

H U M A N I T A S

Vol. 33

Winter 2010

Issue 2

A New Editor is Coming!

I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Judith de Luce of Miami University of Ohio for agreeing to serve as the new editor of *Humanitas*. Together with Shannon Byrne and Pam Rose at Xavier, who handle mailing, and Jeff Kolo, who posts it on the website, Judith will help to ensure that *Humanitas* continues to arrive into your mailbox and onto your computer screen. (And the computers of people around the world! We recently received a query from someone whose Wikipedia article on lemurs includes a link to an archived *Humanitas* piece by Jarrod Lux on the *Lemuria*.)

Stay tuned for new developments in the format and content of *Humanitas*. Thanks to those of you who have completed the survey about *Humanitas*. The feedback gained through that survey will help us to determine the future direction of this publication.

Meanwhile, this issue contains two articles that I believe exemplify the connection between the world of scholarship and the work we do in the classroom. First, Bruce Heiden explains how his approach to the structure of the *Iliad* can help us and our students get a handle on the epic. Second, Brian Harvey shows us how to bring the Romans alive by incorporating inscriptions into our language and civilization courses.

While Judith and others continue to discuss how *Humanitas* can best serve its audience, we need

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Highlights of the 2009 OCC Meeting | 2 |
| Getting Oriented in the <i>Iliad</i> <i>Bruce Heiden, The Ohio State University</i> | 3 |
| Resources Available from CAMWS | 8 |
| The Use of Latin Inscriptions in the Modern Classroom <i>Brian K. Harvey, Kent State University</i> | 9 |
| OCC Officers and Council | 15 |



your submissions! Items (articles, advertisements, news) for inclusion in the spring issue should be sent by April 1 to:

Judith de Luce
Humanitas Editor
Department of Classics
102 Irvin Hall
Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056
delucej@muohio.edu

Thank you for allowing me to serve the OCC for these past couple of years!

Gwen Compton-Engle, Departing Editor

Highlights from the 2009 OCC Meeting in Cleveland

Many thanks to outgoing president Jeff Kolo of Medina High School for organizing a wonderful 2009 meeting in Cleveland. A smooth-running conference is the result of months of behind-the-scenes work. Thanks, Jeff!

The OCC would especially like to thank this year's Vergilian Society Luncheon speaker, Timothy Wutrich of Case Western Reserve University. His lecture, "Dido and Aeneas in the Renaissance and Baroque Periods: Observations on Reception of Vergil's *Aeneid*," offered fascinating insights on the reception of Vergil's poetry throughout the ages. All of those in attendance also greatly enjoyed the lecture given by the OCC banquet speaker, Michael Bennett. Dr. Bennett, who is the Curator of Greek and Roman Art at the Cleveland Museum of Art, addressed the topic, "The Cleveland Apollo and the Celebrity of Praxiteles." Dr. Bennett described the work that has been done and continues to be done on the Apollo Sauroktonos statue recently

acquired by the Cleveland Museum of Art. Keep your eyes out for a symposium on the Apollo statue in Cleveland this summer.

We look forward to seeing everyone at the next meeting of the Ohio Classical Conference, in Columbus on October 15-16, 2010. For more information about next year's meeting, contact OCC President Bruce Heiden: heiden.1@osu.edu.

Getting Oriented in the *Iliad*

▪ Bruce Heiden, *The Ohio State University*
heiden.1@osu.edu

I first read the *Iliad* in the Richmond Lattimore translation the summer between graduating high school and starting college, because the college I was entering had informed me that all freshmen would be taking a test on the *Iliad* during the orientation week as part of a required literature course. The college certainly got my attention. I can remember having at least one discussion with a new friend about how many times we had read the *Iliad* to prepare for this intimidating test that awaited us. I know I read it more than once; and while certain features of the poem, such as the graphic descriptions of wounding and death, made a deep and lasting impression on me, I recall feeling quite confused about who was killing whom and what difference it made to the story line. (I don't remember what I got on the test, but at least I wasn't kicked out.)

You don't have to be stupid to feel confused in the *Iliad*. By now I've taught the *Iliad* to countless classes at Ohio State, and I've learned to expect the glazed look I see when I refer (for example) to Achilles sending Patroklos to Nestor for information about the battle, or Poseidon rallying the Greeks while Zeus is distracted. My students find it very hard to pick out and remember narrative threads and crises amidst all the battling. And it's not just students. English professors of my acquaintance have occasionally

confessed to me that they have never read the *Iliad* all the way through. Obviously, they could "put it down"; which is a little distressing since Homer is renowned as a "master storyteller". Was Homer *not* a master storyteller? Or if he was, how can we help our students better comprehend and enjoy the unfolding story? How can we comprehend it better ourselves?

Professional Homeric scholarship, voluminous as it is, is hardly any help in understanding Homeric storytelling, because for centuries the orthodox view of scholarship has been that the *Iliad* doesn't *have* the features of coherence that readers of literary narratives expect; and readers shouldn't be disappointed because, appearances notwithstanding, the *Iliad* isn't really a book anyway. As far back as the middle 17th century progressive thinkers claimed that the *Iliad* was not even really a poem, but only a sloppy pastiche of fragments from different poems.¹ By the late 18th century this disdain had merged with the dubious idea that writing must have been nonexistent in Homer's time, and the union—via the midwifery of F.A. Wolf's famous *Prolegomena ad Homerum* of 1795—engendered the disciplinary dogma that the authentic Homeric poems were not the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* but orally composed predecessors that philology could try to reconstruct *from* the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. For scholarship

the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* became in effect a kind of archeological site; the epics were excavated rather than understood. The idea that the real Homeric poetry was extemporaneously composed by traditional folk balladeers—traceable back to the early 18th century²—in the 20th generated the now-mainstream discipline devoted to reconstructing the formulas, themes, and social dynamics of the traditional oral medium. It created an object of research that is called “Homeric poetry”, but misleadingly, because it is not the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This philological discipline investigates a poetic language rather than particular poems composed *in* a language.

As a result of the disciplinary prestidigitation that substituted “Homeric poetry” for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, those two great epics have received less study than even Homeric scholars may realize, because the agenda of professionally researchable topics usually excludes or marginalizes the features of the poems that are resistant to the oral-linguistic paradigm. Examples of such features are the familiar written format itself; the fixity of the standard enumerated sequence of verses; and paratextual features such as the transmitted articulation of the *Iliad* into chapter-like “books”. When Homeric scholars examine Homeric verse-types or scene-types they may *seem* to be studying the *Iliad*, but these objects of study are not the *Iliad* because they lack the unique fixed arrangement. To give an elementary illustration, from reading Homeric scholarship one might easily get the impression that there are many repeated verses in the *Iliad*. But this is an illusion; each verse is distinguished from every other, including

those with the exact same words, by a property that escapes linguistic analysis because it is non-verbal: the verse’s unique position in the sequence. This is a difference between (a) a language that exists as a capacity a speaker may draw upon to make utterances, and (b) an actual utterance such as a work of literature. The confusion exacts a price when a scholar like John Miles Foley propounds a theory of “traditional referentiality” whereby a given “Homeric” phrase supposedly carried with it a body of associations that recurred in full to the comprehension of a competent traditional audience every time the phrase was repeated.³ But repeatable phrases with repeatable meanings do not exist; Foley has imagined them. *Patterns* of sound and phrasing may be drawn upon repeatedly; but when the patterns are instantiated in the composition of an actual text like the *Iliad* the verses they yield are all unique, if for no other reason than because each has a unique position relative to the others.

The point of this brief critique of professional Homeric scholarship is simply to emphasize that the pedagogical issue of comprehending the story of the *Iliad* has implications not only for us as teachers, but also for the discipline of Homeric scholarship that has taken so much of its form precisely by rationalizing its neglect of the problem of reading the *Iliad*. I’m not the first scholar to suggest that much modern Homeric scholarship is actually an obstacle to study of the *Iliad*. It’s a maverick position, to be sure, but it’s always been around, and one of the more outspoken mavericks was Adam Parry, whose Introduction to his father’s collected works offers a surprisingly

sour evaluation of their influence.⁴ As a Homeric maverick myself I have tried to investigate some of the problems of comprehension I mentioned earlier. My research found that the composition of the *Iliad*, massive, complicated, and apparently drifting as it is, does offer a comprehensive system of dramatic trajectories and thematic relationships, as well as certain means of orienting attention to the system so that its configuration can be kept in sight and mastered well enough to facilitate a directed search for meaning. In other words, the poem has a map-like design, and once you've seen it, you can recognize and hold many details and developments in your head. As Aristotle said of a well-formed *muthos*, all the parts can be seen in relationship simultaneously (*Poetics* 1451a).

I began this research about fifteen years ago, when the Cambridge commentary on the *Iliad* had just recently been completed. In using the commentary to prepare a graduate seminar on Homer for my students at Ohio State I realized very vividly how much room Homeric research had left for investigation of fixed textual relationships longer than brief ensembles of verses like arming scenes and similes. For example there was very little to be found on how dramatic dialogue scenes progressed, what logic, if any, governed the transmitted chapter-like articulation into "books", or whether the epic's story had any overall coherence that scholars had missed. So in organizing the seminar I created study units for these and a few other topics. Since I wanted to get away from the familiar tendency to start with small ensembles and build up, I started instead with the biggest hypothetical ensembles

that the scholarly literature had considered. A handful of scholars, some of them very renowned (although mavericks with respect to mainstream Homeric research), had occasionally suggested that the *Iliad* was structured in three so-called "movements" with definite beginnings and ends, and separated in performance by intermissions.⁵ Two new proposals of this sort, by Oliver Taplin and Keith Stanley, had appeared in the early '90s.⁶ When I brought all the scholarship on the "three movements" proposals together—it wasn't much—I noticed that there was little agreement about where the intermissions should go, and that each proposal was based upon a different rationale. Taplin, for example, proposed that a reciter of the *Iliad* would quit for the night when he reached the points in the story where the sun set and the warriors quit fighting for the day. But Taplin never mentioned the alternative rationales or weighed his against them; and his rivals were just as unmethodical.

Looking over these proposals I felt they were all intuitively unsatisfactory—the reasons seemed mechanical, and the intermissions seemed ill-placed, to my taste. Nobody would have blamed me if like the majority of Homeric scholars I had just waved off the whole question because the specialists working on it hadn't convinced me. But instead, I interrogated myself about what inchoate standard of analysis I was applying to these fellow-researchers, and therefore what kind of analysis might convince me, if it could be done. In comparing the various proposals to one another I had also casually thought over other segmented narratives like plays and old movie serials—still screened at theater matinees

when I was a kid—and I realized that intermissions sometimes functioned orientationally, marking points of emphasis that cued attention to important themes or dramatic crises. None of the existing proposals for segmenting the *Iliad* was based upon a rationale of this sort; none even mentioned its possibility. So I decided to conduct an experiment. I would frame a hypothesis about specific functions of intermissions, and then seek passages in the *Iliad* that might fulfill those functions, if intermissions occurred there. Of course this experiment could not answer the historical question of whether the *Iliad* was ever performed with planned intermissions anywhere, but it might elicit information about whether or how the *Iliad* could have furnished orientation.

Realizing that an intermission marks the end of one performance segment and the beginning of another, I also realized that what I was actually seeking were sets of suitable beginnings and endings, and that they had to be of equal number and coordinated, or they would undermine the function of orientation (i.e., they would cause confusion). I then noted that the suitable locations were not all unknowns, since we already knew where the whole *Iliad* begins and where it ends. Therefore I postulated that the unknown beginnings might be analogous to the known beginning, and the unknown ends might be analogous to the known end. What kinds of analogies would matter for purposes of orientation? In the case of the known *Iliad*-beginning (book one), it seemed pretty clear that the episode foregrounds a highly consequential decision in the epic's plot trajectory, since it narrates how Achilles withdrew from the battle and ob-

tained Zeus' agreement to punish the Greeks. Positing Achilles' decision as the salient functional characteristic of a typical *Iliad*-beginning, I looked for other episodes with that characteristic, and I found two: book 9, where Achilles refuses the appeal of Agamemnon's envoys, and book 16, where Achilles permits Patroklos to replace him in the battle. Turning to the known *Iliad*-ending (book 24), I found that it too narrates a highly consequential decision in Zeus' proposal that Achilles should return Hektor's body to Priam in exchange for ransom. Positing Zeus' decisive intervention as the salient functional characteristic of an *Iliad*-end, I found two other books that shared it: book 8, in which Zeus forbids divine interference on the battlefield but reveals part of his plan to Hera, and book 15, in which Zeus again forbids interference and reveals more of his plan to Hera.

The hypothetical principle of analogy therefore yielded three suitable beginnings, books 1, 9, and 16, and three suitable endings, books 8, 15, and 24. These sets were identical in number and exactly coordinated, yielding three non-overlapping hypothetical movements, (I) 1 through 8, (II) 9 through 15, and (III) 16 through 24. I had in essence imagined the *Iliad* as a sort of three-night miniseries that started (as it were) at 8 pm on Monday with an episode focused on Achilles' plan, and ended at 11 pm with an episode focused on Zeus' plan; started again at 8 pm Tuesday with book 9, again an episode focused on Achilles' plan, and ended at 11 pm with an episode focused on Zeus' plan; started its "series finale" at 8 pm Wednesday with book 16, an episode focused on Achilles' plan, and ended at 11 pm

with book 24, focused on Zeus' plan. This segmentation was there in what the text provided.

What my little experiment had found was actually better than what I was looking for. First of all, I had a new proposal for articulating the *Iliad*—nobody had ever proposed exactly this segmentation before—and unlike the other proposals the new one at least had a defensible functional rationale. Moreover, the very powerful analogies among books 8, 15, and 24, the Zeus-decision books, had also gone unnoticed, even by scholars like Cedric Whitman and Keith Stanley who had labored to demonstrate analogies that were much less significant to the epic than these.⁷ Homeric scholarship had largely downplayed the role of Zeus in favor of the mortal heroes Achilles and Hektor. Cued by the passages about Zeus' plan in books 8, 15, and 24, I subsequently did an analysis of the whole progression of events in the *Iliad*, and I found that all the trajectories arise from the central agency of Zeus in deciding how to fulfill Achilles' request. This central agency is the feature of the plot which readers must keep in sight if they are not to become confused. But how are they to do it? Much of the time the poet wraps Zeus' agency in cloud: in the epic's twenty-four book length it emerges into the narrative foreground in only three, books 8, 15, and 24, and secondarily in three more, books 1, 9, and 16 (where Achilles' decisions presume Zeus' cooperation). Six books out of twenty-four, and none but the first introduced by a special rhetorical fanfare that evokes an overarching trajectory. No wonder readers have gotten lost.

But it just so happens that if we were

to insert a kind of punctuation-mark between books 8 and 9, and another marker between books 15 and 16—the hypothetical intermissions—then without needing to change a single word we would have made those six books—and only those six—stand out from all the rest. So that's the way I structure reading assignments in the *Iliad* for my classes, and I point out the parallelisms of Achilles-decisions and Zeus-decisions.

Following up this discovery I also found that each of the three articulations has an internal trajectory, so that a reader who is aware of the movement within each articulation from the Achilles book to the Zeus book has orientation within a horizon of about eight books. The *Iliad* loses the appearance of a loose, baggy monster as the punctuation marks facilitate comprehension of the epic's meaningful mega-phrasing.

The premises of this research, the data, and a series of analyses and interpretations are available in my recently published book about the *Iliad*, *Homer's Cosmic Fabrication* (see note 5). I hope that teachers of the *Iliad* at all levels will find it an aid to appreciation and instruction as they guide new readers into Homer's enduring poem.

¹ For an accessible account of 17th and 18th century thought about Homer, see Kirsti Simonsuuri, *Homer's Original Genius* (Cambridge 1979).

² See Luigi Ferreri, *La questione omerica dal cinquecento al settecento* (Rome 2007) 241-246.

³ John Miles Foley, *Homer's Traditional Art*

(Penn State, 1998).

⁴ Adam Parry, ed., *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford 1971).

⁵ The following discussion summarizes passages from the introduction to Bruce Heiden, *Homer's Cosmic Fabrication: Choice*

and Design in the Iliad (Oxford 2008).

⁶ Oliver Taplin, *Homeric Soundings* (Oxford 1992); Keith Stanley, *The Shield of Homer* (Princeton 1993).

⁷ Cedric Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Harvard 1958).

Resources Available from the CAMWS Committee for the Promotion of Latin

Want to do more with your Latin classes but don't have the funds? Fear that your program is in danger of elimination? Looking for some recognition of your students' accomplishments? One valuable source of funds and materials is the Classical Association of the Middle West and South's Committee for the Promotion of Latin (CPL).

Resources available on the CPL website (<http://www.camws.org/cpl/index.html>):

- **Caristia Grants** for field trips, speakers, events, or convention travel
- **Freely downloadable promotional materials** suitable for distribution to administrators, parents, and students (fliers, posters, speeches on the value of Latin; statistics on SAT scores, etc.)
- **Emergency resources for programs in crisis:** contact information for letter-writing campaigns, strategies for dealing with potential program closure, etc.
- **Translation contests** for your students
- **Awards** for best promotional activities
- **Award for Secondary School Teaching** (through CAMWS proper, not CPL)

Consider applying for any of these, or nominate a colleague!

For further information, contact any of the CAMWS officers for this region:
 Regional Vice President, Ohio Valley: Gwen Compton-Engle, John Carroll University
 State Vice President, **Ohio**: Zara Torlone, Miami University
 State Vice President, **West Virginia**: E. Del Chrol, Marshall University
 State Vice President, **Kentucky**: Jarrod Lux, Conner High School

The Use of Latin Inscriptions in the Modern Classroom

▪ *Brian K. Harvey, Kent State University*
bkharvey@kent.edu

Epigraphy is the study of inscriptions, written texts that have been preserved on some kind of durable material such as stone or metal. A large number of inscriptions have been preserved from the Roman world. Some of these are documentary texts that preserve copies of official enactments; others, most notably inscriptions on tombstones, were written by individuals and are of a much more personal nature. Because a large proportion of Roman society was commemorated after death with a funerary inscription, these are by far the most common type of inscription to be preserved.

Epigraphy is particularly useful for revealing the lives of Romans of a wide range of social statuses (more so than other textual sources). The following tombstone from Rome commemorates a freedman auctioneer:

Rogat ut resistas hospes te hic tacitus
 lapis dum ostendit quod mandavit
 quouis umbram tegit pudentis hominis
 frugi sum magna fide praeconis
 Oli Grani sunt ossa heic sita tantum
 est hoc voluit nescius ne esse vale.
 A(ulus) Granius M(arci) l(ibertus)
 Stabilio praecox. (*CIL* 1².1210)

This silent stone, friend, asks that you stop while it reveals to you what he whose shade it covers entrusted it to

show. Here rest the bones of a modest and frugal man, of the greatest trustworthiness, an auctioneer, Aulus Granius. That is all there is. He wished that you not be ignorant of his existence. Goodbye. Aulus Granius Stabillis, freedman of Marcus, auctioneer.

This inscription tells us the name of the deceased, his profession, some of his virtues, and the length of his life. On average, the Romans did not live very long. The average life expectancy was only 25-30 years. Perhaps as a result of their relatively short lives, Roman families often allocated a great deal of their monetary resources to erecting such commemorative monuments. Granius' tombstone, in fact, directly addresses the reader and asks him to evoke the memory of the deceased. In my experience, it is such personal texts as these to which students are drawn more than any other primary source.

Of course, like all ancient artifacts and texts, Roman inscriptions must be examined within their specific cultural context. The text itself is often very detailed and can be highly abbreviated. Decoding the texts, therefore, can be difficult without outside help. It is this aspect of epigraphy that most often prevents instructors from using inscriptions in the classroom. The following inscription on a marble funerary urn from Rome commemorates a soldier in the emperor's

cavalry bodyguard, the *Equites Singulares*.

Aurel(io) Victori eq(uiti) sing(ulari)
tur(ma) Costantini nat(ione) Dacus
allect(us) ex ala I Illyricor(um) vix(it)
an(nos) XXXIII mil(itavit) an(nos)
XIII Ulpus Macedo et Ulp(ius) Ma-
ternus dupl(icarii) hered(es). (*CIL*
6.3234b)

To Aurelius Victor, *eques singularis* in the contingent of Constantine, Dacian by nationality, enlisted out of the 1st Illyrian auxiliary cavalry regiment; he lived 33 years, and served in the military 13 years; his heirs Ulpus Macedo and Ulpus Maternus, junior officers at double pay grade, put this up.

Terms such as *eques singularis*, *turma*, *ala*, and *duplicarius* are words that are not often seen in the elementary texts our students generally read. Understanding these terms, however, is vital to achieving a complete understanding of the life of this person and reflects the organization and command structure of the *equites singulares* as well as the cavalry auxiliary forces in the provinces. In fact, there are many secondary sources in which one can find relevant information for understanding ancient inscriptions such as this one, some of which are listed in the bibliography.

It is clear that ancient Latin inscriptions can and should have a place in an upper division Classics curriculum aimed at majors, but what about at the lower levels or in high school? We are told that the modern classroom should be a learner-centered environment in which students

learn actively through engagement, interaction, and discovery. Achieving such an environment can be especially difficult in general education courses where large enrollments and non-majors are the norm rather than the exception. At Kent State University, I teach the Roman Achievement course, a kind of Roman civilization class that aims to introduce students to not only the history and literature of the ancient Romans but also their material culture and the people themselves. Because this course fulfills a general diversity requirement, each semester it enrolls 60 to 80 students (primarily non-majors). In order to better engage the students, I include many funerary epitaphs translated into English that record the lives of everyday Romans.

Unlike the literary sources written almost exclusively by aristocratic Roman men, funerary epitaphs document the lives of a very wide range of people: senators, equestrians, soldiers, the urban and rural poor; free, freed and slave; tenant farmers and merchants; gladiators and craftsmen; men and women. Students are drawn to such texts frequently because inscriptions allow them a glimpse of the lives of diverse individuals and encourage the students to draw modern comparisons. One of my favorite inscriptions to show the students early in the semester is one that, in addition to the written inscription, includes a full-body relief sculpture of a girl in a tunic holding her hands up in the air. All ten of her fingers are clearly visible. The text is a fairly typical one:

D(is) M(anibus) Laberiae Auxime
quae vix(it) an(nos) X m(enses) VI
d(ies) XII L(ucius) Laberius Hermes
fecit pater. (*CIL* 6.38527a)

To the Spirits of the Dead; to Labe-
ria Auxime, who lived 10 years, 6
months, 12 days; Lucius Laberius
Hermes, her father, made this.

This text is especially interesting because it incorporates visual and textual elements on a single stone. I ask the students what they believe the girl in the relief sculpture is doing. Typical responses include “dancing,” “praying,” “pleading,” and the like. As they consider the possibilities, I ask them what a person would often ask a child whom they didn’t know. The students then quickly respond, “How old are you?” as they realize that the girl is showing with her hands how old she is (10 years old). By recognizing the girl’s pose, the students see the connection between themselves and this ancient child.

By commemorating the lives of ancient people, funerary inscriptions can tell us much about Roman society. The following inscription commemorates a young woman who was married to a slave in the imperial household.

D(is) M(anibus) Urbicae suae fe-
cit Olympus Matidiae Aug(ustae)
f(iliae) ser(vus) cum qua vix(it) anno I
m(ensibus) VIII d(iebus) XXII h(oris)
III quae decessit ann(or)um XIII
m(ensium) XI. (IPOstie-A, 261)

To the Spirits of the Dead; Olympus,
slave of Matidia the daughter of the
Augusta, made this for his wife Ur-
bica with whom he lived for 1 year, 8
months, 22 days, and 3 hours and died
at the age of 14 years, 11 months.

The text records not only the age of the woman at the time of her death, but also how long she was married, and in the process reveals some of the realities of Roman marriage and the lives of young women. Students are quite surprised to find out how young girls were when they were married. That surprise, however, can lead to a discussion of the short life expectancy among Romans in general and the related need for girls to begin producing children as soon as possible in their lives. Once again, students are encouraged to draw a comparison between their own lives and those of the ancient Romans.

Latin funerary inscriptions tend to be formulaic. The ways in which people described themselves and their loved ones follow the traditional virtues valued in men and women. Sometimes, however, one can find rare gems of oddity that can lead to interesting discussions in which students apply what they have already learned to the anomaly. This inscription from Ostia seems to commemorate a man who had three wives:

L(ucius) Mindius Dius fecit sibi et
Genucia Tryphaenae coniugi incom-
parabili cum qua vixit annis XXIII
mens(ibus) III et Luceiae Ianuariae
maritae et Anniae Laveriae contu-
vernali suae sanctissimae et libert(is)
libertab(usque) suis poster(is)q(ue)
eor(um) h(oc) m(onumentum)
e(xterum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur)
in fronte p(edes) XXX in agro p(edes)
XXXXI. (CIL14.5026)

Lucius Mindius Dius made this for
himself and for his incomparable wife
(*coniunx*) Genucia Tryphaena, with

whom he lived 24 years, 3 months, and for Luceia Ianuaria, his wife (*marita*), and for Annia Laveria, his most blameless concubine (*contubernalis*), as well as for their freedmen, freedwoman, and their posterity; his heirs cannot use this monument for burial purposes; the monument is 30 feet in front and 30 feet deep.

Although remarriage after death or divorce was quite common in ancient Rome, tombstones rarely mention them and instead focus on couples or individuals and avoid mentioning anything that did not fit with that traditional view of marriage. Mindius Dius, however, commemorates three women on the same stone: a *coniunx*, a *marita*, and a *contubernalis*. It is not clear if these were wives from three successive marriages, but the citizen status of all three women would seem to rule out the possibility of any being a slave concubine. *Contubernalis* was the term used to describe slave spouses who did not legally possess the rite of marriage under Roman law, but Dius may have used both *contubernalis* and *marita* simply for variety. Also, the name of the final woman, the *contubernalis* Annia Laveria, seems to be written over an earlier erasure and perhaps Dius added her name later after the stone had been erected. The ambiguity of the inscription allows for a number of hypotheses and has sparked some insightful discussion among the students.

For instructors wishing to use epigraphic material to engage students, the first step is to select appropriate inscriptions. For Latin courses, a transcription of the text of the inscription should be provided, when possible alongside a modern

photograph of it and (if one can be found) the monument to which the inscription was attached. In the case of courses taught in English, however, it is necessary to also provide translations. Only a tiny percentage of the vast number of funerary inscriptions that have survived from antiquity have been translated into English. While many commonly-used sourcebooks include funerary inscriptions, they tend to use only a few, and often the same inscriptions appear from sourcebook to sourcebook because they have been deemed more significant in some way. Funerary inscriptions, however, are generally quite easy to read, and so, with some research and practice, teachers can translate their own collections of inscriptions to give to their students.

For Latin texts, the most important collection is the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (the *CIL*). This monumental work, whose aim is to publish every inscription from the Roman world, began in the 19th century under the supervision of Theodor Mommsen. Collection and publication continues today. The massive and expensive volumes can be found in a number of libraries in Ohio. The volumes are generally arranged geographically (volume 6 is Rome). The introductory materials, notes, and indices are written completely in Latin. For those who do not have access to the *CIL* or would prefer a smaller corpus from which to choose there is Herman Dessau's *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. This is a selection created in the late 19th and early 20th centuries from what was then included in the *CIL*. The material is arranged thematically with excellent indices. The notes in the *ILS* are also in Latin. There have been reprints of the *ILS* over the years. The publisher BiblioLife recently reprinted one of the smaller volumes (the volume

including the funerary inscriptions of the lower classes) in hardcover. This printing is currently available from Amazon.com for under \$30.

One very important innovation in recent years that has made inscriptions more accessible is the creation of several online databases for Latin epigraphy. The Heidelberg and Frankfurt databases are two of the most useful. Although these databases do not give detailed editorial and findspot information, they nonetheless give an accurate text in which all of the abbreviations have been filled out. The Heidelberg database has more detailed information, emended texts and more recent inscriptions. The Frankfurt database, on the other hand, includes the majority of *CIL*. Both are excellent tools for finding Latin inscriptions. The internet URLs for these

two sites can be found in the bibliography.

I have found that the inclusion of such texts in my curriculum has made the material I teach more interesting and engaging to my students. It is easier for them to make a personal connection with antiquity. The complexity of these inscriptions requires students to be more analytical in their reading of an ancient text, and the lessons they learn from funerary inscriptions are easily applied to other forms of evidence both written and visual. In talking with former students, I have found that the epigraphic material is what makes the biggest impression upon the students and it is an aspect of the course which they tend to remember long after they have completed the course.

Remember the OCC Website:

<http://www.xavier.edu/OCC/>

- List of scholarship opportunities and contests!
- Lists of Ohio classics programs (K-12 and college)!
- Information about past and future annual meetings!
- All the OCC forms you need at your fingertips!
- Archived issues of *Humanitas* in pdf format!

Special thanks to webmaster Jeff Kolo and to Xavier University for hosting the site.

Selected Bibliography and Resources for Latin Inscriptions

Major Epigraphic Reference Works

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL).

Dessau, H., *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae (ILS)* (Berlin, 1892-1916, and repr.).

Introductory Texts and Reference Works on Inscriptions

Adkins, L and R., *Handbook to Life in Ancient Rome* (New York, 1994).

Bodel, J., ed., *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions* (London/New York, 2001).

Egbert, J., *Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions* (New York, 1923).

Gordon, A., *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1983).

Keppie, L., *Understanding Roman Inscriptions* (Baltimore, 1991).

Miller, M.C.J., *Abbreviations in Latin* (Chicago, 1998).

Sandys, J., *Latin Epigraphy*, 2nd Ed. rev. by S.G. Campbell (Cambridge, 1927).

Collections of Translated Texts (Including Inscriptions)

Campbell, B., *The Roman Army: 31 BC – AD 337: A Sourcebook* (London/New York, 1994).

Harvey, B., *Roman Lives: Ancient Roman Life as Illustrated by Latin Inscriptions* (Newbury port, 2004).

Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M., *Roman Civilization, Volume 1: the Republic and the Augustan Age*, 3rd Edition (New York, 1990).

Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M., *Roman Civilization, Volume 2: the Empire*, 3rd Edition (New York, 1990).

Maxfield, V. and Dobson, B., *Inscriptions of Roman Britain*, London Association of Classical Teachers (London, 1995).

Shelton, J. *As the Romans Did: A Sourcebook on Roman Social History* (Oxford, 1997).

Sherk, R., *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian, Translated Documents of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge, 1988).

Warmington, B. and Miller, S., *Inscriptions of the Roman Empire, AD 14-117*, London Association of Classical Teachers (London, 1996).

Links to Online Databases

<http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/sonst/adw/edh/index.html.en>

http://compute-in.ku-eichstaett.de:8888/pls/epigr/epigraphik_en

OCC Officers

President

Bruce Heiden, The Ohio State University

1st Vice President

Mary Jo Behrensmeyer, Mt. Vernon High School

2nd Vice President

Amber Scaife, Kenyon College

Secretary-Treasurer

Shannon Byrne, Xavier University

Humanitas Editor (through Winter 2010)

Gwen Compton-Engle, John Carroll University

Humanitas Editor (beginning Spring 2010)

Judith de Luce, Miami University



OCC Council

Term Ending 2010:

Dan Cavoli, Saint Edward High School

Edmund Cueva, Xavier University

Franz Gruber, The Columbus Academy

Fr. Bede Kotlinski, Benedictine High School

Benjamin Lupica, Padua Franciscan High School

Amber Scaife, Kenyon College

Term Ending 2011:

Daniel Arbezniak, St. Ignatius High School

K.C. Kless, Indian Hill High School

Nicholas Russo, St. Francis deSales High School

Emelie St. Cyr, Granville High School

Amy Sawan, Medina High School

Steven Strauss, Notre Dame Academy

Term Ending 2012:

Susan Bonvallet, The Wellington School (ret.)

Chris Bungard, Butler University

Gwen Compton-Engle, John Carroll University

Scott Keister, Minerva High School

Steven Tuck, Miami University

Timothy Wutrich, Case Western Reserve University

Scholarship Committee:

Kelly Kusch, Covington Latin School, Chair

Susan Bonvallet, The Wellington School

James Andrews, Ohio University

Hildesheim Vase Committee:

Mary Jo Behrensmeyer, Mt. Vernon High School

Susan Bonvallet, The Wellington School (ret.)

Monica Florence, College of Wooster

Steven Strauss, Notre Dame Academy

Finance Committee:

Shannon Byrne, Chair, Xavier University

Franz Gruber, The Columbus Academy

Jeff Kolo, Medina High School

Stergios Lazos, Saint Edward High School

Nominations Committee:

Amber Scaife, Kenyon College

Representative to OFLA:

Franz Gruber, The Columbus Academy

Representative to ACL:

Melissa Burgess, Indian Hill High School