tokenized (divided into constituent words) and then each of these tokens had been matched to a dictionary headword or lemma. We did, however, lemmatize three new texts: *Via Periculosa* and two texts from the *Vulgate*.

Table 1. Sample Texts (by category and alphabetical)

Title	Category	Total Word Count	Unique Words or Types
<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	Beginner	5054	1046
Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	Beginner	2647	291
<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> Chs. 1–10	Beginner	4181	735
<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> Chs. 24–31	Beginner	4224	1181
Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	Intermediate	3367	891
<i>Vulgate, Genesis</i> 37, 39–43 (Story of Joseph)	Intermediate	3472	807
<i>Vulgate, Gospel of John</i> 1–8	Intermediate	6159	650
Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , “Hercules” (12–56)	Intermediate	4541	1011
Apuleius, <i>Metamorphosis</i> (Finkelpearl)	Advanced	4643	1934
Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	Advanced	8259	1400
Catullus 1–60	Advanced	4514	1525
Catullus 61–68	Advanced	6428	2041
Catullus 69–116	Advanced	2149	833
Petronius 26–38, 41–49	Advanced	4453	1525
Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	Advanced	5147	1660

We chose four texts intended for students in beginning Latin: Groton and May, *38 Latin Stories*; Olimpi, *Via Periculosa*; and two selections from the narrative stories in *Oxford Latin Course, College Edition* (Chapters 1–10 and 24–31). For example, the subtitle for *38 Latin Stories* – “Designed to accompany Frederic M. Wheelock’s *Latin: An Introductory Course Based on Latin Authors*” – makes explicit the target audience. The “Foreword” further indicates that the first eighteen stories are the author’s compositions, “often inspired by Ovid,” and the last twenty are adaptations of passages “from Caesar, Catullus, Cicero, Horace, Livy” (1). Olimpi’s novella is based on Petronius’ *Satyrica* 62–63 and the Author’s “Preface” sets out his principles in adapting Petronius: he has deliberately “sheltered” the vocabulary, limiting the number of words a reader was expected to recognize to 88 common Latin words and glossing other words as they appear. Finally, the *Oxford Latin Course, College Edition* is a well-known first-year textbook that employs the reading approach, developing a continuous narrative that roughly follows the life of Horace. Chapters 1–10 recount a young Horace’s life with his family; his travails at school, which include a simplified account of the Trojan War and Books 3 and 4 of the *Aeneid*; and his father’s decision to send him to Rome to continue his studies. Chapters 24–31, the concluding chapters of the textbook, begin with Horace experimenting as a poet, being invited into the circle of

Maecenas, journeying to Brundisium, meeting Propertius and Tibullus, receiving a country villa from Maecenas, learning of the battle of Actium, becoming a friend of the *princeps*, and feeling that death was imminent. Nearly each of these later chapters include an excerpt from the poetry of Horace or his contemporaries. All four first-year texts provide generous help with vocabulary by glossing unfamiliar words.

For our intermediate sample texts we selected a modern work, an ancient historical work, and two biblical texts that did not offer complex syntactical challenges: the story of Hercules in *Ritchie's Fabulae Faciles* (Chapters 12–56); Books 1 and 3 of Eutropius' *Breviarium Historiae Romanae* or *Epitome of Roman History*; the story of Joseph and his brothers in *Genesis*, Chapters 37 and 39–43; and the *Gospel of John*.¹² Unlike some of the first-year texts, the vocabulary is not sheltered in any of these texts. Ritchie in his “Preface” to the 1884 edition emphasizes the difficulties of accidence, syntax, and idiom, but does not mention anything about the principles of vocabulary in retelling the stories. Neither does Kirtland in his 1903 revised edition. Eutropius' *Breviarium* served as a popular school text from the eighteenth to mid-twentieth century and at the turn of the twentieth century was available in fourteen different editions, suggesting its perceived usefulness as “a bridge between the textbook and the authors normally read during the second year (Beyer 2009, xi). The *Breviarium* traces Roman history in ten books from the founding by Romulus to the accession of Valens as emperor in 364 CE. Book 1 summarizes the seven kings of Rome, the overthrow of Tarquin the Proud by Brutus, and Camillus' defeat of the Gauls; Book 3 focuses on the second Punic War. Both are available in recent editions designed to be taught at the advanced-beginner-to-intermediate levels.¹³ Jerome's translation of *Genesis* was a logical choice as an intermediate text since “the texts are considerably easier to read than mainstream Classical authors because the underlying Hebrew/Aramaic models have a simple, paratactic structure with highly repetitive vocabulary” (Clauss 2018). The story of Joseph was selected because it formed a coherent narrative of a length similar to those in the other texts being analyzed. Finally, the *Gospel of John* was selected because it offers a coherent, easy-to-follow narrative with a high degree of repetition that seemed appropriate for intermediate readers. Indeed, it is frequently listed as the book of the New Testament that is easiest to read (e.g., Wallace 2013).

At the advanced level, five authors were chosen: three prose (Caesar's *Gallic War* 1; Petronius' *Satyrica*; the Finkelpearl selections of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*) and two poets (Vergil, *Aeneid* 1 and Catullus, whose *liber* was sectioned into its three traditional sub-divisions). A variety of styles and genres (historical *commentarii*, novel, lyric, elegy, epigram, and epic) were sought to offer a reasonable sampling of the kinds of texts student regularly encounter at this level. Three of these texts have been included on syllabi for Advanced Placement Latin, while the *Satyrica* and *Metamorphoses*—because of their subject matter, uncanonical (i.e., non-Ciceronian) style, and densely textured literary imitation and sophisticated parody of traditional texts—have rarely been taught at the high school level but in the past few decades have begun to be included in the college curriculum with increasing frequency.¹⁴

5. Method

Calculations for this study were made using the lemmatized textual data created for *The Bridge* (bridge.haverford.edu), a free web-based tool that allows users to produce customized

¹² *Genesis* 38, the digression on Judah and Tamar, was excluded from the sample.

¹³ Beyer's editions of Eutropius (2009, 2015) are both subtitled “authentic Latin Prose for the Beginning Student.” Vanderpool and Katsenes (2016), moreover, have produced an annotated, online version of Eutropius, Books 4–6 that is intended to be “a digital bridge to authentic Latin.”

¹⁴ Finkelpearl states that her edition of Apuleius “is designed for upper intermediate to advanced students” (2012, ix); Severy-Hoven's recent student edition of Petronius (*The Satyrical of Petronius: An Intermediate Reader with Commentary and Guided Review*) claims to be “appropriate for third- or fourth-semester undergraduate Latin courses or advanced high school Latin” (2014, xiii).

Greek and Latin vocabulary lists. *The Bridge* generates vocabulary lists from a database of fully lemmatized texts—i.e., texts in which every word has been matched to its dictionary headword. For most *Bridge* texts, a combination of machine tools and human effort created these data, producing a level of accuracy beyond what is currently possible using machine tools alone.¹⁵ To lemmatize a text, a digital version of the text (e.g., Olimpi’s *Via Periculosa* or the *Gospel of John*) was first pre-processed using a Python-based application known as *Bridge/Lemmatizer*.¹⁶ *Bridge/Lemmatizer* employs the *Classical Language Toolkit* tokenizer and a lemmatization table to identify unambiguous word-forms that match a single lemma.¹⁷ The lemmata of unambiguous words, usually around 60% in a typical Latin text, are then converted into a format that allows the lemmata to be matched to data in the *Bridge Dictionary* and added to a lemmatization spreadsheet. The lemmatization sheets are then completed by Latin readers, who verify the automatically-identified unambiguous lemmata and manually match each ambiguous form with its proper *Bridge* lemma.

Using these data as a foundation, we created an Excel spreadsheet for each sample text. For every word in a sample text, we imported its part of speech from the *Bridge Dictionary*; noted whether the word was a proper noun or adjective; marked the first appearance of the word in a text, and indicated whether the word appeared in any of the sample Core Lists (Diederich and DCC).

From this spreadsheet we generated the following variables:

The *Word Count* is a simple sum of all words or tokens in each sample text.¹⁸

Average Word Length was calculated using Excel’s native “LEN” function.

Unique Words (or types) is the sum of a column that flagged the first time a word (token) appeared in the text.

Word Frequency was calculated as the percentage of core words in a text (i.e., those also found in the *Diederich 300* and *DCC Latin Core Vocabulary*; but excluding proper names) divided by the total number of words.¹⁹

Lexical Sophistication was calculated as the percentage of advanced words in a text (i.e., those not in the *Diederich 1500*; but excluding proper names) divided by the total number of words.

To calculate *Lexical Density*, the sum of content words (i.e., nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, numbers, or idioms) was divided by the *Word Count* and multiplied by 100 to generate the number of content words per 100 words.

Lexical Variation was calculated using four standard methods. TTR or Type-Token Ratio is the ratio of the number of unique word tokens or types (V) to the total number of word tokens in a text (N). We also calculated three standard methods to

compensate for the susceptibility of TTR $\left(\frac{V}{N}\right)$ to be distorted by the length of the

¹⁵ Data for all sample texts were created using this process with the exception of Caesar, Catullus, and Vergil, which were lemmatized by scholars of the *Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes* (LASLA). Excluding those texts lemmatized by LASLA, the raw lemmatization sheets for all treated texts are available at github.com/GitClassical/Bridge/data/Readability_NECJ_Data. Detailed information about the lemmatized texts used for this study is available at: <https://bridge.haverford.edu/about/texts>.

¹⁶ *Bridge/Lemmatizer* is available on-line at <https://bridge.haverford.edu/lemmatize/Lemmatizer>.

¹⁷ The *Classical Language Toolkit* or CLTK (cltk.org) offers open-source code to support the natural language processing of the languages of Ancient, Classical, and Medieval Eurasia. The texts for this study were pre-processed using the CLTK lemmatizer version 0.1.91.

¹⁸ Our data for this study cleaved enclitics, creating two separate words that were then used as the basis for the statistical analysis; for example, *virumque* was treated as *virum* and *-que* in our sample. As a result, the *Word Count* was increased and the *Average Word Length* similarly decreased compared to the raw text. Given the general infrequency of enclitics in Latin, the effect of this decision on our results was minimal.

¹⁹ When proper names are excluded, they were not assumed to be known but were removed from the calculation entirely (i.e., from the measure count and the count of total tokens).

treated text: R or Guiraud's Root TTR $\left(\frac{V}{\sqrt{2N}}\right)$; $CTTR$ or Carroll's Corrected TTR $\left(\frac{V}{\log V}\right)$; and $Log\ TTR$ or Herdan's C $\left(\frac{V}{\log N}\right)$. A *Composite Score* was calculated for each sample text using an average of each text's rank in (1) *Average Word Length*; (2) the percentage of words in the *Diederich 300* and DCC lists; (3) *Lexical Sophistication*; (4) *Lexical Density*; and (5) an average rank of the four calculations of *Lexical Variation*.

Finally, from these variables a new measure of lexical readability — *LexR* — was created. *LexR* factors several relevant measures of lexical complexity to produce a single score of a Latin text's lexical complexity. Unlike the *Composite Score*, which can only be used to compare the relative difficulties the fifteen texts within our sample corpus, *LexR* is derived from a fixed formula into which data from any Latin text could be entered. *LexR*, therefore, offers a reproducible method that can be applied to any lemmatized Latin text.

6. Results and Discussion

6.1 Word length. In early English readability studies, word length was considered a good gauge of a text's difficulty: the shorter words being easier to read and quickly comprehend than longer ones.

Table 2. Average Word Length in Sample Texts

Rank	Title	Average Word Length
1	Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	4.91
2	<i>Vulgate, Gospel of John</i> 1–8	4.92
3	Catullus 69–116	5.35
4	<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	5.39
5	Catullus 1–60	5.47
6	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 1–10	5.48
7	<i>Vulgate, Genesis</i> 37, 39–43 (Story of Joseph)	5.55
8	Petronius 26–38, 41–49	5.61
9	Catullus 61–68	5.73
10	Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	5.78
11	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 24–31	5.80
12	Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	5.88
13	Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	6.21
14	Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> (Finkelpearl)	6.27
15	Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , "Hercules" (12–56)	6.36

Appropriately, Olimpi's *Via Periculosa* exhibited the shortest average word length (4.9) but the *Gospel of John* nearly matched it with the same rounded length. Catullus' polometrics (5.3) and epigrams (5.5) exhibit word length similar to *38 Latin Stories* (5.4). *OLC* 1–10 (5.5) and the story of Joseph in *Genesis* (5.5), followed by Petronius (5.6), Catullus' long poems (5.7), and Vergil (5.8). Interestingly, the texts with the longest average word length — *OLC* 24–31 (5.8), Eutropius (5.9), and Caesar (6.2), Apuleius (6.3), and *Fabulae Faciles*

(6.4) — appear across our presumed beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels. The only poetic texts that approaches this group are Catullus 61–68 (5.7) and Vergil (5.8).

Poetic texts — with their large number of adjectives, present tenses, enclitics; and fewer compound verbs — tend to have a shorter word length. Prose texts, conversely, also tend to emphasize narratives using past tenses (imperfect, perfect, and pluperfect tenses) and thus tend to have longer verbs because the stems and endings for these verbs increases their length, thereby increasing the number of long words. Conversely, while there is some variability in mean word length (between 4.9 and 6.4 letters long), it is unclear whether this amount of variation is meaningful for comprehension.²⁰ The elimination of proper nouns did not significantly affect the rankings of mean word length, except for Eutropius, which fell from one of the longer average lengths to close to the median.

6.2 Word frequency. We also examined the extent to which the sample texts comprise high frequency vocabulary. For this measurement, we removed proper nouns and adjectives from consideration, since their semantic requirements, while not trivial, are different than other words and their capitalization in edited texts effectively signals to students that they belong to familiar class of words independent of previous knowledge of the word. Two frequency lists were used for this measurement: The *Diederich 300* list (58% coverage), the *DCC Latin Core Vocabulary* (70% coverage).²¹

Table 3. Word Frequency (% of total words in select core lists, excluding proper nouns)

Rank (average)	Title	% in <i>Diederich</i> <i>300</i>	% in <i>DCC</i> <i>Latin Core</i>
1	<i>Vulgate, Gospel of John</i> 1–8	76.57	86.81
2	<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	69.39	86.39
3	Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	59.36	81.13
4	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 1–10	57.97	82.18
5	Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	68.24	79.99
6	Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	61.56	80.38
7	Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , “Hercules” (12–56)	57.82	80.17
8	<i>Genesis</i> 37, 39–43 (Story of Joseph)	65.98	78.41
9	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 24–31	56.30	77.47
10	Catullus 69–116	58.16	74.70
11	Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	48.81	71.39
12	Catullus 1–60	56.69	71.00
13	Petronius 26–38, 41–49	54.32	67.79
14	Catullus 61–68	46.02	66.02
15	Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> (Finkelpearl)	43.12	57.52

Four texts exhibited a high proportion of words from the *Diederich 300* list: *Gospel of John* (76.6%), *38 Latin Stories* (69.4%), *Via Periculosa* (68.2%), and *Genesis* 37, 39–43

²⁰ There is little correlation between word length and the other measures of lexical difficulty — e.g., percentage of words outside the *Diederich 1500* ($r = 0.106$) and Log TTR ($r = 0.219$); since the effect of longer word length on Latin comprehension has not been studied, it would be premature to place too much weight on this measure.

²¹ We use the *Diederich 1500* (84% coverage) for the measure of *Lexical Sophistication* (see below).

(66.0%), while three others contained a far lower percentage of words from the most common Latin vocabulary: Vergil (48.8%), Catullus' long poems (46.0%), and Apuleius (43.1%). When examining texts with a high percentage of words from the DCC list, seven texts cleared the threshold of having more than 80% of their vocabularies drawn from high frequency words. The *Gospel of John* (86.8%) and *38 Latin Stories* (86.4%) again led the way. Five other texts surpassed the 80% threshold: *OLC 1–10* (82.2%), Eutropius (81.1%), Caesar (80.4%), *Fabulae Faciles* (80.2%), and *Via Periculosa* (80.0%). The poetic texts and Roman novels contained a below average percentage of the high-frequency words on the DCC list: Vergil (71.4%), Catullus 1–60 (71.0%), Petronius (67.8%), and Catullus' long poems (66.0%). Apuleius was a further outlier in the category (57.5%).

6.3 Lexical Sophistication. As a measure of their lexical sophistication or rareness, we calculated the percentage of words (excluding proper names) in our fifteen Latin texts that fall outside the *Diederich 1500* list (84% coverage for the texts in his sample).

Table 4. Lexical Sophistication in Sample Texts

Rank	Title	% Total Words outside <i>Diederich 1500</i> (excluding Proper Names)
1	<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	7.41
2	<i>Vulgate, Gospel of John 1–8</i>	7.57
3	Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	7.58
4	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed. 1–10</i>	9.05
5	Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , "Hercules" (12–56)	13.17
6	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed. 24–31</i>	13.50
7	Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	13.70
8	<i>Genesis 37, 39–43</i> (Story of Joseph)	14.43
9	Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	14.75
10	Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	18.68
11	Catullus 69–116	20.30
12	Catullus 1–60	23.58
13	Catullus 61–68	23.72
14	Petronius 26–38, 41–49	26.32
15	Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> (Finkelpearl)	33.64

Unsurprisingly, the Latin novels and the poetic texts revealed the greatest lexical sophistication and included a large percentage of words not found in *Diederich*: Apuleius (33.6%), Petronius (26.3%), Catullus 61–68 (23.7%), Catullus 1–60 (23.6%), Catullus 69–116 (20.3%) and Vergil (18.7%). Appropriately, first-year and intermediate texts limited their use of "sophisticated" words "beyond *Diederich*" to 15% of their total words or less: *38 Latin Stories* (7.4%), the *Gospel of John* (7.6%), Eutropius (7.6%) and *OLC 1–10* (9.1%) showed the least lexical sophistication, with two modern texts — *Fabulae Faciles* (13.2%), *OLC 24–31* (13.5%) and *Via Periculosa* (13.7%) — in the next group, and two ancient works, *Genesis* (14.4%) and Caesar (14.8%), at the higher end of the range among the intermediate prose texts.

Because of the level of historical and cultural knowledge required to process frequent proper names, we compared our standard measure of lexical sophistication with one that included proper names. The absolute lexical sophistication of most texts remained similar, with the typical text gaining 4–6% of “sophisticated” vocabulary. Only Eutropius saw its ranking change appreciably. Because of its high number of unique proper names, Eutropius displayed a much higher degree of lexical sophistication when proper names were included (23.5% vs. 7.6%).

6.4 Lexical Density. Lexical density tracks the number of lexical (or content) words that are the primary carriers of meaning — nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs — divided by the total number of words in a text (Ure 1971; Read 2000). A text with a high lexical density has higher propositional content and so is likely more difficult to comprehend.

Table 5. Lexical Density in Sample Texts

Rank	Title	Density Score
1	<i>Gospel of John</i> 1–8	59.75
2	<i>Genesis</i> 37, 39–43 (Story of Joseph)	67.66
3	Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	69.56
4	Catullus 69–116	71.75
5	Catullus 1–60	71.78
6	Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , "Hercules" (12–56)	72.08
7	Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	73.10
8	<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	73.55
9	Petronius 26–38, 41–49	73.63
10	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 24–31	75.17
11	Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	77.00
12	Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	77.17
13	Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> (Finkelpearl)	77.73
14	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 1–10	78.33
15	Catullus 61–68	79.00

All fifteen sample texts surpassed Ure’s benchmark for written texts (40%), ranging from the two Vulgate texts (59.7% and 67.7%), Caesar (69.6%), and Catullus’s polymetrics and epigrams (71.8%) at the lower (i.e., less dense and so more readable) end of the distribution compared to Eutropius (77.0%), Vergil (77.2%), Apuleius (77.7%), *OLC* 1–10 (78.3%) and Catullus 61–68 (79.0%) at the higher end. It is not surprising that Latin texts exhibit such high lexical density. First, Latin typically uses pronouns only for emphasis and indicates the subject in the verb ending. And second, Latin case usage, especially the genitive, dative, and ablative, reduces the need for prepositions.²² Yet studies have not shown

²² The minimization of pronouns and prepositions explains the unexpectedly high lexical density of the stories in the first ten chapters of the *Oxford Latin Course for College*, since prepositions and conjunctions are rare in the first few chapters and pronouns are only formally introduced in Chs. 6 and 7.

a correlation between the lexical density of written texts and their readability. In studies of lexical density in student writing, the results do not demonstrate a significant relationship between the proportion of content words and the quality of essays (Cheryl 1995; Kalantari and Gholami 2017; Linnarud 1986; Vidakovic and Barker 2009). Similarly, To, Fan, and Thomas (2013) reported no strong link between lexical density and readability. Thus, it is unclear whether the lexical density results in this study suggest a meaningful relationship between this metric and the readability of the Latin texts.

6.5 Lexical Variation. In attempting to measure the lexical variation or diversity of the fifteen texts in our sample corpus, this study employed four common methods for calculating the Type-Token Ratio: traditional TTR, Root TTR, Log TTR, and Corrected TTR. Traditional TTR displayed the expected bias towards longer texts.

Table 6. Lexical Variation of Sample Texts (ranked by average of methods)

Rank	Title	TTR	RootTTR	CTTR	LogTTR
1	Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	0.11	5.66	4.00	0.72
2	<i>Gospel of John</i>	0.11	8.28	5.86	0.72
3	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed. 1–10</i>	0.18	11.37	8.04	0.79
4	<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	0.21	14.71	10.40	0.82
5	Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	0.17	15.41	10.89	0.80
6	<i>Genesis 37, 39–43</i> (Story of Joseph)	0.22	13.99	9.90	0.82
7	Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , "Hercules" (12–56)	0.22	15.00	10.61	0.82
8	Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	0.26	15.36	10.86	0.84
9	<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed. 24–31</i>	0.28	18.17	12.85	0.85
10	Catullus 69–116	0.39	17.97	12.71	0.88
11	Catullus 1–60	0.34	22.71	16.06	0.87
12	Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	0.32	23.14	16.36	0.87
13	Petronius 26–38, 41–49	0.34	22.85	16.16	0.87
14	Catullus 61–68	0.32	25.46	18.00	0.87
15	Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> (FinkelpEARL)	0.42	28.38	20.07	0.90

According to the three measures that attempt to compensate for text length, the texts that exhibited the greatest lexical variation were the poetic texts, Petronius, and Apuleius, although Catullus 69–116 showed less lexical diversity than the other texts in this group according to Root TTR and Corrected TTR. At the other end of the scale, *Via Periculosa* and the *Gospel of John* far outstripped the other texts in how little lexical variation was present. In other words, *Via Periculosa* kept its promise to shelter vocabulary and provide students numerous repetitions of the words in the story, while the hymn-like opening of the *Gospel of John* produced a high percentage of repeated words. The various measurements showed some disagreement regarding the lexical diversity of *Genesis*, *Fabulae Faciles*, and Caesar. According to Root TTR and Corrected TTR, *Genesis* (3475 words) demonstrated less lexical diversity than *Fabulae Faciles* (4541 words) and Caesar (8262 words). Yet Log TTR places *Genesis* on par with *Fabulae Faciles* and as more lexically diverse than Caesar. Similarly, in Root TTR and Corrected TTR, Catullus 69–116—at just 2149 words, the shortest text in our sample corpus—exhibits less lexical diversity than the other Catullan texts as well as Vergil and Petronius. For the texts in our sample, Log TTR seems to provide

less information about degrees of lexical variation than the other measures. Aside from *Via Periculosa* and the *Gospel of John*, Log TTR clusters the introductory and intermediate texts into one narrow band, and Petronius and the poetic texts into a second, with Apuleius as a slight outlier beyond this second band.

6.6 Composite Average. Table 7 compiles the rankings of texts in our sample corpus and generates a Composite Average of each text’s ranking across our five key measures of lexical complexity.

Table 7. Compiled Rankings for Sample Texts and Composite Average

Title	Word Length	Word Frequency	Lexical Sophistication	Lexical Density	Lexical Variation	Composite Average
<i>Gospel of John</i>	2	1	3	1	2	1.8
<i>38 Latin Stories</i>	4	2	1	8	5	3.8
Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	1	5	7	7	1	4.2
<i>Genesis 37, 39–43</i>	7	7	8	2	4	5.6
<i>Oxford Latin Course 1–10</i>	6	4	4	14	3	6.2
Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	13	6	9	3	7	7.2
Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	12	3	2	11	8	7.6
Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> 12–56	14	7	5	6	6	7.6
Catullus 69–116	3	10	11	4	10	7.6
Catullus 1–60	5	11	12	5	11	8.8
<i>Oxford Latin Course 24–31</i>	11	9	6	10	9	9
Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	10	11	10	12	12	11
Petronius 26–38, 41–49	8	13	14	9	13	11.4
Catullus 61–68	9	14	13	15	14	13
Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> (Finkelpearl)	15	15	15	13	15	14.6

The Compiled Rankings (Table 7) allows a reader to grasp the relative difficulties of the sample texts according to different lexical measures and to observe which of these texts consistently manifest scores towards the easier end of the distribution (e.g., the *Gospel of John*), which manifest scores towards the more difficult (e.g., Petronius, Apuleius, Vergil), as well those texts that received inconsistent scores and so are “easier” by some measures but more “difficult” by others (e.g., *Oxford Latin Course*, *College* Chs. 24–31 or Catullus 69–116). This Composite Average, however, has several limitations. Since these rankings are relative, the insights are limited to our sample of texts: it would not be possible to compare a text outside our sample with these data. Moreover, the rankings obscure the true differences in given measures between texts. For example, the difference in lexical sophistication between the first and second ranked texts is only 0.1% but between the fourth and fifth it is 4.1%. It also gives equal weight to each measure.

7. *LexR*: A New Lexical Readability Score for Latin Texts

To facilitate further research on the readability of these and other Latin texts, we sought to establish a new measurement of lexical readability that could be generated for any Latin text for which the requisite textual data were available. Using the lexical data from our sample corpus of fifteen texts it was possible to construct such a measure: *Mulligan's LexR*. To create *LexR* we took the significant measurements identified in this study and subjected them to *Principal Component Analysis* (PCA). PCA is a statistical procedure that takes multiple variables or characteristics and combines them into a single score on a 12-point scale (-6 to +6), while retaining as much information about the differences between the texts as possible.²³ For ease of comprehension, we then converted PCA's default 12-point scale to a more intuitive 10-point scale with 0 indicating minimal and 10 maximal lexical difficulty.²⁴

$$\text{LexR} = ((\text{mean word length} \times 0.457) + (\% \text{ outside Diederich 300} \times 0.063) + (\% \text{ outside DCC} \times 0.076) + (\% \text{ outside Diederich 1500} \times 0.092) + (\text{Log TTR} \times 0.312) + (\text{Root TTR} \times 0.143) - 11.7) \times 0.833$$

Where, -11.7 is the constant to set base score at 0; the coefficient 0.833 converts the score to a 10-point scale.²⁵

Table 8. *LexR* Scores for Sample Texts

Title	<i>LexR</i> Score
<i>Vulgate, Gospel of John</i> 1–8	1.1
Olimpi, <i>Via Periculosa</i>	2.0
38 Latin Stories	2.4
<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 1–10	3.1
<i>Vulgate, Genesis</i> 37, 39–43 (Story of Joseph)	3.5
Ritchie, <i>Fabulae Faciles</i> , "Hercules" (12–56)	3.6
Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i> Books 1 & 3	3.8
Caesar, <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> Book 1	4.2
<i>Oxford Latin Course, College Ed.</i> 24–31	4.7
Catullus 69–116	5.0
Catullus 1–60	6.2
Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> Book 1	6.5
Petronius 26–38, 41–49	6.8
Catullus 61–68	7.6

²³ Because research on the relative impact of these different measures of lexical difficulty on the comprehension of *Latin* has not yet been undertaken, we did not deem it appropriate to generate the coefficients for *LexR* ourselves but instead allowed these to be created algorithmically via PCA.

²⁴ We believe that almost all real-world Latin texts will fall within *LexR*'s standard range of 0 to 10; but theoretically texts with greater or lesser scores are possible; for example, a long text consisting of a single, repeated high-frequency word (e.g., the preposition "a" (*ab*) would have a score of -9.5; a text comprising thousands of lengthy words, each used only once and none of which is found in *Diederich 1500* would have a score of 25.5.

²⁵ The precise methods for determining these factors are described in Section 5; the Primary Component Analysis excluded Corrected TTR from the calculation because it is collinear to Root TTR (i.e., it yields same information but on a different scale) and so does not contribute to creating a differential scoring of the texts. We also excluded Lexical Density because of the lack of evidence that it is correlated with reading difficulty (see above) and traditional TTR because of the different lengths of our sample texts and the known bias of traditional TTR against shorter texts.

These results suggest that *LexR* offers a mechanism for distilling the significant measures of lexical complexity discussed in this study into a single, informative, integrated score that provides a sense of the comparative lexical complexity, and so difficulty, of texts. Nevertheless, it is important to reiterate that *LexR* quantifies only one axis of textual difficulty. A reader may not necessarily find a text with a lower *LexR* score easier to read, since the overall accessibility of a text depends on a matrix of factors including its syntax, pragmatics, and assumed cultural background knowledge. Nor is it possible, at this point, to fully characterize how the scale of *LexR* scores relates to the comparative difficulties of a text: that is, it seems well founded to conclude that Catullus 69–116 (5.0) is more lexically challenging than *38 Latin Stories* (2.4) and meaningfully so; but it would be premature to characterize the former as more than twice as lexically difficult as the latter.²⁶

8. Conclusions

In general, first-year texts in this study reveal less lexical complexity and a high proportion of high frequency words. Both selections of the *Oxford Latin Course* incorporate fewer high-frequency words from the *Diederich 300* than might be expected, but balance those low scores by employing a high percentage of words from the *DCC Latin Core Vocabulary* and *Diederich 1500* in the earlier chapters and the *Diederich 1500* list by the later chapters. As a result, it reveals more lexical variation than the other first-year texts, especially in the more complex later chapters. This suggests that the lexical difficulty and so the reading level of the text may increase faster than would be ideal once unadapted selections of Horace are introduced in its later chapters.

Most intermediate texts perform nearly as well as first-year texts and the *Gospel of John*, with the lowest *LexR* score of 1.1, exceeds them in many measurements. The lexical variation scores (Root TTR and CTTR) of the biblical texts are comparable to or better than *38 Latin Stories* and their level of lexical sophistication is below the mean. Although there remain questions about the correlation between lexical density and readability, it is interesting that the *Gospel of John* and the story of Joseph in *Genesis* score first and second overall (i.e., lowest) in the measure, perhaps in part because of the higher proportion of prepositions and pronouns in post-classical Latin. They likewise are more similar to the first-year texts than other classical texts in lexical variation (second and fourth, respectively); and in high frequency vocabulary: first and fourth by the *Diederich 300*; first and eighth by the DCC list. These specific results and the *LexR* scores of the *Gospel of John* (1.1) and the story of Joseph (3.5) reinforce recent suggestions that instructors might look to the Latin Vulgate and other postclassical texts as suitable bridges to classical authors (Clauss 2018; Hendrickson 2018).

Eutropius, traditionally thought to be a good school text, exhibits a mixed lexical profile that may challenge second-year students. Its *LexR* score of 3.8 placed it in the middle of our sample corpus, more like Caesar than beginner texts. Moreover, with 596 proper nouns, Eutropius includes proportionately more than twice as many proper nouns as any other text. With those proper nouns removed, the text reveals good scores in high frequency vocabulary and lexical variation. But factoring in those proper nouns, its lexical density is the third highest after only Catullus 61–68 and Vergil. In short, the density of proper nouns and the highly compressed nature of the text may lead intermediate readers to find the propositional content too challenging to manage without a solid knowledge of the major players in Roman history.

Caesar, a canonical prose text, also ranked in the middle of our sample corpus by *LexR* (4.2). While it exhibited the third lowest lexical density after the Vulgate passages, it consistently placed in the middle of our sample corpus for use of high frequency words,

²⁶ Future testing of reading comprehension and comparing with *LexR* could establish whether this scale of lexical difficulty is linear, geometric, exponential, or discontinuous.

lexical sophistication, and lexical variation. These results support its selection as one of the first advanced-level texts that a student might read. Finally, the two Roman novels and the poetic texts of Catullus and Vergil reveal the highest lexical complexity. Although they tend to have shorter words on average than narrative prose texts, they display higher lexical sophistication and lexical variation. In terms of lexical sophistication, Vergil and Catullus 69–116 exhibit slightly less lexical sophistication than the rest of Catullus, Petronius, and Apuleius. In light of their high lexical sophistication and lexical variation, as well as their *LexR* scores, this study would suggest that instructors recognize the lexical challenges of tackling Vergil (6.5), Petronius (6.8), Catullus 61–68 (7.6), and especially Apuleius (9.5)—and the extra vocabulary work that readers and instructors will have to undertake to make these texts readable.

8.1 Implications for teaching

These findings suggest the importance of teaching vocabulary intentionally at all levels of the curriculum. As discussed above, vocabulary knowledge is critical for reading comprehension: without knowing 95–98% of the words in a text, the reader will be challenged to comprehend its meaning. While incidental vocabulary learning may occur as students read these texts, explicit teaching would foreground new words and help students internalize them into their developing lexicon (Nation 2013, 97). Opportunities for involvement, clear focus, repetition, and retrieval can help students achieve higher rates of learning vocabulary. Sample activities might include classifying words (e.g., synonyms, antonyms, positive/negative connotation, living or non-living, cause and effect, cultural context), drawing and labeling pictures, producing word families from one word (e.g., *liberare*: *liber*, *liberalis*, *liberaliter*, *libertus*), creating compound words from prefixes or suffixes, completing a cloze passage with targeted words, peer teaching of new or important vocabulary, or collaborative reconstruction of a passage (see Nation 2013; Golonka et al. 2015 for more examples). The DCC list and *Diederich 1500* provide excellent targets for students as they progress from year to year.

Even the texts that reveal the least lexical complexity have words that do not appear on any list. Ideally, an instructor would try to identify the highest frequency words that do not appear on these lists for intentional vocabulary instruction. With new tools it would be possible for instructors to craft more intentional paths to vocabulary acquisition for specific texts. For the texts, textbooks, and lists in its database, *The Bridge* allows users to create vocabulary lists for a text or a selection, screening out known words or revealing the words in common between texts. Within the generated list, users can find morphological information, links to lexical resources like *Logeion* (logeion.uchicago.edu), and the frequency of the word within the text or the entire Bridge corpus to quickly identify high- (or low-) frequency words. These lists can then be filtered to focus on one or more parts of speech, among other options, and then printed or downloaded in a variety of formats. For texts not in *The Bridge*, the Perseus (www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper) and the Alpheios Projects (<https://alpheios.net/pages/tools/>) will link words to definitions, and the *Perseus Vocabulary Tool* (www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/vocablist?lang=la) will automatically generate a list of linked vocabulary, although the process yields a fair number of false returns (e.g., *edo* ‘to eat’ is listed as the 16th most popular word in *Bellum Gallicum* because of a mislemmatization of *est*). Any list created with the Perseus Tool would have to be corrected before being used as a reliable resource for teaching and reading.

Finally, to help students build their mental lexicon and be better prepared to approach intermediate and advanced historical texts, provide opportunities for extensive reading with Latin novellas (Piazza 2017) and explore medieval texts such as the Latin Vulgate, the travels of Egeria, *Apollonius King of Tyre*, Hrotsvitha’s *Dulcitus*, or *The Legend of Barlaam and Josaphat*. Likewise, simplify difficult texts by removing or replacing

some of the more difficult vocabulary or use embedded readings to help students guess the new vocabulary when they see it in the unadapted passage.²⁷

8.2 Limitations of the Present Study and Future Directions

This study provides a surface measure of the vocabulary knowledge a reader might need to approach these texts. Future studies might examine additional measures of lexical complexity such as: (1) the range of texts and genres in which a word can be found; (2) n-grams and collocations; (3) concreteness and imageability; (4) discourse features such as lexical cohesion and topic continuity from sentence to sentence; (5) the density of rare words used infrequently (e.g., the presence of hapax legomena); and (6) the number or percent of words a reader needs to reach the 95 or 98% thresholds needed for unassisted comprehension.²⁸ Moreover, since the different length of the sample texts affects the calculation of Type-Token Ratios, more work will need to be done to ascertain the best method for measuring lexical variation. One possibility would be to take repeated same-length sections of every text under analysis (e.g., word 1 to word 1000, word 2 to word 1001, etc.) to capture an average lexical variation for the text as well as measures of internal variability and slope (i.e., does a text become appreciable easier or more difficult as it unfolds). Finally, this preliminary work on lexical complexity could be complemented by analysis of syntactic features such as clause length, the number of T-units, and the number of subordinate clauses.²⁹

Since only a portion of many of the authors in our sample have been analyzed, larger samples from these authors might yield richer results. In addition to the fifteen texts analyzed here, future studies could expand the number, range, and size of texts subjected to similar analysis. Other commonly taught texts (by different authors, in different genres, and from different time-periods) should be analyzed. Ideally, these preliminary results could be the foundation for a variety of experimental studies that test how traditional measures of lexical complexity correlate to the reading comprehension of Latin — and eventually other historical languages.

Cornell College
jgruber-miller@cornellcollege.edu

Haverford College
bmulliga@haverford.edu

²⁷ For sample embedded readings, see *Tiered Reading List for Operation CAESAR* (lapis.practomime.com/index.php/operation-caesar-reading-list).

²⁸ See Vajjala and Meurers 2012; Xia et al. 2016; an “n-gram” refers to sequences of words of a given (*n*) length (e.g., *re vera; ei nomen est*).

²⁹ A “T-unit” refers to a main clause and all its subordinate clauses.

Works Cited

- Balme, Maurice, and James Morwood. 2012. *Oxford Latin Course, College Edition: Readings and Vocabulary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie, and Paul Nation. 1993. "Word Families." *International Journal of Lexicography* 6.4: 253–279. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/6.4.253>
- Belinda, C. C. 2007. *The Language of Business Studies Lectures: A Corpus-Assisted Analysis*. The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Beyer, Brian. 2008. "Yale University Press to Publish RU Master's Thesis." Rutgers Classics Department Blog. 2 July 2008.
- Carroll, J. B. 1964. *Language and Thought*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chall, J. S. 1958. *Readability: An Appraisal of Research and Application*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Bureau of Educational Research.
- Chall, J. S., and E. Dale. 1995. *Readability Revisited, the New Dale-Chall Readability Formula*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Clauss, James J. 2018. "Teaching the Old and New Testaments to Students of Greek and Latin Simultaneously with Numerous and Fascinating Outcomes." *Teaching Classical Languages* 10.1: 99–125.
- Coxhead, A. 2000. "A new academic word list." *TESOL Quarterly* 34.2: 213–38. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>
- Dale, E. and J. S. Chall, 1949. "The Concept of Readability." *Elementary English* 26: 23.
- Diederich, Paul. 1939. *The Frequency of Latin Words and Their Endings*. Diss. Chicago.
- DuBay, W. H. 2004. *The Principles of Readability*. Costa Mesa: Impact Information.
- Finkelppearl, E. 2012. *An Apuleius Reader: Selections from the Metamorphoses*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.
- Francese, Christopher. 2018. "Core Vocabulary." Dickinson College Commentaries.
- Golonka, Ewa, Anita Bowles, Noah Silbert, Debra Kramasz, Charles Blake, and Tim Buckwalter. 2015. "The Role of Context and Cognitive Effort in Vocabulary Learning: A Study of Intermediate-Level Learners of Arabic." *Modern Language Journal* 99.1: 19–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12191>
- Goodman, J., P. Dale, P. Li. 2008. "Does Frequency Count? Parental Input and the Acquisition of Vocabulary." *Journal of Child Language* 35: 515–31. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000907008641>
- Grabe, William, and Fredricka Stoller. 2011. *Teaching and Researching Reading*. 2nd ed. Harlow, UK: Pearson/Longman.
- Guiraud, P. 1960. *Problèmes et méthodes de la statistique linguistique*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: D. Reidl.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. *Spoken and written language*. Melbourne, AUS: Deakin University Press.
- Hendrickson, T. 2018. "Why So Few of Us Teach Neo-Latin and Why More Of Us Should." *Eidolon* 12 March 2018. <<https://eidolon.pub/why-so-few-of-us-teach-neo-latin-3f85eb1984b6>>
- Herdan, G. 1964. *Quantitative Linguistics*. London: Butterworths.
- Hirsch, D., and I. S. P. Nation. 1992. "What Vocabulary Size is Needed to Read Unsimplified Texts for Pleasure?" *Reading in a Foreign Language* 8: 689–96.
- Hu, M., and I. S. P. Nation. 2000. "Unknown Vocabulary Density and Reading Comprehension." *Reading in a Foreign Language* 13.1: 403–30.
- Jockers, Matthew. 2013. *Macroanalysis: Digital Methods and Literary History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. <https://doi.org/10.5406/illinois/9780252037528.001.0001>
- Johansson, Victoria. 2008. "Lexical Diversity and Lexical Density in Speech and Writing: A Developmental Perspective." *Lund University. Department of Linguistics and Phonetics Working Papers* 53: 61–79.

- Kalantari, Reza, and Javad Gholami. 2017. "Lexical Complexity Development from Dynamic Systems Theory Perspective: Lexical Density, Diversity, and Sophistication." *International Journal of Instruction* 10.4: 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1041a>
- Kirtland, John Copeland, ed. 1903. *Ritchie's Fabulae Faciles: A First Latin Reader*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Kyle, Kristopher, and Scott Crossley. 2015. "Automatically Assessing Lexical Sophistication: Indices, Tools, Findings, and Application." *TESOL Quarterly* 49.4: 757–86.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.194>
- Laufer, Batia. 1989. "What Percentage of Text-Lexis is Essential for Comprehension?" In *Special Language: From Humans to Thinking Machines*, edited by C. Lauren and M. Nordman, 316–23. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Laufer, Batia. 1992. "How Much Lexis is Necessary for Reading Comprehension? In *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*, edited by P. J. L. Arnaud and H. Béjoint, 126–32. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-12396-4_12
- Laufer, Batia. 1997. "The Lexical Plight in Second Language Reading: Words You Don't Know, Words You Think You Know and Words You Can't Guess." In *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*, edited by J. Coady and T. Huckin, 20–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524643.004>
- Laufer, Batia, and Tami Aviad-Levitzky. 2017. "What Type of Vocabulary Knowledge Predicts Reading Comprehension: Word Meaning Recall or Word Meaning Recognition?" *Modern Language Journal* 101.4: 729-41.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12431>
- Laufer, Batia, and I. S. P. Nation. 1995. "Vocabulary Size and Use: Lexical Richness in L2 Written Production." *Applied Linguistics* 16.3: 307–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.3.307>
- Laufer, Batia, and Geke Ravenhorst-Kalovski. 2010. "Lexical Threshold Revisited: Lexical Text Coverage, Learners' Vocabulary Size and Reading Comprehension." *Reading in a Foreign Language* 22.1: 15–30.
"Lexical Density." 2019. *Analyze My Writing*.
- Linnarud, M. 1986. *Lexis in Composition: A Performance Analysis of Swedish Learners' Written English*. Lund: Sweden: CWK Gleerup.
- Lodge, Gonzales. 1907. *The Vocabulary of High School Latin: Being the Vocabulary of Caesar's Gallic War, Books I–V; Cicero Against Catiline, On Pompey's Command, For the Poet Archias; Vergil's Aeneid, Books I–VI; Arranged Alphabetically and in the Order of Occurrence*. New York. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4385719>
- Lu, Xiaofei. 2012. "The Relationship of Lexical Richness to the Quality of ESL Learners' Oral Narratives." *Modern Language Journal* 96.2: 190–208.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01232.1.x>
- Malvern, David, Brian Richards, Ngoni Chipere, and Pilar Durán. 2004. *Lexical diversity and language development: quantification and assessment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511804>
- McCarthy, Philip M., and Scott Jarvis. 2007. "Voecd: a theoretical and empirical evaluation." *Language Testing* 24.4: 59–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532207080767>
- Muccigrosso, John. 2004. "Frequent Vocabulary in Latin Instruction." *Classical World* 97.4: 409–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4352875>
- Nation, I. S. P. 2006. "How Large a Vocabulary is Needed for Reading and Listening?" *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 63.1: 59–82. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59>
- _____. 2013. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656>

- Olimpi, Andrew. 2017. *Via Periculosa: A Latin Novella*. Dacula, GA: Comprehensible Classics Press.
- Piazza, John. 2017. "Beginner Latin Novels: A General Overview." *Teaching Classical Languages* 8.2: 154–66.
- Pike, L. 1979. *An Analysis of Alternative Item Formats for Testing English as a Foreign Language*. TOEFL Research Reports No. 2. Princeton: Educational Testing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.1979.tb01174.x>
- Read, John. 2000. *Assessing Vocabulary*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732942>
- Ritchie, Francis. 1884. *Fabulae Faciles: A First Latin Reader*. London: Rivingtons.
- Schmitt, Norbert, Tom Cobb, Marlise Horst, and Diane Schmitt. 2015. "How Much Vocabulary is Needed to Use English? Replication of van Zeeland and Schmitt (2012), Nation (2006) and Cobb (2007)." *Language Teaching* 50.2: 212–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000075>
- Schmitt, Norbert, Xiangying Jiang, and William Grabe. 2011. "The Percentage of Words Known in a Text and Reading Comprehension." *Modern Language Journal* 95.1: 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01146.x>
- Schoonen, Rob, Jan Hulstijn, and Bart Bossers. 1998. "Metacognitive and Language Specific Knowledge in Native and Foreign Language Reading Comprehension: An Empirical Study among Dutch Students in Grades 6, 8 and 10." *Language Learning* 48.1: 71–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00033>
- Shrum, Judith L., and Eileen W. Glisan. 2015. *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction*. 5th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Staehr, L. S. 2008. "Vocabulary size and the skills of listening, reading and writing." *The Language Learning Journal* 36.2: 139–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730802389975>
- To, Vinh, Si Fan, and Damon Thomas. 2013. "Lexical Density and Readability: A Case Study of English Textbooks." *Internet Journal of Language, Culture and Society* 37: 61–71.
- Turk, C., and J. Kirkman. 1989. *Effective Writing: Improving Scientific, Technical, and Business Communication*. 2nd ed. London: E and F. N. Spon.
- Ure, J. 1971. "Lexical density and register differentiation." In *Applications of Linguistics*, edited by G. E. Perren and J. L. M. Trim, 443–452. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vajjala, Sowmya, and Detmar Meurers. 2012. "On Improving the Accuracy of Readability Classification Using Insights from Second Language Acquisition." The 7th Workshop on the Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications, June 3–8, 2012. Montreal: Association of Computational Linguistics. 163–173.
- Van Zeeland, H. & N. Schmitt. 2013. "Lexical Coverage in L1 and L2 Listening Comprehension: The Same or Different from Reading Comprehension?" *Applied Linguistics* 34.4: 457–79. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams074>
- Vanderpool, Emma, and Matthew Katsenes, eds. 2016. *Eutropius, Breviarium Historiae Romanae*. Monmouth College.
- Venditti, E. 2021. "Using Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom to Enhance Language Proficiency." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 22.43: 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2058631021000039>
- Wallace, Daniel B. 2013. "Reading through the Greek New Testament." Daniel B. Wallace Blog. 29 Dec 2013.
- Xia, Menglin, Ekaterina Kochmar, and Ted Briscoe. 2016. "Text Readability Assessment for Second Language Learners." *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Innovative*

Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications. San Diego. 16 June 2016.

Association for Computational Linguistics. 12–22.

<https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W16-0502>

Yu, Guoxing. 2010. “Lexical Diversity in Writing and Speaking Task Performances.”
Applied Linguistics 31.2: 236–59. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp024>

Zamanian, Mostafa, and Pooneh Heydari. 2012. “Readability of Texts: State of the Art.”
Theory and Practice in Language Studies 2.1: 43–53.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.1.43-53>

The Utility and Representational Opportunity of Latin Novellas

TERESA RAMSBY

Abstract: This paper argues for the use of the Latin novella in Latin, educational contexts, particularly within the K-12 classroom. The design of Latin novellas corresponds to features associated with Comprehensible Input: offering a limited and repeated vocabulary, and providing compelling narratives. The many Latin novellas now published broaden the opportunity for narrative selection by Latin students, giving students a choice in what they read. Moreover, many narratives feature central characters that increase the representation of layers of society typically found in Latin textbooks or in the ancient, classical sources. By way of example, *Cloelia*, by Ellie Arnold, receives focus in this paper.

Key Words: Latin novella, Comprehensible Input, vocabulary, compelling, choice, representation, *Cloelia*.

The Latin novella has been receiving much attention in pedagogical circles recently, as demonstrated by a number of recent panels and articles on their use.¹ As I will argue below, the Latin novella resolves at least two problematic issues that have persistently plagued efforts in teaching Latin: the one-size-fits-all nature of narratives in Latin textbooks, and the focus in Latin textbooks on the hegemonic and male-dominated nature of Roman society and the nature of power within that society. Professor Jacqueline (Jacqui) Carlon, our honorand, cares deeply about issues of accessibility and equity in the Latin classroom, and her advocacy for those things has, to some extent, led to the development of this new resource.² These works, authored by writers with advanced understanding of the language, offer the possibility for students to read something that interests them in Latin, and allow students to read narratives from the perspectives of people too frequently unheard in authentic Roman sources. The Latin novella thus contributes to an experience reading Latin that can be individualized and enlightening, rather than assigned and predictable. In this piece, I will address the nature and utility of the Latin novella, and then I will discuss one novella that features a woman and her story in a way that has influenced later works in this genre: *Cloelia* by Ellie Arnold.

For a very long time, Latin instructors of all levels have been discussing the problems students face when they progress from the Latin stories or passages in their textbooks to the Latin written by ancient Roman writers.³ The publishing industry's solution to that problem tends to be new textbooks with new storylines that attempt to grant the student a re-configured opportunity to experience Latin through reading, one that will, allegedly, better prepare them for Roman literature. One of the major problems with textbooks is that,

¹ John Piazza, in his 2017 article, offers an extensive justification for using “beginner novels” in the Latin classroom, and provides short reviews of the novellas available at that time. The panel “Novellas: Aligning Purpose and Audience” took place at the 2021 annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England, and three papers from that panel were published in *Classical Outlook*: Conway (2021), Piantaggini (2021), and Vanderpool (2021b).

² I commend Jacqui Carlon for all her outstanding work as a mentor and teacher for so many Latin teachers as they learned about and prepared for their careers. Her mentoring and advice over the last decade have been incredibly helpful to me as well: *gratias maximas, carissima*. I also wish to thank Peter Barrios Lech for his patient work in organizing this volume, and Aaron Seider for his work as editor of *NECJ*, bringing this issue to publication.

³ Kenneth Kitchell's 2000 article addresses many aspects of this, with focus on the cultural knowledge required to read any Roman authored text. Jacqui Carlon also addresses this in her 2015 article. Another relevant piece is the 1993 article by Dexter Hoyos “Decoding of Sight-Reading? Problems with Understanding Latin.” There are many articles and blog sites addressing this issue, and I point the reader to Katharine Russell's 2018 article which summarizes many of the issues and provides key bibliography.

however many passages they include, the amount of text and the storyline is bound by the book itself. Students can read ahead if they want to, but they will have to read the same text with their classmates eventually. Teachers can innovate on the story and offer texts of their own, but most teachers do not have time to do this regularly or in a way that satisfies individual students' interests. Consider also that, by contrast, the modern language teacher has an almost unlimited number of textual resources – magazines, comic books, newspapers – in the target language, and can easily provide opportunities for students to find something interesting to them; they do not have to *create* the texts their students read for pleasure or interest.⁴

Latin classrooms in particular suffer from this problem of a textbook-controlled narrative that not everyone will enjoy. There are surely cases where no one in the class enjoys a particular reading in the textbook, and other in-class work becomes preferable to reading the story on offer. Even in cases where most or all students enjoy a textbook narrative, there is little opportunity to branch out beyond it. A teacher may find a passage from a Roman author that is level-appropriate, but then faces the problem of scaffolding for students the challenges of Roman literature, with all its cultural, historical, and linguistic baggage. Granting students space within the class for independent reading of Latin, or “free voluntary reading” (FVR), is a method that encourages students to think of Latin as something they can enjoy individually and privately, as well as within the academic context. The Latin novella can serve as an excellent bridge between the grammar-relevant texts in the textbook, and the concept of reading Latin out of interest, or even for fun, as Emma Vanderpool argues throughout her recent article (2021b). Reading a two-line poem by Catullus with the teacher's aid and commentary, as comprehensible as that may be, may not be as satisfying or confidence-building as reading alone, in Latin, a chapter-book with illustrations on Psyche and Cupid (Olimpi, 2017).

The notion that a narrative used in learning contexts should be comprehensible and compelling is based in common sense, of course, but is also linked to findings in linguistics research of several recent decades. In her groundbreaking 2013 article, Jacqui Carlon introduced many in Classics to the researchers in applied linguistics who have promoted significant innovations in methods of instruction related to second language acquisition. Key ideas that emerge from the research is that students learning a language need to acquire a core vocabulary to read fluently, and that they continue to acquire vocabulary through reading.⁵ This branch of applied linguistics, dubbed Second Language Acquisition (SLA), argues for methods conducive to the acquisition of vocabulary tied to meanings of words in their relationship to other words, rather than memorization of individual words in a list. In a Latin class, such methods include the repeated exposure of vocabulary through spoken Latin, where phrases and simple sentences are repeated frequently, and the consistent use of Latin texts that students can read proficiently, with few glosses or notes.⁶ This process of guiding students to develop a core vocabulary, that then leads to higher proficiency in reading, is called “comprehensible input,” or “CI,” and texts that meet this criteria of CI-related methods contain a high volume of known vocabulary words (95% to 98% in one recent finding), making them ideal for proficient reading.⁷ Emma Vanderpool, an author of several novellas, states it clearly, “a complicated narrative in the target language is of no use if students cannot read it” (2021a, 61).

Another idea explored in these studies is that material selected for student-reading be compelling, a simple enough concept: if students enjoy reading the material, they are likely

⁴ See, for example, the 1999 book by Paul Sanderson on using newspapers in the language classroom.

⁵ See Stephen Krashen's 1989 article for articulation of the “input hypothesis.”

⁶ There are many resources on these methods created by teachers and practitioners, and I point the interested reader to the helpful and expansive list that Justin Slocum Bailey offers on his site, *Indwelling Language*: <http://indwellinglanguage.com/limen-a-latin-teaching-portal/#resources>.

⁷ For a recent study on the correlation between reading proficiency and vocabulary knowledge, see Schmitt, *et al.*, 2011.

to do more of it. The sheer variety of subjects covered by the novellas that are available, and emerging in increasing numbers, makes it possible for students to find something compelling to them, provided that they have access to the novellas in their classroom or school library.⁸ Most novella authors carefully correlate their vocabularies to frequently used words in classical Latin texts.⁹ Even first-year Latin students should be able to find a Latin novella that corresponds to their vocabulary knowledge and proficiency in reading. The more compelling the novella is, the more willingly the student will meet the challenge of new vocabulary, selectively glossed in the margins of novellas, for the sake of continuing the story.

Tiered readings is another effective method to bridge the gap between textbook readings and ancient Roman writings. Tiered readings are passages from a text that have been simplified for easier comprehension.¹⁰ The teacher then has the option to present successively more complex versions of the text until the students can comprehend the original text: this is a method that I use to some degree in my undergraduate seminars.¹¹ A problem with tiered reading, however, is that even simplified texts by Cicero, Caesar, and Vergil, authors long taught in the advanced Latin classroom, still require much foreknowledge and context. Students are unlikely to read a passage from the *Aeneid* and understand, on their own, the sweep and significance of the story's plot, or the literary and cultural history that underlies the epic poem.¹² If we want students to read Latin on their own, thereby increasing their proficiency and comfort level reading the language, we need texts that are comprehensible and compelling, and that can be appreciated in solitary reading.

One may have legitimate questions about the quality of the Latin within the novellas on offer, and, as in any literary genre, there are texts of greater and lesser quality, depending on how one judges quality. As Daniel Conway demonstrates in his recent article, metrics of syntactical simplicity, complexity, or narrative quality are difficult to establish, even within a single author's collection (2021). The notion of a novella's "*latinitas*," a word popular among practitioners of spoken Latin, refers to the vocabulary and structure of the Latin used: the extent of English-cognate usage in the Latin (rather than words classical authors would use), the Latin's adherence to the syntactical patterns, modes of expression, and grammatical rules of classical sources or later Latin sources. I consider these judgments to be of academic import, essentially, and I encourage the reader to remember that Latin novellas are meant to provide engaging narratives in Latin for young readers. I have read several of these novellas, and I have not yet found a book with multiple, egregious errors in the Latin – only the occasional lapse. The worst I have seen in a Latin novella is repetitiveness of ideas and words, in which case the author is using a limited vocabulary and simple syntax for the sake of a lower-proficiency reader, which can prohibit a variety of expression. Even this is not necessarily an impediment to the beginning Latin student: as a parent, I recall the long-listed repetitiveness in books by Theodor Geisel (Dr. Seuss) that delighted the young reader in my household, and frustrated only the parent reading the book aloud for the twentieth (or hundredth) time. The significance of relative proficiency, and to what extent that shapes

⁸ The Latin teacher interested in creating a Latin novella library might seek out the numerous grants made available for educational resources by regional organizations for the promotion of Latin, such as the CANE educational grant: https://caneweb.org/new/?page_id=35. Lance Piantaggini maintains a list of available Latin novellas on his website *Magister P.*: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bF8hZuxTDtgNMSSdonEX112JJaVYqoPH7w27Oju9ETs>.

⁹ Dickinson College Commentaries provides a well-known and much cited core vocabulary list: <https://dcc.dickinson.edu/vocab/core-vocabulary>. See Emma Vanderpool 2021a, 62-64, on her selection of vocabulary for a novella on gladiators (2021c) by aligning it to gladiator narratives in the *Cambridge Latin Course* (Stage 14) and *Ecce Romani* (Chapter 48).

¹⁰ See Lindsay Sears and Kevin Ballestrini (2019) on the method, its application, and its justification.

¹¹ For example, in my undergraduate Ovid course, I have students read several stories in the simplified versions provided by the useful textbook by Christine Albricht (2019), with focus on key original passages from the story. Using this method, I concentrate their efforts of long-form reading and comprehension upon stories and passages that are particularly packed with literary artistry and material for analysis.

¹² See Kitchell (2000) for more on this problem.

perspective and judgment upon a narrative, is important to keep in mind – early Latin readers are less likely to judge a narrative for issues related to *latinitas*, and more likely to judge it for the story it presents.

Another problem shared by most textbook storylines and authentic texts is that they suffer from a narrowness of perspectives. In their attempt to be true to historical reality, and in their justifiable need to satisfy the refereed process of academic publishing houses, even textbooks that feature invented, fictional narratives tend to stay close to the known facts regarding social and political dynamics of the ancient world. By contrast, the five-part “Percy Jackson” series by Rick Riordan, loosely based on Greek mythology, is incredibly popular among young readers; yet, as critics have noted, an educated reader would quickly note the inaccuracies and liberties that abound in these novels.¹³ That’s just the point though: students read Riordan’s books because they are loosely connected to things that interest them in their academic classes, but that spark their imagination in a different way.

Here enters the utility of the Latin novella: marketed as they are, slim paperbacks, often with intriguing pictures on the cover (and sometimes including many illustrations throughout the book), covering topics that tend to be relevant to the ancient world (mythology, history, daily life), these novellas present an author’s imaginative perspective on a topic, expressed in Latin. There is a presumption that novellas dealing with historical topics will treat the topic appropriately, and they do, but perhaps with a twist – such as Emma Vanderpool’s *Surus: Fabula Belli et Elephatorum*, where Hannibal’s journey over the Alps is told from the perspective of not just the great Carthaginian commander, but also of his favorite elephant and the elephant’s trainer. The novella on a legend or myth, not bound by historical verity, typically tends to preserve the basic structure of the tale, but may bring greater focus to the mindset and actions of the principal characters, as seen, for example, in many of Andrew Olimpi’s novellas.¹⁴ Given the range of reader interests and the extent of knowledge we have about the ancient world, there is really no limit to the number of stories and approaches that can emerge within this genre.¹⁵ The Latin novella, therefore, plays an essential role in providing a platform for concentrated reading and learning in a way that is engaging and appropriate to the age-level and interests of the student.

The possibility for focus on women and their perspectives is an enticing aspect of the Latin novella, given that our access to literature written by women of the ancient Greek and Roman worlds is profoundly limited. There have been incisive critiques of the way slaves, and notably slave-women, are represented in many Latin textbooks, and similar complaints have been made about the way women are depicted.¹⁶ The dominant textbooks tend to depict the narrow realities of women’s lives in the ancient world where women are mothers or slaves, and girls are sisters, future brides, or slaves, and the more interesting narratives are driven by male characters. There are exceptions, as seen in the recent *Suburani* textbook, and in *Disce!* by Kenneth Kitchell and Thomas Sienkewicz, where women are frequently at the center of the narrative. Again, however, we return to the problem of the monolithic, one-size-fits-all narrative. The Latin novella, with its capability to present myriad characters within myriad plot-lines, provides greater opportunity for representation.

As we know, the Roman sources extant to us are sorely lacking in representations of women, particularly those with agency, and even those representations available to us often display ulterior authorial motives. Jacqui Carlon dedicated much of her research to the works of Pliny the Younger, and in particular his representation of the women of his social circle. Pliny makes available to us narratives of women’s deeds we would not otherwise know, but

¹³ See Rebecca Mead’s piece in *The New Yorker*, “The Percy Jackson Problem” for an astute diagnosis of the issues.

¹⁴ Andrew Olimpi provides a list of his novellas, many of them based on Greek mythology, on his site, *Comprehensible Classics*: <https://comprehensibleclassics.wordpress.com/publications/>.

¹⁵ Bolchazy Carducci has recently launched their own Latin novella series, as seen on their website: <https://www.bolchazy.com/Default.aspx>.

¹⁶ E.g.: see Kelly Dugan (2019) for an astute analysis of the problems of slave representation in Latin textbooks, and see Emily Amos (2020) on students’ perceptions of gender representation within the *Cambridge Latin Course*.

Carlson notes his portraits of women are self-serving to a great degree, a means of bolstering his self-image: “he presents an image of himself as interacting only with women of impeccable character and status,” to fashion “a portrait of the author’s best side” (2009, 220). Moreover, throughout our many Roman sources, if we seek in-depth development of character, or well-rounded attempts to explain women’s motivations, we look in vain. There is need for narratives that represent the wide range of activities and aspirations of women in ancient societies. Among modern fiction-writers in English, the re-envisioning of women in ancient texts has appeared for several decades, and since 2017 there have been at least a dozen top-selling, new volumes that re-explore women’s roles in ancient Greek and Roman myth and legend, such as the top-selling book *Circe* by Madeline Miller.¹⁷ The Latin novella provides an opportunity, therefore, to advance the interests of young people who want to learn Latin, and who want to learn about the ancient world, but who want to do so with stories that immerse them into the milieu of ancient Greece and Rome among characters with whom they can identify.

There are several Latin novellas that place female characters in the center of the narrative. Ellie Arnold wrote one of the first novellas on Cloelia, the heroine from Livy’s history (2016). Emma Vanderpool has written a novella on Amanirenas, the queen of Nubia who initially held off a Roman army attempting to expand into her territory in 25 BCE; a novella on Medusa that explores the injustice done to her by Neptune; and a novella on Eumachia, the enterprising and well-commemorated woman of Pompeii (2020). Rachel Ash has written a novella on Camilla from Vergil’s *Aeneid* with emphasis on the warrior woman’s perspective (2018). Andrew Olimpi offers us a compelling and nicely illustrated version of Psyche’s travails (2017). On the more fictional side of the spectrum, Lance Piantaggini provides a series of novellas that feature strong female central characters, such as a plebeian woman named Agrippina who secretly practices sword-fighting (2017).¹⁸ The idea here is that young readers may take delight in such content, and as they progress in their reading skills, they may find themselves increasingly interested in the challenges of reading works written by ancient or medieval or Renaissance authors.

A Latin novella worthy of analysis, and which I will dedicate the remainder of my essay to discussing, is *Cloelia: puella Romana*, written by Ellie Arnold and published in 2016. The novella presents the perspective of its protagonist Cloelia, while informing the reader of many aspects of Roman society along the way. First, however, a caveat: despite the points I made about the Latin novella being a work that students can read on their own, this novella is an example of one (and there are others) that may be more effective if guided by the teacher. *Cloelia* introduces difficult concepts regarding how virtue is designated differently for men and women in Roman society, and students may have questions about it, and benefit from teacher-led discussion. I will explain more about this below.

Arnold’s book features the heroics of Cloelia recorded in the second Book of Livy’s history (*AUC* 2.13) and in Valerius Maximus’s accounts of deeds of bravery (*de Fort.* 3.2.2). The young Cloelia leads her fellow Roman captives to freedom from a treaty-arranged hostage situation under the Etruscan king Porsenna, shortly after the Romans have expelled the Etruscan monarch Tarquinius in the (alleged) late-sixth-century BCE. Both Livy and Valerius contextualize Cloelia within the similarly brave deeds of contemporary men, Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaevola, and Livy distinguishes her courage as *virtus*, a quality typically designated to men rather than women.¹⁹ Fittingly, then, Arnold uses the majority of her novella, leading up to Cloelia’s daring escape, to develop a sophisticated concept: the means by which Cloelia might have learned about her culture, its *mores*, and the nature

¹⁷ See, for example, “50 must-read books on Classical mythology”: <https://bookriot.com/2019/03/14/classical-mythology-retellings/>.

¹⁸ Again, see Piantaggini’s ongoing list for many more titles – many of which have female protagonists: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bF8bZuxTDtgNMSSdonEX112JJaVYqoPH7w27Qju9ETs>.

¹⁹ Livy *AUC* 2.13. See Balmaceda (2017, 124-5) on the manly nature of *virtus* in general and how Cloelia merits the attribution in Livy.

of courage. Arnold depicts Cloelia's exposure to a succession of significant stories within her culture, mostly tales of Roman events, but also one Greek myth, all delivered within a domestic context. The reader thus gains multiple stories within this one novella, all of which bring focus to the notion of virtue, and how that shapes Cloelia's world-view: offering her a map for defying constructed, gendered expectations.

In the beginning of the novella, Cloelia is weaving with her mother and her mother's friend Lucretia (yes, *that* Lucretia). Her mother tells her daughter the story of Camilla from Vergil's *Aeneid*, whose death prompts a reaction of sadness from Cloelia, only to be told that in their society, women make clothes, not war. Even so, Cloelia tucks away this idea about women being brave and capable in battle. Weeks later, Cloelia's father reports terrible news – Lucretia is dead, and Rome is going to war. He tells Cloelia and her mother part of Lucretia's story, but is reluctant to reveal the terrible rape and suicide in the presence of his daughter, until his wife reminds him that in war, "*hostes scelera contra mulieres puellasque semper faciunt*" (14). Her father, therefore, tells the whole story, to which Cloelia reacts in horror, asking why Lucretia is dead, and Sextus Tarquinius, her attacker, is alive. Her mother reminds her of *puđicitia*, and explains that women of great virtue find it difficult to live if they have been so greatly dishonored. Cloelia's mother adds also that Sextus's actions violated Lucretia's vow of marriage (15: *votum matrimonii illius quoque violavit*), and that the gods are angry at any man or woman who breaks their vow, despite their agency in the matter. Cloelia's mother then follows this warning with the story of Kallisto, punished by Diana for being raped by Jupiter and, as the fearsome goddess sees it, breaking her vow of *puđicitia*; Diana asks: "*nonne tu votum mihi fecisti?*" (18). Cloelia's mother uses the story to explain that, according to Roman religious beliefs, the gods punish mortals for breaking their promises, no matter how minimal their agency may be in the process.

These are harsh lessons for a young reader to encounter, but we know from our sources that Romans organized their society, *mores*, and laws around gendered aspects of virtue, many of which were misogynistic.²⁰ I commend Arnold for not avoiding these realities of Roman culture, and for using the many facets of story-telling to explore how a young girl like Cloelia might have found the inspiration and inner strength to achieve what she did. Arnold points out in her preface that parts of her novella deemed inappropriate by a teacher can be removed from the text without damaging the main narrative. Regardless, I have seen this text used among high school audiences. Students express dismay or curiosity about the actions described, but the teachers then use that opportunity to talk about the plight of women in the ancient world, and to point to relevant aspects in modern times. Recent studies have shown that stories play an important role in helping students begin to grapple with life and the human condition, and that they build empathy.²¹ Even so, the nature of the lessons in *Cloelia* justifies making sure that the audience is appropriately prepared for the content and any discussion that may ensue.²²

The novella continues: Mucius Scaevola appears in the house of Brutus, whose daughter Iunia is hosting Cloelia for the day, and Cloelia overhears Scaevola tell his tale of bravery when discovered in the Etruscan camp (placing his right hand into a flame to prove how stalwart Romans can be). Right after this story is told, Porsenna sends messengers to ask for hostages in return for a truce with Rome. Iunia and Cloelia end up as hostages in the Etruscan camp, and while there, Cloelia encourages her fellow captives with the story she knows about Horatius at the bridge – this is the only story Cloelia tells herself, and we are not told how she has learned it. Shortly after that, she leads her fellow Romans to freedom, but

²⁰ The notion of *levitas animi* (the idea that women possessed a "frivolity of mind") was encoded in Roman law, and justified women's exclusion from political engagement and self-determination, (Gaius *Inst.* 1.144): *veteres enim voluerunt feminas, etiamsi perfectae aetatis sint, propter animi levitatem in tutela esse.* ("For our forebears wanted women, on account of their frivolity of mind, even if they were of full age, to have guardians.")

²¹ See, for example, the article by Emy Koopman (2016) on this topic.

²² See the edited volume by Fiona McHardy and Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz (2014) for great suggestions on presenting such difficult topics in the classroom.

when she arrives home, her parents remind her that the hostage situation was part of a treaty (a promise made) to protect Rome (37: *tu es votum quod Romam servare potest*), and that she must return to the Etruscan camp. Due to Cloelia's bravery, Porsenna declares that only she must be returned, that she may choose other hostages for release, and that the truce will be upheld. So back Cloelia goes, and Arnold, true to the narrative in our ancient historians, leaves it uncertain as to whether or not Cloelia will ever return home. As she departs, Arnold's Cloelia remembers the stories that have formed her, particularly those about women, reminding the reader how artfully the novella has created a narrative to support Cloelia's courage (40): "*pro domo pugnabo, ut Camilla pro Italia pugnavit. votum meum tenebo, ut Lucretia et Kallisto vota sua tenere volebant*" ("I will fight for my home, just as Camilla fought for Italy. I will keep my vow, just as Lucretia and Kallisto wished to keep theirs.")

Arnold successfully imagines the process whereby a girl like Cloelia might learn examples of courage and deconstruct gendered notions of virtue: she hears the stories of Camilla and Kallisto, told by her mother, the tragic end of Lucretia, told by her father, and the ordeal of Mucius Scaevola, told by Mucius himself. While in captivity, Arnold's Cloelia engages in the oral tradition herself, telling her comrades the story of Horatius Cocles, a story that mentally prepares them for the dangerous escape they will soon achieve. Whereas Livy and Valerius Maximus offered Cloelia's story as a glorious aberration of girls behaving like men, demonstrating Roman virtue (even Roman girls do extraordinary things), Arnold presents a girl who learns from and partakes in a tradition of sharing edifying narratives, a tradition that includes the perspectives of women, and is often designed for a female audience.²³

This idea that women's deeds were discussed in an oral tradition within a domestic context has resonance within our ancient sources. As Jacqui Carlon discusses in her study, Pliny the younger had particular praise for Arria, the wife of Caecina Paetus, who famously stabbed herself before her husband's eyes to give him the courage to commit suicide, as ordered by the emperor Claudius in 42 CE (2009, 43-48). Carlon goes on to add that Pliny quotes Arria eight times in his epistle 3.16, more than any other person in the entire collection (47). When Pliny closes the letter, he points out to his correspondent that although Arria's words, spoken at the moment of her self-sacrifice, "it doesn't hurt, Paetus" (*Paete, non dolet*), are quite famous (*illud quidem ingens fama*), her other sayings, Pliny points out, are not widely known (*haec nulla circumfert*).²⁴ Carlon renders the idea this way, "one's greatest deeds can easily be unknown outside of one's intimate circle" (47). Thus Pliny's offhand remark reveals the extensive oral tradition that preserved women's deeds and sayings within a familial context, a tradition that often went unrecorded in literary form. We are indeed grateful when we find other glimpses of women's courageous deeds, as recorded in the famous inscription dedicated "to my wife" (*uxori*), in which a grateful husband praises in detail his wife's efforts to save his life, among many other notable achievements within the chaos of the triumvirate. Such discoveries, however, should cause us to consider how many such accounts we lack.²⁵

²³ In Vanderpool's recent 2020 novella, *Medusa*, we see Medusa's mother telling her daughter stories to warn her about, first, the dangers of arrogance toward the gods, via the story of Arachne, and, second, the dangers of using one's gifts to help cruel men, via the story of Ariadne.

²⁴ Pliny opens his letter (3.16) with this remark: "I have often noted that some deeds and words of men and women are more famous, but others are more significant" (*adnotasse videor facta dictaque virorum feminarumque alia clariora esse alia maiora*).

²⁵ The "*Laudatio Turia*" inscription is *CIL* VI 1527, 31670, 37053 = *ILS* 8393. See Josiah Osgood's study (2014) of this woman's story and the context it provides to the triumviral period; Osgood does not support the identification of this *uxor* as the Turia referred to in Valerius Maximus 6.7.2. Regarding the tantalizing work that still remains to be done to try to reconstruct the missing narratives of so many women, I point the reader to a piece by Amy Richlin (2013) that attempts to reconstruct the non-extant letters of Terentia to her husband Cicero, working off of Cicero's letters to and about her.

Arnold's re-telling in *Cloelia*, therefore, cleverly demonstrates an oral tradition that can shape a society, a culture, and a young girl's potential for bravery. By the same token, with the stories of Lucretia and Kallisto, Arnold grants her Latin-learning audience the space to consider the layers of stringent authority placed on women's bodies, lives, and behaviors by the societies in which they live. *Cloelia* shows that girls in the ancient world, just like girls in the modern one, seek to find ways to pursue their own greatness. In the ever growing array of Latin novellas available, all young people are likely to find something that speaks to them. The Latin novellas now available offer Latin teachers a wonderful opportunity to capitalize on the interests, curiosity, and desire for escapism and edification among early Latin readers. Obtaining a collection of these relatively inexpensive books for the Latin classroom is an enriching and effective way to help young people build their Latin reading skills, to the point where reading works by classical, medieval, and Renaissance authors might become a more desirable objective for all involved.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
tramsby@umass.edu

Works Cited

- Albright, Christine. 2018. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Reader for Students in Elementary College Latin*. New York: Routledge.
- Amos, Emily. 2020. "A Case Study Investigation of Student Perceptions of Women as Seen in the *Cambridge Latin Course* in a Selective Girls Grammar School." *The Journal of Classics Teaching* 21.42: 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2058631020000422>.
- Arnold, Ellie. 2016. *Cloelia puella Romana*. Creative Commons.
- Ash, Rachel. 2018. *Camilla*. Lawrenceville, GA: Pomegranate Beginnings Publishing.
- Balmaceda, Catalina. 2017. *Virtus Romana Politics and Morality in the Roman Histories*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Carlson, Jacqueline. 2015. "Rethinking the Latin Classroom: Changing the Role of Translation in Assessment." *CO* 90.4: 138-140.
- _____. 2014. *Pliny's Women: Constructing Virtue and Creating Identity in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2013. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Latin Instruction and Securing its Place in Curricula." *Teaching Classical Languages* 4.2: 106-122.
- Conway, Daniel. 2021. "Style Variations in Latin Novellas: An Analysis of Three Authors' Works." *CO* 96.3: forthcoming.
- Dugan, Kelly. 2019. "The 'Happy Slave' Narrative and Classics Pedagogy: A Verbal and Visual Analysis of Beginning Greek and Latin Textbooks." *NECJ* 46.1: 62-87.
- Hoyos, Dexter. 1993. "Decoding or Sight-Reading? Problems with Understanding Latin." *CO* 70.4: 126-30.
- Kitchell, Kenneth. 2000. "Latin III's Dirty Little Secret - Why Johnny Can't Read." *NECJ* 27: 206-226.
- Kitchell, Kenneth, and Thomas Sienkewicz. 2010. *Disce! An Introductory Latin Course*. Pearson.
- Koopman, Emy. 2016. "Effects of 'Literariness' on Emotions and on Empathy and Reflection after Reading." *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 10.1: 82-98.
- Krashen, Stephen. 1989. "We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis." *The Modern Language Journal* 73.4: 440-464.
- McHardy, Fiona, and Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz (eds). 2014. *From Abortion to Pederasty: Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Mead, Rebecca. 2014. "[The Percy Jackson Problem](#)." *The New Yorker*. October 22. Web. Accessed 5 July, 2021.
- Miller, Madeline. 2018. *Circe: A Novel*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Olimpi, Andrew. 2017. *Filia Regis et Monstrum Horribile: A Latin Novella*. Dacula, GA: Comprehensible Classics Press.
- Osgood, Josiah. 2014. *Turia: A Roman Woman's Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piantaggini, Lance. 2021. "Teaching Latin To Students Who Do Not Know Latin and Do Not Care Much About The Romans." *CO* 96.3: forthcoming.
- _____. 2017. *Agrippina Mater Fortis*. Springfield, MA: Poetulus Publishing.
- Piazza, John. 2017. "Beginner Latin Novels: A General Overview." *Teaching Classical Languages* 8.2: 154-166.
- Richlin, Amy. 2013. "The Fragments of Terentia," in *Roman Literature, Gender, and Reception: Domina Illustris. Essays in honor of Judith Peller Hallett*, eds. Donald Lateiner, Barbara K. Gold, and Judith Perkins. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Russell, Katharine. 2018. "Read Like a Roman: Teaching Students to Read in Latin Word Order." *The Journal of Classics Teaching*, 19.37: 17 – 29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S205863101800003X>.

- Sanderson, Paul. 1999. *Using Newspapers in the Classroom*. Cambridge Handbooks for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, Norbert, Xiangying Jiang, and William Grabe. 2011. "The Percentage of Words Known in a Text and Reading Comprehension." *The Modern Language Journal* 95.1: 26-43.
- Sears, Lindsay, and Kevin Ballestrini. 2019. "Adapting Antiquity: Using Tiered Texts to Increase Latin Reading Proficiency." *The Journal of Classics Teaching* 20.39: 71-77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2058631019000138>
- Suburani. 2020. Haverhill, UK: Hands Up Education.
- Ullery, Sarah. 2019. "[50 Must-Read Classical Mythology Retellings](#)." March 14. Web. Accessed: 5 July, 2021.
- Vanderpool, Emma. 2021a. "Recreating the Voice of the Gladiator for the Secondary School Latin Classroom." *CO* 96.2: 60-66.
- _____. 2021b. "Novellas as a Bridge to Authentic Literature." *CO* 96.3: 108-112.
- _____. 2021c. *Gladiatores Orbis Terrarum*. Kindle Direct Publishing (self-published).
- _____. 2020a. *Eumachia: Mercator Pompeiana*. Vanderpool (self-published).
- _____. 2020b. *Kandake Amanirenas: Regina Nubia*. Vanderpool (self-published).
- _____. 2020c. *Medusa: Femina Potens et Fortis*. Vanderpool (self-published).
- _____. 2020d. *Surus: Fabula Belli et Elephantorum*. Vanderpool (self-published).

On Teaching Sallust in Latin: The Why and the How

JORGE TÁRREGA GARRIDO

Abstract: There exist many pedagogical methods we can use to examine, expound and explain ancient authors to our students. In this paper I propose an alternative approach to teach Sallust in an undergraduate setting, with explanatory aids, exercises, tests and quizzes. The latter result not from quick consideration, but from daily use and application in my own classes. In addition, I give reasons why it is helpful to teach Latin *in Latin* and what advantages it has for students who have learned well the grammar and have moved on to reading and analysis of the ancient texts. Students who had had no prior exposure to this approach completed an evaluation at the end of the academic year; the results are provided as a conclusion to the article.

Keywords: Pedagogical methods, Sallust, Lecturing, active Latin pedagogy

Tantummodo incepto opus est, cetera res expedit “We only need to start, the course of the events will accomplish the rest” (Sall. *Cat.* 20)

As methods of teaching Latin that exercise and foster all four language skills are more and more employed in high schools and universities across the world and we are seeing an increase in the number of studies in which scholars seek out more engaging, more efficient and more aligned approaches with the teaching of any other modern language,¹ we felt quite appropriate to put into practice all these theoretical approaches and tailor them to our college classes. In fact, eighteen years ago, von Albrecht (2002: 7-13) made a number of arguments as to why Latin itself should be used within the discipline of Classics. Of these arguments, the following stand out: 1. *Argumentum ex rerum memoria*: producing scholarship in Latin continues a centuries-long tradition of writing about philology in Latin; 2. *Argumentum ex analogia*: in other languages, they use the very same language they research: English language scholars teach in English, German in German, and so on; 3. *Argumentum commoditatis*: it is convenient for scholars across the world to focus their attentions on just one common language; 4. *Argumentum ex rerum natura*: what is in Latin, let it be taught in Latin; 5. *Argumentum ex re sive ex apto*: it is easier to teach in the Latin language and Roman culture; 6. *Argumentum utilitatis*: it benefits the student, since the student who practices Latin prose composition will be most ready to understand and discuss texts written in Latin.

In the following pages, I share some of the content and nature of my teaching, fruit of my own study and experience teaching ancient authors at the University of Valencia (Spain). In particular, I focus on examples of my approach as applied to a single author, the historian Sallust, whom undergraduate students are taught in their sophomore year. From the start, my wish was to use and put to the test my own approach, even though the materials and subject matter had been decided on already by the program administrators. The project was not without difficulties at the beginning; nowadays, most undergraduate students have never *heard* the Latin language, nor have they been asked to actually *read* the texts; rather, they are required to *translate* word-by-word. So I implemented an active Latin approach through which students could understand the subject and advance in their own command of the language.

Nonetheless, I am aware that not all my department colleagues use active methodologies in their classes, that is, do not use all four skills, speaking, hearing, writing, in addition to reading; rather they have long pursued traditional approaches. Still I think that at

¹ Cf. e.g. Aguilar García 2020 & 2019; Arend 2018; Lloyd 2017; Owens 2016; Carlon 2016 & 2013; Patrick 2015; Minkova 2014; Ricucci 2014 & 2013; Coffee 2012.

least the **exercises** which will be laid out below, can help students as subsidiary activities even in a class using traditional approaches. That is, even if students have learned or are learning the language in other ways before and after a class carried out this way, I think the lessons plans below will be of great benefit to them. My own rationale is at once simple and manifold right from the beginning: to make the language, through examples and actual use, a true means of communication, not some obscure and odd artifact;² and so that students understand Sallust's subject and the style through which it is conveyed; finally so that we further discuss questions that pertain to politics and human nature.

Passages Selected

The course I am discussing here is set up to be done over a three-month term; with a total of fifty hours, distributed across two two-hour sessions per week. That being the case, selection of passages must be suited to the time available, and care taken that the resulting group of passages are not some random congeries offering fodder for explaining grammatical rules. To this end, I have excerpted the beginning of Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum*. In its first chapters, Sallust lays the foundation for the narrative and sketches the origins of the war, **all of which takes up chapters 5 to 16**. I have designed the following headings in order to provide a quick overview of the contents of each paragraph:

V: Quid sit Sallustius scripturus. Post bellum Punicum secundum quid acciderit. Masinissa. Micipsa regnum obtinuit.
VI: Iugurthae virtus. Micipsa anxietate tenebatur propter Iugurtham.
VII: Iugurtha praefectus est Numidis in Hispania. Bellum Numantinum.
VIII: Novi atque nobiles Romani Iugurtham accendebant. Scipio monet Iugurtham.
IX: Litterae Scipionis Micipsae redditae.
IX-X: Micipsa Iugurtham beneficiis vincere aggreditur. Quid Micipsa ante mortem dixerit.
XI: Micipsa mortuo, disceptatio de regno.
XII: Hiempsal necatur. Nex Hiempsalis.
XIII: Alii Numidae Adherbalem secuntur, alii Iugurtham. Adherbal se Romam confert; etiam legati Iugurthae.
XIV. Loquitur Adherbal in senatu.
XV. Iugurthae legati respondent in senatu.
XV-XVI: Senatus consulitur.

² See Carlon 2013, 106: "It [Latin] is frequently viewed as an artifact, a leftover from an elitist and antiquated educational system" and further (112): "We must avoid at all costs teaching grammar without context, as if it were an artifact all on its own, disconnected from the language that defines it."

Individual Classes

Each class falls into four parts:

1. *Prolegomena*. Students are asked to report in Latin on what was covered in the previous class. Review of syntactical structures and subjects dealt with.

2. *Reading*. As we read through the passage slowly, I offer many ways to understand the text and review vocabulary, for instance: synonyms and antonyms, examples from the context; paraphrases. I constantly encourage the students to try to respond in Latin³, which they do not always do, but quite often.

3. *Exercises* (See below for details).

4. Finally, once the passage is read through slowly, and its difficulties solved, we read it and appreciate it: meaning, not just exploration of style and diction, but that ‘enjoyment’ that can be experienced in the reading of literature, which Cicero attests to⁴.

As far as the use of the language is concerned, I decided that I would give the course in Latin from day one. In addition to Prof. von Albrecht’s arguments, given above, let me sum up why I teach the subject in Latin, and why from my own experience I think using the language can bring the students substantial benefits: 1. Students gradually attune their ears to the language which leads them to a more complete immersion; 2. As they are actively using the same language they are trying to learn, they do not feel it is something strange and alien to them; 3. The structures read in Sallust are practiced frequently in an active way; 4. They more readily grasp the vocabulary this way.

Exercises

Although innumerable activities and exercises can be adduced, I select only some, suited to the individual chapters. Many other instances can be produced on the example of these:

Exercitia ad capitulum V excogitata

A) Responde ad interrogata:

- Quale fuit bellum inter populum Romanum et Iugurtham?
- Quid finem fecit studiis civilibus?
- Quid sibi vult Sallustius antequam explanat belli initium? Quem ad finem talia dicit?
- Quis opes Italiae maxime attriverat?
- Fuitne Masinissa amicus Romanorum?
- Qua de causa fuit Scipioni cognomen "Africanus"?
- Quid fecerat bello Punico secundo Masinissa?

³ Minkova (2014: 298) gives many examples employed in the teaching of Caesar at her university. She says that it is very helpful to ask students questions, to get them to paraphrase, and to have them write summaries. Add to these the extremely useful approaches for coming up with activities in Carlon 2016 & 2015, Patrick 2015 and Harrison 2010.

⁴ Cic. *Epist.* VI,12: *Est unum perflugium doctrina ac litterae, quibus semper usi sumus, quae secundis rebus delectationem modo habere videbantur, nunc vero etiam salutem* “One refuge is that of learning and reading literature — I’ve always had recourse to it — they offered me pleasure when things were going well, but now, in addition, they offer a means of self-preservation”

B) De verbis idem significantibus:

Quaere in capitulo V verba idem significantia:

arrogantia		patentia	
dirum		absolveret	
diversa		explano	
postea		pugna	
quod		solitudo	
altero		egregia	
facultates (divitias)		facta	

C) De morphologia:

Quaere in loco praeterita plusquamperfecta eorumque verborum enuntiatum indica.

D) De re

Quae erat contentio in Re Publica Romana, de qua Sallustius in capitulo V loquitur?

Exercitia ad capitulum VI excogitata

A. Iunge A cum B singulariter

A		B
Plurimum facere		ferire
Pleraque tempora in venando		anteire
Leonem atque feras		minimum de se loqui
Omnes gloriā		certare
Cursu cum aequalibus		agere

B. Sententias Latinas compone his vocabulis fretus:

- dedit- luxu- neque - ubi - corrupendum – se – non – inertiae – adolevit
- qui – primum
- Iugurthae – fore - regno – virtutem – existumabat – gloriae – suo - Micipsa
- eo – permotus – cum – tametsi – negotio - fuerat – multa – animo – initio –
volvebat – laetus – vehementer – suo

C. Responde ad interrogata:

1. Indica sex artes quibus Iugurtha adulescens se exercebat
2. Quid terrebat Micipsam?
3. Quid saepe conturbat homines modestos apud Sallustium?
4. Erantne Numidae irati Iugurthae?
5. Quid forsitan accidisset, si Iugurtha dolis necatus esset?
6. Quid tu censes? Decetne hominem multum de se ipso loqui? Estne virtutis
“minimum de se loqui”?

D. Quaere verba idem significantia in capitulo VI *Belli Iugurthini* (ex “Qui ubi” ad “de se loqui”):

vultu		potens	
praestaret		pugnare	
cum primum		bestias	
vulnerare		robustus	
consuetudo			

E. Quaere in capitulo VI *Belli Iugurthini* (ex “Quibus rebus” ad “anxius erat”):

- Accusativum cum infinitivo:
- Ablativum absolutum:
- Participium coniunctum:
- Sententiam concessivam:
- Gerundivum:
- Plusquamperfectum:
- Ablativum causae:
- Ablativum instrumenti:
- Duas proprietates Sallustii generis scribendi:

Exercitia in capitulum VII excogitata

A) Quid congruit?

Iugurtha volebat parēre	Romanos/Romanis/Romanas
Micipsa praefecit Iugurth..... Numid.....	Iugurtham-Numidis/ Iugurthae Numidas/ Iugurthis-Numidam
Misit auxilia	equis/equitum/equitatum
Saepe obviam ibat	pericula/periculos/periculis
Neque eius inceptum frustra erat!	ullum/nullum/nemo

B) Quaere verba idem significantia in capitulo VII *Belli Iugurthini*:

fraudibus		decevit	
difficiles		periclitari	
cupidus		monstrando	
putaverat		accidit	
sagacitas		acuto	

C) Quaere verba contrarium significantia in capitulo VII *Belli Iugurthini*:

clementia		fugiendo	
eodem modo		odiosus	
negligentia		amori	
maximā superbiā		ignavo	
raro		disiunxerat	

D) Dic aliis verbis:

1. Virtus eius regni tui gloriam amplificabit
2. Numantinos terrebat Iugurtha
3. Micipsa sic periclitatus est
4. Nostri maxime amabant Iugurtham
5. Maxime cupiebat gloriam militarem

E) Responde ad interrogata:

1. Cur nolebat Micipsa interficere Iugurtham?
2. Quomodo sperabat Micipsa Iugurtham necatum iri?
3. Quibus adiectivis describit Iugurtham Sallustius in capitulo VII?
4. Quid fecit Iugurtha ad animos Publii Scipionis alliciendos?
5. Terrebatne Iugurtha Numantinos?
6. Quid fit, Sallustio teste, si nimis utimur prudentiā? Quid fit, si nimis audaciter agimus?
7. Num deficiebat saepe in inceptis suis Iugurtha?
8. Quos sibi amicitia comparaverat Iugurtha? Quibus rebus?

E) GRAMMATICA: Quaere in capitulo VII *Belli Iugurthini*:

- Duos Accusativos cum infinitivo:
- Gerundium:
- Vt consecutivum:
- Ablativum qualitatis:
- Cum narrativum:

G) De genere scribendi Sallustiano. Suntne in capitulo VII...?

- Variationes:
- Medii, qui dicuntur, soni:
- Chiasmi:
- Infinitivi historici:
- Accusativi plurales tertiae decl. in -is exeuntes:
- Numquid plura?

Exercitia ad capitulum XIII excogitata

A) Quaere verba idem significantia in capitulo XIII *Belli Iugurthini*:

factum		perfectis	
adicit		operam dabant	
confisus		iubet	
proelium		haesitent	
discessit		nece	

B) Responde ad interrogata:

1. Qui Numidae Iugurtham secuntur?
2. Suntne sponte secuti omnes Numidae Iugurtham?
3. Num Iugurtha devictus est ab Adherbale? Quid accidit post proelium?
4. Quibus rebus fretus volebat Iugurtha iram mitigare Romanorum?
5. Suntne irā accensi Romani propter Iugurthae largitudinem?

C) Sententias Latinas compone his vocabulis fretus:

- itineribus contendit Galliam Quam maximis in ulteriorem
- potest generum maximas parat copias omnium quam potest
- totius sperant sese potiri Galliae posse
- eo volvebat negotio multa suo vehementer permotus animo cum
- legatum Marius iubet Manlium proficisci
- iubet erumpere milites Marius tollere atque portis clamorem
- imperat Ciceroprehendant Allobrogum comitatus (*IV declinatio!*) praetoribus ut
- ne Omnes transeant ope decet summā vitam homines niti silentio

D) De proprietatibus generis scribendi Sallustiani. Suntne in capitulo XIII...?

- Variationes:
- Medii, qui dicuntur, soni:
- Infinitivi historici:
- Accusativi plurales tertiae declinationis in -is exeuntes:
- Numquid plura?

On the Subject Matter

Sallust doesn't sprinkle his work with words to be appreciated in passing, as an afterthought; in fact, as soon as we talk about Sallust's syntax and his diction, or his characteristic phrases and abundant examples illustrating the language itself and how it works, we stop and talk about Sallust's thoughts on statesmanship, on the failings of politicians, on honor-seeking. This is not the place to analyze Sallust's thought on these matters, something many other learned and practiced scholars have done⁵, but rather to advise on the suitability of undertaking a

⁵ Studies on Sallust are quite abundant: it will suffice to refer here to several discussions, which, if read by the student, will lead him or her to other, more detailed scholarship: Kraus & Woodman 1997; von Albrecht 1989 & 1997; McGushin 1977; Ciruelo 1973; La Penna 1968; Syme 1964. Also in Latin: D'Elia 1964, Vallaurius 1860, Burnouf 1821 & Valpy 1820.

serious discussion on Sallust's thinking with regard to the above-mentioned matters, one that will benefit the students and, as Quintilian says, 'will be taken home' after class⁶. I encourage my students to read the prefaces of both the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and the *Bellum Catilinarium* first, then to think about and answer the following questions:

1. Scribe summarium praefationum Sallustii in *Bellum Catilinarium* et *Bellum Jugurthinum*.
2. Quem ad finem scripsit Sallustius *Bellum Jugurthinum*?
3. Saepe disserit de ambitione et corruptelis populi Romani. Quid tu sentis de rerum descriptione, qua utitur? Distatne multum vita Sallustii a consiliis, quibus opera sua aspersit?

After the students have written out answers to these questions as an assigned task for review by the instructor, a class discussion is facilitated, wherein students talk about anything that comes up for argument or debate, express their opinions, counter those of others, including Sallust's own, so that they can say, along with Horace (*Ep.* 1.14-15): *nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri, / quo me cumque rapit tempestas, deferor hospes* "I'm not bound to swear any oath dictated by an instructor. Wherever the storm winds take me, there I come as a welcome guest".

Here are some sentences which will help the students engage in a useful discussion:

1. Cum omnis gloriā anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse (cap. VI) / gloriā invidiam vicisti (cap. X)
2. Plurimum facere, minimum ipse de se loqui (cap. VI)
3. Proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio, quorum alterum ex providentiā timorem, alterum ex audaciā temeritatem afferre plerumque solet (cap. VII)
4. Romae omnia venalia esse (cap. VIII)
5. En habes virum dignum te atque avo suo Massinissa (cap. IX)
6. Non exercitus neque thesauri praesidia regni sunt, verum amici, quos neque armis cogere neque auro parare queas: officio et fide pariuntur (cap. X)
7. Nam concordia parvae res crescunt, discordia maximae dilabuntur (cap. X)
8. In omni certamine qui opulentior est, etiam si accipit iniuriam, tamen, quia plus potest, facere videtur (cap. X)

On Assessment

I now come to assessing and examining students; to which end, I do not introduce my own questions without also adding traditional assessment methods, as is required by the faculty. By implementing both methods in the formal assessment, we meet the faculty standards as well as we ensure that the approach we have used in our classes is also reflected in the final examination. Accordingly, I give the students a two-part exam, of which the one contains subjects and passages dealt with in our class, while the other contains passages excerpted from Sallust's work. I should add that in Spain 20% of the holistic assessment consists in homework

⁶ *Inst.* II 2, 8: *Ipse [i.e. praceptor] aliquid, immo multa cotidie dicat quae secum auditores referant. Licet enim satis exemplorum ad imitandum ex lectione suppeditet, tamen viva illa, ut dicitur, vox alit plenius* "Let the teacher say something every day, indeed many things, that the students can take home with them. No matter how many examples to imitate he provides them with out of the texts, it is more nourishing to listen to a few words, as they say, 'viva voce'".

and projects undertaken by students. Therefore, the final grade is calculated as follows: *pars prima* (40) + *pars altera* (40) + assignments (20) = 100.

Here are the two parts of an assessment example:

PARS PRIMA

1. Sesquihora ad respondendum, nullo lexico adhibito
2. Nihil convertendum est nisi pars significata.
3. Ratio huius partis: 40p

Lege locum ex Sallustii *Bello Iugurthino* depromptum:

Numida mandata brevi conficit atque, uti doctus erat, noctu Iugurthae milites introducit. Qui postquam in aedis irrupere, divorsi regem quaerere, dormientis alios, alios occurrentis interficere, scrutari loca abdita, clausa effringere, strepitu et tumultu omnia miscere, quom interim Hiempsal reperitur occultans se tugurio mulieris ancillae, quo initio pavidus et ignarus loci perfugerat. Numidae caput eius, uti iussi erant, ad Iugurtham referunt. Ceterum fama tanti facinoris per omnem Africam brevi divulgatur. Adherbalem omnisque, qui sub imperio Micipsae fuerant, metus invadit. In duas partis discedunt Numidae: plures Adherbalem secuntur, sed illum alterum bello meliores.

A) Responde ad interrogata (10p):

- a) De quo Numidā hic loquitur Sallustius?
- b) Quem interficiunt Iugurthae milites intrantes?
- c) Vbi repertus est Hiempsal? Cur se ibi occultavit?
- d) Terrenturne fautores Adherbalis? Cur?
- e) Qui homines Iugurthae favent?

B) Quaere in loco (8p):

verba idem significantia		verba contrarium significantia	
patrat		vigilantis	
repugnantis		egressi sunt	
tradunt		manifesta	
invenitur		audax	
sceleris		postremo	

- C) Converte in sermonem vulgarem partem loci adnotatam: a “Qui postquam...” ad “perfugerat” (10p.)
- D) Quaere in loco VI proprietates, quae saepe a Sallustio in scribendo adhibentur (12p.)

PARS ALTERA

1. Sesquihora ad respondendum. Lexico uti licet
2. Nihil convertendum est nisi pars significata.
3. Ratio huius partis: 40p.

Lege locum ex Sallustii *Bello Iugurthino* depromptum:

Postquam diviso regno legati Africā decessere et Iugurtha contra timorem animi praemia sceleris adeptum sese videt, certum esse ratus, quod ex amicis apud Numantiam acceperat, omnia Romae venalia esse, simul et illorum pollicitationibus adensus, quos paulo ante muneribus expleverat, in regnum Adherbalis animum intendit. Ipse acer, bellicosus; at is quem petebat quietus, inbellis, placido ingenio, opportunus iniuriae, metuens magis quam metuendus. Igitur ex inproviso finis eius cum magnā manu invadit, multos mortalis cum pecore atque alia praeda capit, aedificia incendit, pleraque loca hostiliter cum equitatu adcedit.

A) Responde ad interrogata (10p):

- a) Quando legati Romani ex Africā discessere?
- b) Quid certissime Iugurtha sciebat?
- c) Cur nullo timore Iugurtha tetendit in regnum Adherbalis?
- d) Quibus verbis depingitur Adherbal?
- e) Cuius finibus potitus est Iugurtha?

B) Converte in sermonem vulgarem partem loci adnotatam: a “Postquam...” ad “intendit” (10p.)

C) Quaere in loco IV proprietates, quae saepe a Sallustio in scribendo adhibentur (4p)

D) De syntaxi: quid congruit? (16p)

In tantam claritudinem brevi pervenerat, ut _____ vehementer carus, _____ maxumo terrori esset	1. Nostris-Numantinis 2. Nostrum-Numantini 3. Nostros-Numantinos
Existumabat virtutem Iugurthae regni _____ su _____ glori _____ fore	1. Regno suo-gloriae 2. Regni sui-gloriam 3. Regna sua-gloriis
Natura praeceps ad explend _____ animi cupidin _____	1. explendam-cupidinem 2. explendae-cupidinis 3. explendum-cupinidinis

Ne _____ seditio aut bellum oriretur, anxius erat.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qua 2. Aliqua 3. Quo
Videt neque per vim neque insidiis _____ posse hominem tam acceptum popularibus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. opprimi 2. opprimendi 3. opprimendos
Non se luxu neque inertiae _____ dedit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. corrumpere 2. corrumpendam 3. corrumpendum
En habes virum dignum _____	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. tibi atque avi tui 2. te atque avum tuum 3. te atque avo suo
Morb _____ atque aetat _____ confectus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Morbo-aetate 2. Morbi-aetatis 3. Morbos-aetates
Amici, quos neque armis cogere neque auro parare queas, officio et fide _____	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. parentur 2. pariuntur 3. parant
_____, Iugurtha, decet providere	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tibi 2. Te 3. Tui
Tempus ad utramque rem decernitur, sed maturius ad pecuniam distribue _____	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. distribuere 2. distribuendam 3. distribuendi
Iugurtha omn _____ Numidi _____ imperare parat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. omni Numidiae 2. omni Numidia 3. omnem Numidiam
Nolite pati _____ nepotem Masinissae frustra a _____ auxilium petere	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ego-vos 2. mihi-vobis 3. me-vobis
Aut quisquam _____ misereri potest?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. nostros 2. nostri 3. nos
Rex finem _____ fecit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. loquendi 2. loquendum 3. loquendo
Pauci, quibus bonum et aequom divitiis carius erat, _____ Adherbali et Hiempsalis mortem severe _____ censebant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. subvenire-vindicare 2. subventum-vindicatum 3. subveniendum-vindicandum

Conclusions and Student Evaluations

It has been our aim to share the approach that we have recently put into practice at University of Valencia and that, as we have experienced, led our students to a greater command of Latin as well as to a deeper knowledge of a classical author. The reasons we were encouraged by at the beginning were stepwise confirmed in every class through constant exercises and tests. Moreover the students themselves, when they were asked about this approach, drew the conclusions and highly valued the usefulness of the course: at the end of the last scheduled class, I decided to find out what they thought about the classes and the method. 28 students responded voluntarily to the following questions:

1. What do you think about classes that are given entirely in Latin?
2. Do you find this approach useful?
3. Would you have preferred the course to be given in Spanish (not in Latin)?

Some students responded to each question, some gave a general answer, only on one condition: it should remain anonymous. It is clear from their responses that all of them liked that the class was given entirely in Latin; no one indicated that s/he preferred the class to be given in vernacular; all thought the approaches used were effective. The chart below summarizes some of the typical responses:

Student responses	Frequency of responses
- "I learned a lot of vocabulary by listening and reading"	9
- "I really learned Latin"	8
- "I really enjoyed the course"	8
- "I understand Sallust better"	6
- "A lot of commitment is required so as not to get lost during the class"	5
- "It would be a great benefit to the students if more of the instruction was done in Latin"	4
- "We're compelled to think in Latin and to imagine the Roman mentality"	3
- "With such approaches, Latin lives; it's not at all dead"	2

Survey information	
Total Students	28
Level	2nd year undergraduate students of Classics
Place	Faculty of Philology, University of Valencia (Spain)
Day	5/18/2017
Procedure	Handwritten response to anonymous student questionnaire ⁷

UMass Boston
jorge.tarregarrido@umb.edu

⁷ I would like to thank the anonymous *NECJ* reviewer for their helpful suggestions and Prof. Barrios Lech for his translation of the Latin original version into English.

Works Cited⁸

Latin Pedagogy

- Aguilar García, María Luisa. 2020. "De rationibus ac principiis quibus constat *Comparatio aliarum linguarum* (SLA) ad linguam Latinam tralatis ac conversis", *Classical World* 113.3: 335-356. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2020.0027>
- Aguilar García, María Luisa. 2019. "Usus adversus doctrinam? Grammatica in schola alterius linguae. Grammatica Latine tradita", *Thamyris* 10: 237-264.
- Albrecht, Michael von. 2002. "De lingua Latina in Philologia Latina adhibenda", *Estudios Clásicos* 122: 5-16.
- Arend, Alan van den. 2018. "Something Old, Something New: Marrying Early Modern Latin Pedagogy and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Theory", *Teaching Classical Languages* 10.1: 1-32.
- Carlson, Jacqueline. 2016. "Quomodo Dicitur? The Importance of Memory in Language Learning", *Teaching Classical Languages* 7.2: 109-135.
- Carlson, Jacqueline. 2015. "Rethinking the Latin classroom: changing the role of translation in assessment", *The Classical Outlook* 90.4: 138-140.
- Carlson, Jacqueline M. 2013. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Latin Instruction and Securing its Place in Curricula", *Teaching Classical Languages* 4.2: 106-122.
- Coffee, Neil. 2012. "Active Latin. Quo tendimus?", *Classical World* 105.2: 255-269. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2012.0007>
- Harrison, Rebecca. 2010. "Exercises for Developing Prediction Skills in Reading Latin Sentences", *Teaching Classical Languages* 2.1: 1-30.
- Lloyd, Mair Elizabeth. 2017. *Living Latin: Exploring a Communicative Approach to Latin Teaching Through a Sociocultural Perspective on Language Learning*, PhD Thesis, The Open University. <https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0000bef6>
- Minkova, Milena. 2014. "De Caesare in scholis Latinis provecioribus destinatis modo activo proponendo", *Nordlit* 33: 297-309. <https://doi.org/10.7557/13.3168>
- Owens, Patrick. 2016. "Barbarisms at the Gate: An Analysis of Some Perils in Active Latin Pedagogy", *Classical World* 109.4: 507-523. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2016.0047>
- Patrick, Robert. 2015. "Making Sense of Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom", *Teaching Classical Languages* 6.1: 108-136.
- Ricucci, Marco. 2014. "Oltre i confini di Babele; riflessioni per una didattica della grammatica latina con il metodo neocomparativo", *Euphrosyne* 42: 225-43. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.EUPHR.5.125454>
- Ricucci, Marco. 2013. "Al cospetto di Theuth. Understanding reading tra note teoriche e tecniche didattiche", *Thamyris* 4: 11-32.

Roman literature

- Albrecht, Michael von. 1997. *Historia de la literatura romana*, Barcelona.
- Albrecht, Michael von. 1989 (=1971). *Masters of Roman Prose, From Cato to Apuleius*, Anglice redditum a Neil Adkin.
- D'Elia, Antonio. 1964. *Latinarum litterarum historia*, Neapoli.
- Kraus, Christina S. & Woodman, Anthony J. 1997, *Latin Historians*, Oxford.
- Vallaurius, Thomas. 1860. *Historia critica litterarum latinarum*, Augustae Taurinorum.

Sallust

- Burnouf, Jean Louis. 1821. *Caius Crispus Sallustius ad codices Parisinos recensitus cum varietate lectionum et novis commentariis*, Parisiis.
- Ciruelo, José Ignacio. 1973. *Salustio: política e historiografía*, Barcelona.
- La Penna, Antonio. 1968. *Sallustio e la "rivoluzione" romana*, Milano.
- McGushin, Patrick. 1977. *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae. A Commentary*, Lugduni

⁸ Last access to all links: 8/13/2020.

Batavorum. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004327627>
Syme, Ronald. 1964. *Sallust*, Berkeley. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520929104>
Valpy, Abraham John. 1820. *Caii Crispi Sallustii opera omnia ex editione Gottlieb Cortii cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini, variis lectionibus, notis variorum, notitia literaria, recensu editionum et codicum et indicibus locupletissimis accurate recensita*, Londini.

Katz Contest Winner

Horace's Use of the Myth of Icarus in the *Odes*

BENJAMIN CLAESSENS

In his *Odes*, Horace expresses his awareness of the potential for artistic failure that is inherent in taking on an ambitious poetic project such as his *Odes* and Vergil's *Aeneid*. Horace enlists a complex program of metaphor and imagery throughout the text which revolves around wax and feathers, the materials Daedalus used to craft the ill-fated wings of Icarus. My discussion of these themes will be based around Horace's three allusions to the myth of Icarus in his *Odes*.

The earliest surviving extended account of the myth of Icarus is from Ovid, who was active several decades after Horace and seems to have been especially influenced by him, for Ovid includes three metamorphoses into swans in his most famous work which were likely inspired by Ode 2.20.¹ Ovid tells this story in both the *Ars Amatoria* and the *Metamorphoses*. My discussion will focus on his more detailed and famous account in the *Metamorphoses*. Briefly, the story is that the master craftsman, Daedalus, and his son, Icarus, are imprisoned together, so Daedalus makes wings out of feathers and wax for both Icarus and himself so that they can escape by flight. He warns Icarus to fly neither too low, for the sea could destroy the wings, nor too high, for the sun could also destroy them. In fact, Daedalus closes his warning with the words *carpe viam* (8.208). These words are clearly an allusion to Horace's metrically identical phrase in the famous last line of Ode 1.11: *carpe diem* (8). Icarus, however, in the midst of their escape, foolishly disobeys his father's command and flies too close to the sun, which melts the wax on his wings, causing him to fall to his death and to become an emblem of immoderation. The sea into which he falls is then named after him.

Ode 1.3 introduces several of the themes I want to discuss. This ode is a propempticon, a farewell poem addressed to someone about to go on a voyage, which was a solemn occasion in the Ancient Mediterranean since there was always a reasonable chance one might die at sea. The poem, although ostensibly addressed to the ship, is really meant for Vergil, who was in the midst of writing the *Aeneid* and was Horace's dear friend. Horace begins by praying to various gods, asking them to keep Vergil's ship safe. But the poem quickly becomes a diatribe against the folly of human cleverness by lamenting the invention of sailing. While demonstrating the many dangers of sailing, Horace also outlines Vergil's proposed voyage, which follows the same route as Aeneas' Mediterranean voyage in the *Aeneid*,² suggesting that this voyage of which Horace is writing really refers to Vergil's attempt to write the story of Aeneas' travels: the first half of the *Aeneid*, to which Horace was likely privy since Vergil was his poetic colleague. Near the middle of Ode 1.3, at the typical pivot of the Horatian Ode, where the poem takes some sort of unexpected turn, Horace says that the gods' creation of boundaries was pointless "if people leap across seas one ought not to touch upon impious rafts" (23-24).³ Two lines later, Horace goes so far as to call sailing *vetitum nefas*, forbidden sin (26). This stanza therefore establishes that the crossing of divine boundaries, such as seas, using human craft, like ships, is impious. Horace then goes on to explain how Prometheus' crossing of divine boundaries by stealing fire, which is the gift that allowed mankind to become craftsmen, brought immense suffering to mankind. In the following lines he then writes, "Daedalus essayed the empty air on feathers not given to humans" (34-35). The relevance of these details is twofold.

¹ 2.367 ff., 7.371 ff., & 12.64 ff.

² Hornbeck 2014 p. 148.

³ All translations throughout the essay are my own.

First, Horace clearly states that Daedalus transgressed the divine boundary of the air through his craft of making wings, just as Prometheus transgressed through his craft of trickery, and just as Vergil might also do through his craft of poetry. Horace reiterates this point by repeating the word *audax* at the emphatic position of the beginning of the first and third line of the second to last stanza (25, 27). This impiety, then, is of overreaching or immoderation—not knowing one’s place. Vergil is attempting to do something that is beyond human limits. If he succeeds, he proves himself to be divine; if he fails, he is immoderate. Horace thereby establishes a correspondence between writing poetry, flying, and sailing while simultaneously claiming that all three are potentially immoderate.

Secondly, through these aforementioned elements of the ode, Horace sets up an important relationship between two Ancient Greek ideas: *τεχνη*, which means “craft” and has to do with human craftiness and cunning, that which separates mankind from beasts, and *φύσις*, a Greek concept meaning something like “growth” or “nature.” Both the Greeks and the Romans (including Horace) were very concerned with that which is according to nature. In the case of Ode 1.3, sailing is clearly not according to *φύσις*, because it is using *τεχνη* to cross natural boundaries not meant to be touched: *non tangenda [...] vada* (1.3.24).

Ode 2.20 contains another allusion to Icarus’ fateful flight, wherein Horace undergoes a partial metamorphosis into a swan. In this poem, Horace claims that he will not die but instead will turn into a swan-man creature, which seems to be a hybrid between himself and his poetry since he describes it as *biformis* (2). In this form he will fly over many distant lands and become “more famous than Icarus” (14). By comparing himself to Icarus in this way, Horace recognizes and acknowledges that he is using the very *τεχνη* about which he spoke so harshly in Ode 1.3, but implicitly claims that his craft of poetry will succeed, unlike Daedalus’ craft, which had tragic consequences.

In this poem, Horace also continues to assert that his poetry is in accordance with nature. He uses passive verbs to describe his transformation. He says in line one that he will be borne through the air, not that he will fly, and in line ten that he is being changed into a bird, not that he is changing himself into a bird. This construction draws an important distinction between Horace and Daedalus, who changes himself into a bird through *τεχνη*, whereas to describe the formation of *his* wings, Horace uses the word *nascor*, meaning to be born, to sprout forth, or to grow; this word emphatically connotes *φύσις*.

Ode 4.2 offers Horace’s final allusion to the myth of Icarus in the *Odes*. In this poem, Horace begins by warning a fellow poet that trying to imitate Pindar, the pinnacle of grand lyric poetry, is like relying on feathers smeared with wax by the strength of Daedalus. Horace goes on to call Pindar a swan, which is typical, for Pindar is the origin of this poetic trope, but, at the pivot of the ode, Horace calls himself a bee, which, through great effort, plucks herbs and (abruptly coming out of the metaphor) laboriously forms poems. Thus, Horace continues his campaign of establishing himself as one who lives according to nature, as opposed to others who rely on feathers smeared with wax by Daedalus. In fact, the verb he uses to describe his writing of poems is “*tingo*,” which sometimes means “to form in wax.” So, whereas Daedalus smears wax upon feathers, Horace contrasts himself as a meticulous bee, the very source of wax, laboriously forming his poems until he naturally turns into a swan when he dies, as described in Ode 2.20. Horace uses waxen imagery not only to contrast himself with Daedalus, whose wax didn’t stand up to the test, but also to denote the waxen tablets upon which Romans actually wrote.

Homer’s *Odyssey* sheds further light upon these Horatian themes by providing yet another strong connection between poetry, sailing, and Icarus: feathers. Homer uses the phrase “speaking with winged words” over one hundred times in the *Odyssey* alone.⁴ But James Thomson sensibly notes that this epithet literally translates to “speaking *feathered* words” rather than “*winged* words,” as it is usually translated, and actually compares words

⁴ “ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδων” (*Odyssey* 1.122, 2.269, 3.362, 4.25, etc.).

to arrows, not birds.⁵ Homer also calls a ship's oars "feathered" twice.⁶ This featheredness of both oars and words further solidifies the connection between ships, Icarus, and poetry; all three use feathers through craft to unnaturally cross distances. Birds are naturally meant to fly because they are endowed with wings, but men use birds' feathers to craft arrows to fly across distances and kill men from afar.⁷ Likewise, men also use their craft to build ships, which allow them to fly across the sea by taking on characteristics of fish through a sort of partial metamorphosis, much like Horace's partial metamorphosis into a swan. In the same way, Daedalus uses his craft to construct artificial wings, which then allow Icarus and himself to partially metamorphose into birds and thereby trespass into the realm of Jove.

Horace employs this program of metaphor and imagery in order to highlight the potential danger in writing poetry by demonstrating how humans use feathers and wax, which are Nature's gifts to birds and bees, to do unnatural things through their craft. Mankind imitates birds by using feathers to make arrows that kill men, and imitates fish by building boats to cross natural boundaries. Daedalus imitated birds by using feathers and wax to craft wings to fly across natural boundaries. All these instances of the impious utilization of τεχνη have resulted in death. Therefore, Horace warns, one ought to be careful when using wax to craft lofty poetry. One should be wary of attempting a feat beyond one's capacity. Horace, however, is nevertheless confident in his capabilities, for he boasts in the final ode of book three as follows. "I have completed a monument more lasting than bronze" (3.30.1).

⁵ Thomson 1936

⁶ *Odyssey* 15.527 and 23.272: "ἔρετμά, τὰ τε πτερὰ νηυσὶ πέλονται."

⁷ Sutherland 2001 p. 117

Works Cited

- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Harvard University Press, 1989, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvk12q35>.
- Horace. *Horace: Epodes, Odes, and Carmen Saeculare*. Translated and edited by Stephanie McCarter, University of Oklahoma Press, 2020.
- Hornbeck, Cynthia. 2014 “Caelum Ipsum Petimus : Daedalus and Icarus in Horace’s *Odes*.” *The Classical Journal* 109: 147–169. <https://doi.org/10.1353/tcj.2013.0016>
- Hendrickson, G. L. 1908. “Horace’s Propempticon to Virgil.” *The Classical Journal* 3: 100–104.
- Lockyer, Charles W. 1967. “Horace’s ‘Propempticon’ and Vergil’s Voyage.” *The Classical World*, 61: 42–45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4346345>.
- Nisbet, Robin G. M. and Margaret Hubbard. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Sutherland, Caroline. 2001. “Archery in the Homeric Epics.” *Classics Ireland* 8: 111–120. <https://doi.org/doi:10.2307/25528380>.
- Thomson, J. A. K. 1936. “Winged Words.” *The Classical Quarterly* 30: 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838800012994>.

CANE Student Writing Contest Winner

2020 Topic

Re-Singing Myth

Ovid begins the *Metamorphoses* by explaining that his genre-breaking epic will be about “forms changed into new bodies”. In the 15 books that follow, the poet proceeds to reinvent a panoply of Greek myths, both well-known and obscure, using his signature wit and imagination. Some of the stories he recounts according to the traditional versions, but others he changes completely in the service of different aims. In the same way, in the centuries and millennia since the body of Greco-Roman mythology was first written down, poets, authors, and artists have engaged with these myths by re-inventing them for their own contexts. For example, Luciano Garbati’s sculpture of Medusa holding the head of Perseus imagines a post-#MeToo world where the “hero” may not actually be all that heroic and the victim of sexual assault and misogyny is empowered to change her destiny. In the words of the sculptor himself when asked about the rationale behind the piece: “There are lots of depictions of Medusa, and they are always describing the myth at its worst... What would it look like, her victory, not his? How should that sculpture look?”

As we strive to bring a more just and equitable approach to studying classics, how might we re-sing the ancient tales? Whose voices have been excluded from the stories and whose stories have never been told?

For this writing contest: provide your own short story, poem, essay, or dialogue re-singing a myth or myths from the classical tradition. Your project will be judged holistically, based on how successfully you address the given topic, how well you engage your reader, and how well you write as you present your idea. Deadline for submission: **December 15, 2021**.

Guidelines for Students (please note all these):

- Your project may be a short story, poem, drama, or essay.
- Maximum length: 700 words.
- Your project should not be hand-written. Please provide a typed document.
- If you use any source materials for this project, you must provide a bibliography with specific references.
- Your name should not appear on the project itself.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals has placed this program on the 2021-2022 NASSP List of Approved Contests, Programs, and Activities for Students.

A Perspective on Pandora's Box

MIA SCHENENGA

Tortured, forgotten,
I am the writer of all myth;
 ink of the pen,
 meaning of the word,
 inflection of the eloquent storyteller.

Imprisoned as I am,
 Most don't know my name.
I spread my always broken wings
 confined within one frame.
I fly to those who need me,
 who don't want to need me.
 They do.

My opportunity to escape was fleeting.
A split second window; a vision of
 flying past the cursed silhouette of Pandora,
I was fast enough, but;
 I decided to stay.

Good or evil, then they said,
 as if hope could be an accursed thing
 to the ill-fated humanity,
 plaything of the divine world.
 They need me most.

A young woman holding a floral bouquet,
 the only way I'm known.
Not worthy enough to be a goddess,
 now a nameless spirit.
Young, a reckless decision, that
 I won't regret.
I promise
 to never admit defeat.

I am not ignorant or naive
 as all those do expect; I am:
the mortal life of the divine world,
the presence of the mind,
the intention of their existence
 even if they ignore mine.

There is only one story you know of me,
 although I wrote them all.
I stayed in the cursed box of Pandora;
 The lonely spirit of hope.

Some may call me Elpis,
 While others call me Spes.
You can try to defy me,
But my decision has been made; I am:
 the quiet strength inside your head,
 the choice to change your life,
 that selfless hope that never leaves,
 the chance to keep moving on.

Forever I am haunted
 by the vision of what could be.
The epitome of potential,
 that's who I am,
 what I must live to be.
There will be hope for you,
 and so there can't be hope for me.

East Greenwich High School
Teacher: Ben Revkin

Book Reviews

Andreas Karkavitsas. 2021. Translated by Johanna Hanink. *The Archeologist and Selected Sea Stories*. United States: Penguin Random House. Pp 220. Paperback. (ISBN 9780143136248) \$17.00.

It is a pleasure to see a selection from the works of Andreas Karkavitsas (1866-1922) assume a place in the international fiction series of a prestigious publishing house. First published in Greek in 1904 and translated for the first time into English by Johanna Hanink in this edition, its 128-page count disposes it to be called a novella. The portmanteau description on the back cover describes it as “An allegory of Greek nationalism stylized as a folktale,” while Karkavitsas himself, with the two epigraphs that preface his narrative, casts it in the epic tradition. The first, from an anonymous medieval Greek poem, is Iliadic in nature, yet its immediate reference is the Fall of Constantinople. The second, evoking the textile technologies of *The Odyssey*, is a rhyme that traditionally prefaced the recitation of a folktale: “Twirled crimson thread / Whirled on a wheel / Now kick to make it spin / So our tale may begin. / A good evening to you” (p. 7). The narrative continues to showcase its own hybridity by challenging the reader to engage their own positionality regarding its narrative configuration: “Is it truth I’m telling, or fairytale? Take it as you please” (pg. 8). Such generous options inevitably elude generic classification—the apt achievement of a person, like Karkavitsas, of such diverse professional profile: army doctor and author, prominent intellectual and language activist, naturalist, and pedagogue.

In Chapter One we meet two brothers: Aristodemos, the archeologist of the title, representing the “tyranny of classicism,” and the younger Dimitrakis, who rejects books and study in favor of the natural world. Chapter Two introduces Elpida, Dimitrakis’ refuge and the emissary of Karkavitsas’ voice within the text, which is ultimately didactic within its frame of entertainment. This triad of characters serves the valence of dualities present in the allegory, the potential of which for reductivity is depicted in the cover art of this edition: East/West, past glories/future potential, youth/age, black (figure)/red (figure), foreigners/“natives,” *katharevousa*/demotic. The figures represented are Aristodemos/the Archeologist and Dimitrakis. Elpida’s figural absence is perhaps present in the tree that shatters and exposes this rigid vessel and represents the organicism of the folk tradition, existing beyond the repetitive holding patterns of these cultural and geopolitical categories. Its colors homogenize with the ultimate palimpsest, the backdrop of the natural environment, and seem thereby to potentiate the disruptive palette of the figure who freely steps out into it. In the story *within* the covers, this is the plane tree dynamited to uncover potential antiquities, while being itself the very proclamation of the continuity of Greek life from its appearance in Plato’s *Phaidros* (230 b-c) to its presence in every village in Greece today. It is also an embodiment of Elpida’s metaphor for continuity as the trunk of a tree that bridges the roots of the past and the leaves of the future (p. 71). As such, it is the book’s main character.

As an invested outsider who is by no means expert in the history and geopolitics underlying the “allegory of Greek nationalism,” I found instruction whilst being pleasantly entertained by their fairytale-like transparencies. Without appreciation of the balance, and the elegant power of fairytale as a speech act, the allegory seems mere caricature, as indeed it was received by contemporary critics. One feels that the work was hardly addressed to them, but envisaged as a kind of primer for the Greek people, now an autonomous state in its infancy. Independence may have been declared on March 25th, 1821, but, as with a child, it takes time to learn to live it: “it says something to my ridiculed people... Over here—I believe you know this—it is not yet time for carefree song. We also need to instruct” (Karkavitsas’ comment to Karl Dieterich, May 21st, 1905). Karkavitsas is much concerned with continuity of tradition and consistently reanimates classical “tropes” as vehicles for instruction in more proximate traditions and history. The “ekphrasis” of Elpida’s embroidery in Chapter Four goes back as far as Homer. It is a lesson both for Dimitrakis and for readers looking over his

shoulders. Yet he understands well the need to entertain while delivering instruction, and, subsequent to the publication of *The Archeologist*, wrote five primers for schoolchildren. For all his readers, it is Karkavitsas' position on "The Language Question," where he chose to write in Demotic Greek rather than in *katharevousa*, a form stylized upon features of Ancient Greek, that is the core of his *curriculum*. "He married his medium to his message," as Hanink succinctly puts it (Introduction, xlvii). And to Aristodemus/the Archeologist is given the intermittent opportunity to voice, by way of contrast, the other side of the debate—and most appropriately, since one meaning of "arkhaiologos" (archeologist) is precisely "a person who speaks in an old-fashioned way." One such occurs with the funeral oration he declaims over his dead mother (p. 97-98). Hanink well captures the grandiosity of this Periclean extravaganza by opting for translation into the English of the King James Bible.

The Archeologist ends, having taught us so much along the way about Greek folk traditions, with the fairytale marriage of Elpida and Dimitrakis. Yet Karkavitsas pulls yet one more tradition, one more genre, out of his hat. For those disposed to entertainment, what began as fairytale ends, in Chapter Nine, in farce, in pantomime: "The Archeologist died—and they buried him[!]. And they all lived happily ever after" (p. 134). Behind this final chapter, for which those preceding have set the stage, lies the shadow-puppet theatre tradition of Karagiosis—an art form arising in the gap between peoples divided in the Fall of Constantinople, the decisive event referenced in the first of the two epigraphs to the book. Here, the veil of illusion between characters and the shadow-idea they "represent" in the allegorical "code" is at its most osmotic. Karkavitsas manipulates his puppets by a tactful artistry of voice and character, which once again belies received opinion that Karkavitsas worked in every literary genre except drama.

Turning now to the *Sea Stories*, published five years earlier than *The Archeologist*, in 1899, we see that Karkavitsas is always writing to the imaginative faculty, whether that of children or childlike readers. It is worth pointing out that the full title of the collection from which these four stories are selected is *Words from the Prow: Sea Stories*. This is not so much the naïve promise to deliver words "from the horse's mouth," as it were, as a signal of adherence, at the level of genre-appropriate form, to the Homeric model of self-narration. Hanink (Introduction, xxxix) does not consider this aspect of Karkavitsas' writing in the *Sea Stories*. It comprises not only vocabulary choice but also Karkavitsas' concern to situate it within its own literary tradition in a reception that carries it forward alive. *Sich verändert erhielt*: it holds fast in those very ways in which it is up-dated. But it *does* hold fast, by means of the formal choices which guarantee recognition of provenance. The avatar for these voices is Odysseus himself, whose adventures *told in his own words*, are a mix of fairy-tale and actual reports brought back by the earliest Ionian sailors from explorations to the Black Sea and Gulf of Sidra. Karkavitsas actually did spend time, in his professional career as an army doctor, at the prow of ships, talking to sailors taking rest there, and on Hydra researching the lives of sponge-divers. It is no accident that these places prove the very ones in the stories before us. That is, the tradition *empirically*, as well as literarily, perpetuates. Just because Karkavitsas "claim[s] in the preface to the first of the published stories that he had often been moved by the sailors' "simple [or simply put?] words" (Introduction, xxxix), this does not preclude their being "colorful," "transnational," and "transcultural." Odysseus himself and his crew picked up some *recherché* vocabulary, if Homer is anything to go by.

The *Sea Stories* are that quintessentially Greek mixture of empirical accuracy and its imaginative embellishment. This mix never—unlike empires and their *linguae francae*—fell from favor. The tongue-in-cheek "True Stories" of Lucian of Samosata (2nd century C. E.) belong in the same tradition as those of Karkavitsas. An old-timer on Krete once told me that Kretans still heard sirens singing out at sea up until the arrival of television on the island. Today we all too easily leave little to the imagination. In Karkavitsas, the only screen on board is the open sea and sky. It is the perfect canvas for his ecstatic, cosmic, and naturalist sensibility. In *The Gorgon*, for example, his description of an epiphany of the sister of Alexander the Great is perhaps the imaginative understanding of an electrical storm at sea.

Of the ship-captain in the story *Doomed* we hear: “Sea, sky, land, stars, clouds, the sun’s rising and setting kept no secret from him. They spoke to his soul” (p. 143).

Another story, *The Sponge Divers*, complements *The Archeologist* in two respects. First, it concerns raising things from the depths, whether marbles or the sponges that once again highlight the naturalist dimensions of Karkavitsas’ writing. Second, the story tells of two brothers, who end as unwitting competitors over the harvesting of a highly-prized sponge. It is a mistaken identity on the seafloor that leads to fratricide, a plot which follows the conventions of a Greek tragedy. Before the tragic events unfold, Karkavitsas exercises his talent for naturalist description. His portrait of “the deep” (p. 161) anticipates our later access to these regions on television and YouTube. The preponderance of directional adverbs, adjectives, metaphors, and similes convey the darting visual excitement of the “χιλιόμορφο κόσμος” (“thousand-formed / kaleidoscopic world”) (p. 161) existing in these dark and murky depths (Karkavitsas 1925, 64). The grammatical density and agglomerative capacity of Greek to form compound adjectives creates momentum and fuels enthralment at this “κῆπο ὄνειροφανταστό” (“dream garden”) (p.161) (Karkavitsas 1925, 64). The unpacking of such potential into English is a challenge for the translator. In this particular section, where we hear so directly the ecstatic voice characteristic of Karkavitsas’ naturalistic mode, I could have wished to see more risks taken to enliven the flattening effect of reliable prose translation—perhaps even by the orthography of exclamation appropriate to this “θαύμα ἰδέσαι” (“wonder to behold”), another classical trope frequently encountered in epic. Having been “dressed” for his descent in underwater diving apparatus (the skaphander, introduced in the 1860s), the diver, too, will have his costume on the sea floor—in his own turn a wonder for the sea creatures to behold! A surreal flash of humor before tragedy unfolds, complete with decoy.

The descriptive aside concludes abruptly by rounding upon itself with the announcement that the diver, intent upon his work, sees none of the above. Artistry returns the story to its empirical dimension as social documentary of a working tradition and the perils entailed therein. As Salvador Dali was to discover in 1936, when he donned the skaphander in a gimmick to take his audience at the first surrealist exhibition on English soil on a deep-sea dive into the sub-conscious of the human mind and almost suffocated, on dry land!

What relevance do Karkavitsas’ works hold for those trained in classical Greek? K. P. Kavafy wrote, “Δὲν εἶμαι Ἕλληνας. Εἶμαι Ἕλληνικός” (“I am not a Greek. I am Greek”)—by which I take him to mean that Greekness is not a single embodiment but an indeterminate plurality. I count myself fortunate that my relationship with the modernities of “Greekness” preceded my training in its classical forms. The former has always provided spiritual nourishment; the latter would have been all too often a set of grammar rules and regulations had I not felt that onward thrust into time that was its life. When we arbitrarily cut off the flow of receptions and conceptions of “Greekness,” we are at risk of our own misconceptions. This brings disastrous consequences—for example, stripping the vibrant colors from looted marbles we want to be white, unchanging, Olympian. The very way that Aristodemus is compelled to show himself “the moment he saw the foreigners”: “His eyes had no tears, and his face showed no emotion” (p. 98). How else do we become aware of our own positionality if not by encountering texts that challenge it and its effects?

Karkavitsas has given his own text a cameo appearance within itself when the narrator says of *The Enduring and Unchanged Eumorphopoulos Spirit*, the tome of Alamanos, one of Aristodemus’ three scholarly companions, that “it wasn’t so much a book as a mirror” (p. 122). Who will look into *The Archeologist* and see their own reflection? Should we not take advantage of both Karkavitsas’ and his translator’s exemplary efforts to model “for an international readership... a perspective on the classical legacy of the sort that has rarely crossed the language barrier from (Modern) Greek into English” (Introduction, xxxvii)? Karkavitsas’ voice has a place in the study of language, Classical Reception, Greek Folklore, Greek and Balkan history, Women’s studies, the history of foreign “schools” of archeology on Greek soil, and the ethics of conservation and acquisition of antiquities.

His works are appropriate for undergraduate and lay readers, as well as for experts.

Karkavitsas, and this translation, with its hugely supportive notes and background material, are treasures. Penguin Random House and Johanna Hanink are to be congratulated upon raising them to the surface. They warrant attention.

Danielle Freedman

Auburn, Maine

danielle.freedman4@gmail.com

Works Cited

- Freedman, Ilana. *Indeterminate "Greekness": A Diasporic and Transnational Poetics*. PhD Dissertation. Harvard University, 2022.
- Karkavitsas, Andreas. *Τα Άπαντα. Λόγια της πλώρης - Σκόρπια διηγήματα - Λυρικές πρόξες - Η λυγερή - Ο ζητιάνος* Vol 2. Athens: Χρ. Γιοβάνη, 1973.
- Karkavitsas, Andreas. *Τα Άπαντα. Διηγήματα "Διγενή Ακρίτα" - Οι μέλισσες - Ταξιδιωτικά - Σ' ανατολή και Δύση - Λαογραφικά* Vol 4. Athens: Χρ. Γιοβάνη, 1973.

Luis Alfaro. Rosa Andújar, ed. *The Greek Trilogy of Luis Alfaro: Electricidad; Oedipus El Rey; Mojada*. London: Methuen Drama, 2021. Pp. 296. Paper (ISBN 978-1-3501-5540-4) \$34.95.

Luis Alfaro's work has long been a fixture of queer and Latinx theatre, and the L.A.-based Chicano artist's recent turn toward Greek tragedy as scaffolding for his storytelling has garnered attention from classicists as well. Classicists' eager reception of Alfaro is part of a growing interest in the adaptation of Greco-Roman antiquity in Latinx and Latin American drama, as evinced by recent work including Carrete (2021), Barrenechea (2016), Nikoloutsos (2010), and two SCS 2022 talks by Kim and Cruz. One obstacle facing those interested in working on these plays is that the scripts are, for the most part, unpublished—although this is not the case for Alfaro's earlier works, many of which have been published in anthologies of queer and Latinx drama such as *O Solo Homo* (1998) and *Out of the Fringe* (2000). Andújar's edition of Alfaro's Greek Trilogy meets a real need for the primary texts, and provides useful introductory essays geared towards a wide audience, including scholars in fields other than classics and general readers. The volume is a solid base upon which scholars can familiarize themselves with Alfaro's work in preparation for teaching, research, and for enjoying future performances of the plays.

Andújar's edition of the Greek Trilogy of Luis Alfaro begins with a broad introduction (pp. 1-19) which contextualizes the plays in three areas: within the rest of Alfaro's oeuvre, within the history of Chicanx and Latinx theater, and within a tradition of Greek tragic adaptations. The "Further Reading" section offers additional guidance in all three areas. The plays are then presented in the order of their creation; each is printed with an accompanying introduction which describes the history of adaptation from the ancient Greek source text and offers a primer of what to expect from the script itself and the themes that Alfaro draws out, complete with robust citations. Information about the original production also appears with each play. A full production history (pp. 238-265) presents the results of painstaking work on the part of Andújar: it includes URLs for reviews of each production and lists of each production's creative team. This is valuable information for those who wish to undertake serious study of Alfaro's plays. For instance, the creative team for the the 2007 production of *Electricidad* at the San Pedro Playhouse in San Antonio, TX includes both a graffiti artist and a tattoo designer. Such details hint at the additional layers of artistry invested in the production of Alfaro's plays—details which cannot be captured by the scripts alone.

When introducing the Greek plays in relation to Alfaro's other work, Andújar touches on the significance of his background as a queer Chicano who was raised Catholic in East L.A.; using quotes from Alfaro's varied oeuvre, she demonstrates to readers the importance of these components of Alfaro's identity in shaping his artistic production. Next, the plays are introduced as urban North American adaptations of Greek tragedy. As Andújar points out, Alfaro's plays "go beyond transposing classical tragedies to an urban context, but rather assemble the structure provided by the Greeks as a vehicle to convey complex socio-political realities to wide and diverse audiences" (p. 3). Lastly, the plays are introduced as works produced within the traditions of U.S. Chicax and Latinx theater. In this section, Andújar also offers quick remarks on these demographic terms; here, she introduces the complexities of *Latinidad*, noting that it collapses language, race, ethnicity, nationality, and other categories and states that other terms for identity, like Chicax, have ideological components as well. She avoids offering precise definitions, which is a defensible decision given that these terms and their applicability continue to be hotly debated within Latinx communities today, and indeed she gestures towards these debates in her citations of Twitter hashtags, sociological and cultural studies, and autobiographical writings. Those familiar with the issues at stake here will likely find this overview sufficient; those for whom this is new territory may need to seek out additional information. Andújar then offers an overview of Hispanophone theater in North America, taking care to situate Alfaro's work within three interconnected traditions. The first is *teatro de carpa*, or Mexican tent theater, which consists of pastiche sketches on contemporary political issues and has historically been performed widely on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border. The second is Chicano *Teatro Campesino*, or Farm Workers' Theater, which drew upon *teatro de carpa* and was created to educate and agitate workers during the UFW strikes of the 1960s. Lastly, Andújar places Alfaro's work within the intellectual space of the Chicano Movement, the Mexican-American civil rights movement which was most active through the 1960s and 1970s. She then returns to the wider Latinx context of Alfaro's work, flagging its interfaces with other diaspora theater traditions and highlighting the opportunities that Alfaro's plays have created for Latinx actors and other theater professionals. All of this is important context for classicists who are less familiar with these topics and is a salutary starting point for further engagement.

Throughout her critical introduction, Andújar emphasizes that Alfaro's plays should be understood as belonging to several distinct contexts: the environment of East L.A., the *barrio* (that is, the neighborhood or hood), and North American urban theater. Andújar makes the case for these contexts' relevance by flagging that their attendant inequalities are front and center in the Greek trilogy, just as she makes the case for how the generic categories of "Chicax/Latinx theater" and "North American urban theater" enhance interpretation. Readers may want to interrogate Andújar's choices and consider further possible categories of analysis for Alfaro's Greek plays. An obvious one might be their connection to the rich history of Latin American engagement with Greek drama, since the details of this history have now been brought together in González Betancur (2010) and Nikoloutsos (2012). Andújar's choice to elide this connection is justifiable, in that it emphasizes Alfaro's U.S. context, and yet it represents a choice rather than a given of interpretation.

The introductions to each play include a short excursus on the relevant Greek mythic tradition, covering how the figures were treated by different ancient dramatists, and then identifying how Alfaro has aligned his play with those traditions or departed from them. They are an easy guide for reading each play, bringing some basic themes of each work to the surface. Additional contextual notes offer sporadic mentions of other modern adaptations of each play which, in Andújar's view, deploy similar adaptive strategies. These essays are somewhat impressionistic, offering small bites of information about many different topics. As a result, they seem well-suited to framing high-school or undergraduate classroom discussion, since they leave plenty of room for students to trace themes independently and generate their own readings of the plays.

Andújar's introduction to *Electricidad* (pp. 20-26) offers a brief discussion of the *barrio* setting and *cholo* culture (a particular Chicana street gang subculture). Most of her emphasis, however, is on Alfaro's treatment of his women characters, which she rightly presents as an innovation in relation to the women of Sophocles' *Electra*. First *Electricidad* and *Clemencia* are introduced, then *La Ifi* (Iphigenia) and *La Abuela*, a character original to Alfaro's play. Lastly, Andújar connects the chorus of *vecinas* (older women neighbors) directly to a typical fifth-century Athenian chorus, especially in terms of the structures of their speech and their appeal to the assembled community of listeners. Andújar notes that women are at the center of Alfaro's play, whereas in Greek myth misfortunes are focalized around men—Alfaro's Orestes is little more than a supporting character, while the women's personal histories, inner lives, and conflicts take center stage.

Oedipus El Rey is introduced (pp. 110-114) by casting Alfaro's focus on Oedipus as particularly Sophoclean, even as he introduces the family's *miasma* as one caused by incarceration rather than incest (although Alfaro includes this too). Again, Andújar tells us that innovations include a greater focus on women characters (Jocasta's life is rendered in greater detail and with greater emotional force), and a more varied role for the chorus of incarcerated men. The setting, a prison, makes criticism of mass incarceration the central theme of the play.

The *Mojada* essay (pp. 180-186) remarks on the configuration of Medea's "otherness" as gendered and racialized in many adaptations, before introducing Alfaro's Medea as one who refuses to assimilate to U.S. culture and who embodies "potent Latinx stereotypes about motherhood and femininity." (p. 181) Medea's role as a witch, both in Alfaro's *Mojada* and in other broadly American *Medea* adaptations, receives brief treatment. Lastly, Andújar includes a discussion of how *Mojada* was adapted for performance in different cities in the U.S.; the identities and experiences of supporting characters were modified to correspond to the Latinx populations which made up each new audience (for example, among *caribeños* in New York).

The final section of the book is dedicated to the production history, a Spanish/Spanglish glossary (266-281), an interview with Alfaro conducted by Andújar (pp. 282-291), and a section with further reading on the topics of Greek tragedy; Chicana and Latinx drama; and Luis Alfaro's own works (292-295). Andújar does well with the glossary—no easy task—especially in her translation of slang terms. Occasionally her notes amount to cultural rather than strictly linguistic translation (such as entries on *huaraches* or *guayabera*). There are some minor inconsistencies in the format of these translations. For instance, Andújar occasionally notes when slang terms are particular to Mexicans or Mexican-Americans (e.g. *ese*), but not always (as in the case of *firme* or *tecolote*). There are then some predictable difficulties with identifying the degree of offensiveness for specific derogatory terms; here my own judgements sometimes differ from Andújar's. Differences of this kind are likely to be more pronounced, and more problematic, in classroom contexts where teachers do not speak Spanish but students do.

The transcription of Andújar's interview of Alfaro is a valuable addition to the collection. Its placement at the end of the volume allows readers to navigate the plays more independently, but Alfaro's discussion of how he views his source texts and his language, the process of making community-based art, and his take on various societal ills should encourage readers to revisit each play with added interpretive nuance. Andújar should be commended for her role as an interviewer here, asking open-ended questions which allow Alfaro to get to the heart of so many elements of his work.

The volume contains a tantalizing single black-and-white photograph from the 2008 production of *Electricidad*; since the plays are driven by such a keen sense of place, further photographs or illustrations would have enriched the reader's experience. On the other hand, the book is affordable—a merit in its own right—and Andújar's development of introductions and supplementary materials is successful in serving readers from a variety of backgrounds, including Classics, theatre, Chicana literature, and general readers inspired by curiosity.

Unavoidably, some major themes in Alfaro's work have not received space here. Among them are *machismo*, queerness, and religion—each of these are enormous topics with robust bibliographies and intense lived realities which could not be adequately treated within a single volume whose emphasis was Alfaro's engagement with ancient drama. To this point, I will conclude with the words of Alfaro himself (p. 286): “[T]here is a cultural reality at play here. I am doing a Greek adaptation, but it is much more important, I think, to know about Latinx culture, community, ritual, and manner of speaking.”

Linda McNulty Perez
Princeton University
lmcnulty@princeton.edu

Works Cited

- Alfaro, Luis. (2000). “Straight as a Line.” In Caridad Svich and María Teresa Marrero (Eds.), *Out of the Fringe: Contemporary Latina/Latino Theatre and Performance* (1-42). Theatre Communications Group.
- . (1998). “Downtown.” In Holly Hughes and David Román (Eds.), *O Solo Homo: The New Queer Performance* (313-348). Grove Press.
- Barrenechea, Francisco. (2016). “Tragic Impostures: Greek Tragedy and Pre-Hispanic Myth in the Theatre of Rodolfo Usigli and Salvador Novo.” *Classical Reception Journal* 8: 191-215.
- Carrete, Andrés A. (2021). “Humanity and Revolution in José Fuentes Mares’ *La joven Antígona se va a la guerra*.” *Classical Reception Journal* 13 (4): 507-529.
- Cruz, Kathleen. (2022, January 7). *Bodies, Burials, and Borders: Living and Dying Latinx in Marisela Treviño Orta’s Woman on Fire* [Paper presentation]. SCS 2022: San Francisco, CA.
- González Betancur, Juan David. (2010). “Antigone y el teatro latinoamericano.” *Calle: revista de investigación en el campo del arte* 14 (4): 72-85.
- Kim, Young Richard. (2022, January 6). *Teaching with Luis Alfaro* [Paper presentation]. SCS 2022: San Francisco, CA.
- Nikoloutsos, Konstantinos P., ed. (2012). “Reception of Greek and Roman Drama in Latin America.” *Romance Quarterly* 59 (1).
- . (2010). “Appropriating Greek Myth: Iphigenia and Argentine Patriarchal Society in Inés de Oliveira Cézár’s *Extranjera*.” *Classical Reception Journal* 2 (1): 92-113.

Kim Bowes, ed. *The Roman Peasant Project 2009–2014: Excavating the Roman Rural Poor*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2021. Pp. 824. Hardcover (ISBN 9781949057072) \$120.00.

Classical archaeology is a discipline that has faced profound changes for the last two decades. Nevertheless, its dominant narratives are still deeply rooted in the interpretation of material remains left almost exclusively by activities of the ancient elites, from which recent scholarship is still struggling to move on. Even very influential recent publications have been renewing elite-centric approaches to antiquity through the development of a well-developed theoretical apparatus (see, for example, Terrenato 2019). This pattern leaves archaeologists of the Greek and Roman worlds with many important steps to be taken in shaping our knowledge of the ancient world; first and foremost towards deconstructing our perceived sense of familiarity with the Roman world, which both academia and popular culture picture as something naturally inherited by and deeply embedded in today's western society. Since a critical history of the world cannot simply correspond to the narratives built around the material remains left by the ruling classes, Roman archaeologists need to critically investigate both the theoretical frameworks used to produce such a crystallised knowledge of the Roman world, and the

methodology of data collection. This is crucial to enhancing our chances of successfully detecting and interpreting the presence of non-elite groups within the archaeological record.

The Roman Peasant Project 2009–2014: Excavating the Roman Rural Poor, edited by Kim Bowes, is a choral effort to answer such neglected yet crucial research questions. The book intends to offer a bottom-up history of the Roman period focusing on the lives of peasants, by holding a perspective as close as possible to peasants and as far as possible from the elites (p. 16). Focusing on the results of an archaeological project run over a period of six years, with a multidisciplinary approach involving landscape and bones studies, ceramic and botanical analyses, the project involved the collection and interpretation of first-hand data coming from a landscape survey and the excavation of seven sites in Tuscany highlighted during the survey phase. While Bowes' volume fully succeeds in distancing itself from elite-centred narratives, the admittedly challenging goal of focusing solely on the signs of lives left by rural peasants proved harder to accomplish in a single archaeological project, no matter how consistent and stratified. Ultimately, this book breaks some new ground and will produce even better results if similar projects decide to follow the theoretical and methodological frameworks set out by Bowes.

The main strength of the volume is its structural and methodological clarity, accompanied by a remarkable theoretical consistency. The clarity and consistency displayed by every contributor made this book a very pleasant and well-structured read, in which it is remarkably hard to get lost, despite it being over 700 pages in length. Part 1 ("Old Questions and New Data" and Part 2 ("A New Synthesis") are in close dialogue with one another. The book starts off exposing in detail the questions central to the research project: can the lives of non-elite rural groups of Roman times, particularly peasants, be archaeologically detected? The hypothesis formulated to tackle this question is that "even the poorest rural dwellers would leave some material traces" (p. 14) that can be highlighted through a combination of survey, geophysics, and thereafter thoroughly investigated through excavation. To test this hypothesis, the project worked on three other questions: where, and above all how, Roman peasants lived, in terms of diet, economy, agricultural activities; how they related to their environment, and how much they were shaped by it—using the useful concept of locale—and finally how poor they actually were. The last question, central to the project's design, does not rely on an overly simplistic definition of poverty, but maturely answered by defining poverty as a spectrum and taking into account parameters such as access to land, information, food, goods, and mobility.

The data, uniformly obtained for all seven sites investigated by the project, come from survey, remote sensing, and excavation, resulting in a vast diversity of typology which includes ceramics, faunal and botanical remains, coins, small finds, glass, and building materials; all presented in a way that is effective and relevant to the book's framework. Such remains are discussed in a dedicated and easy-to-find subsection within the analysis of each site, curated by specialists on the subject. In addition to thoroughly describing the research questions asked, and constantly reminding the reader of which questions the analyses refer to, the editor also lists some potential research questions that were not included, and justifies their exclusion from the project accordingly: amongst the latter are the power relationships between the elites and the Roman peasants, and the use of ancient texts. These exclusions, for instance, are justified with the intention to focus on the many horizontal relationships that characterise the daily life of peasants (p. 17), which are deemed by the editor to be usually obscured by the excessive focus on vertical relationships and hence by elites-oriented archaeological reconstructions.

Bowes' honesty and methodological transparency are exemplary: she freely admits when some of the research questions turn out to be the wrong ones, either because they are not conducive to understanding the lives of the rural non-elites, or because they are not answerable with the types of data collected. For example, Bowes remarks upon the near-total absence of evidence concerning human remains, which would have been particularly desirable in order to answer questions on the Roman peasants' lifestyle. This lack of evidence,

however, is not treated as a data flaw that compromises the research question, but rather as a) evidence in itself, useful for looking into the lack of “any clear evidence for activities or places that could be described as religious or ritual” (p. 588) in the rural landscape (e.g., temples and burials) and b) as an opportunity to investigate the peasants’ diet with the available data coming from animal bones and pollens.

Significantly, this volume sets up an important theoretical apparatus aimed at defining the word central to the project: peasant. A well-rounded definition is arrived at by thoroughly reviewing the figure of the peasant in the historiographical and archaeological tradition. The reference to the initial photograph (p. 2), taken in 1921 by Giovanni Bartolotti in Campana alle Vergini, Agro Pontino, frames the search for Roman peasants in an effectively vivid and imaginative way, while also warning the reader about the risks of essentialist modern rhetoric that tends to treat peasants as a monolith. In doing so, this volume follows previous attempts to challenge the supposed “timelessness” of peasants, such as McCarthy 2013 did for the context of Roman Britain. That photo, however, highlighted the plight of the rural poor in Italy and in Europe in general, inspiring the authors to draw attention to the rural poor in antiquity *and* modernity. Indeed, solidarity towards the rural workers neglected by history is not only explicitly expressed at the beginning of the volume (p. 1), but the idea that the lives of rural peasants should and need to be analysed, studied, and revealed permeates the volume as a whole is the distinguishing feature of the Roman Peasant Project.

Taking on board, and critically discussing, socio-cultural reflections of Marxist traditions, especially the British and Italian ones, the book makes use of the word peasantry to embrace all inhabitants of rural areas and does so by excluding all archaeological contexts with secure connection to the elites such as baths, temples, villas. Certainly, this is done with clarity and it is logically straightforward to link the presence of elite-associated contexts to the risk of building elite-centred narratives. However, the assumption that sweeping away elite-related contexts will make the rural peasants more visible in their life in a sort of unspoilt environment untouched by the elites, excluding the power relationships from the narratives of their lives, is one that brings back the concept of purity and as such needs reviewing. It must be stated that the editor herself is fully aware of the mechanical implications of this choice, realising that, being the project mainly an economy-centred one based on accessibility of goods and foods, escaping power relationships, even in archaeological contexts that seem peasants-related only, is practically impossible.

The manner in which this volume deals with the biases of an approach centred on elite-free contexts is just one of several examples of its scientifically rigorous and self-aware approach for future research projects to build on. Indeed, the editor expresses the need to apply strong interpretive frameworks, even with all of their limitations, in order to advance an even more important agenda which should be more widely adopted in archaeological research of the classical world: that is, to go beyond the limits of the purely empirical and to incite further interpretive work, as “lists provoke no responses” (p. 638). This is perhaps the main takeaway of the book, which invites all archaeologists to find a balance between our own presentist preconceptions and the lived experience of the past.

Worth singling out from the volume are chapter 14 (“Diet, Dining and Subsistence”) by Bowes, MacKinnon, Mercuri, Rattighieri, Rinaldi, Vaccaro, given the authors’ remarkable efforts to interpret material culture as evidence of a dynamic rural society. Likewise, section 18.7 of the Conclusions chapter, written by Bowes and Grey, provides a complex answer to the potentially essentialist question of “how rich or poor were Roman peasants” (p. 629), suggesting that “Roman peasants had some important capabilities” that are sometimes unseen—or interpreted as belonging to pseudo-elites—as “archaeology as a discipline has probably underestimated the material footprint of peasants” (p. 633).

There are no major omissions or errors readers should be aware of in this book. However, some of the theoretical frameworks mentioned in the first chapters were not explored as thoroughly as others. For instance, although Antonio Gramsci’s approach to

subalterns is only briefly mentioned in relation to Carandini's slave society interpretation of the Roman villa at Settefinestre and dismissed as "less methodologically innovative" (p. 9) and not truly fitting the aims of the book because of its entrenchment in power relationships, it could be reviewed in a potential follow-up of this research project. Gramsci's Notebook 25, which aims to recover the traces of subaltern activities aimed towards maintaining their (horizontal) relationships or fixing them after their breakage caused by the elites' intrusion (vertical power relationships), could be particularly helpful in reconstructing horizontal relationships between peasants.

The notes, apparatus, images, diagrams, and bibliography are all very rich and conducive to the fulfilment of the volume's stated aims. The bibliographic references are up-to-date, including relevant works published within a year's time of the book's publication. Older references are not neglected either but engaged with critically and coherently.

The Roman Peasant Project is a must-read for both senior scholars, who might be interested in and have the opportunity to create similar multi-year research projects, as well as for early career researchers and advanced students of the Roman world who want to move beyond the classificatory approaches still so frequent in archaeology, and towards fully embracing interpretive stands.

Mauro Puddu
Marie Sklodowska-Curie Fellow
Ca' Foscari University of Venice
mauro.puddu@unive.it

Works Cited

- McCarthy, Michael. (2013). *The Romano-British Peasant. Towards a Study of People, Landscapes, and Work during the Roman Occupation of Britain*. Windgather Press.
- Terrenato, Nicola. (2019). *The Early Roman Expansion into Italy. Elite Negotiation and Family Agendas*. Cambridge University Press.

Shadi Bartsch, translator. *The Aeneid*. New York: Penguin Random House, 2021. Pp. 464. Hardcover (ISBN 9781984854100) \$35.00.

Ambitious in scope and diligently researched, Shadi Bartsch's new translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* cleverly captures the ancient poem's style and imbues it with a critical sensibility for a modern Anglophone audience. This edition comes with the stated aim to provide a valuable resource to students and teachers of Classics who do not read Latin (LV). Opportunities for ancient language learning are increasingly rare outside of private education. Nevertheless, an eager audience for the stories of the ancient world has long existed and never truly diminished. To make this epic accessible, Bartsch renders the Latin into digestible, idiomatic English while simultaneously evoking Virgil's intricate wordplay. Using deceptively simple literary devices, like alliteration, anaphora, and anacoluthon (LIV), Bartsch stays true to the story's original poetic format. Though her intentions are to capture the spirit of Virgil's epic to non-Latin readers Bartsch still emphasizes that this is her version of this story (LV). Bartsch thus sets herself the challenge faced by every translator before her: to strike a balance between the scholar and the poet.

Bartsch's *Aeneid* is an accessible and enjoyable read, and it boasts many scholarly merits as well. This new edition draws out the complexities of Virgil's poem through four main themes. First, the complex relationship between the colonizer and colonized as understood through Bartsch's modern and sympathetic perspective; then a discussion of Bartsch's treatment of Aeneas's perplexing epithet: *pius*; then how she deals with gender and gender expression, and femininity in particular; finally, a brief note on the meta-narratives within the *Aeneid* and Virgil's use of ekphrasis.

FATO PROFUGUS: Colonizers and Refugees

This translation's first innovation is in its initial line: "My song is of war and a man: a refugee by fate," (1.1). Parsing the Latin participle *profugus* as "refugee" invokes contemporary issues while situating us in the ancient world. Bartsch draws clever parallels between Aeneas's world and ours, which she describes as, "an age of refugees seeking to escape their war-torn homelands," (XV). The figure of the refugee in the *Aeneid* is incredibly multifaceted and morally grey: from Sinon whose "fugitive's false claims" (XIX) lead to the invitation of the Trojan Horse within the city walls, to later Dido's hosting of a shipwrecked Aeneas leads to her own demise. Bartsch describes Aeneas as "a refugee smiled on (eventually) by fate," (XIX); the unseen force dictates Aeneas's fugitive status and strips him of agency. Despite his happy ending, Aeneas' time as a refugee is still frantic and out-of-control. In her translator's note, Bartsch describes her own life as a state of near-constant migration as she, "grew up as a foreigner in other peoples' countries [...] not as a refugee but as an outsider to the dominant culture." (XLVII). Bartsch's personal identification as an "outsider" means she has a great deal of sympathy and nuance for the chaos of constant migration.

However, Virgil's *nostos* is far more about "founding" a home rather than returning to one. Bartsch does not fail to report that many scholars like Ronald Syme (1939) and the Harvard School have interpreted the *Aeneid* as a "national" myth commissioned by the emperor Augustus. Much work has been devoted to uncovering the extent to which modern imperial and fascist vernacular has been engendered by Virgil's poem, with authoritarian dictators like Benito Mussolini using it as a tool to promote Italian national unity (XVIII; Harrison 1990; Martindale, 1997; Nelis 2007). British imperial discourse made use of Jupiter's promise to the future Romans of *imperium sine fine*, an empire without end (Vance, 2011), and Juno's insistence on total cultural erasure for the Trojans and forced assimilation with the Latin tribes. Conversely, many scholars have argued for the *Aeneid* as a covert critique of Augustan rule. Undermining the much-advertised idea of Augustus' clemency (XXVIII), the poem ends with Aeneas executing Turnus at the sight of a war spoil from the young Pallas. This moment has been read as a warning about the psychological toll of war (Parry, 1963) and a critique of Augustus' imperial expansion. Like many before her (e.g. Barchiesi, 1997 and Conte 1986) Bartsch takes the modern tack of resisting the simplicity of this pro-Augustan/anti-Augustan binary. Ultimately, she is successful in treating this complex discourse with nuance by focalizing these themes through the narrative of a refugee.

In the world of the *Aeneid*, it is ultimately fate that determines who is a refugee and who is a colonizer and when they occupy either position. Bartsch's translation highlights the tensions surrounding exile and expansion in the discourses of the epic's own characters. For instance, in book two, Priam laments the destruction of his homeland at the hands of the Greeks (2.159), and though a member of Aeneas's party is explicit in their intent not "to plunder Libyan homes," (1.527) when they seek refuge from Dido, in the end (though under different circumstances) both the Carthaginians and the Latins suffer violence in their homeland and the murder of their leaders, all the destruction now led by the Trojans. The Latins are largely framed as justified for defending their homeland-- at some points they even remind the Trojans that they suffered the same trauma of siege at the hands of the Greeks (9.144). Nevertheless, they still use "Eastern" stereotypes about the Trojans. Bartsch's interpretation of the many forms of cultural contact in the *Aeneid* are informed by Edward Said's *Orientalism*, which posits that many European nations forge their identities as a "Western" self which is defined in opposition to an "Eastern," or "Oriental" other (Said, 1978). Numanus Remulus, Turnus's brother-in-law, taunts the Trojans with orientalist and gendered language. He says, "...Your clothes / have violet and saffron stitching, your hobby's laziness, you love to dance, your tunics / have long sleeves and your hats are bonnets! / O Phrygian ladies (no men here)..." (9.613-17). Effeminacy is a trope conjured as an insult by the African king Iarbas as well, who calls Aeneas "that Paris" and berates "his half-men" (4.215). Thus, the main thrust of "orientalist" tension in the *Aeneid* comes from the Trojans' dual role as both refugees and colonizers. Though we cannot know if Virgil's

Roman audience thought critically about this fundamental hypocrisy in the narrative, Bartsch's careful attention to these themes enables the reader to reflect upon just that.

PIUS AENEAS: An Ambivalent Hero?

In her translator's note, Bartsch discusses the difficulties of translating Aeneas's epithet *pious*, noting that "the Latin [term] has a broader compass than the English word "pious" and refers to at least three simultaneous kinds of piety," (XXXI). These include worship of Gods, both Olympian and household, of male progenitors, and finally, a life-giving devotion to one's "country." Past translators have approached *pious* by glossing it differently each time it appears, and in doing so they give a sense of which of the many Latin meanings it is evoking in the context of the line in which it appears. John Dryden's 1697 translation, for example, has "good Aeneas," when the hero introduces himself to Dido, as does Christopher Pitt in 1778, and "pious Aeneas," when he awards gifts at Priam's funeral games. In more modern translations like Robert Fagles' 2006 edition, when Aeneas introduces himself to his godly mother, the epithet is the incisive yet wordy "duty-bound," (1.380) and Edward McCrorie's 1995 version chooses to omit every instance of the epithet altogether. To his own unique effect, McCrorie opts to use different adverbs which capture just one of the many nuances in the Latin idea of *pietas*, describing Aeneas "reverently" performing sacrifice (8.84-5) and "wisely" assessing the wind for sailing (5.26).

Though each of these choices has its own merits, this translation's strength is in its simplicity: choosing to consistently use "pious." In her introductory material, Bartsch outlines her particular interest in the competing mythological traditions of Aeneas—specifically certain pre-Virgilian stories of Aeneas ultimately betraying Troy to facilitate his escape (XXX-XXXI). Bartsch's decision to keep the translation consistently "pious," empowers her readers to decide which nuance the word takes on within the context of its appearance. As in the beginning of book six, "Pious Aeneas," heads to the temple of Apollo to begin his *katabasis* at the behest of the Gods (6.9), and then in book ten after the gruesome killing of a Latin soldier named Lucagus, "Pious Aeneas," critiques the "hot-headed," fighting tactics of the enemy soldiers (10.591). Bartsch allows the reader to appreciate the nuances of this epithet by introducing these many semantic possibilities and then leaving it up to the reader to appreciate the myriad ways it appears in the poem.

VARIUM ET MUTABILE: Women and Gender

The *Aeneid* is remarkable for its many complex female characters, but none stand out more than the tragic figure of Dido, queen of Carthage. Dido's great misfortune is that she can only ever be a brief stop on Aeneas's journey. When divine influence makes her fall in love with Aeneas, it is yet another god—Mercury—who urges Aeneas to leave her, uttering the famous line: *varium et mutabile semper femina*, or "fickle and changeable always (is) woman," (4.560-570). Over the many years of the *Aeneid*'s translation history in English, this line has continued to prove symptomatic of how each translator has dealt with women in this epic.

One of the earliest translations of this line by Richard Stanyhurst in 1582 reads, "a wind fane changabil huf puffe / Always is a wooman." Stanyhurst compares Dido to a weather vane, casting her fickleness in imagery commonplace and concrete for his 16th century audience. Throughout the English translations from the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries we see Mercury's misogyny reflect the mores of the translator's society. Then, in 1956, W.F. Jackson Knight's translation ("Women were ever things of many changing moods") marks a subtle semantic shift: "changeability" is attributed to a woman's moods rather than ascribing them, more immutably, to the female gender itself. Other 20th and 21st century innovations of note include McCrorie's "the woman's a constant swing of change" (1995), which shifts the blame on Dido specifically, thus dodging generalizations about all women. Fagles' 2006 translation, "woman's a thing that's always changing, shifting like the wind," actually evokes Stanyhurst once again—Dido started as a weather vane and now she is the wind itself.

The complex history of this line can be traced within Bartsch's edition as well. Her translation, "females are a fickle thing / always prone to change," (4.569-70), is particularly well suited to a twenty-first century audience. By translating "femina," as "females," Bartsch evokes the often-bigoted arguments of misogynists online. Substantivizing the adjective "female," lends a particularly dehumanizing quality when it is used to describe a group of women, and is commonplace in internet fora, which have increasingly been relying on the aesthetic of Ancient Greece and Rome to further many of their bigoted views (on this, see Zuckerberg 2018). With this reference Bartsch's innovation is to emphasize the purposefulness of Mercury's misogyny. The God is making a desperate plea to drive Aeneas back to his mission. arguing that women are incapable of reason, Mercury reframes Aeneas as the only logical actor, and his colonizing mission as the only rational choice.

ARMA VIRUMQUE CANO: Virgil and the Meta-Narrative

In her introductory notes, Bartsch asserts that "...the *Aeneid* is in many ways a story about stories," (Bartsch XXIV). In this respect, it is useful to remember Jean-François Lyotard's concept of "meta-narrative," which looks critically at the purpose of a story and the dynamics of power lurking beneath the surface (Lyotard 1979). Lyotard argued that modern society had fallen victim to an overreliance on grand narratives, such as the promise of progress or enlightenment. He promoted approaching these narratives with "incredulity," which is not unlike the fundamental skepticism towards grand narratives prominent in the *Aeneid* and much recent scholarship on it (Barchiesi 2001, Zanker 1988, Kyriakidis 1998, Gasti 2010). In Bartsch's translation, incredulity towards the narrative of "national" myths is exemplified by her treatment of the many instances of ekphrasis.

Ekphrasis was itself a remarkably avant-garde ancient literary practice which came out of the efflorescence of scholarship in Alexandria during Ptolemaic rule. Evoking the idea of stories within stories, ekphrasis in Virgil's *Aeneid* often force the protagonists to confront stories about their own exploits. In book one, Virgil depicts Aeneas and his men glued to detailed scenes of the destruction of Troy painted on the walls of Dido's nascent kingdom: "This fame will bring some safety / He spoke and fed his soul on empty images, / sighing heavily, Tears streamed down his face," (1.463-5). Observing a depiction of the very recent story of Troy's defeat has a heavy emotional impact on Aeneas, but he also recognizes that these depictions are vital for keeping at least the memory of Troy alive. In experiencing a piece of art (wall painting) by way of another piece of art (epic poem) creates a fractal effect. Overlapping layers of interpretation evoke the postmodern by reminding the reader of the underlying constructs of the story. Bartsch's rich descriptions make this complex storytelling come to life on the page, and still leaves room for deeper thinking.

Conclusion

Bartsch's *Aeneid* is strongest in its self-professed ambition to be a text which is good to "think with," (XV). Bartsch's interpretation is appropriately shaped by modern sympathies and global awareness, yet she still elucidated the many ways the messaging of the *Aeneid* could espouse and perpetuate the valorization of violent imperial expansion. Evaluated as an English poem, it is fast-paced and stylish and accessible to a modern reader with any level of background knowledge in Classics.

Neha Rahman
Toronto, ON, Canada
neharahman@outlook.com

Works Cited

- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2001. *Speaking Volumes. Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, ed. & transl. by Matt Fox & Simone Marchesi. London: Duckworth.
- Bartsch, Shadi. 2021. *The Aeneid*. New York: Penguin Random House.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca and New York.
- Dryden, John. 1909. *Virgil's Aeneid, with Introduction and Notes*. New York: P.F. Collier and Son.
- Fagles, Robert and Bernard Knox. 2006. *The Aeneid*. New York: Viking.
- Gasti, Helen. 2010. "Narrative self-consciousness in Virgil's *Aeneid* 3" in *Dictynna* vol. 7. <https://doi.org/10.4000/dictynna.348>
- Harrison, S.J. 1990. "Some Views of the Aeneid in the Twentieth Century." Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid. Ed. S.J. Harrison. United States: Oxford University Press.
- Knight, W. F. Jackson. 1958. *The Aeneid*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Liotard, Jean-François & transl. By Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Martindale, Charles. 1997. "The Classic of all Europe." in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Ed. Charles Martindale. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- McCrorie, Edward. 1995. *The Aeneid*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Nelis, Jan. 2007. "Constructing Fascist Identity: Benito Mussolini and the Myth of Romanitas." *The Classical World* 100: 391-415. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2007.0069>
- Parry, Adam. 1963. "The Two Voices of Virgil's '*Aeneid*'." *Arion* 2: 66-80.
- Pitt, Christopher. 1778. *The works of Virgil, in Latin & English. The Aeneid tr. by the Rev. Mr. Christopher Pitt*. London: J. Dodsley.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Press.
- Squire, Michael. 2015. "ekphrasis." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.2365>
- Stanyhurst, Richard. 1582. *The First Foure Bookes of Virgils Æneis, Translated into English Heroicall Verse, by Richard Stanyhurst: with Other poetickl Deuises Thereto Annexed*. At London: Imprinted by Henrie Bynneman dwelling in Thames streate neare vnto Baynardes Castell.
- Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Vance, Norman. 2011. "Anxieties of Empire and the Moral Tradition: Rome and Britain." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 18: 246-61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12138-011-0250-7>
- Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.12362>
- Zetzel, James. 2017. "The 'Harvard School': A Historical Note by an Alumnus." *Classical World*. 111: 125-128. <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2017.0086>
- Zuckerberg, Donna. 2018. *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and Misogyny in the Digital Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674989801>

Brian P. Sowers, *In Her Own Words: The Life and Poetry of Aelia Eudocia*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2020. Pp. 224. Paper (ISBN 978-0-674-98737-1) \$24.95.

A female writer of the fifth century CE, the empress Aelia Eudocia stands as one of the preeminent authors of the Late Antique Greek world. Not only is she of great interest to historians as an important political figure, but to philologists as well. She is known for her poetry in the epic genre, her most famous works being in the styles of paraphrasis and cento, which seek to elevate the content of Christian stories to classical epic proportions. Most philological analyses of the recent decades, including editions, commentaries, and monographs on her *Homerocentones* and the *Martyrdom of Cyprian*, have focused on in-depth examinations of one particular work within the literary corpus of this intriguing figure (see for example the many works by Bevegni, Schembra, and Usher). Sowers' recent contribution is also of a philological nature, but it takes an entirely different approach from previous studies. In his own words, Sowers' objective is "to recover the literary Eudocia" (p. 2). His book successfully investigates the self-image that Eudocia presented throughout her works, which complements well the portrait that has thus far been reconstructed on the basis of historical evidence.

In order to present a well-rounded account of Eudocia's literary identity, Sowers discusses select passages from each of her extant works: what little remains of her speech in Antioch, the honorific poem at Hammat Gader, the Homeric Cento, and the *Martyrdom of Cyprian*. The lattermost receives a treatment in two separate chapters dedicated to each of the two extant books, entitled the *Conversion* and the *Confession*. The book also helpfully includes the first complete English translation of the entire *Martyrdom of Cyprian* as an appendix. After a brief introductory chapter that outlines the overarching arguments of the book, the first chapter introduces Eudocia as a "Homeric benefactress" by focusing on Eudocia's speech at Antioch as well as on the poem at Hammat Gader. With the term "Homeric *euergetes*," Sowers is referring to Eudocia's imperial projects that included local socio-economic initiatives, such as building and alimentary programs, which she framed in a Homeric, literary context. For example, Eudocia's economic support to the city of Antioch, which included the construction of a basilica, was accompanied by a speech that adapts a Homeric line from the Iliad featuring Diomedes and Glaukos in battle. The famous scene depicts the two Homeric heroes refusing to fight on the basis of a preexisting relationship of *xenia* between their two families. By creating a parallel between the heroes' relationship and her relationship with the city of Antioch, Sowers argues that Eudocia lends greater authority to the latter, while also displaying her erudition.

Despite the author's earlier statement that he would only mention historical details when necessary to support his philological analysis, this first chapter still describes Eudocia's early life, marriage, travels, and finally her exile in the Holy Land and the events leading up to it in quite some detail. Scholars unfamiliar with her biography will find in this chapter a clear and well-written summary of the most important events of her life as well as an abundance of footnotes that provide suggestions for further reading. The true highlight of the chapter, though, lies in the analysis of the inscription itself for which Sowers has provided his own translation. The poem's close reading clearly and convincingly reveals Eudocia's use of Homeric word-choice and imagery to further her *euergetistic* agenda.

In chapter two, the focus shifts to her Homeric Cento, a patchwork poem that uses Homeric verses or half-verses word-for-word to recount the stories of the bible. The chapter deals briefly with preceding centonic traditions, including those in Latin from authors such as Ausonius and Proba, the introductory preface of Eudocia's cento, and finally, a passage from the cento itself. As in chapter 1, the close-reading analysis of the text itself, and especially the preface, is particularly convincing. The comparisons with Ausonius and Proba provide a fruitful point of reference and could perhaps even be investigated in greater detail. Eudocia, being a female cento author, has been compared before to the Latin female cento author, Proba, but the comparison with Ausonius is more novel and represents a most welcome innovation. Furthermore, by focusing on Eudocia's introductory passage as a site for her own self-presentation as an editor and critic of her predecessor Patricius, Sowers sketches an interesting image of her poetic circle, which is characterized by mutual exchange and literary critique.

The second half of this chapter analyzes the story of the Samaritan woman at the well, a biblical story found in John 4. Sowers argues that through Eudocia's interventions in the biblical text, namely by removing characters and elements specific to first-century sociohistorical realities (such as Samaritan-Jewish references), and by introducing epic-style ring-composition in Jesus' conversation, she updates the biblical moral of the story to reflect fifth-century sensibilities with regards to the female gender and conversion; the convert not only believes in Jesus but also returns to convert others to Christianity. Finally, through intertextual allusions to Nausicaa and Penelope, the character of the Samaritan woman is granted epic status. Though the literary analysis itself is detailed and well-thought-out, it would have been easier for the reader to follow the analysis if the Greek text and/or an English translation of the passage had been provided. Furthermore, since the beginning of the chapter makes the important point that Eudocia's relationship to the text is closer to that of an editor as she reworks an already existing cento, the discussion of the passage in the second half of the chapter would have benefitted from reintroducing Patricius into the conversation rather than implying that Eudocia was the sole author. This point notwithstanding, the chapter is very useful in providing new approaches to the cento genre in that it introduces Latin authors such as Ausonius and Proba as points of reference for close-reading of the texts, and in explaining some of Eudocia's theological aims in her cento.

The third and fourth chapter respectively deal with the first and second book of Eudocia's *Martyrdom of Cyprian*. Eudocia was inspired by the fourth-century legend of Saint Cyprian which recounts the story of an Antiochene, pagan magician, who attempts to seduce the young Christian Justina, fails, and subsequently converts to Christianity. The first chapter introduces the story of Justina primarily, and then goes on to discuss intertextual relations between Eudocia's narrative and other Christian prose fictions, such as the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (*APT*). The chapter also engages with Victor Turner's theory of social drama (see e.g. Turner 1981) for which Turner proposes four stages, namely breach, crisis, redress, and reintegration. This theory, as explained by Sowers, has already been applied to Medieval hagiographies by scholars such as Bynum (1991), who argues that this theory, though useful for male-authored stories, does not apply well to female-authored stories. Sowers builds upon her work by discussing how we have to nuance Turner's theory when adapting it to a story like Justina's which was written by a woman. Sowers argues that Eudocia disrupts social drama theory by presenting Justina as a new type of feminine ideal that does not go against patriarchal authority but also as someone who represents, in her own way, female agency. Indeed, Justina, unlike the heroine of the *APT*, does not adopt traditionally male characteristics nor engage in socially transgressive actions. Eudocia's main character, however, adheres to more feminine social expectations, but is still able to defeat the demons she encounters. The book's engagement with these theoretical concepts offers a new perspective on Justina's representation. The fourth chapter, on the other hand, focuses more on Cyprian himself. In parallel to the third, the author investigates intertextual connections to other pagan itinerant magicians and argues that Eudocia's version presents Cyprian as surpassing the previous literary models. These chapters represent a slight shift from the previous sections of the book, which consist of close-reading analyses of shorter passages of text. In this way, I believe, they could be of particular interest to scholars in women and gender studies and to those investigating Christian attitudes towards and portrayals of Late Antique paganism and ritual.

As a monograph investigating Eudocia's self-portrayal as seen through her works, this book succeeds in establishing a multi-faceted and nuanced image of the author. The book represents an indispensable addition to the corpus of scholarship on this topic as it combines her many literary endeavors and offers a novel perspective from which specialists may better understand this complex figures of late antique literature. Sowers' modern and accessible translation in the appendix of the book also broadens the potential audience for Eudocia's work; one could easily imagine using this translation in a higher-education

classroom setting. That having been said, the analysis itself does appear to tend towards a specialist audience in that it presupposes familiarity with many late antique phenomena and literary and theological concepts, such as paraphrase and monophysitism. As the introduction itself states, the book is primarily intended for an audience of “classicists, experts in late antique poetry, and colleagues in women and gender studies” (p. 2). Members of this audience will find in this book a most notable and thought-provoking contribution to a quickly expanding scholarly field.

Hannelore Segers
Harvard University
hmsegers@g.harvard.edu

Works Cited

- Bevegni, Claudio. 2006. “Il *De Sancto Cypriano* dell’imperatrice Eudocia: questioni aperte.” *Koinonia* 30: 155–68.
- Bynum, Caroline W. 1991. “Women’s Stories, Women’s Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner’s Theory of Liminality.” In *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*, 27–51. New York: Zone Books.
- Schembra, Rocco. 2006. *La prima redazione dei centoni omerici: Traduzione e commento*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Turner, Victor. 1981. “Social Dramas and Stories About Them.” In *On Narrative*, edited by William J. T. Mitchell, 137–64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Usher, Mark D. 1998. *Homeric Stitchings: The Homeric Centos of the Empress Eudocia*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

S·U·B·U·R·A·N·I

BOOKS 1 AND 2 NOW WIDELY ADOPTED ...

BOOK 3 IN DEVELOPMENT!

A new transitional reader for students moving from Latin II into reading authentic literature.



Textbook (paperback) \$55

Textbook (hardback) \$75

Digital starter pack \$40

approx. \$4 per student per year.

APPLY FOR A CANE GRANT!

You can apply for a grant from the Classical Association of New England to buy *Suburani* textbooks or online accounts to try in your classroom.

Apply now at caneweb.org

“ The experience I am having with *Suburani* is unlike any I have experienced in 30+ years of teaching. I have been able to use most texts successfully, but no text has really "connected" with and energized my students as much as *Suburani* has. ”

US High School teacher

Go to suburani.com to find out more.

ORDER A FREE DESK COPY NOW



2023 National Latin Exam

- More than 100,000 registered students in 2022
- 40 question multiple choice exam
- Grammar, reading comprehension, mythology, derivatives, literature, Roman life, history & oral Latin
- Gold and silver medals
- Opportunities for Scholarships
- \$6 per US student, \$8 per foreign student, \$10 minimum order
- N.B. \$15 shipping fee for school; \$30 shipping fee for residential. For orders outside North America: ONLINE exams strongly encouraged; if not possible, contact office for shipping.
- Deadline for registration: January 23, 2023

For Registration and Information:

National Latin Exam
University of Mary Washington, 1301 College Avenue
Fredericksburg, VA 22401

website: www.nle.org

email: nle@umw.edu

National Latin Exam-since 1977

Sponsored by The American Classical League/National Junior Classical League

